

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 97 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

December 2nd, 1999

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Board reports that it held a meeting on Thursday, December 2nd, 1999 at 4 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. An attendance list is attached to this report. In this report, item 3 is presented for Executive Committee confirmation and the remaining items are reported for information.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

The report of the previous meeting, dated October 21st, 1999, was approved.

2. Report Number 82 of the Agenda Committee

The report was presented for information.

3. Faculty of Nursing: Constitution - Amendments

Professor Gallop explained that changes to the administrative structure of the Faculty and the introduction of new academic programs had necessitated changes to the Constitution. New committee structures were also introduced. Retroactive approval was being sought since the committees for this year had been struck in accordance with the new Constitution.

On a motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

The Faculty of Nursing Constitution, dated November 1999, effective July 1, 1999.

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper

Professor Sedra said that it was with pleasure that he brought to the Academic Board the discussion paper on enrolment expansion. It was truly a discussion paper; there were no

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

recommendations proposed and he was looking forward to hearing the views of the Board. The paper set out the pros and cons of enrolment expansion in terms of the various campuses, programs and levels of study.

He briefly outlined the process for dealing with this issue. The paper had already been discussed by the Principals and Deans, by the larger group, Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs, and by the Planning and Budget Committee. It was now before the Academic Board. The discussion paper would be published as an insert in the December 13th issue of the *Bulletin*, creating a further opportunity for input from the University community. On December 15th, the paper would also be discussed at Governing Council. The administration would consider what it had heard in discussion and received from the University community, and it would bring forward, by early February, its best advice for a framework for enrolment expansion. Following governance approval of the framework, his Office would work with the divisions to draft plans for expansion. These plans would be considered by the Planning and Budget Committee.

Professor Tuohy spoke to the particulars of the discussion paper. She noted too that it was not a 'white paper' with recommendations that members were accustomed to seeing; it was a discussion paper which attempted to frame the issues and focus discussion of the most important challenge to face the Ontario university system in the coming decade - how to respond to increasing demand for post-secondary education.

She stated that a necessary condition of expansion would be the provision of adequate public funding. It would be essential to receive at least the average cost of the new students, technically through a corridor adjustment. The University would also need funds for quality improvement and infrastructure support. Funding would be required to address the already high faculty:student ratio and to improve the provision of administrative services and other co-curricular activities. The enrolment would expand only where expansion would lead to enhanced quality, for example, where the associated expansion of faculty complement would enable a division to achieve critical mass in certain disciplines and to increase the scope of coverage of evolving areas of study. At the same time that individual divisions considered their plans, there was a need to look at global issues. Individual divisions' decisions, if simply aggregated, could lead to congestion and other diseconomies of scale. She suggested that the University was currently reasonably balanced in terms of disciplines and programs, and therefore some marginal changes in the balance could be made without distorting the character of the University.

Professor Tuohy drew attention to the scenarios at the end of the paper. These had been provided to illustrate what would happen if the University decided to take its share of the expected expansion based on its current proportion of graduate and undergraduate enrolment in the province. Each scenario assumed that the increase would be distributed across first-entry, doctoral stream and second-entry programs proportional to current enrolment levels. The two scenarios differed only in terms of the distribution of the first-entry increase. The first scenario showed a 30% increase on the St. George campus and a 60% increase on the

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

suburban campuses. The second scenario showed an approximate 10% increase at St. George and a 100% increase on each suburban campus.

The Chair said that he had granted permission for Mr. Chris Borst from the Graduate Students' Union (GSU) to address the Board. Mr. Borst said that the GSU supported expansion only on the basis of full funding which took into account such things as student financial aid and student support services. He hoped that the University would not be tempted by packages like the recent ATOP program which included provisions for matching funding, underfunding and deregulation. Some arguments for expansion were worrisome, for example, the argument that expansion would create a brand new market for faculty. He suggested that universities had been overproducing the number of PhD graduates for many years. There were already four new PhDs for every new appointment in the Canadian system. An increase in faculty appointments at the suburban campuses would cause a shift in the location of graduate research and this issue needed to be addressed. He also noted that relative to peer institutions, the University was currently underfunding divisions I and II (the humanities and social sciences). The idea that expansion would only occur in areas where quality could be increased was worrisome. It presupposed selectivity and targets in terms of critical mass and coverage. How would this work? He was also concerned about the balance between the humanities and social science disciplines as opposed to the physical and life sciences. He had calculated that a reversal of the current undergraduate enrolment balance of 55% humanities and social sciences and 45% physical and life sciences would mean that 85% of all new undergraduate enrolment would have to be in the latter disciplines. On a last point, he noted that Scarborough was planning a large increase in management studies; he would prefer that it focus its enrolment expansion in the Arts and Science disciplines.

Professor Mock invited members to read the report of the previous meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee which had been distributed with the agenda. That meeting had largely been taken up with discussing this paper.

The President commented that this issue would be the defining issue of the next few years - choosing what the University wished to do in response to an increasing demand for post-secondary education. The University would shape what it wanted to be, starting with what it was at this point in time. He did not expect the government's response to the universities' demands for full funding to be given in one announcement. It was important that the University have a clear view of what it wanted to be in order to navigate through whatever government processes emerge. He suggested that the government's response would not be simple. If the government's responses were sporadic, the University would not want to react without a clear view of its future.

Elimination of the Three-year Degree

A great deal of discussion focused on the possibility, noted in the discussion paper, of ceasing to offer a three-year degree program because Ontario students would no longer be completing five years of secondary school education.

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

The Chair said that he had granted permission for Mr. Chris Turner, an alumnus, to address the Board. Mr. Turner said that he was concerned about the University's suggestion to eliminate the three-year degree. He believed the reasons given, though appealing, were flawed. The University has suggested that it needed to change to compensate for the change in the high school curriculum, where five years would be reduced to four. Ministry officials, on the other hand, claimed that the high school curriculum has been strengthened and condensed - that all the OAC material was still taught but in a revamped curriculum. The University also said that a three-year degree was not up to North American standards where the four-year degree was now the norm. Both three- and four-year degrees had been offered in Canada for some time. Eliminating the three-year degree because it would compare unfavourably to American standards was not a sufficient reason. He said that 40% of all undergraduate students at U of T chose a three-year degree. In particular, part-time students, with domestic and work commitments, often chose a three-year program which they took over five to fifteen years. An additional five credits would add another burden to those students. The University advocated accessibility and Mr. Turner suggested that this proposal was counter to that principle. Summer courses would not help part-time students to complete their degrees any faster since the condensed nature of summer courses required an increased time commitment. In summary, he said that eliminating the three-year degree based on keeping up appearances would violate the University's own commitment to integrity.

A member who had been involved as part of the COU team in drafting the curriculum for grades 11 and 12 commented on the Ministry's claim that the new curriculum would cover the same material as the old OAC courses. That was the intention, but he suggested that it be taken with a grain of salt. So much had been crammed into the new courses that he was concerned that the new curriculum was unteachable. With respect to the intention of offering more summer courses, he said that this was an obvious thing to suggest. However, the summer was a valuable time for research; the rest of the year was taken up with teaching and provided little opportunity to pursue research activities. Professor Sedra said that it was not his intention to respond to all comments, but in this case he wished to make clear that faculty complement would have to expand commensurate with increased enrolment. The point was that in aggregate, teaching would be spread more evenly across three terms rather than two. Some faculty might well wish to teach in the summer and do their research over the fall or winter terms.

A member mentioned the timelines for discussing the issue of the three-year degree. The General Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Science would begin exploration of the topic at its meeting on December 6th. The issue would be thoroughly discussed and there would be broad consultation. The plan was to have a recommendation by March or April. She asked Mr. Turner to make a copy of his remarks available to the General Committee.

A member suggested that there was reason to question the equivalence of the fifth year of high school in Ontario with the first year of university in the U.S..

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

A member who was a part-time student said that eliminating the three-year degree would hurt part-time students. A three-year degree was daunting when undertaken on a part-time basis. Adding an additional year would mean additional sacrifices in terms of time and money.

A member said that the degree offered a complete education. It was an important option and agreed its elimination would disadvantage part-time students.

Principal Hildyard noted that Woodsworth College was the college of choice of part-time students. She suggested that the three-year degree matter be recast as the 15 versus 20 credits issue. She supported the elimination of the 15 credit degree academically. She suggested that part-time students could be assisted by providing more half courses and by improved scheduling of courses. In terms of summer courses, the University should look at ways of better integrating summer courses with the rest of the programs. In her opinion, Woodsworth College would be a more vibrant community if it accepted more full-time students.

Dean Amrhein commented on the discussion concerning the three-year degree. He agreed that the better way of phrasing it was 15 versus 20 credits and not how long the program took a full-time student to complete. The question was whether the University should offer a credential that terminated with 15 credits and what should it be called. In his opinion, it should not be called a baccalaureate. It would have to be accepted as readily as the current credential obtained after 13 years in school plus 15 credits at University. This province was no longer going to have a grade 13. This University had to protect the value of its credential. In some American universities, ten credits led to an associate's degree. He said that the University should move to the North American standard of 12 years plus 20 credits for a baccalaureate degree.

A member commented on the question of the preparation of students following four years of high school and the question of whether this could be used as an argument to eliminate a 15 credit degree. As someone who had recently completed high school, he noted that the new curriculum would eliminate the breadth of studies available in the schools but would leave the depth of study intact. He said that the students would not learn less and thus the reduction in years was not a valid argument to eliminate the 15 credit degree. A member responded that if there was no breadth, the secondary school curriculum was living on borrowed time and the University would have to act even faster.

General Comments

A member mentioned that many members of the University community were subject to stress arising from the recent budget cutbacks. People were expected to do more and more with less and less. The notion of taking on more students would lead to more stress. He noted the suggestion to add more students on the suburban campuses, and he hoped the colleagues at those colleges would have a disproportionate say in any enrolment expansion plans. He suggested that there were not many universities the University wished to emulate

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

that were bigger than the University currently was. Faculty hiring was difficult; there was the problem of finding exactly the right candidate with the intellect, vision and promise to do the job. There appeared to be the expectation that the appropriate candidate could readily be found.

A member welcomed the discussion paper and said that a look at this issue was long overdue independent of the double cohort and demographic situation. All people benefited from a University education and it should be accessible to all. There was no choice between quality and expansion; both were essential. He urged the University to look at an international model and not just the American institutions. If there was not an appropriate one, the University should create its own. He noted that there had been a good discussion of the Scarborough and Erindale situations at the Planning and Budget Committee meeting. He emphasized the importance of doing graduate work on those campuses. The links among the campuses should be strengthened since there were advantages on all campuses. He suggested that the lines of a student's campus affiliation be blurred.

A member thanked the administration for the report but suggested he needed more information to assess some of the arguments presented. With respect to the institutions that had larger enrolments than this University, what were the comparable data on such matters as funding levels, faculty:student ratios and size of classes? Some of the institutions were multi-campus ones; was each campus a full-fledged university? His second point concerned the absence of discussion of the constraints on expansion. For example, there might be funding for a position but no appropriate faculty member to fill it. How long would it take to build the facilities needed to house and provide classroom space for the new students? The enrolment expansion was close at hand; what could the University do to accommodate it? What were the options?

A member from Mississauga campus spoke in support of the document. She believed that with planned growth, the quality of the student experience could be increased by expanding in selected areas. She used the program in biology on her campus as an example of what could be done with a critical mass of faculty, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows. The program had a good relation with the departments on the St. George campus. The College needed more faculty in certain areas to attain the critical mass for good programs. This could be achieved through planned growth.

A member expressed her concern about accommodating any of the enrolment growth on the St. George campus. The University was already building residences on green spaces to accommodate its current enrolment.

Another member from a suburban campus commented that the possibility of expansion was exciting. Past budget reductions had driven a number of disciplines below their critical mass to support quality programs. There were a number of exciting and innovative undergraduate programs that the College wished to mount, but they needed new faculty. Enrolment expansion would provide an opportunity for real change. On another point, he was puzzled

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

by the comments on fracturing graduate programs if they were spread over the three campuses. Graduate studies already existed across all parts of the University. He agreed that better transportation between the campuses would be necessary.

A member noted that one of the priorities in "Raising Our Sights" was an increased access to a professional-experience year program or community experience year. After three years at University, it would be advantageous to provide such placements so that the students would be better prepared to complete the fourth year. He hoped the University would find new ways to integrate work and experience.

A member suggested that it would be interesting to know which of the comparable institutions in the tables provided were commuter schools and which were situated in college towns. There was a difference in the educational experience for those students who lived at home and those who lived in residence.

A member asked about the effects of a large expansion on the suburban campuses. If they each grew to 10,000 students would they have their own governing structure? Would there be professional faculties? Would they need their own college systems? The University's current enrolment was about 40,000 FTE students. He suggested that there was no need to be 60,000 strong. How much open space would disappear to support expansion plans?

A member suggested that the starting point for this discussion was the double cohort problem and the demographics. He said that the University should not look at the issue as a matter of taking our share of the increased enrolment. Doing so would upset the balance of enrolment and make the University even more an institution serving the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). Rather the University should search for students elsewhere in Canada and abroad in order to become a more international institution. The overriding concern should be quality. On the suburban campuses, the concern seemed to be critical mass. Enrolment expansion should improve or at the least maintain quality. With respect to critical mass, what was it? He suggested that critical mass came in various sizes of institutions. He could not accept that St. George campus needed to grow to attain critical mass. He suggested instead that the University be guided by excellence. Indicators must be employed. Was the quality of graduate programs enhanced by dispersal of those programs? He commented that it might work in some disciplines, not in others. He was repeating comments made by colleagues on this matter. The President noted that the Principals of Scarborough and Erindale believed that the quality of undergraduate education would be improved through expansion. He asked whether the member was disputing this judgment, or whether his concern was with graduate education. The member responded that increasing undergraduate enrolment entailed a similar increase in graduate programs because the faculty hired for the first would expect to participate in teaching the second, and that he was concerned about the dispersion of graduate teaching that this might entail.

Professor McNutt said that expansion would give his college the opportunity to broaden its offerings and attract world-class faculty. He would be happy to discuss the benefits of

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

graduate programs to the suburban campuses. The mix of undergraduate and graduate programs was why most faculty came here. This University was a graduate University; students on every campus had the same right to that experience.

A member noted that the eastern edge of the St. George campus was not as densely populated as the remainder of the campus. It was not at the ideal level in terms of classes or co-curricular or extra-curricular activities. He hoped that some attention would be given to growing that part of the campus.

If the enrolment was expected to rise by 20,000 in the next decade, the processes surrounding admission and financial aid would need to be re-examined. The staff were already stretched and better infrastructure was needed now to support these functions.

A member made a number of points. He suggested that the University of London was a good example of a multi-campus university. On the issue of critical mass, it was the number of faculty that was important not the number of students. With respect to growth in graduate studies, it should be the result of very careful planning that would avoid duplication and maximize opportunities. One example was the neuroscience program on the Scarborough campus. Further, graduate studies was not now focused solely on the St. George campus. It took place in Downsview and in the teaching hospitals as well as on the suburban campuses.

Principal Foley pointed out that demographics showed an increasing number of students in the GTA who were considering a university education. For a variety of reasons - financial, cultural, family - attending a university far from home was not an option. There would be an increasing demand to attend the suburban campuses. The original plan for Scarborough, begun in the 1960s, was never completed. The government put a freeze on development; some teaching was still being done in portable classrooms thirty years later. This expected enrolment expansion was a wonderful opportunity for the suburban campuses to reach their full potential. They had the capacity to expand without impinging on the overall level of green space on their campuses.

A member asked about the process to be followed. As he understood it, there would be a framework paper for expansion produced in February for consideration by governance, but the deadline for comments from divisional perspectives was likely the end of January. Professor Sedra confirmed that this was the timetable. The member was concerned that there was a lot of uncertainty about some of the points made about graduate studies in particular. In addition, if the St. George campus was to grow by about 2100 undergraduates, what would be the time frame? Should the assumption be 500 a year for four years? More detailed scenarios were needed to help assess the individual colleges' shares in the increase and the need for more residence places, for example. If the increase was expected over a longer period of time, different scenarios would need to be constructed.

The President explained that the number of students in the school system was increasing. A bulge in the number seeking post-secondary education would also be produced by the double

4. Enrolment Expansion at the University of Toronto: Discussion Paper (cont'd)

cohort. Whether it would be smooth or sharp was unknown at this time. The question was what did this University want to do in response to this projected increase and how fast. Scarborough and Erindale could not accept large increases in enrolment without the addition of physical facilities and faculty to handle the new students. These questions were being discussed by the principals. Once the vision has been articulated, the means of achieving it would be discussed.

A member suggested that it was not just buildings for classrooms and laboratories that were required; infrastructure such as libraries, student services, and athletic facilities would also be needed. Another member expanded on the point about adequacy of library facilities to support enrolment expansion. She said that the excellence of the current library facilities was one of the important factors that made this University rank so well in comparison with its North American peers. There have been many initiatives to expand the services of the libraries including the Information Commons and renovations to the law and music libraries. However, the libraries were already at capacity; study space was short. Past experience in expanding libraries had been to look at the needs five years ahead. However, before the expansion process was complete the libraries had exceeded the new planned capacity. If the libraries were to continue to be of international quality, they would need more space, better equipment and growing collections. The further ahead the plans, the better.

Professor Sedra thanked the members for their helpful views. Along with the comments he hoped to receive from the University community at large following the printing of the paper, these remarks would help inform the framework response he planned to bring back to this Board in February. The President urged members to communicate any further comments they had as early as possible. The matter was urgent.

5. Items for Information

- (a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost
 - (i) Appointment of New President

The President was pleased to report that Dr. Robert J. Birgeneau had been appointed President of the University effective July 1, 2000. He hoped the Board would extend an invitation to Dr. Birgeneau to attend one of its meetings in the new year. Dr. Birgeneau had resigned his position as Dean of Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology effective January 1, 2000. The President said that Dr. Cunningham, in his office, was coordinating Dr. Birgeneau's activities during the transition. In the meantime, he and the vice-presidents would continue to work hard on their various portfolios.

- (ii) Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library

The membership of the Provost's Advisory Committee on the University of Toronto Library for 1999-2000 was presented for information.

5. Items for Information**(a) Report of the Vice-President and Provost****(iii) Appointments and Status Changes**

The report was presented for information.

(b) Items for Information in Report Number 55 of the Planning and Budget Committee

Professor Mock drew attention to developments regarding the question of the use of the land surrounding the Robarts library.

A member referred to the changes in OSAP regulations that had arisen from the provincial throne speech. In particular, post-secondary education institutions would have increased responsibilities for students who defaulted on their loans. The issue of private universities was also raised in the speech. The President noted his concern over the increased attention to the credit worthiness of students applying for OSAP. Requiring payments from institutions with high default rates was not so much a concern for universities. This was not an increased burden for the students. Institutions were required to pay if the default rate of its students was above 28.5%. The default rate of university students had declined recently and most universities had default rates under 10%. The measure would instead affect for-profit training schools.

(c) Review: Academic Programs and Units

Because of time constraints, Professor Rolph agreed to delay her presentation until the next meeting.

(d) Quarterly List of Donations August 1, 1999 to October 31, 1999

The quarterly list of donations of \$250,000 or more to the University and its federated universities was distributed as members arrived at the meeting. It was presented for information.

6. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on January 13th, 2000.

7. Other Business

A member asked that a report be given at the next meeting on Dr. Chun whose case was currently before the Human Rights Commission. The President undertook to report.

The Board moved into closed session.

8. Academic Administrative Appointments

The following academic administrative appointments were approved:

Faculty of Arts and Science

Department of Fine Art

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Professor Phillip Sohm | Acting Chair from November 1, 1999 to May 1, 2000 |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|

Faculty of Medicine

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Professor Catharine I. Whiteside | Associate Dean, Inter-Faculty and Graduate Affairs from January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2002 |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

OISE/UT

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Professor Carl Corter | Acting Dean from February 1, 2000 to July 31, 2000 |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|

Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Professor Keith Oatley | Chair from September 1, 1999 to June 30, 2002 (with possibility of renewal to June 30, 2004) |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Secretary
December 7th, 1999

Chair