

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 243

HE 003 569

TITLE System Emerging. First Annual Review (1966-67) of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario.

INSTITUTION Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, Toronto.

PUB DATE 67

NOTE 64p.

AVAILABLE FROM University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, Canada (\$1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Improvement; *Educational Opportunities; Educational Planning; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; International Education; *Regional Planning

ABSTRACT

Over the past several years, the universities of Ontario have made a gigantic effort under the direction of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario (CPUO) to provide quality higher education for all qualified students. This document presents a review of the activities of the CPUO prior to 1966, a discussion of the highlights of developments that took place in 1966-67, and a brief review of publications of the CPUO. Discussions include the development of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education, library resources, admission to a university, teacher education, computer services, educational finance, and student concerns including aid, governance and housing. (HS)

ED 069243

SYSTEM EMERGING

FIRST ANNUAL REVIEW
(1966-67) OF
THE COMMITTEE OF
PRESIDENTS OF
UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

*Committee of
Presidents of Universities of Ontario
4 Devonshire Place, Toronto 5*

1967

695 E 1924
HEU 3569

ED 069243

System Emerging

FIRST ANNUAL REVIEW
(1966-67) OF
THE COMMITTEE OF
PRESIDENTS OF
UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

*Committee of
Presidents of Universities of Ontario
4 Devonshire Place, Toronto 5*

1967

**PUBLISHED REPORTS OF
THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF
UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO**

(All except the first, which is out of print,
are available from the University of Toronto Press.)

Post-Secondary Education in Ontario, 1962-1970
1962. (Out of print)

The Structure of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario
1963. \$1.50

The City College, 1965. \$1.00

University Television, 1965. \$1.00

*The Health Sciences in Ontario Universities:
Recent Experience and Prospects for the Next Decade*
1966. \$1.00

*From the Sixties to the Seventies:
An Appraisal of Higher Education in Ontario*
1966. \$2.00

*System Emerging:
First Annual Review (1966-67) of the Committee of Presidents
of Universities of Ontario*
1967. \$1.00

Printed at the University of Toronto Press, 1967

Foreword

The Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario decided to publish an annual review as a way of informing members of the academic community, the Legislature, and the public of the achievements and problems of the universities.

In a sense this first annual review is a sequel to the reports previously published by the Committee, notably *Post-Secondary Education in Ontario 1962-1970* (1962) and *From the Sixties to the Seventies: An Appraisal of Higher Education in Ontario* (1966).

Seen in perspective, I think it will be agreed that the year 1966-67 has been one of significant progress, giving satisfaction to the universities and the Government and people of Ontario. I say this in spite of the difficult problems we still face, because we have the wit and the will to tackle them and we are beginning to develop the forms of organization and the interorganizational relations that are needed.

Kingston, September 1967

J. A. CORRY
Chairman of the Committee

Contents

FOREWORD	iii
1. The Committee of Presidents: Development and Organization	1
<i>The Early Years, 1962 to 1966</i>	1
<i>Developments in 1966-67</i>	2
<i>Publications of the Committee of Presidents</i>	4
2. Highlights, 1966-67	5
3. The Impetus to Co-ordination	9
<i>Spinks and After</i>	9
<i>Commission on Post-Secondary Education</i>	12
4. The Evolving System	14
<i>Graduate Studies and Research</i>	14
<i>Library Resources</i>	16
<i>Co-ordination of University Library Research Facilities</i>	18
<i>Admission to University</i>	18
<i>Teacher Education</i>	21
<i>Training for the Social Services</i>	21
<i>University Television</i>	22
<i>Computer Services</i>	23
5. Financing the System	24
<i>Operating Grants</i>	24
<i>Grants to Church-Related Institutions</i>	27
<i>Capital Financing and Planning</i>	27
<i>Financing of Research</i>	29
6. Focus on the Student	31
<i>University Government: The Students' Concerns</i>	31
<i>Student Aid</i>	32
<i>Province of Ontario Student Awards Program</i>	33
<i>Province of Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program</i>	36
<i>Graduate Awards by Universities</i>	37
<i>Student Housing</i>	39

7. Assessment and Agenda	41
APPENDIX A	45
APPENDIX B	46
APPENDIX C	49
APPENDIX D	54

1. The Committee of Presidents: Development and Organization

THE EARLY YEARS, 1962 TO 1966

The early history of the Committee of Presidents of Provincially Assisted Universities and Colleges of Ontario, as it was called, is to be found in chapter iv of *From the Sixties to the Seventies*,¹ and only the briefest summary will be attempted here.

Presidents of Ontario universities were called together in March 1962 by the Government's Advisory Committee on University Affairs and asked to develop plans to meet the enrolment crisis predicted by Dr. R. W. B. Jackson, then Director of the Department of Educational Research, Ontario College of Education. The Presidents met again on several occasions and at their December 1962 meeting they resolved to form themselves into a continuing organization with Dr. Claude Bissell, President of the University of Toronto, as its first chairman.

From the beginning, the Presidents were advised by the Academic Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Dr. John J. Deutsch. (This Subcommittee was later renamed the Presidents' Research Committee and is now known as the Subcommittee on Research and Planning.) In November 1963 a Select Committee of University Registrars, with Mr. Robin Ross of the University of Toronto as chairman, was set up to study the growing problem of multiple applications. Early in 1964 the Research Committee was authorized to set up an *ad hoc* Subcommittee on Librarianship under Professor George Whalley of Queen's University. Its first task was to report on the academic considerations that should govern the location of a proposed new library school in Ontario. In June 1964 the Presidents set up a Subcommittee on Television under the chairmanship of Dr. D. C. Williams of the University of Toronto, to report on "an imaginative and academically respectable

¹Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, *From the Sixties to the Seventies: An Appraisal of Higher Education in Ontario* (Toronto, 1968).

pattern for the use of educational television." Another group set up by the Presidents in the early years was an Advisory Committee on Graduate Studies (April 1964). Five bodies were created in June 1965: a Committee on the Co-ordination of Academic Library Services (Professor Carl Klinck, chairman), a Subcommittee on Grants Formulæ (Mr. Bernard Trotter), a Subcommittee on Public Relations and Information (Mr. Bill Boss), the Ontario Universities' Television Council (Dr. D. C. Williams), which replaced the Television Subcommittee, and the Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions (Dr. F. A. DeMarco).

DEVELOPMENTS IN 1966-67

At the beginning of the year under review the name of the Committee was shortened to Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, though there was no change in its membership. Dr. J. A. Corry, Principal of Queen's University, was elected chairman for a two-year term, succeeding Dr. Bissell. A list of members is given in Appendix A to this Review. In December 1966, four years after its inception, the Committee of Presidents adopted a formal constitution, which is reproduced as Appendix B. The Committee's objects as stated in the constitution are "to promote co-operation among the provincially assisted universities of Ontario and between them and the Government of the Province, and, generally, to work for the improvement of higher education for the people of Ontario."

For the first three and a half years of its existence, the Committee of Presidents had no full-time staff, and Mr. W. W. Small, now Vice-President (Administration) of York University, performed the duties of secretary. For the academic year beginning July 1, 1966, it was decided to set up a small secretariat with offices in Massey College, Toronto. Dr. Edward F. Sheffield, formerly Director of Research of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, was appointed Professor of Higher Education, University of Toronto, and seconded on a three-quarters time basis to be Executive Vice-Chairman of the Committee for an initial period of two years. In that post were included the duties of secretary and treasurer. A year later J. A. d'Oliveira, formerly with the Treasury Board of Ontario, became Assistant to the Executive Vice-Chairman and assumed the duties of secretary of the Committee. The secretariat performs the usual functions of preparing the agenda and minutes of meetings and conducting correspondence on behalf of the Committee of Presidents, but its key role is as a nerve centre through which information and ideas flow from the Committee of

Presidents to its subcommittees and affiliates and vice versa. Members of the staff are also listed in Appendix A.

The creation of the secretariat has not altered the decentralized pattern by which the Committee of Presidents operates, and in 1966-67 there was a considerable extension of the practice of calling upon the many persons with specialized talents available in the universities to serve on committees to study various problems. A number of the Committee's subgroups were reorganized and strengthened, the process often being inarked by a change of name, some *ad hoc* bodies were made permanent, and the "councils" were defined as bodies having more autonomous status than the subcommittees but still responsible to the Committee of Presidents and formally designated as affiliates. The subcommittees and affiliates draw their membership from university administrators, including academic administrators, but also to a considerable extent from full-time faculty members. A complete list of subcommittees and affiliates, with a summary of their tasks and membership patterns, is given in Appendix C. The story of their efforts and their achievements in 1966-67 is told on every page of this Review.

The general administration budget of the Committee of Presidents is financed by subscriptions from the fourteen member universities in proportion to the operating grants which they receive from the Province. This budget covers the expenses of meetings of the Committee and of its Executive and the normal expenses of the secretariat. The costs incurred by the subcommittees and affiliates are borne largely by the individual universities, though some of the expenditures attendant on their activities are charged to the budget of the Committee of Presidents. Major "system" undertakings, most of which were launched at the beginning of the 1967-68 academic session, are financed centrally from contributions by the universities either in proportion to the governmental grants they receive or in another proportion judged to be more closely related to the benefit each is expected to derive from the joint undertaking.

Though, as has been said, the Committee is advised and assisted by a network of subcommittees and affiliates drawn from academics and administrators, there is a clear need for improved communications among the various elements within the universities. The Committee of Presidents met with the Ontario Council of University Faculty Associations at the Guild Inn in June 1966, and a year later a tripartite conference was held at Glendon College of York University, including representatives of the Ontario Union of Students as well as the Committee of Presidents and the Council of Faculty Associations. As noted later in the Review, the Presidents also worked with the faculty and

student associations to produce, in June 1966, a joint statement on the Province of Ontario Student Awards Program. It is intended that continuing contact should be maintained with faculty and student associations. As another experiment in communication, each President brought an academic colleague with him to the September 1967 meeting of the Committee. Proposals are under study for the establishment of more formal machinery for consultation of the various segments of the academic community.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS

Between 1962 and 1965, the Research Committee (or its predecessor) produced for the Committee of Presidents three reports which were subsequently published. The first of these, *Post-Secondary Education in Ontario, 1962-1970*, was presented in May 1962 and published in revised form in the spring of 1963. *The Structure of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario*, published in October 1963, had as its main recommendation the creation of colleges of technology and applied arts as an alternative means of providing education beyond the high school. The proposals for a new type of post-secondary institution in Ontario were further developed and crystallized in the publication *The City College*, issued in January 1965.

Though prepared for publication in mid-1966, two studies by the Presidents' Research Committee (then under the chairmanship of Mr. R. B. Willis, Vice-President of the University of Western Ontario) were not actually released until much later. One of these, *The Health Sciences in Ontario Universities: Recent Experience and Prospects for the Next Decade*, was originally planned as a chapter in *From the Sixties to the Seventies: An Appraisal of Higher Education in Ontario*, but it was later decided to extract it, and it was published separately in January 1967. The larger report, *From the Sixties to the Seventies*, was released in March of the same year. The latter was a comprehensive statement of what the universities had been doing in the years 1962 to 1966 and an assessment of the problems faced by the universities in the future. It contained three major recommendations: the appointment of a commission of inquiry into post-secondary education in Ontario, a major thrust by the universities to meet critical needs in the welfare field, and the early establishment of a commission on student housing.

2. Highlights, 1966-67

As Canada celebrates its centennial, the universities of Ontario look back on an academic session studded with significant developments which are likely to shape the pattern of university affairs in the Province for many years to come. Elsewhere in this Review, the story of these developments is told more fully, and this section will attempt only to point to some of the major happenings and to place them in perspective.

The Committee of Presidents has, from its inception, been served by a number of subcommittees made up of members of the university community—faculty as well as administrators—and, as described in the preceding section, 1966-67 was marked by the strengthening of these bodies and by the evolution of the “councils” into semi-autonomous affiliates of the Committee of Presidents. It is one of the great strengths of the Committee of Presidents that it has such a wealth of specialized talent and experience available in the universities to draw upon, making it possible for it to operate effectively on a decentralized basis without the need to provide itself with a large full-time research staff. The establishment of the secretariat at the beginning of the academic year did not change this decentralized pattern, since it is designed as a nerve centre to facilitate the flow of information between the Committee and its network of subcommittees and affiliates.

While the seeds of co-operation among the universities of Ontario have been present for some years, it may fairly be said that the report of the Spinks Commission, published at the end of 1966, is responsible for bringing it to full flower. Creation of a University of Ontario, the most talked-about recommendation of the Spinks Commission, was regarded both by the Government and by the universities as inappropriate in the Ontario context, but the co-ordination it was designed to promote is being achieved by voluntary action among the universities. Based on the Spinks recommendations, an appraisals procedure has been established under the auspices of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, providing for evaluation and assessment of graduate

programmes at the request of a university. The appraisals procedure, together with proposed consultations between chairmen of departments with a view to allocation of responsibility for graduate studies as between the various universities, should encourage a rational distribution of well-planned graduate programmes in Ontario and discourage the unnecessary duplication in this area against which the Spinks Commission warned.

Also inspired by recommendations of the Spinks Commission, a province-wide universities' library system is being developed under the supervision of the Ontario Council of University Librarians, working closely with the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. The system is designed to provide for maximum co-operative use of scarce and expensive research library collections. System projects planned include a bibliographic centre to be located within the University of Toronto Library and arrangements for the co-operative use of research collections which will afford reader privileges for visiting scholars at all provincially assisted universities. In connection with the latter project, additional space will be made available in the new University of Toronto Humanities and Social Sciences Research Library. Another co-operative library venture is the interuniversity library transit system, launched in the autumn of 1967 under the management of York University, which involves a daily delivery service of books by truck to the universities in the southern part of the Province and by air freight to the two universities in northern Ontario.

The problem of duplicate admissions, with the attendant danger that some university places may remain unfilled while qualified applicants are denied admission, should be greatly reduced if not eliminated entirely by new admission procedures recently ratified by the universities for implementation in the academic year 1968-69. The new procedures involve the use of a common general application form on which the prospective student will list in order of preference all the universities to which he wishes to apply. When he is offered admission by one of the universities on the list, he will be asked to indicate formal acceptance of the offer by a specified date. If he does so, this acceptance will be notified to the other universities listed on his application form.

During the year, the Federal Government ended its policy of direct operating grants to universities, transferring the fiscal equivalent to the provinces. One method by which the funds to be transferred may be calculated is on the basis of 50 per cent of the operating costs of post-secondary institutions. The provinces are not required to earmark the funds transferred from the Federal Government for grants to post-

secondary institutions but are free to spend them as they see fit. The Province of Ontario has moved to fill the gap left by the withdrawal of the Federal Government by increasing its grants to the provincially assisted universities. Withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of direct support of universities threatened to place the church-related institutions in Ontario in an embarrassing predicament. It is the long-standing policy of the Ontario Government not to make grants to church-related universities and colleges, and these institutions were, therefore, heavily dependent on federal support. However, the Provincial Government announced that it would make operating grants to existing church-affiliated institutions equivalent to 50 per cent of the grant they would have received if they had not had a religious affiliation.

Now that the universities will be even more dependent on the Provincial Government for their operating funds than before, it is gratifying to record the inauguration in 1967-68 of a system of formula financing for operating grants which will contribute to the preservation of university autonomy by obviating the necessity of detailed scrutiny of university budgets. Each category of students has been assigned a weight ranging from 1 for undergraduate arts and science to 6 for advanced PhD work. Each university's weighted enrolment as of December 1 is multiplied by the value of a "basic income unit" (roughly equivalent to the cost of educating one undergraduate for one year in a liberal arts college) and the university's grant is calculated by subtracting standard fees from the product. Major new undertakings proposed by a university are considered separately and if approved are financed by special grants. The formula does not answer the needs of the emerging universities with their high initial costs and small enrolments with low average weights, and these universities will receive additional grants until they attain the status of fully developed institutions. Efforts are being made to devise a formula suited to the needs of the emerging universities. The universities are finding great difficulty in financing their capital requirements, and a recently appointed Capital Studies Committee, comprising representatives of the Committee on University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents, has begun the search for both short- and long-term solutions of the problems of capital financing.

Not the least among the events of note during the past year was the decision of the Government to appoint a full-time Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs, Dr. D. T. Wright, former Dean of Engineering at the University of Waterloo. Dr. Wright has been present during part of each meeting of the Committee of Presidents

since his appointment, and this practice has facilitated frank and informal exchanges of views.

Following the appointment of Dr. J. R. McCarthy as Deputy Minister of Education in January 1967, Mr. E. E. Stewart was promoted from the post of Assistant Deputy Minister to that of Deputy Minister of University Affairs and, later, Mr. Alan P. Gordon, former Registrar and latterly Assistant to the President of the University of Waterloo, became Assistant Deputy Minister. Both these appointments were welcomed by the Committee of Presidents.

The students' concerns came to the fore during 1966-67. The year witnessed the introduction of the Province of Ontario Student Awards Program which consolidated several schemes of Provincial Government support for university students and established for the first time the principle that student aid would be based on need rather than on marks. The original Program contained a number of serious flaws which have, happily, largely been removed from the Program as revised for 1967-68. Differing views regarding the student's role in university government received a public airing when the Private Bills Committee of the Ontario Legislature amended the University of Western Ontario Bill to permit the student body to elect one of their number to sit on the Board of Governors, instead of a non-student representative as provided for in the original Bill. Believing that universities should be free to decide on the manner of their governance, the Government restored the Bill to its original form when it came before the House.

Those who are caught up in a swiftly moving enterprise lack the perspective from which to survey the field in which they are labouring and to evaluate objectively their own endeavours. The very pace and breadth of recent developments in the field of higher education in Ontario therefore prompted the Committee of Presidents to recommend to the Government the establishment of a commission of inquiry into questions relating not to the universities alone but to the whole field of post-secondary education. This recommendation was accepted, and the Minister of University Affairs announced in the Legislature in June 1967 the establishment of a commission to study post-secondary education in Ontario. The personnel of the commission is expected to be appointed shortly.

3. The Impetus to Co-ordination

SPINKS AND AFTER

While the report of the Spinks Commission on Graduate Studies² was a significant step on the road to co-ordination of university activities in Ontario, it should be borne in mind that it was not the first such step. The fact of the creation of the Committee of Presidents in 1962 was an indication that the heads of individual institutions recognized the need for co-operative approaches to matters of concern to Ontario universities as a whole. The development of this co-operative approach can be traced through the studies produced under the sponsorship of the Committee of Presidents in the early years and in the gradual emergence of a university system in Ontario, which was fostered by the universities themselves. It is true of course that along with the spontaneous recognition by the universities of the desirability of co-operation, there was growing pressure from the outside. The clear interest of the Government in ensuring efficient use of the sharply increasing grants from public funds being made to the universities was apparent in the decision in 1964 to strengthen the Committee on University Affairs and to establish a Department of University Affairs. The Government's concerns received their clearest expression in the Frank Gerstein Lecture of the Minister of University Affairs at York University in February 1966³ in which he suggested that university autonomy is a condition to be desired only if the universities themselves are able and willing to assume the high degree of responsibility that goes with it.

The universities realized that, as a first priority, co-ordination was necessary at the level of graduate studies because of the appreciably higher costs associated with work at this level. The Committee of

²*Report of the Commission to Study the Development of Graduate Programmes in Ontario Universities* (Toronto: Ontario Department of University Affairs, 1966).

³William C. Davis, "The Government of Ontario and the Universities of the Province," *Governments and the University* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1966).

Presidents therefore took the initiative in suggesting to the Committee on University Affairs in the spring of 1965 that the two bodies should jointly sponsor a commission to examine post-graduate education in Ontario, and the latter readily agreed. The Commission was appointed in the summer of the same year with Dr. J. W. T. Spinks, President of the University of Saskatchewan, as Chairman, Dr. G. A. Arlt, President of the American Association of Graduate Schools, and Professor Kenneth Hare of King's College, University of London, as members. A year later, the Commission had submitted an interim report, and its final report was released at the end of 1966.

It is unfortunate that so much emphasis has been laid on the proposal of the Spinks Commission for the creation of a University of Ontario, to the virtual exclusion of its other recommendations which pointed the way towards a sound pattern for the development of graduate studies in Ontario. Shortly after the publication of the report, the Committee of Presidents prepared an interim statement of its views on the seventeen recommendations contained in it and forwarded this statement to the Committee on University Affairs. A summary of the comments made in that interim statement, revised in the light of subsequent developments, is set out in the following paragraphs of this section.

The Spinks Commission recommended that the Provincial Government should adopt a method of determining operating and capital grants such as would permit rational forward planning with respect to graduate studies and research. The Committee of Presidents agreed with this recommendation and notes with satisfaction the decision of the Government to introduce formula financing for operating grants. The question of finding a satisfactory basis for capital grants remains, but it is heartening to note that concrete steps have been and are being taken towards the development of such a basis. The recommendation calling for appropriate steps to ensure co-operation and co-ordination in the fields of graduate studies and research was also endorsed by the Presidents and is being given effect in the appraisals programme of the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies, in the consultations planned with a view to dividing responsibility for graduate programmes in the various disciplines, and in the development of a province-wide system of library resources and facilities, all of which are described in greater detail in later sections of this Review.

The establishment of an Ontario Universities' Research Council, another recommendation of the Spinks Commission, was accepted in principle by the Committee of Presidents, subject to further consideration of appropriate terms of reference and of the composition

of such a Council. The Spinks proposal that this Council should accept responsibility for the Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program was not, however, considered appropriate, partly because the Program is intended for the support of potential university teachers rather than of research in itself. The recommendation that the Provincial Government should adopt a plan of adequate support for those graduate students (including graduate students in professional schools) not supported by Federal and private plans was accepted by the Committee of Presidents. The Committee hopes to convince the Government of the need to have a flexible scheme of graduate awards operated by the universities to supplement the Province of Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program and has made a proposal that the Fellowship Program should be extended to include students seeking advanced professional degrees in engineering and law. The Committee of Presidents welcomed the recommendations relating to the immediate provision of funds for research facilities and equipment.

The group of recommendations on libraries was regarded as of particular importance. The main recommendation here was that there should be an Ontario Provincial Universities Library. This proposal was accompanied by recommendations that the research libraries of all the provincially supported universities be designated as provincial resources and be available to faculty and qualified graduate students, that each research Library be operated by the library and the staff of the university in which it is located, with additional moderate grants to each library to help it carry out its new responsibilities. In addition, the Spinks Commission drew attention to the urgent need to bring the undergraduate libraries of the nine then deficient universities up to acceptable standards at an estimated immediate cost of \$9 to \$10 million.

The Committee of Presidents agrees on the urgent need to bring undergraduate libraries up to acceptable standards but notes that the cost would now be substantially higher than \$9 or \$10 million, since the Spinks Commission estimate was based on 1964-65 enrolment and holdings. The Presidents would also stress the need to build up library holdings to support graduate studies not only to make up the deficiency of five million volumes estimated to exist four years ago, but to accelerate current annual acquisition rates to support existing graduate programmes at all levels as well as developing or newly proposed graduate programmes. In addition, the Committee of Presidents commended the observation of the Spinks Commission that a special grant of \$4 million a year for five years would acquire for Ontario vital, highly specialized material that is rapidly disappearing from world

markets. The recommendation regarding the establishment of an Ontario Provincial Universities Library, interpreted to mean a province-wide universities research library system, met with the hearty approval of the Committee of Presidents and is in the process of implementation, as shown in the section on libraries below.

The well-publicized recommendation that a provincial University of Ontario be established was not endorsed by the Committee of Presidents, which thought that the alternative methods of co-ordination already under way would serve the main objective. The Presidents further consider that the Committee on University Affairs can most usefully respond to the needs of co-ordination and co-operation now that it has a full-time Chairman but that it should also have its own secretariat.

COMMISSION ON POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

After the co-ordination of graduate studies had been given the degree of priority it merited, attention turned to the need for co-ordination of university education generally and indeed on the need to place the universities in the context of post-secondary education as a whole. The appointment of a commission on higher education in Ontario was a major recommendation of the Presidents' Research Committee in *From the Sixties to the Seventies*. This proposal was endorsed by the joint conference of the Committee of Presidents and the Ontario Council of University Faculty Associations in June 1966, and a recommendation was forwarded to the Minister of University Affairs that such a commission should be launched. The Minister quickly responded to this proposal and asked the Committee of Presidents for suggestions on terms of reference and personnel.

Agreement with the Minister's desire that the commission should embrace all forms of post-secondary education in the Province is a reflection of the Presidents' continuing interest in the development of alternatives to the university. The need for such alternatives had been explored in the first report published by the Committee of Presidents, *Post-Secondary Education in Ontario 1962-1970*, and further examined in the two supplements to that report, *The Structure of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario* (1963) and *The City College* (1965). The Government's decision to create a network of colleges of applied arts and technology, approved by the Ontario Legislature in 1965, was welcomed by the Committee of Presidents as being substantially in keeping with the proposals contained in the publications referred to above. The Presidents have followed closely the steps leading to the

establishment of the colleges, and there have been concrete instances of co-operation between universities and some of the colleges, notably in the planning of programmes in the health sciences area.

Regarding it as essential to examine the whole pattern of the future relationships between the universities and the colleges of applied arts and technology before the latter institutions have established their own traditions too firmly, the Presidents feel that the decision to set up the Commission on Post-Secondary Education is timely. One important aspect of this relationship is the question of student transfer from the colleges to the universities. The Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions, an affiliate of the Committee of Presidents, is at present engaged in studying this matter, and its recommendations will be of interest to the Commission on Post-Secondary Education as it considers this aspect of its field of inquiry.

The first formal announcement of the proposal to set up the Commission was made in the Legislature on June 5, 1967, by the Minister of University Affairs in introducing the estimates of this Department. The Minister said that, after considerable discussion involving officials of the Department of Education, the Department of University Affairs, the Committee of Presidents, and the Council of Regents of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, it had been decided to establish a Commission which would have the exclusive duty of studying post-secondary education in Ontario and offering the Province a course of development from the present to 1980. The Minister also announced the Commission's terms of reference, among which would be "to consider in the light of present provisions for university and other post-secondary education in Ontario the pattern necessary to ensure the further orderly balance and effective development of institutions of post-secondary education in the Province during the period to 1980 and to make recommendations thereon."

The Minister said that the Commission will comprise three full-time and twelve part-time members representing a cross-section of interested groups. The Chairman will be one of the full-time members. The Commission will be provided with a full-time secretariat and research staff. The Committee of Presidents was asked by the Minister to suggest persons for appointment to the Commission, which they did. By the end of September, however, membership of the Commission had not been announced.

4. The Evolving System

GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

As soon as the report of the Spinks Commission became available, the Committee of Presidents referred the relevant sections to its Advisory Committee on Graduate Studies, chaired by Dr. Ernest Sirluck, Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Toronto. The Advisory Committee (which was reorganized in December 1966 as the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and designated as an affiliate of the Committee of Presidents) submitted two recommendations of far-reaching import. The first envisaged the establishment of what came to be called an appraisal procedure for programmes of graduate study, and the second, consultation within individual disciplines and professions with a view to working out a division of responsibility for particular aspects of graduate study and research.

The Committee on Graduate Studies agreed with the Spinks Commission's premise that "all Provincial universities should move towards the development of honours and masters programmes in the central disciplines (though not necessarily in all of them) and that doctoral programmes ought to be restricted (at any one time) to a smaller list of institutions where adequate funds and facilities are available" and with the concomitant recommendation that "the Province equip itself with an authorization procedure for doctoral programmes." Proposals were therefore developed for a procedure whereby graduate programmes in any discipline may be appraised and evaluated at the request of a university or of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. The procedure as finally adopted by the Council, with the approval of the Committee of Presidents, is embodied in a By-Law of the Council, which is reproduced as Appendix D to this Review. Briefly, a university wishing to have a proposed graduate programme appraised will submit it to the Council on Graduate Studies before submitting it to its own Senate for final approval.

It is intended that existing as well as proposed graduate programmes

will be appraised, but priority will be given to new programmes and existing ones will be appraised only selectively. The Ontario Council on Graduate Studies had considered a suggestion that only PhD programmes be appraised, in strict accord with the Spinks recommendation on the matter; however, since a PhD programme might be expected to grow out of a master's programme in many cases, it was decided to afford the universities the opportunity of having their capacity to undertake graduate work in a given field appraised at the outset. Appraisal of a PhD programme will be valid for an initial period of five years, after which it will be reassessed. In the case of master's programmes there will be no time limit on the validity of the appraisal. The fee for appraisal of a PhD programme has been set at \$2,500 and for a master's programme at \$1,500. The appraisals procedure has been ratified by the appropriate bodies in the various universities. By mid-September, three PhD programmes and four master's programmes had already been approved, with several other programmes in process of appraisal.

It must be emphasized that appraisals are based solely on academic considerations. The procedure is not designed primarily to eliminate duplication in graduate offerings by the universities, although it may contribute indirectly to that end. Each university is free to decide whether or not to seek appraisal of a proposed graduate programme and whether to proceed with the programme even if it has not received a favourable appraisal. However, the ready response shown by the universities to the opportunity of having an independent evaluation of their proposed graduate programmes is clear evidence of their concern for quality and an indication that there is no desire among Ontario universities to launch graduate programmes before the institution is equipped to sustain them at an appropriate level.

Since the appraisals programme was not designed to prevent undesirable duplication of graduate programmes in Ontario, the Committee on Graduate Studies, in its other major recommendation, proposed that there should be provision for province-wide interuniversity consultation within individual disciplines and professions. Chairmen of departments should come together to take inventory of the distribution of existing resources in each discipline and of planned development, the Committee advised. Department chairmen should also try to reach preliminary agreement about division of responsibility for particular aspects of graduate work and research. The Committee of Presidents endorsed these proposals and asked the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies to consider and recommend ways of bringing about the desired consultation. Although more than a dozen discipline

groups have organized more or less formally for such discussions, development of this plan remains as one of the major tasks to be undertaken by the universities in the coming year.

LIBRARY RESOURCES

Among the many needs of university education library resources occupy an especially prominent place. The Spinks Commission drew attention to the great deficiencies that exist in this area in most Ontario universities, and measures aimed at correcting these deficiencies must be taken in the years immediately ahead. But while there is need to build up collections at all levels and in all universities, a co-operative approach and the pooling of facilities can accomplish much towards making the best use of whatever resources are available.

A highly successful co-operative undertaking which was completed during 1966-67 was the Ontario New University Libraries Project aimed at providing the University of Guelph, Brock, and Trent universities and Scarborough and Erindale colleges of the University of Toronto with library resources for undergraduate work in arts and science which would form the nucleus of more diversified collections in years to come. The Project costs were met by an Ontario Government grant including \$1.3 million for books. It was administered by the University of Toronto Library which undertook the task of selecting, acquiring, processing, and delivering five identical collections of 17,500 in-print monograph titles, about 35,000 volumes each, in 26 subjects of concentration. Catalogues and shelf lists were supplied with each collection, and up-to-date accumulated catalogues will be forwarded each year. The Project reached its original collections target of 17,500 titles in December 1965 in just half its allotted time, and with money left over it was decided to continue. When the Project came to an end in June of 1967, each library had received nearly 10,000 volumes more than originally planned, together with a grant of \$10,000 from the unspent balance in the Project budget.

A clear definition of the responsibilities which properly belong to individual university libraries and of the areas in which co-operation could be most fruitful was put forward in December 1966 by the Committee on the Co-ordination of Academic Library Services. This Committee had been requested by the Committee of Presidents to consider the relevant sections of the Spinks Report, and it did so with the collaboration of the Advisory Committee on Graduate Studies. The report that resulted was therefore made with the support of both committees.

The Committee of Presidents adopted the basic recommendations of the Committee on the Co-ordination of Academic Library Resources (later replaced at its own request by the Ontario Council of University Librarians, an affiliate of the Committee of Presidents, with Mrs. Doris Lewis, Librarian of the University of Waterloo, as chairman). These recommendations were that each Ontario university should be enabled to provide its own library resources required for all undergraduate courses, including honours. In addition, each university library should develop basic research collections in its existing graduate and research fields and in any new fields for which it should become responsible in the future. Concerning advanced research collections, it was noted that the long-term division of responsibility between universities would depend on any eventual division of responsibility for graduate studies that might be worked out. The creation of a provincial universities library system was also approved. The system would include province-wide reader services in which all universities would share, a bibliographic centre to be established in the University of Toronto Library, and facilities for moving persons and materials from one library to another.

Progress on implementation of the system proposals has been rapid. The Committee of Presidents accepted an offer of the University of Toronto to make space available for the proposed bibliographic centre and province-wide reader services in its new Humanities and Social Science Research Library. The Presidents also approved an agreement on co-operative use of collections, which will ensure that faculty members, graduate students, and other authorized persons from the provincially assisted universities of Ontario will have privileges at all member libraries. Inaugurated in the autumn of 1967, the system involves the use of faculty introduction cards and permits use of special facilities. The bibliographic centre to be located in the new University of Toronto Library aims at correlating and systematizing the library holdings and acquisitions of the university libraries of Ontario.

Arrangements for the interuniversity library transit system were approved by the Committee of Presidents in April 1967 and it went into operation in the autumn. Such a system had been advocated by the Spinks Commission as the most effective means, from the standpoint of time and wear and tear on books, of sharing the total resources of the Province in the face of inadequacies of collections for graduate study. Station wagons ply daily between the twelve provincially assisted universities in the southern part of the Province, expediting interlibrary loans of books. Air freight is employed for delivery of materials to Laurentian and Lakehead universities. For the time being, the transit

system is limited to library materials but it is envisaged that later faculty, graduate students, and visiting scholars may also be transported to enable them to consult materials at libraries other than their own. The transit system is under the direction of the Librarian of York University acting for the Ontario Council of University Librarians, and is financed from the budget of the Committee of Presidents.

Libraries will constitute one of the subjects for special study by the recently created steering committee on capital financing, set up jointly by the Committee on University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents, described in the section on "Capital Financing and Planning" below. In this context, discussions are also being held between representatives of the Committee on University Affairs and representatives of the Ontario Council of University Librarians on a joint approach to a fundamental study of system management and resource allocation in the field of library services.

CO-ORDINATION OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY RESEARCH FACILITIES

In June 1967 the Committee of Presidents approved the setting up of the Advisory Joint Council on the Co-ordination of University Library Research Facilities, consisting of all members of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and the Ontario Council of University Librarians.

The responsibilities of the Advisory Joint Council are to advise the Committee of Presidents on matters of policy and budget relating to the co-ordination of library research facilities, to ensure the discharge of responsibilities assumed by institutions in accepting the allocation of special areas of research development and the duties with respect to the bibliographic centre and the special reader services, to advise the Ontario Council of University Librarians on the operation of the bibliographic centre and the reader services, and to advise the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies on the operation of appraisal procedures as they affect libraries. The Advisory Joint Council will recommend to the Committee of Presidents the total appropriation to be provided for the operation of the common services and its allocation as among the various services.

ADMISSION TO UNIVERSITY

The growing demand for university places in Province of Ontario has led candidates for admission increasingly to make application to a

number of universities at once. This practice gave the applicant the assurance that if his application to the university of his first choice was not successful, he would be considered for admission to other institutions before all their places had been filled. The advantage to the prospective student of making multiple applications is obvious, but it has created an acute problem for the universities in cases where an applicant is accepted by more than one institution and fails to signify his choice to the universities whose offers of admission he does not intend to accept. This gives rise to the danger that there will be unfilled places available in some universities in the Province while there are qualified candidates who have been denied admission to university.

The beginnings of a co-operative approach to admissions in Ontario universities came three years ago when the universities agreed to pool information on unfilled first-year places in the various faculties and courses. This information was sent to a central clearing-house each week after the Grade 13 results had been published and up to registration-day. The clearing-house, located in the admissions office of York University, then tabulated the information received and distributed it weekly to all the universities. This enabled the admissions office in each university to direct qualified applicants for courses that had already been filled in that institution to another university which was reported as having unfilled places in the courses concerned. This practice has been useful, but it has not, of course, discouraged multiple applications.

A further step towards co-operation in the field of admissions was taken with the establishment of the Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions in the autumn of 1966, with Dr. F. A. DeMarco, Vice-President of the University of Windsor, as chairman. The Council comprises two or three members from each of the provincially assisted universities, including mainly admissions officers and members of teaching staffs. It is an affiliate of the Committee of Presidents. In April 1967, the Council on Admissions presented to the Committee of Presidents its recommendations on procedures to be adopted in 1968-69 for admission of applicants enrolled in 1967-68 in Ontario secondary schools, designed to assure students of systematic consideration of their applications for admission by the universities of their choice, in the order of their choice, to lighten the load of reporting by the secondary schools, and to eliminate the "no-show" problem.

For entry in 1968, the universities are using a common general application form, to be completed by applicants and forwarded by the

secondary schools to the universities. On this form the applicant lists, in order of preference, all the universities to which he wants to apply. The universities will be free to ask applicants for any additional information not on the common application form. Not earlier than May 15, 1968, formal offers of early final or provisional admission may be made to candidates, valid for the following September, and on June 15, but not before, the universities may require a candidate to accept formally an offer of admission. Universities may require candidates to make a deposit with formal acceptance of up to \$50, to be applied against fees. Each university receiving formal acceptance will notify each other university listed on the common application form of the student's response, and none of the other universities will consider admission of the applicant unless the university receiving the student's formal acceptance issues a release or he provides evidence of having informed that university that he does not intend to take up the place reserved for him. At the discretion of an admissions officer, the candidate may be informed of vacancies known to be available in other universities.

The Committee of Presidents approved the recommendations regarding admissions procedures for 1968-69 and authorized their submission to the individual universities for ratification. The procedures have been ratified by all the provincially assisted universities and are now in effect. They should go far towards eliminating the problem of duplicate admissions and should facilitate a more exact matching of candidates to places. It should be added that adoption of the new procedures will pose no problem for those prospective university students who for one reason or another are not in a position to make an early application. The timetable set out in the admissions procedures does not preclude submission of an application at any time before the normal closing-date, and candidates may defer their applications accordingly. Those who delay making their application will, of course, face the same hazard that they face now, that the places in their first-choice university or course will have been filled.

The next important matter on the agenda for the Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions is the question of admission to university of students from colleges of applied arts and technology and other post-secondary institutions. This question was referred to the Council by the Committee of Presidents in December 1966. The Presidents' Subcommittee on Research and Planning, which had taken an interest in relations between the universities and the colleges of applied arts and technology, has established liaison with the special committee of the Council on Admissions which has been studying the transfer question.

TEACHER EDUCATION

The MacLeod Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers had recommended, early in 1966,⁴ that the present one-year course after Grade 13 in the teachers' colleges should be replaced by a full university course, including professional training, either concurrently with course work leading to a bachelor's degree or in a final year after the BA. The Minister of Education expressed the hope that this recommendation could be implemented soon. The Committee of Presidents appointed a Subcommittee on Teacher Education comprising Dr. J. A. Gibson, President of Brock University, as chairman, together with representatives of the other universities, to study the implications for the universities of Ontario of the education and training of teachers by the universities, to make recommendations to the Committee of Presidents regarding policy and procedures to be followed in establishing new programmes in teacher education in the universities, and to act as a continuing advisory committee to the universities in the development of these programmes.

The Subcommittee outlined a series of problems for discussion and invited the Chairman of the Committee on University Affairs and appropriate officials of the Department of Education to a meeting in September. The Committee of Presidents believes that discussions with the Government on teacher education are likely to prove more fruitful if conducted by the universities collectively than if each university is approached separately, and it will be an important part of the Subcommittee's role to provide the forum for these discussions.

TRAINING FOR THE SOCIAL SERVICES

One of the main recommendations of *From the Sixties to the Seventies* was for "a major thrust by the universities of Ontario, individually and collectively, to meet the critical needs in the welfare field—that they investigate the possibilities mentioned above, that they give leadership and assistance in the development of appropriate related programmes in the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, and that the existing professional schools give a high priority to the expansion of the specialized aspects such as medical social work and psychiatric social work" (p. 90). In September 1966 the Committee of Presidents endorsed this recommendation and, to enable the magnitude of the task

⁴Report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers (Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, 1966).

to be assessed, a meeting of representatives of interested universities was arranged to explore ways in which the universities might support one another in their efforts in this field, and to act collectively if this seemed appropriate. This meeting, held in June 1967, was attended by representatives of the universities, of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, the colleges of applied arts and technology, and interested departments of the Government of Ontario. The meeting appointed three working parties, one for assessment of manpower needs for the social services, another to consider the differential use of staff, and a third to study issues involved in field instruction. A further meeting was held in October to discuss working papers on the three topics chosen. At that meeting the parent body constituted itself the Continuing Conference on Education and Training for the Social Services in Ontario. Chairman is Dr. Edward F. Sheffield, Executive Vice-Chairman of the Committee of Presidents. Membership is open to educational institutions, employer groups, professional associations, and other organizations having an interest in personnel for the social services. Each member organization is represented at sessions of the conference by its chief administrator or his alternate, together with one additional delegate if the organization wishes to appoint one.

UNIVERSITY TELEVISION

The Ontario Universities' Television Council, establishment of which was authorized by the Committee of Presidents in June 1965, had its terms of reference broadened in September 1966 to empower it on request to advise and assist universities in the development and use of television teaching in Ontario universities. The Council, now chaired by Professor W. J. McCallion, Director of Educational Services, McMaster University, is charged also with maintaining liaison with authorities in the field of secondary education.

In June 1966, the Committee of Presidents approved the establishment of an office staffed by a part-time executive officer and his full-time assistant to serve as a centre for information and advice with respect to closed-circuit television, extending later perhaps to broadcast television. The activities of the centre will include the establishment of standards for compatible equipment, since videotape recorded on equipment supplied by one manufacturer sometimes cannot be replayed on the equipment of any other manufacturer; collecting and exchanging information about recent technical and programming developments among all universities; collaborating with the Canadian Association of University Teachers in producing acceptable guidelines

on the rights and responsibilities of university staff members using television; and establishing liaison with the Department of Education in its development of an educational television network in Ontario.

The television centre went into operation in September 1967 under the supervision of Dr. D. L. C. Miller, Associate Professor of Philosophy and Assistant to the Dean for educational communications at Scarborough College of the University of Toronto.

COMPUTER SERVICES

The latest in the network of subcommittees set up to advise the Committee of Presidents is the Subcommittee on Computer Services which was established in June 1967 under the chairmanship of Professor C. C. Gotlieb, Director of the Institute of Computer Science, University of Toronto. The Subcommittee's terms of reference empower it to study and make recommendations to the Committee of Presidents on problems related to the development, co-ordination, and financing of university computing services in Ontario, to provide representation of the Committee of Presidents for joint discussions with representatives of the Committee on University Affairs on these problems, and to examine appropriate relations with institutions and agencies inside and outside the Province. Membership of the Subcommittee comprises a representative of each of the Ontario universities with computer needs or installations, with power to add.

The Subcommittee on Computer Services held its inaugural meeting in July and named two subgroups to study the problems involved in sharing computer facilities and establishing communications links in a number of regional centres. In view of the interest of the Regional Data Centre in the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in matters relating to regional facilities, the Institute was invited to nominate a member to the Subcommittee.

5. Financing the System

OPERATING GRANTS

Perhaps the most significant development in university affairs in Ontario over the past year was the decision to introduce formula financing. The principle had been accepted by the Minister of University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents early in 1965 and it had been strongly endorsed by the Bladen Commission on the financing of universities.⁵ Of great significance too, for the future of relations between the Government and the universities, was the method by which the formula was developed. The Subcommittee on Finance of the Committee on University Affairs and the Subcommittee on Grants Formulae of the Presidents' Research Committee worked jointly on the question and in August 1966 produced a joint report which was then submitted by each subcommittee to its parent body.

The joint report, which was immediately approved in principle by the Presidents, noted that the purpose of the formula was to provide an objective mechanism for determining the share of the total provincial operating grant to be allocated to each university. It emphasized that the formula would not fix the total amount to be made available to the universities, nor should it be taken as a means of determining the pattern of spending within a particular university. Formula financing had the advantage of buttressing the independence of the universities by ensuring a basic income to each institution without the close scrutiny of operating budgets necessarily involved in subjective review by the granting authority. As it took no account of income from sources other than tuition fees and Government grants the formula would provide an incentive to private donors to make gifts for operating purposes, giving them the assurance that their gifts

⁵*Financing Higher Education in Canada: Report of a Commission to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965).

would be an added resource of the university and not a substitute for public support. For the universities themselves, formula financing would give maximum incentive for efficient management.

As approved by the Committee on University Affairs and submitted to and approved by the Government for introduction in 1967-68,⁹ the formula provides for each university to receive a grant calculated by multiplying the value of the "basic income unit" by its actual "weighted enrolment" as of December 1 and subtracting standard tuition fees from the product. The "basic income unit" is roughly equivalent to the average cost per student of general degree work in a liberal arts course. Work in honours, professional, and graduate courses is then related on a rough cost basis to this base, each student category being weighted in relation to the basic unit. The weights adopted for 1967-68 range from 1 for general arts, general science, and first year undergraduate work generally to 6 for PhD work after the first year beyond the bachelor's degree. A university's total "weighted enrolment" is the sum of the number of students in each category multiplied by the appropriate weight. The Presidents felt that there was room for discussion about the proposed weights to be assigned to the various categories but thought it best to accept them for the first year on the understanding that they would be reviewed and refined in subsequent years on the basis of cost studies currently in progress.

Since the formula is not suitable both for emerging universities and for established institutions, the emerging universities receive in addition grants based on examination of actual needs. In the fully established institutions the formula grant alone is not sufficient to cover new undertakings such as a new faculty or school, and special supplementary grants are made to support such projects. Special provision is also made for the two universities—Ottawa and Laurentian—offering instruction in both French and English.

A point of crucial interest to the Presidents was, of course, the value of the basic income unit, which is determined by the Government on the advice of the Committee on University Affairs. The value of the basic income unit set for 1967-68, \$1,320, fell short of expectations. The Committee of Presidents recognizes that the public purse is not bottomless and that grants to universities are only one of the priorities to which the Government is committed. However, the Committee believes that the Government should be made fully aware of the needs of

⁹Ontario, Committee on University Affairs, *Report to the Minister of University Affairs: A Formula for Operating Grants to Provincially Assisted Universities in Ontario* (Toronto: Ontario Department of University Affairs, 1966).

higher education in Ontario and should set its level of support, whatever it may be, only in the light of a careful assessment of these needs. Realizing that their inability to give the Government a documented analysis of their collective needs for 1967-68 was in part responsible for the disappointing level of support received, the Committee of Presidents asked its Subcommittee on Grants Formulae to make a thorough analysis of what the operating costs of the universities were likely to be in 1968-69 and to recommend an appropriate level for the basic income unit for that year. For this purpose the universities agreed to pool their financial data and to make them available to the Subcommittee. This enabled the Subcommittee to conduct exhaustive analyses and to produce a carefully reasoned and documented report for submission to the Committee on University Affairs.

With the introduction of formula financing the necessity of detailed submissions by individual universities to the Committee on University Affairs had been reduced. Instead, the Committee of Presidents could make a joint presentation on the value of the basic income unit, leaving it to those universities that wished to request special supplementary grants to make individual presentations. Accordingly, the Executive of the Committee of Presidents met with the Committee on University Affairs in August and made a consolidated submission on the value of the basic income unit for 1968-69, based on the report of the Subcommittee on Grants Formulae.

The question of devising an objective basis for determining operating grants is engaging the attention of the Committee of Presidents. In November 1966, at a joint meeting of the Committee on University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents, it was suggested that both bodies should name subcommittees to study the problem of the emerging universities and to suggest a pattern by which such institutions might be defined and how their financing might change as they move from the status of emerging to emerged. Shortly afterwards, the Committee of Presidents set up a Subcommittee on the Financing of Emergent Universities, with Dr. T. L. Batke of the University of Waterloo as chairman, to study this problem. The necessity of finding an agreed solution became even more apparent in February when the emerging universities were notified of the supplementary grants they would receive in 1967-68 in connection with their emergent status. The universities concerned were disappointed at these grants, which they regarded as inadequate. The Presidents' Subcommittee submitted an interim report in September.

GRANTS TO CHURCH-RELATED INSTITUTIONS

In the autumn of 1966 the Federal Government announced its intention of ending direct assistance to universities, transferring the fiscal equivalent to the provinces. One method by which the funds to be transferred may be calculated is on the basis of 50 per cent of the operating costs of post-secondary institutions in the Province, but the provinces are not required to spend the fiscal equivalent in support of post-secondary institutions.

Withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of direct support of universities threatened to place the church-related institutions in Ontario in an embarrassing predicament. It has been the long-standing policy of the Ontario Government not to make grants to church-related universities and colleges; these institutions were heavily dependent on the Federal per-capita grants they had been receiving.

The Minister of University Affairs asked the Committee of Presidents for suggestions as to how the church-related institutions might be compensated for the loss of Federal grants without the Government's departing from its traditional policy. At first the Presidents did not think that they as a body should express a view on this question, but they later informed the Minister of University Affairs that, if it were decided to make grants to the church-related institutions, the provincially assisted universities would be willing to act as channels through which Government funds could be conveyed to the church colleges affiliated or federated to them.

The Ontario Government later announced its intention to make operating grants to existing church-affiliated institutions in the Province, equivalent to 50 per cent of the grant they would have received if they had not had a religious affiliation. It is estimated that the grants paid in 1967-68 will be approximately of the same order as those received by the institutions concerned from the Federal Government in the preceding year. Grants to colleges affiliated to provincially assisted universities will be made through the parent university, as suggested by the Committee of Presidents. Grants will be made direct to Waterloo Lutheran University, the only independent church-related university in the Province.

CAPITAL FINANCING AND PLANNING

Adoption of a formula for operating grants has pointed to the unsatisfactory position with regard to capital financing and has

prompted the search for a capital formula. The existing arrangements require the universities to find 15 per cent of the capital cost of academic facilities and 50 per cent in the case of other projects. The universities have conducted campaigns to raise funds for their share of building costs, but in most cases the funds so raised are virtually exhausted and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find money for capital development. One problem, ironically enough, seems to be that the greater the share of capital costs underwritten by the Government, the more difficult it becomes for the universities to raise their reduced share. This is explainable in part, of course, by the escalating amount in absolute terms required to finance university development, but it also seems to be due in some measure to a growing impression that the heavy Government commitment in this area relieves the private donor of the need to contribute.

In November 1966 university officers concerned with capital finance and planning met at the invitation of the Committee of Presidents. This meeting recommended that the Committee should urge the Government to support comprehensive and forward planning by the universities, and to provide the necessary financing for this function, reviewing the present method of capital support with a view to revising it. The meeting also recommended that the Committee of Presidents should set up a subcommittee from among business officers and others concerned with university planning to study capital financing and planning. The Committee accepted this recommendation and in January 1967, the Subcommittee on Capital Financing was appointed with Mr. D. M. Hedden of McMaster University as chairman.

A series of meetings was held, beginning in February 1967, attended by members of the Committee on University Affairs and the Department of University Affairs, and by the new Subcommittee on Capital Financing. Arising out of these meetings it was agreed that the problem should be tackled in three phases, short-, medium-, and long-term. The short-term period was taken as the timespan from July 1, 1964, when financing under the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corporation began, to June 30, 1969, which would encompass capital projects then under construction or in the active planning stage. The study of the short-term problem is now well advanced, and it is hoped that it will lead to a means of revising on an interim basis the current capital financing arrangements so as to enable the universities to carry on with expansion plans for the next two years while a more sophisticated method of approach is developed.

Phase II would extend from 1967 to 1972, phase I commitments being carried over into the second period. Studies to be conducted in con-

nection with phase II would investigate each university's requirements based on its own enrolment projections. Joint studies by the universities and the Government agencies concerned should lead to standards acceptable to all, and hopefully a realistic financing formula will be developed. The second period would merge into phase III which would run from 1970 to 1975. By that time more sophisticated standards should have been devised and the Commission on Post-Secondary Education should have assembled province-wide and regional enrolment projections which would permit more positive planning by the universities. This should lead to a long-term solution for capital financing which would be continually reviewed by a succession of annual studies.

To guide the necessary studies, the Subcommittee on Capital Financing recommended the appointment of a joint steering committee comprising representatives of the Committee on University Affairs and of the universities. This recommendation was accepted by the Committee of Presidents and by the Government, and the Capital Studies Committee was established with six members—three from the Committee on University Affairs and three from the universities, under the chairmanship of Dr. D. T. Wright, Chairman of the former. The Capital Studies Committee held its first meeting in June 1967 and selected as its main areas of study: enrolment (in co-operation with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education); a space inventory of Ontario universities on a standardized basis; system resources—libraries, computers, television, residences; policies and practices for control of capital planning in other jurisdictions (with the help of consultants); the structure of the building industry—negotiated contracts, builder proposals, and other techniques.

FINANCING OF RESEARCH

A report in 1966 by a study group, appointed by the Committee on University Affairs and chaired by the Director of Research of the Ontario Research Foundation, recommended continuance of Ontario Government support of research in the sciences and added "that the humanities, social sciences, and many other professional fields were equally deserving of research support and would recommend strongly that consideration be given to the establishment of some type of programme that would assist faculty members in these areas."

The report was adopted by the Department of University Affairs in the latter part of 1966, and the statement quoted above was endorsed by the Committee of Presidents in June 1967. The Presidents suggested

to the Committee on University Affairs that a joint committee be established to give further study to the proposal of the special study group, as well as to the recommendations of the Spinks Commission relating to financial support for research, and to the composition of the body to distribute research funds. In September the Committee on University Affairs proposed instead that the Committee of Presidents nominate two or three persons to meet with the Subcommittee on Research and Graduate Studies of the former Committee, in the hope that policy recommendations could be readied after a few such meetings. The principle of this counter-proposal was accepted by the Presidents, who suggested, however, that four persons should be nominated, one from each major disciplinary area. This was agreed to by the Committee on University Affairs.

6. Focus on the Student

UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT: THE STUDENTS' CONCERNS

The role of the student in university government was a question that came very much to the fore in the academic session under review. The search had been going on for some time for ways of involving the student more closely in decisions affecting him made within the university community, prompted in part by disturbances at large American universities where considerable remoteness of the student body from the administration and faculty had developed.

The Duff/Berdahl Report on *University Government in Canada*⁷ favoured joint student-faculty committees within departments or faculties and saw no great objection to student membership on Senate, but it recommended that students should elect someone who was not a student to represent them on the Board, on the model of the "Rector" at the Scottish universities. Ontario universities set up machinery, usually in the form of joint Board-Senate committees, to consider the Duff/Berdahl recommendations and to frame proposals for possible revision of their governing structures.

The University of Western Ontario had had a revision of its Act under consideration prior to the publication of the Duff/Berdahl Report, but the recommendations of the report regarding student participation in university government were reflected in a private bill (Pr31) submitted to the Ontario Legislature at its 1967 session. The Bill provided for three student representatives on the Senate and for one Board member, elected by the student body, who had not been a student at the University during the preceeding twelve months. The Private Bills Committee amended the provision relating to student representation on the Board to permit the election of a student.

⁷James Duff and Robert O. Berdahl, *University Government in Canada: Report of a Commission sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966).

The Committee of Presidents wrote to the Prime Minister of Ontario expressing concern, not with the substance of the amendment, but rather with the fact that the Private Bills Committee had made it without prior consultation with the University, and stating the Presidents' hope that action on the Bill as amended would be deferred unless the Bill could be passed in its original form. When the Bill was debated in the Legislature on June 14, 1967, the Government introduced amendments which had the effect of restoring it to its original form in the matter of student representation on the Board; it was in this form that the Bill was passed the following day. In the course of the debate on the Bill the Minister of University Affairs made it clear that the Government had no objection to student representation on university boards of governors but he said that in the interest of preserving university autonomy, the Government felt that it should be left to the universities to settle questions relating to the manner of their governance.

The question of student participation in university government remains a matter of concern to the university community. The Committee of Presidents requested its Subcommittee on Research and Planning (now chaired by Mr. Bernard Trotter of Queen's University) to prepare a working paper on the question of student participation for consideration by the Presidents and for later discussion on the various campuses. It is likely, however, that this matter will not lend itself to the adoption of a uniform solution and differing patterns of government may well be evolved in the various universities.

STUDENT AID

The Committee of Presidents is fully conscious of the need for a comprehensive and generous programme of student aid as an essential element in the development of university education in Ontario. The inauguration of the Province of Ontario Student Awards Program at the beginning of the academic year 1966-67 was therefore welcomed in spite of shortcomings, many of which have happily been remedied in the revised Program for 1967-68. Also to be commended is the continuation of the Province of Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program instituted in 1962. These two programmes are dealt with in greater detail below.

The year under review witnessed the formation of several continuing bodies concerned with student aid. In September 1966 the Minister of University Affairs announced that he was setting up an Advisory Committee on Student Awards to advise him on revisions to the Student

Awards Program for 1967-68. At the suggestion of the Committee of Presidents, this committee was later converted into a continuing body. For its part, the Committee of Presidents approved in February 1967 the creation of a Subcommittee on Student Aid comprising seven or eight persons, some experienced in the formation of policy for, and some in the administration of, university student aid programmes. The tasks of the Subcommittee are to study the financial problems relating to the provision and administration of financial aid to university students in Ontario, to make recommendations on these matters to the Committee of Presidents, and to maintain liaison with appropriate officials of the Department of University Affairs. Student awards officers of universities of Ontario created an association in April of this year and, in June, this body was affiliated to the Committee of Presidents. Among its aims are to encourage and conduct studies on matters relating to student financial assistance programmes and to advise the Committee of Presidents through its Subcommittee on Student Aid.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO STUDENT AWARDS PROGRAM

On April 4, 1966, the Minister of University Affairs announced the creation of the Province of Ontario Student Awards Program, an all-inclusive scheme which would replace the previous Type A and Type B bursaries and travel assistance grants and would incorporate the Canada Student Loans Plan introduced in 1964. The most significant feature of the new Program was its acceptance of the principle, long urged by the universities of Ontario, that if a student was worthy of a place he was worthy of support. In contrast to the previous arrangements, under which the student was required to have a minimum mark of 66 per cent to qualify for an award, the Student Awards Program was concerned only with the student's need once he gained admission to a university. The Program then provided that the applicant would receive the first \$150 of assessed need in the form of a loan and the balance in the proportions 60 per cent loan and 40 per cent grant. Awards from other sources would be applied first against the grant portion of the award.

The universities welcomed the Student Awards Program as a serious effort on the part of the Government towards achieving its objective of bringing a university education within the reach of any young person in Ontario qualified and willing to undertake it. However, the Program contained a number of flaws which at once became apparent, and in June 1966 a joint statement was issued by the Committee of

Presidents, the Ontario Council of University Faculty Associations, and the Ontario Region of the Canadian Union of Students drawing attention to these flaws. The statement pointed out that the heavy dependence on loans as a form of student aid was a most serious drawback, since loans acted as a deterrent rather than an incentive for students from the lower income groups, the very students the Program was intended to reach. It was also noted that loans constituted a negative dowry for women and were likely to force many students into highly paid jobs after graduation and away from other socially important occupations such as teaching, the ministry, social work and voluntary service through CUSO (Canadian University Service Overseas), and similar organizations.

Another drawback to which the joint statement drew attention was the detailed and demanding application form which required the student's parents to supply details of all their assets. Yet another unfortunate feature was the fact that the student was arbitrarily assessed with an amount that he ought to have saved from summer employment without regard to the amount he was actually able to save; this penalized those who took summer courses, or were ill, or who took unpaid or low-paid employment with one of the volunteer agencies. Finally, the statement made the point that the provision that other awards would be offset against the grant portion under the Program failed to give recognition to academic excellence.

Shortly after this statement was issued, the Minister met with representatives of the three sponsoring bodies and with student awards officers from the universities. At this meeting the university representatives expressed their concerns and recommended the setting up of a permanent advisory committee to the Minister on student awards. The Minister accepted the recommendation that he should set up an advisory committee and in September he announced its establishment, not as a permanent body but an *ad hoc* one to advise him on modifications to be made to the Student Awards Program for 1967-68. This Advisory Committee comprised two representatives of the Committee of Presidents and two university student awards officers named by the Presidents, two nominees each of the Ontario Council of University Faculty Associations and the Ontario Region of the Canadian Union of Students, together with government representatives.

The Advisory Committee reported in February 1967, and in April particulars of the Student Awards Program for 1967-68 were published. The Committee of Presidents was pleased to note that the revised Program incorporated a large number of the recommendations of

the Advisory Committee and remedied many of the defects that had flawed the initial Program.

For 1967-68, the application form was simplified, and all reference to family assets other than income deleted. The basis on which the student can be considered independent of his parents was widened and now includes those who are married, or have completed three successful years at a post-secondary institution, or have been employed in a full-time job for at least twelve consecutive months. The administration of the Program was decentralized and applications from prospective university students are handled by the student aid officers in the universities. The Government will reimburse the universities for the costs of administering the Program at the rate of \$4.50 per application in 1967-68; studies carried out in the universities indicate that this figure is likely to be on the low side but the Committee of Presidents accepted it on the Government's assurance that if any serious difficulty was encountered the position would be reviewed at the end of the academic session. (It is likely that in future years this cost will be borne by the universities and that provincial operating grants will be determined with this taken into account.)

The provisions in the original Program relating to the proportion of loan to grant have been retained with important modifications. Previously, the entire amount of any other award was deducted from the grant portion under the Program but now the first \$150 of any award received by a student from another source is not deducted. As in the original Program, the first \$150 of assessed need must still be taken in the form of a loan but, whereas formerly the whole amount of assessed need in excess of \$150 was met in the proportions 60 per cent loan and 40 per cent grant, now the amount so met is limited to \$750, and the whole amount of an award over \$900 will be in the form of a non-repayable grant. The effect of this is to place a ceiling of \$600 on the amount of loan taken by a student in any one year. While the Committee of Presidents would have preferred a more generous proportion of grant to loan for the whole amount of the award, it is satisfied that the solution adopted will keep the burden of debt on the student down to a tolerable level. The rules relating to summer earnings were relaxed and special allowance is made in the case of students in summer school, or those carrying out summer service work at a relatively low salary, or those who were medically unfit to undertake summer work.

An important recommendation of the Minister's Advisory Committee, reinforcing the suggestion made by the Committee of Presidents, was

that the Advisory Committee should be converted into a standing body. This recommendation was accepted by the Minister and the standing Ontario Committee on Student Awards was created. The existence of this and the other bodies mentioned in the introduction to this section—the Subcommittee on Student Aid of the Committee of Presidents and the Association of University Student Awards Officers—will enable the Student Awards Program to be kept under review and will provide a means whereby improvements can be suggested as difficulties are noted.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The year 1966-67 was the fourth year of operation of the Province of Ontario Graduate Fellowship Program originally launched in 1962 with the object of attracting large numbers into the profession of university teaching. The Program was designed to support mainly candidates in the humanities and social sciences, but there was a quota for pure science and mathematics students with a clear interest in a university teaching career.

For the academic session under review, the maximum annual value of each fellowship remained unchanged at \$1,500 with a summer supplement of \$500. However, the total amount that a fellow could receive under the Program was increased from \$4,500 to \$6,000 for a PhD student, with corresponding increases for candidates for the lower graduate degrees. Another welcome change was the increase in the maximum annual income the fellow could receive, including his fellowship; this was revised from \$3,500 to \$4,000 at the PhD level with a corresponding increase at the master's level.

One feature of the arrangements for the Graduate Fellowship Program in 1966-67 which greatly exercised the Committee of Presidents was the imposition for the first time of a quota for each university for fellowship awards in the humanities and social sciences. Under the original Program, a quota had been set for fellows in pure science and mathematics, but this was understandable in view of the deliberate emphasis on the training of university teachers in the humanities and social sciences.

The proposed extension of the quota system to the two basic fields covered by the Program meant that the universities would not be allowed to make awards in excess of their quota in spite of the certainty, based on experience, of a fair percentage of dropouts in the original list of applicants. There was, therefore, the risk that a number of available fellowships in each university would not be taken up.

The Presidents' Advisory Committee on Graduate Studies, forerunner of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, made representations to the Department of University Affairs and secured agreement that there should be a limited over-award scheme for the Program in 1967-68. The Committee of Presidents is appreciative of this modification, which has made a substantial contribution to effective administration of the quota.

In view of the usefulness of the Minister's Advisory Committee on Student Awards, the Committee of Presidents considered whether it might be advisable to recommend the establishment of a similar committee for the Graduate Fellowship Program. However, the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, which acts as an advisory committee to the Presidents on graduate awards, reported that it had enjoyed satisfactory contact with the Subcommittee on Research and Graduate Studies of the Committee on University Affairs. Since this informal consultative machinery was working well, it did not appear necessary to pursue the question of a formal advisory committee.

GRADUATE AWARDS BY UNIVERSITIES

Along with the Graduate Fellowship Program, funds were set aside by the universities to enable them to make discretionary awards to graduate students in cases where the student did not qualify under the Fellowship Program, or as a supplement to the regular award. An interpretation early in 1967 by the Department of University Affairs that operating grants could no longer be used to make fellowship awards was a matter of concern to the Committee of Presidents. The case for making discretionary awards was prepared by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies at the Presidents' request and put to the Government, but to no avail. The Government maintained that since there was already a generous scheme of graduate support from public funds, operating grants by the Province should not be used to make additional awards. Universities could, if they wished, use funds available to them from other sources to make fellowship awards, provided the total amount spent on items excluded from grant aid did not exceed the total of "free" money available to the university.

One of the arguments advanced by the universities in support of discretionary fellowships was the frank need to strengthen the competitive position of Ontario universities as a whole. Generous fellowships were available in other jurisdictions, and the best Ontario students could be tempted by these if the alternative was to accept a smaller fellowship in Ontario and supplement it by loans. Another concern

expressed by the universities was the need for flexibility. While the Graduate Fellowship Program is an excellent one, it is centrally controlled and inevitably lacks flexibility. Flexibility is important to widen horizons and open opportunities for the development of new academic enterprises. If the universities had money available to them to make graduate awards, they could make provision for post-doctoral fellowships which are not covered under the Government Program. Post-doctoral fellows can make a great contribution to the life of the university and, in the case of the newer universities, their presence can provide the stimulus that would otherwise be lacking where there is not a well-established graduate school. While it is true, as suggested by the Government, that money available from other sources could be used to provide graduate fellowships, this would not be of significant help to universities whose other sources of funds are very limited.

The Ontario Council on Graduate Studies was asked to consider this problem and to seek solutions which would meet the needs of the universities and which would also be acceptable to the Government. This was done and at its September 1967 meeting, the Committee of Presidents agreed to recommend to the Government the Council's proposal that Ontario universities be permitted to use formula income to provide fellowships for the support of graduate students, the upper limits of such fellowships to be \$1,000 for a student in a prerequisite year, \$4,000 for a student in the first year of graduate study, and \$5,000 for a student in the second or subsequent years.

Another aspect of the matter is worthy of consideration: the question whether the prohibition on the use of operating grants for specific purposes is compatible with the principle of formula financing. In the report to the Minister on the formula⁸ the Committee on University Affairs stated: "Regulations about the acceptable purposes for which grant income may be used are a separate matter for consideration. . . ." However, the Committee of Presidents believes that a formula, to be a truly effective guardian of university autonomy, should operate as a means of channelling public support to the universities without specific limitations on the purpose for which such funds are spent; in principle then, the universities should be free to apply the funds received under the formula to any legitimate purposes that they consider desirable. The importance of this principle goes beyond the particular question of graduate awards and the Committee of Presi-

⁸Ontario, Committee on University Affairs, *Report to the Minister of University Affairs: A Formula for Operating Grants to Provincially Assisted Universities in Ontario* (Toronto: Ontario Department of University Affairs, 1966), pp. 2-3.

dents will pursue opportunities to clarify the position with the Government.

STUDENT HOUSING

One of the major recommendations of *From the Sixties to the Seventies* was "that the Committee of Presidents and the Committee on University Affairs establish at an early date a Commission on Student Housing to consider the need for student housing, the educational objectives sought and the financial problems involved, and develop a comprehensive plan of capital assistance and subsidy to ensure that these needs are met with due regard to conditions prevailing at each institution and over-all educational objectives" (pp. 37-8). The urgency of this problem lies partly in the fact that, as the number of students attending university increases, existing residences are fully occupied and the communities are reaching the limit of their capacity to provide lodging in private homes. New residences must therefore be built to accommodate the largest part of the increase in the student population.

Financing of student residences is at present done in one of two ways. Where the cost per bed does not exceed \$7,000 the Government will make a grant of \$1,400 per bed, and a mortgage not exceeding \$4,200 per bed may be obtained from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, with the university finding the balance from other sources. The alternative method is for the newly formed Ontario Student Housing Corporation to build or acquire residences and lease them back to the universities for a fifty-year period. Under the latter arrangement, the full cost of the mortgage must be met by the universities out of charges made to students. However, it would appear that full carrying charges and amortization can be met out of charges to students only by raising residence fees substantially above current charges for student accommodation.

The Committee of Presidents is deeply concerned about the problem of providing student residence places at reasonable rates. In September 1966 the Committee agreed to make an urgent request that the Department of University Affairs and the Ontario Student Housing Corporation make available to the universities of Ontario the \$1,400 per bed grant and such other subsidy or grant as would enable the universities to carry the net mortgage and to operate residences on a self-liquidating basis without forcing students to pay residence charges in excess of the generally prevailing average for student accommodation in the community. This request was conveyed to the Minister of University Affairs in October 1966 and his decision is still awaited.

As mentioned under "Capital Finance and Planning," student housing was one of the items selected for special study by the joint Capital Studies Committee. Another study to be conducted in this area, sponsored jointly by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, was launched during the summer of 1967. It is planned to cover universities throughout Canada and the presidents of Ontario universities have been asked to participate. This study as planned should prove to be fruitful.

7. Assessment and Agenda

Running through the preceding pages of this Review is the thread of improved communication between the universities and the Government and a growing tendency for the Government to consult the universities on matters of joint concern rather than to act unilaterally.

The Province of Ontario Student Awards Program which was presented to the universities as a *fait accompli* for 1966-67 was revised for 1967-68 on the recommendation of an Advisory Committee composed of representatives of the Committee of Presidents and the faculty and student associations as well as Government nominees. The revised Program is a considerable improvement over the original one. The development of the operating grants formula (which is justifiably getting world-wide attention) provides another example of fruitful consultation: subcommittees of the Committee on University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents worked together and produced a joint report which was then submitted to the respective parent bodies. The pattern of joint consultation has also been established in the important area of capital financing where a Capital Studies Committee, made up of representatives of the Committee on University Affairs and the Committee of Presidents, is at work.

One area in which prior consultation is vital is in determining the value of the basic income unit under the operating grants formula. The universities realized that when the value of the basic income unit for 1967-68 was fixed much below what they had hoped for, they had not sufficient data to enable them to make a reasoned protest. Subsequent pooling and analysis of financial information has made it possible for the universities to make to the Committee on University Affairs a carefully documented presentation on the value of the basic income unit for 1968-69. Further consultation is expected before the value is fixed.

The main channel of communication between the universities and the Government is the Committee on University Affairs and that Committee is much better fitted to perform this function now that it has a

full-time Chairman in the person of Dr. D. T. Wright. The practice which has grown up since Dr. Wright's appointment whereby he meets with the Committee of Presidents in the course of its regular meetings provides a valuable opportunity for continuing informal contact. The Presidents are anxious to see greater academic representation on the Committee on University Affairs and the establishment of a full-time secretariat for the Committee. The response to the latter suggestion has not so far been encouraging. It is also essential to clarify the role of the Committee on University Affairs vis-à-vis the universities on the one hand and the Minister and Department of University Affairs on the other. The Committee acts in an advisory capacity to the Government, and there is a natural desire on the part of its members to have its advice accepted on as many occasions as possible. This situation carries with it the danger that the Committee may be tempted to tailor its advice to what it believes to be consistent with the Government's own order of priorities. But to be truly effective the Committee should jealously guard its independent status and should address itself constantly to the task of determining the actual needs of higher education in Ontario and making these needs known to the Government, leaving it to the latter to decide how far it will be able to go in meeting these needs in the light of its other commitments.

At the same time that communication between the universities and the Government has improved, notable advances in this direction have been made among the universities themselves. Creation of a full-time secretariat has provided a clearing-house and vehicle for communication which has been effective. Also, for the first time, confidential financial data relating to the individual universities were pooled in 1967 to facilitate the studies undertaken with a view to suggesting a value for the basic income unit for 1968-69. The emergence of a university "system" in Ontario, which forms the theme of this Review, bespeaks a degree of voluntary co-operation among the universities that would have been difficult to envisage a few short years ago. The appraisals procedure for graduate programmes, the creation of an Ontario universities library system, including a bibliographic centre, province-wide reader services, the interuniversity library transit system, and the common admissions procedures adopted for 1968-69, all mark a significant departure from old ways. However, problems remain in the area of interuniversity co-operation, notably in the steps to be taken in deciding whether a new faculty or school is needed and, if so, where it should be located. Ways must be found of involving the universities collectively in decisions of this nature to ensure that appropriate

criteria are used, that all pertinent factors are considered, and that all interested parties are involved in the process.

Communication among the universities and with the Government has improved, but there are many other groups that have an interest in university affairs with which communication remains less than satisfactory. With the greatly increased demand for university places and the heavy commitment of public funds for the support of the universities, the citizens of Ontario as a whole should be kept informed of what the universities are doing and should have opportunities to make their views known in turn. The Committee of Presidents is studying ways of improving communication with its various publics. The publication of this Review on an annual basis will be one means of placing before the public information on what the universities are doing collectively. Other opportunities for contact and for two-way communication will be explored.

This Review has, of course, been confined to developments in university affairs in Ontario, but it is important not to lose sight of the fact that while education is a provincial responsibility the universities of Ontario exist in a Canadian context and cannot become a closed system. Information on what universities in other provinces are doing must be of benefit to the Ontario system, unless it be thought that Ontario universities have a monopoly on wisdom. The means of communication with other Canadian universities lies at hand in the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. The tentative step it took in May to bring together representatives of provincial, regional, and federal agencies—governmental and non-governmental—concerned with higher education should be encouraged.

It has been a good year and our achievements have been many. All concerned, however, must continue their efforts to evolve appropriate structures and practices to relate the universities to each other and to government so each can discharge its responsibilities effectively.

Appendix A

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO AND OF ITS SECRETARIAT

at October 1, 1967

Brock University—Dr. James A. Gibson, President*
Carleton University—Dr. A. Davidson Dunton, President
University of Guelph—Dr. W.C. Winogard, President
Lakehead University—Dr. W. G. Tamblyn, President
Laurentian University of Sudbury—Mr. S. G. Mullins, President
McMaster University—Dr. H. G. Thode, President*
Université d'Ottawa—T. R. P. Roger Guindon, Recteur*
Queen's University at Kingston—Dr. J. A. Corry, Principal (Chairman)*
University of Toronto—Mr. J. H. Sword, Acting President*
Trent University—Mr. T. H. B. Symons, President
University of Waterloo—Dr. J. G. Hagey, President
University of Western Ontario—Dr. D. C. Williams, President
University of Windsor—Dr. J. F. Leddy, President
York University—Dr. M. G. Ross, President

SECRETARIAT

Edward F. Sheffield, Executive Vice-Chairman (July 1966)*
J. A. d'Oliveira, Assistant to the Executive Vice-Chairman (July 1967)
Jackie Taillon, Secretary to the Executive Vice-Chairman (July 1966)
Linda Aubin, clerk-stenographer (July 1967)

*Member of the Executive

Appendix B

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO/COMITÉ DES PRÉSIDENTS D'UNIVERSITÉ DE L'ONTARIO

(adopted December 9, 1966)*

1. *Name*

(1) The name of this body shall be: "Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario/Comité des Présidents d'Université de l'Ontario."

2. *Objects*

(1) The objects of the Committee are to promote co-operation among the provincially assisted universities of Ontario, and between them and the Government of the Province, and, generally, to work for the improvement of higher education for the people of Ontario.

3. *Membership*

(1) Those eligible for membership are the executive heads of institutions of post-secondary education in Ontario which are in receipt of financial assistance from the Government of the Province of Ontario and have the power to grant university degrees (a power conferred by a legislative or parliamentary act or charter in which such authority is specifically stated) but excluding institutions whose power to grant degrees is limited to a single professional field.

(2) At the time of the coming into force of this constitution, members shall be the executive heads of the universities listed in Annex A attached.

(3) Others eligible for membership may be admitted if recommended by the Executive and approved by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting at a meeting of the Committee of Presidents.

4. *Officers*

(1) The Committee shall have a Chairman, elected from and by its members for a term of two years. He shall serve without remuneration.

(2) The Committee shall have a Vice-Chairman, elected from and by its members for a term of two years. He shall act for the Chairman in the absence of the latter. He, too, shall serve without remuneration.

(3) The Committee shall have as its senior paid officer an Executive Vice-Chairman, appointed by the Executive with the concurrence of not less

*The Committee was formed on December 3, 1962, but was without a formal constitution until December 9, 1966.

than two-thirds of the members of the Committee of Presidents. Included in his functions shall be those of secretary and treasurer of the Committee.

(4) The Committee may have other paid officers, and substaff, as deemed necessary by the Executive.

5. *Subcommittees*

(1) There shall be a subcommittee called "the Executive" composed of six members: the Chairman of the Committee of Presidents (who shall preside), the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Vice-Chairman (who shall have no vote); and three others elected from and by the members of the Committee of Presidents—one from the larger universities, one from those of intermediate size, and one from the smaller universities. Its function is to guide the Committee of Presidents and, on occasion, to act for it between meetings of the Committee.

(2) There shall be a "Subcommittee on Nominations," named by the Chairman with the approval of the Executive. It shall propose candidates for the elective offices and for membership of subcommittees.

(3) There may be such other subcommittees (standing and special) as are deemed necessary.

(4) Members of standing subcommittees shall serve for terms of two years. They may be re-elected. Members of special subcommittees normally shall serve for the duration of the subcommittee.

6. *Affiliates*

(1) Other organizations or associations of personnel serving in the universities of Ontario may be affiliated to the Committee of Presidents.

7. *Meetings*

(1) The Committee of Presidents shall meet at least twice a year.

(2) Meetings of the Committee and of the Executive may be called by the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Vice-Chairman, or any three other members of the Committee.

(3) A member who is unable to attend a meeting of the Committee may be represented by a substitute of his choosing who will have power to vote at the meeting.

(4) Subcommittees will meet as required.

(5) A majority of the members of the Committee of Presidents or of a subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for a meeting of the Committee or subcommittee concerned.

8. *Finance*

(1) The fiscal year of the Committee of Presidents shall end June 30.

(2) The chief source of financial support of the Committee shall be subscriptions paid by the universities whose executive heads are members of the Committee.

(3) The scale of membership subscriptions shall be set by action of the Committee.

(4) The Committee may receive additional financial support from other sources.

(5) The accounts of the Committee shall be audited by a firm of auditors appointed by authority of the Committee for terms of one year, renewable.

9. Amendment

(1) This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds majority of members of the Committee present and voting at a meeting in the notice of which the proposed amendment is specified and at which at least two-thirds of the members are present.

ANNEX A

Provincially assisted universities of Ontario whose executive heads were members of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario at December 9, 1966:

Brock University
Carleton University
University of Guelph
Lakehead University
Laurentian University of Sudbury
McMaster University
Université d'Ottawa
Queen's University at Kingston
University of Toronto
Trent University
University of Waterloo
University of Western Ontario
University of Windsor
York University

Appendix C

SUBCOMMITTEES AND AFFILIATES OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES OF ONTARIO

(as at October 1, 1967)

1. *The Executive*

Task: To guide the Committee of Presidents and on occasion to act for it between meetings of the Committee.

Membership: Six members: the Chairman of the Committee of Presidents (who shall preside), the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Vice-Chairman (who shall have no vote), and three others elected from and by the members of the Committee of Presidents, one from the larger universities, one from those of intermediate size and one from the smaller universities.

Chairman: Dr. J. A. Corry, Principal, Queen's University (ex officio).

2. *Subcommittee on Nominations*

Task: To propose candidates for elective offices and for membership of subcommittees.

Membership: Members shall be named by the Chairman of CPUO.

Chairman: Dr. M. G. Ross, President, York University.

3. *Subcommittee on Research and Planning*

Task: To suggest to the Committee of Presidents research and planning projects which should be undertaken for the development and improvement of higher education in Ontario; at the request of the Committee of Presidents to delineate research and planning projects of this sort and suggest procedures and personnel for carrying them out; to review and comment on the results of such projects for the guidance of the Committee of Presidents.

Membership: Ten or a dozen persons representing university administration and a variety of academic disciplines—persons with experience of social research and an interest in the Subcommittee's task.

Chairman: Mr. Bernard Trotter, Executive Assistant to the Principal of Queen's University.

4. *Subcommittee on Grants Formulae*

Task: To study matters pertaining to the establishment of an equitable Provincial Government operating grant system and to make recommendations on this matter to the Committee of Presidents; to maintain liaison with the relevant subcommittee of the Committee on University Affairs.

Membership: Three members named by and from the membership of the Subcommittee on Research and Planning.

Chairman: Mr. Bernard Trotter, Executive Assistant to the Principal of Queen's University.

5. Special Subcommittee on the Financing of Emergent Universities

Task: To study ways of making equitable Provincial Government operating grants to emergent universities and to make recommendations on this matter to the Subcommittee on Grants Formulae.

Membership: A Chairman from a recently emerged university who is a member of the Subcommittee on Grants Formulae, plus one representative from each of the six universities wholly or partially in the "emergent" category.

Chairman: Dr. T. L. Batke, Vice-President, University Development, University of Waterloo.

6. Subcommittee on Capital Financing

Task: To study the problems presented by the planning, construction and financing of university buildings, and to make recommendations on these matters to the Committee of Presidents; to maintain liaison with the organization of campus planners and physical plant administrators of Ontario universities; to maintain liaison with appropriate officials of the Department of University Affairs.

Membership: About half-a-dozen persons representing large and small universities, and the administrative functions of campus planning and campus financing.

Chairman: Mr. D. M. Hedden, Vice-President (Administration), McMaster University.

7. Subcommittee on Student Aid

Task: To study the problems relating to the provision and administration of financial aid to university students in Ontario, and to make recommendations on these matters to the Committee of Presidents; to maintain liaison with appropriate officials of the Department of University Affairs.

Membership: About seven or eight persons—some experienced in the formation of policy for, and some in the administration of, university student aid programmes.

Chairman: Mr. Robin Ross, Vice-President and Registrar, University of Toronto.

8. Subcommittee on Public Relations

Task: To suggest to the Committee of Presidents ways in which the nature, the roles, the problems and the actions of the universities can be interpreted to the public; to advise the Committee on relations with the press and other media of communication; and, as requested by the Committee of Presidents from time to time, to arrange for news releases.

Membership: Seven or eight persons, including a preponderance of university information or public relations officers, but also representatives of general university administration and of persons oriented primarily towards the philosophy and politics of higher education.

Chairman: Dr. J. C. Hagey, President, University of Waterloo.

9. Subcommittee on Computer Services

Task: To study and make recommendations to the Committee of Presidents on problems related to the development, co-ordination and financing of

university computing services in Ontario; to provide representation of the Committee of Presidents for joint discussions with representatives of the Committee on University Affairs of these problems as opportunities are presented; to examine appropriate relations with institutions and agencies both inside and outside the Province of Ontario with respect to computer services.

Membership: A representative of each of the Ontario universities with computer needs or installations, with power to add.

Chairman: Dr. C. C. Gotlieb, Director, Institute of Computer Science, University of Toronto.

10. *Subcommittee on Teacher Education*

Task: To study the implications for the universities of Ontario of the education and training of teachers by the universities, including the recommendations contained in the *Report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers, 1966*; to make recommendations to the Committee of Presidents regarding policy and procedure to be followed in establishing new programmes of teacher education in the universities of Ontario; to act as a continuing advisory committee to the universities in the development of these programmes.

Membership: At least one representative from each interested university in the Province. Universities with colleges or faculties of education may be represented by two persons—one from the college or faculty of education and the other from the faculty of arts or arts and science.

Chairman: Dr. J. A. Gibson, President, Brock University.

11. *Ontario College Health Association (subcommittee)*

Task: "To develop and pursue all measures which may optimally initiate, preserve, unify, and promote the health of our students and college communities by providing a forum for the exchange of information and the personal sharing of experiences."

Membership: (a) Institutional—institutions of post-secondary education in Ontario. (b) Individual—persons working within or responsible for the establishment of health services in such institutions. (c) Associate—persons working in allied fields and disciplines but not actually within established health services.

President: Dr. D. H. Upton, Director of Student Health Service, Queen's University.

12. *Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions (affiliate)*

Task: To deal with all admissions questions (both policy and procedures) of joint concern to the Ontario universities and specifically to make recommendations with respect to an Ontario Universities' Applications Centre.

Membership: At least one member from each university and not more than three from multi-faculty institutions, selection of the members to be the responsibility of the individual university.

Chairman: Dr. F. A. DeMareo, Vice-President, University of Windsor.

13. *Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (affiliate)*

Task: To promote the advancement of graduate education and research in the provincially assisted universities in Ontario; to consider matters referred

to it by the Committee of Presidents; to advise the Committee of Presidents on the planning and development of an orderly pattern of graduate education and research, having regard, among other things, to the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of programmes and facilities.

Membership: The provincially assisted universities of Ontario, each represented by the Dean of Graduate Studies or the Chairman of the Committee on Graduate Studies.

Chairman: Dr. Ernest Sirluck, Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Toronto.

14. *Ontario Council of University Librarians* (affiliate)

Task: To oversee standards of general library service in the universities; to supervise the management of any such bibliographic centre and system of reader services as may result from the further recommendations of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and the Ontario Council of University Librarians; to co-operate with other agencies and councils as appropriate; to advise the Committee of Presidents on these matters.

Membership: The chief librarians of the provincially assisted universities, with power to add associate members or consultants as occasion requires.

Chairman: Mrs. Doris Lewis, Librarian, University of Waterloo.

15. *Advisory Joint Council on Co-Ordination of Ontario University Library Research Facilities* (affiliate)

Task: (a) to advise the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario on matters of policy and budget relating to the co-ordination of university library research facilities; (b) to ensure the discharge of responsibilities assumed by institutions in accepting the allocation of special areas of research development, and of duties with respect to the bibliographic centre and special reader services; (c) to advise the Ontario Council of University Librarians on the operation of the Bibliographic Centre and special reader services; (d) to advise the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies on the operation of appraisal procedures as they affect libraries.

Membership: The membership of the Advisory Joint Council shall consist of all members of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies and the Ontario Council of University Librarians.

Chairman: Mrs. Doris Lewis, Librarian, University of Waterloo.

16. *Ontario Universities' Television Council* (affiliate)

Task: On request, to advise and assist universities, and to make recommendations to universities or to the Province, or both, on the development and use of television teaching in Ontario universities.

Membership: One academic representative from each provincially assisted university in Ontario.

Chairman: Professor W. J. McCallion, Director of Educational Services, McMaster University.

17. *Ontario Council of Deans of Medicine* (affiliate)

Task: To provide an effective means of co-ordination of effort and a regular medium of communication between the faculties of medicine of universities of Ontario, having regard to the need to avoid unnecessary duplication or overlap of programmes between individual faculties and to

provide special interuniversity projects which relate to medical education, research, and health services; to advise the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario on matters which will influence medical education and research and to consider such matters as are referred to it by the Committee of Presidents; to serve as liaison between the faculties of medicine and government agencies concerned with health and hospital services, professional colleges and associations, and any other organizations the activities of which influence medical education and research.

Membership: Each Ontario university with a faculty of medicine represented by the Dean of Medicine, with power to add the vice presidents of Health Science and other associate members as occasion requires.

Chairman: Dr. E. H. Botterell, Dean of Medicine, Queen's University.

18. *Committee of Ontario Deans of Engineering (affiliate)*

Task: To provide a medium of communication among the engineering faculties of Ontario so that engineering education in the Province may evolve optimally; to advise the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario on any appropriate aspect of education.

Membership: Deans of Engineering of faculties conferring the baccalaureate degree at institutions of post-secondary education in Ontario whose presidents are members of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario.

Chairman: Dr. J. M. Ham, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, University of Toronto.

19. *Association of Student Awards Officers of the Universities of Ontario (affiliate)*

Task: To provide a forum for the discussion of matters relating to student financial assistance programmes; to encourage and conduct studies on matters relating thereto; to advise the Committee of Presidents through the Subcommittee on Student Aid on these matters; to co-operate with other agencies and councils as appropriate; to promote training of student awards staff; to represent the student awards officers of the Association in Canada and internationally and to seek and maintain active liaison with other groups having similar interests and objectives.

Membership: Student awards officers of the provincially assisted universities. Membership may be extended to the student awards officers of other post-secondary institutions in Ontario.

Chairman: Mr. D. N. Ellis, Assistant Registrar (Student Awards), Queen's University.

20. *Ontario Association of Departments of Extension and Summer Schools (affiliate)*

Task: To promote closer relations among individuals and institutions interested in credit and non-credit university extension and to work for the development and improvement of continuing education at the university level.

Membership: Deans, Directors and Associate or Assistant Deans or Directors of Extension of degree-granting universities whose presidents are members of the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario.

Chairman: Reverend E. C. Pappert, Director of Extension, University of Windsor.

Appendix D

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON GRADUATE STUDIES BY-LAW TO ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE ON APPRAISAL OF GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

(as amended September 1967)

- I. 1. There shall be a Standing Committee of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies to be known as the Appraisals Committee.
 2. (a) The Appraisals Committee shall consist of six members of the Council, of whom four shall constitute a quorum.
(b) Except in the first instance when the term of office shall be two for one year, two for two years and two for three years, the term of office on the Committee shall be three calendar years and at least two members* shall be chosen from among Toronto, Western Ontario, Queen's, and McMaster, and at least two from Ottawa, Waterloo, Windsor, Carleton, Guelph, and York.†
 3. The members of the Committee shall be nominated by the Nominating Committee of the Council and elected by the Council at its annual meeting. They shall be eligible for re-election.
 4. The Committee shall elect its own chairman annually and he shall be eligible for re-election.
 5. The Chairman shall have one vote.
- II. 1. The functions of the Committee shall be
 - (a) to evaluate and appraise graduate programs in any discipline at the request of the university, or of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies with the consent of the university.
 - (b) to report on its appraisals as detailed in part III of this By-Law.
 2. The university proposing a new program shall bear the costs of the appraisal according to a schedule established by the Committee and set forth in the procedures; the organization requesting appraisal of an existing program shall bear the costs of the appraisal.

*The members of the Appraisals Committee are the universities; the Nominating Committee, in consultation with the university through its representative on the Council, may nominate a faculty member other than the graduate dean. Continuity is important, and each individual nominated will be expected to serve throughout his university's term.

†The Spinks Commission Report of 1966 categorized the first named group of universities as having "fully-developed honours and graduate programs, to Ph.D. level in many fields" and the second group as having "Honours and graduate programs launched and Ph.D. work in some fields." In the future, the Council may find it desirable to amend this By-Law if one or more universities change categories.

- III. 1. The procedure to be followed by the Committee shall be established by resolution and shall be subject to approval by the Council.
2. It is expected that a university, acting through its graduate dean, will submit a proposed graduate program for appraisal before submission for final approval to its own Senate.
3. After the approved procedure has been followed the Committee will recommend to the Council on Graduate Studies the granting, the refusal, the retention or the suspension of approval, with reasons for its decision.
4. The Council will not debate the detail of the case but will accept or reject the recommendation of the Committee when it has satisfied itself that the procedures of the Committee ensured a thorough and fair study of the case; it can in any case refer the matter back to the Committee.
5. The decision of the Council shall be communicated to the university concerned.
6. The approval of a new Ph.D. program shall be for an initial period of five years. At the end of that time, each program shall be reassessed in a manner specified in Procedures I.11 for re-examination, the results communicated in accordance with paragraph III.5 above and paragraph 9 of the attached procedural resolution, and the appraisal paid for by the university. The university may alternatively request a full appraisal.
7. When a Ph.D. program is assessed that was authorized by the university prior to January 1, 1967, or one that, having been approved by the Council after January 1, 1967, has been in existence for more than five years, the Committee and Council shall follow the same procedure as for a new program. In addition to the options in III.3, the Committee may recommend the approval or the retention of the approval of the program subject to the rectification of certain deficiencies; it may in this case require a re-appraisal similar to that outlined in Procedures I.11.
8. When a program of his own university is being assessed, any member of the Committee shall absent himself from all the Committee's proceedings relevant to that assessment, except for the discussion permitted by paragraph 7(c) of the procedural resolution.
9. If a debate arises in Council on the points permitted by paragraph III.4, the university's representative on Council may make one statement and later a rebuttal.
- IV. No clause in this By-Law shall be suspended or amended unless notice of motion has been given at a previous meeting or is placed on the agenda of the current meeting, unless said suspension or amendment is passed by at least two-thirds of the members present at the said meeting.
- V. *Interpretative Clause*
1. (a) It is understood that all chartered universities have the power to authorize degrees. Submission of programs for appraisal is therefore voluntary.
- (b) It is stressed that approval is not similar to the "accreditation" of certain professional bodies. There are no predetermined quantitative measurements, course requirements, etc.; the Appraisals Com-

mittee will base its decisions essentially on the opinions of the consultants.

(c) It is each separate program that is appraised, not institutions or departments.

2. DEPARTMENT: "Department" shall be read to include any faculty group responsible for the operation of a "program," including institutes, centres, inter-disciplinary committees, and similar organizations.

3. PROGRAM:

(a) The word "program" of a "department" is used to signify all aspects of the graduate undertaking of the department, including the actual and planned staff, extent and limitations of areas of research specialization, research facilities, and curriculum. The appraisal shall embrace all factors which must be considered to establish that the program will be *academically* sound, and only those factors.

(b) The area of work covered by a program is not necessarily coincident with the complete range of instructional and research fields for which a department (or other administrative organ) is responsible. Usually the area of a program is more restricted than the whole of the discipline associated with a department. If a department whose offering has been approved in (or hitherto confined to) specific fields wishes to undertake Ph.D. work in a further field of specialization, the university should seek the opinion of the Committee as to whether an appraisal is desirable.

4. COMMITTEE: Where "Committee" appears without further specification, it shall be construed to mean "Appraisals Committee."

5. COUNCIL: "Council" refers to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

This By-Law shall take effect January 1, 1967.

PROCEDURE OF THE APPRAISALS COMMITTEE

I. Ph.D. Program

When a request for appraisal of a proposed Ph.D. program is made, the Committee shall inform the Chairman of the Council. It may ask the Executive Committee for establishment of priorities in its work. It shall then proceed as follows:

1. The Committee shall ask the university concerned to submit a report showing, along with other relevant material, the following:

(a) proposed areas of specialization;

(b) an estimate of enrolment;

(c) numbers of staff in each area of specialization and proposed staff development;

(d) present and proposed undergraduate and other commitments of the department, showing individual teaching loads where possible;

(e) present library resources and additional requirements for at least five years, including a statement by the Chief Librarian of the university;

(f) laboratory facilities and research equipment;

- (g) availability of research funds;
- (h) adequacy of space for student and staff offices;
- (i) proposed regulations for the program under the headings
 - i admission standards
 - ii courses required
 - iii examinations required
 - iv thesis and language requirements
 - v residence regulations;
- (j) courses available in the department and proposed new courses, showing which courses, if any, are also open to undergraduates;
- (k) any innovation as to subject matter or treatment;
- (l) strength of collateral and supporting departments in the university or available to it;
- (m) experience of the department in advanced work and, where available, information on the subsequent progress of students who have already been awarded the master's degree;
- (n) detailed *curriculum vitae* and publication records of all staff members to be associated with the program, with an indication of each individual's relevant experience including thesis supervision, and with the amounts of research grants held by each individual;
- (o) schedule of action for development of the program, approved by the appropriate university officials.

2. The Committee shall review this report and, unless it considers further discussions with the university to be necessary, it shall appoint as consultants at least three outstanding scholars in the field of study being proposed. The Committee shall in any case proceed with the appraisal if the university so requests. Normally, at least two of the consultants shall not be from universities within the Province of Ontario. The consultants shall visit the department being assessed. If a program has been assessed by consultants acting in connection with accreditation by a professional body, the number of consultants employed by the Committee may be reduced at the discretion of the Committee.

3. The Committee shall ask the university to suggest a list of names from which suitable consultants might be selected by the Committee, at the discretion of the Committee.

4. Before approaching a consultant not suggested by the university, the Committee shall ascertain if the university concerned has objections to the individual proposed.

5. The consultants shall submit reports in writing to the Committee, giving their appraisals of the strengths and weaknesses of the department and their recommendation concerning the wisdom of the department undertaking to offer the Ph.D. program. The consultants' reports shall be in two parts, one part of which may be shown without attribution to the members of the department being appraised or elsewhere *within* the university as the university may see fit. The other part shall be more confidential and must be restricted to the Appraisals Committee, and the university's senior administration and the chairman of the department; it shall also be available without attribution to a *small* university committee, if the internal governmental structure of the university requires that such a committee advise the Graduate Faculty and/or the Senate.

6. The consultants shall report independently (although a joint visit might be made) so that three independent opinions are obtained.

7. The Committee shall

(a) examine the reports;

(b) transmit the reports to the university and request comments; in writing

(c) invite the graduate dean, departmental chairman and up to three senior administrative officers with academic responsibility for the program to discuss the proposal with the Committee.

8. The Committee shall then make the recommendation required in paragraph III.3 of the By-Law.

9. Whether its decision is favorable or otherwise, the Committee shall make a detailed report of its findings to the university. This report will be such as to permit the university to assess its weaknesses and strengths; in this way it will assist the university in determining its development of the department concerned. This report will be confidential and will be released only to the university. While the university may make the decision public, the university must agree not to publish the report in whole or in part, except that it may, if it so wishes, make the report or parts of it available to the University Affairs Committee on a confidential basis. It may paraphrase portions of the report for use in supporting applications to the National Research Council, the Canada Council, the Medical Research Council, and similar funding agencies, provided such applications are confidential.

10. The fee for a Ph.D. appraisal shall be \$2,500. Partial fees may be established by the Committee if the procedure is not completed or if a reappraisal is conducted soon after a full appraisal has been carried out.

11. Five years after the initiation of a (new) Ph.D. program, the Committee shall ask the university to submit a report showing:

(a) current areas of specialization;

(b) current enrolment;

(c) number of staff in each area of specialization;

(d) present library resources and/or laboratory facilities;

(e) the current regulations for the program;

(f) courses available;

(g) number of students graduated from the program;

(h) up-to-date curriculum vitae and publication records of the staff members associated with the program, indicating each individual's relevant experience including thesis supervision and the amounts of his research grants; and

(i) comment on how the plans forecast in the original submission have been followed or departed from.

The Committee shall appoint a consultant in the manner specified in I.3, 4 who may be one of the original consultants but need not be. He will review this report, visit the department, and submit a report in writing to the Committee recommending the retention or suspension of approval. This report shall be handled in a manner similar to that used for the consultants' reports in a full appraisal. If the Appraisals Committee on the receipt of this report considers it desirable, it may appoint a second consultant for an independent opinion. The fee for this service shall be fixed in 1971.

II. Master's Programs

1. The request for appraisal of master's programs may be made by the same organizations entitled to request Ph.D. appraisals.
2. The procedure followed by the Committee and the Council shall be the same, *mutatis mutandis*, as for Ph.D. programs, except that
 - (a) only one consultant shall be required to visit the department, and he need not be from outside Ontario;
 - (b) if the Committee or the university wishes further advice, further consultants shall be obtained; normally they shall visit the department;
 - (c) initial approval may be given for an indefinite period, not for only five years as in the case of Ph.D. programs;
 - (d) the applicable date in paragraph III.7 shall be July 1, 1967.
3. Appraisal of certain professional master's degrees may require some modifications in the procedure, which will be determined as the need arises.
4. In the case of master's degrees involving extensive commitment of resources, either in library, staff, or research equipment, the Committee will on request conduct an appraisal similar to that for the Ph.D. Such requests might be appropriate for certain Phil.M. degrees and for certain M.Sc. or M.Eng. degrees.
5. The fee for a master's appraisal employing only one consultant shall be \$1,500; if more consultants are required the fee shall be set by the Committee but shall not exceed \$2,500.