

*V* <sup>2</sup>*i* <sup>0</sup>*s* <sup>2</sup>*i* <sup>0</sup>*o* *n*

*Motion:* "That the Senate and the Board of Governors of York University endorse the Working Group's Green Paper: 2020 VISION: THE FUTURE OF YORK UNIVERSITY."

Endorsement will have the effect of validating a shared vision of the long-term development of York, and will provide a set of common working assumptions for Senate, Board and administrative planning bodies, for other interested campus groups, and for governmental authorities concerned with our development.

However, endorsement does not chisel in stone a precise statement of the university's future. The working assumptions of the Green Paper should be revisited at regular intervals, say every five years, and more frequently if required. This will permit the introduction of new developmental perspectives and proposals, and the articulation of a new vision. Nor does endorsement commit the university to proceeding at any particular moment with any particular proposal: relevant decision-making bodies must still pass appropriate legislation following normal consultative processes, and a timely and informed assessment of the university's desire and capacity to move forward at that moment in that direction.

*Gloss on the motion:*

In being asked to endorse the Green Paper, Senate is not being asked to adopt a series of specific recommendations, nor to approve the document in principle, but rather to endorse a set of working assumptions. Senate is being invited to indicate that these are appropriate working assumptions for the various bodies engaged in planning across the university.

*Information on the background to the Green Paper's development and relevant discussions, consultations and concerns is contained in Appendix A.*

*The Enrolment Working Group:*

H. W. Arthurs  
R. Drummond  
J. Ellis  
S. Fienberg  
E. Hopkins  
S. Levy  
D. Leyton-Brown  
D. Logan

Endorsed by Senate January 30, 1992  
Endorsed by the Board of Governors March 30, 1992

---

## INTRODUCTION

*The Enrolment Working Group, established by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Senate in partnership with the Administration, has laid out in this Green Paper a set of working assumptions to guide academic, physical and other planning activities at York University over the next three decades.*

*The Senate and Board have endorsed these assumptions, which now form a relatively coherent vision of York's development forward to the year 2020. They have done so with the explicit understanding that (a) the assumptions will be revisited at regular intervals or as required, and (b) implementation of new programs and other major decisions will be taken in accordance with the university's established procedures, and with due regard for their resource implications and their effect on ongoing activities.*

*This Green Paper describes the environment within which York seems likely to develop during the next two or three decades; it suggests strategies of growth and diversification for York and identifies several areas where opportunities for new faculties or significant academic units may emerge; and it proposes further steps towards exploration and implementation of the strategy.*

---

## YORK AS A COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITY

To anticipate our conclusions, and as an organizing theme for these observations, we offer at the outset our vision of the general direction York ought to take over the next twenty or thirty years:

York should strive to become a "comprehensive" university. We should not necessarily replicate the disciplines, structures and styles of other institutions; indeed we have the chance to develop our own distinctive idiom. But we ought to offer our faculty and students, and the community, a much wider range of intellectual perspectives, teaching programs, research activities, and external relationships than we do at present.

We can and should achieve greater diversity and thus greater comprehensiveness by: (a) growing in areas where we are now active, but less so than we believe we should be, (b) recombining existing program elements to form the nucleus of new programs, and (c) adding totally new programs and their student populations, where the availability of new resources permits.

At the same time, we should be wary of unrestrained growth in our well-established and largest programs for three reasons: (a) so that the resources available for those programs can be brought more closely into line with their responsibilities, thus helping to improve their quality, (b) so that the continual growth of existing large programs does not prevent new small programs from attaining an appropriate relative "share" of York's population, and (c) so that the total size of the university does not rapidly escalate out of control.

The combined effect of these approaches should over time somewhat change the balance of disciplines within the university and produce an increase in overall enrolment on our two existing campuses of about 10%.

Finally, both growth and diversification should always be purposeful. They should occur only to the extent that they can be reconciled with a commitment to quality, in order to achieve specific academic objectives, and when supported by adequate resources.

## THE ENVIRONMENT OF CHANGE

What we want York to become is in part the sum of our desires, in part the consequence of our changing environment. We must therefore consider the factors which will have a major impact on our evolution. However, any review of these factors has obvious shortcomings: the future is by definition unknowable; the multiplicity of factors makes their cumulative effect yet more unpredictable; and even to the extent that the future can be read as a straight-line extrapolation of the present, we know too little about the present.

Nonetheless, we have attempted, in an environmental scan (Appendix B) to identify these factors in order to provide a baseline against which to measure the future course of events, and their likely implications. To summarize that scan, despite a vari-

---

ety of troubling signs, there are grounds to believe that York can with impunity embark upon any reasonable long-term enrolment policy which it wishes to embrace for academic or other reasons. The way ahead will not be easy, and we will have to struggle to secure, and use effectively, additional resources. Our main concerns must therefore be to retain, or to introduce, flexibility and responsive capacity so as to be able to deal with both the predictable and the unforeseen opportunities and challenges of the next thirty years.

Critical to our flexibility and responsiveness - and valuable as an end in itself - is the development of greater intellectual diversity at York. This is the next issue which we address.

### DIVERSITY

If we were to take a snapshot of York today, we would see that it is not configured in the same way as most other universities of its size and distinction. In some respects, what is unusual about York is very positive. For example, we are atypical in our emphasis on environmental studies, fine arts, nontraditional student constituencies, interdisciplinary programs and bilingual education.

However, if we compare York with the ten largest Canadian universities, we see that:

- 9 have engineering schools; 8 have medical schools; 6 have architecture schools; 6 have all three; and York has none of these
- 8% of our students are enrolled in science-related programs (science, medicine, engineering and related disciplines) as opposed to an average of 24% for the comparison group
- our undergraduates comprise 91% of our total student population as against an average of 80%

These comparisons show that York departs considerably from the norm in two crucial respects - breadth and depth.

But why should we conform more nearly to the norm? First, the norm itself reflects some kind of tacit consensus across the country concerning what a university is and does. To depart from that consensus marks York off from other institutions in the eyes of prospective students, faculty members, donors and governments. Second, the norm represents a response to what the community wants and expects of a university. We should not always gratify community wants, of course, but when doing so is so obviously acceptable to universities in Canada and around the world, why would we not wish to? Third, some of our departures from the norm are also departures from our own ambitions, as defined in the *University Academic Plan (UAP)*, as in the case of our relatively small graduate programs. And fourth, if as and when we move towards the norm, for example by establishing a new faculty, we can and must at that moment determine whether our own deviant academic profile is something we want to retain or not: the choice is always ours.

---

These are all good reasons why York might choose not to be so very different from other universities. But there is in the end only one positive reason for York to diversify: any university must surely have the ambition of encompassing as much of human knowledge as possible. Natural science has been a characteristic, one might say a dominant, intellectual activity for at least two hundred years: how can York be indifferent to it? Praxis - broadly defined to encompass all forms of applied knowledge in the natural and human sciences - has long provided a lively counterpoint to theory: how can York deny itself a full measure of praxis? And graduate study, the process of acquiring deeper and more advanced knowledge of a subject and training new generations of academic scholars, has been a function of universities for half a millennium and more: why would we not wish to do as much of it as we can?

All of this adds up to an argument for diversification, along the general lines implied by comparing York with other universities. If we work forward in this general direction, we will broaden the scope of our intellectual discourse, increase the range of applied programs we offer our students, enlarge our impact on and relations with the community, enhance our ability to secure support for our activities from funding councils, government and donors, and become a greater presence within a wider range of disciplines and professions, and within the international university community. This is the basis of our proposal that York should become a "comprehensive" or "full-service" university.

Nor is this ambition in any sense a repudiation of our own institutional destiny. From its early days, York aspired to be a large multi-faculty university. Engineering and medicine, for example, were specifically contemplated; science was launched on a trajectory of deliberate and episodic growth. However, all such plans were forestalled by the pessimism, discounted operating grants and truncated capital allocations which have haunted the Ontario university system since the mid-1970s. In effect, no genuinely new faculty of anything has been launched in an Ontario university since then, and our own faculty profile has remained unchanged since the Faculty of Education was founded in 1970.

Thus, it is clear that our unusual profile is for the most part the result of historical accident, not planning. Its positive consequences, if any, are not ones we have chosen deliberately to seek. And its negative consequences appear to be at odds with a number of goals or values to which we are committed in the UAP, such as accessibility, interdisciplinarity, and increased emphasis on graduate studies. By way of example:

- **Accessibility:** Because there are relatively limited opportunities to study science and engineering within the Greater Toronto Area (GTA), relative to comparable conurbations, members of disadvantaged groups denied a chance to study in these important fields must leave home to do so; this they cannot do. It is not all a question of demand push; supply pull counts too. For example, recent expansion of our science and applied science programs has attracted considerable numbers of able young women anxious to take advantage of what York might offer them.

- 
- **Interdisciplinarity:** York faculty members engaged in environmental or health studies lack direct access to collaborators in such adjacent scientific disciplines as epidemiology, environmental medicine and public health. New applied fields which are highly interdisciplinary - such as design - might well be built upon our present strengths, but require new structures, new personnel and facilities, and especially, a new mandate.
  - **Graduate studies:** Some of our outstanding scholars have relatively few graduate students, or none at all, because York is not a significant locus of activity in their particular discipline. Their influence on the development of their disciplines, especially through successive generations of graduate students, might be even greater, were our graduate program enrolments more nearly commensurate with the distinction of our faculty.

These are some of the reasons why, in effect, the UAP has already committed us to diversification of our programs and to increasing the proportion of graduate to undergraduate students; these are the central elements of a strategy which will make York a "full-service" university.

In this Green Paper we seek to lodge the commitments of the UAP in the context of a general institutional aspiration, and at the same time to make them more explicit by proposing several initiatives to be pursued as opportunity presents over the next ten or twenty or more years.

And there is reason to believe that opportunity will present. Incremental resources are being made available to impoverished universities not by way of general support, but in the form of support for specific areas of study or research. At all levels - international, national and provincial - governments are seeking to use universities to achieve social, economic and cultural goals. These goals include enhanced national productive capacity, training of highly qualified personnel, social and cultural development, and the advancement of groups whose members have traditionally been disadvantaged by lack of university credentials.

Several of the areas most likely to attract additional government funding are the very ones in which we might wish to grow. Moreover, as a university with an excellent - albeit idiosyncratic - record of academic achievement, in Canada's largest conurbation, York is a logical candidate for additional responsibilities and the additional resources to support them. And finally, the very fact that we have thought carefully about what we want to do makes it more likely that we will be given the opportunity to do it; that was certainly the lesson of the recent corridor negotiations.

So, we will likely be able to gradually diversify our programs and rebalance our graduate/undergraduate populations. In doing so, however, we will also have to address a number of concerns about quality, which are worth identifying from the outset.

---

## QUALITY

The UAP mandates a concern for quality, as well as the other goals mentioned above, and quality is, regardless, a concern of any self-regarding academic institution. However, enrolments are the focus of this Green Paper; quality issues will be considered mainly to the extent that they affect, or are affected by, changes in enrolment.

It is frequently and accurately observed that we may be driven to choose, or to strike a balance, between quality and other concerns, simply because resources are finite. We should accordingly be careful not to launch ourselves on new enterprises which will have the effect of undermining our existing programs.

However, it is also true that in many instances diversification and rebalancing of our programs will contribute to the overall quality of the university, without draining resources from existing activities.

The single most important consideration in this regard is the recent shift in politics of university financing, noted above. Instead of providing us with a general grant, distribution of which lies within our discretion, more and more marginal increases in funding are being directed towards the achievement of specific objectives, which are defined or approved by government. If we do not pursue those objectives, we will not get the money; it is that simple.

To illustrate: York's most urgent need might be to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction, but (let us suppose) funds are made available only to expand graduate programs designed to renew the professoriate. We have the choice of not accepting the money, of course. Should we do so because government's first priority does not accord with our own? Or should we accept the money because it will help us to rebalance our student complement, one of our declared academic objectives? It is unlikely that we would refuse the money simply because it assisted us with our second or third priority, rather than our first.

Moreover, we can take solace from the fact that expanding or improving our graduate programs might actually have positive side-effects for our undergraduate programs. For example, increasing our faculty complement in order to teach more graduate students might give us the chance to diversify our undergraduate teaching at the same time.

Of course there is a serious risk that government policies may have an undesirable steering effect, to the extent that they tempt us to adopt illicit goals, or do not leave sufficient room for institutional autonomy within broad parameters. We will not hesitate to join with other universities to oppose such policies, and will try to resist temptations offered us to do things we believe to be inappropriate.



---

## ACCESSIBILITY

**H**ow does diversification and rebalancing of our student body affect the principle of "general accessibility" - an opportunity for all qualified students to pursue university studies?

This is a principle to which York is committed. We had the greatest growth amongst Ontario universities during the 1980s. During the recent corridor negotiations, York asked for and received a larger overall increase in its enrolment than any other university. But despite our commitment in principle, our past efforts to accommodate demand, and our plans to grow in the future, we have not been able to practise general accessibility since the 1970s. York has been turning away more and more students, because we lack the facilities, faculty and staff to provide them with a decent education.

The effect has been that entry standards in all of our faculties, and especially in the largest, the Faculty of Arts, have risen discernibly. This has had several consequences.

First, this upward shift in our student intake has caused the bottom of our applicant pool to imperceptibly drain away. In a stable situation, we would now be appealing to a smaller, more highly qualified, cohort of applicants. However, the demographics of the GTA ensure that we get more applications each year, rather than fewer. We should not assume that this state of affairs will persist indefinitely. If our intake is to improve further over the long run, once we lose the benefit of local demographics, we will have to attract additional, even more highly qualified, applicants.

However, since each higher level reached yields applicant cohorts of diminishing size, we will confront fiercer competition with other, usually more affluent, institutions. Thus, our best strategy for attracting more good students in the long run is to appeal to those who do not now apply to York, because of either a perceived or a real failure on our part to offer them the programs in which they are interested. The perception can be dealt with by better advertising; the reality only by diversification of our rather narrow range of offerings.

Of course, good students attract more good students, and in terms of recruiting new faculty, and getting the best out of those already at York, the positive effects of a highly qualified student body should not be underestimated. It is very much in our interest, therefore, to take this point seriously.

Secondly, although practical considerations forced us to move away from "general accessibility" some years ago, the UAP commits us to the principle of "selective accessibility". That principle requires that we administer our admissions policies sensitively, so as to ensure opportunities for able candidates who are working under some personal, social, economic or cultural disadvantage. Our record in this area - admittedly far from perfect - compares favourably with that of other institutions.

---

Moreover, we remain seriously attached to the notion that a significant share of our student body should come from nontraditional constituencies, which comprise a large proportion of mature and part-time students. To reach these constituencies, we must be prepared to adopt new delivery systems, and modify existing ones: outreach programs, distance education, interactive video, work-study and cooperative education all merit careful scrutiny, even though their cumulative effects on both general accessibility and our own numbers are likely to be moderate rather than profound. We recognize our responsibility, resources permitting, to expand services for the ever-wider range of disabled and disadvantaged individuals and groups represented within our student body.

And finally, we have been serving the expanding market for general interest and occupationally-related non-credit programs through our Centre for Continuing Education. This is an area in which the potential for long-term growth is considerable. We would be able to serve this market much more aggressively if we could find a financial formula which would permit us to identify, stimulate or respond to latent demand.

However, even selective accessibility is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain. It is not just that resources are scarcer and scarcer. In addition, the new "corridor" system forecloses further growth by effectively limiting enrolment both across the system and in particular institutions. Essentially, no further expansion of the system is contemplated beyond intake levels reached in 1988-89, and while York "owns" most of what little growth is contemplated hereafter, we are almost at steady state.

What we committed ourselves to in the recent corridor negotiations was, in effect, to diversify with very limited growth, e.g. in areas such as Environmental Studies and Applied Science and Technology. This outcome is consistent with some internal redeployment of enrolment, and might permit a slight reduction in numbers in the Faculty of Arts, with the further consequence that its burdens (but not its share of resources) can be reduced. This in turn implies greater admissions pressures in that very large faculty, rising standards, and an even greater need to make good on our commitment to "selective accessibility". In these circumstances, we must make special efforts to ensure that our admissions policies are principled and responsive.

Yet despite our best efforts, we are contributing to - or at least not doing much to relieve - a situation which ought to engender considerable concern. For personal, ethnocultural or financial reasons, many residents of the GTA must either attend university somewhere within the region, or abandon higher education altogether. If York's enrolment is more-or-less capped, accessibility for these individuals is effectively diminished. And, as noted elsewhere, if public policy increasingly shifts enrolments into areas such as sciences, technology, and health - all areas in which York is relatively small or does not figure at all - GTA residents who wish to study locally in these fields will be particularly disadvantaged. This disadvantage, moreover, will translate into subsequent disadvantage in the labour market. Once again, even from the perspective of accessibility, there is logic in York expanding its programs in areas of the least local opportunity and greatest social need.

We have signalled our willingness to address this problem, if our resources are adjusted appropriately. To a considerable extent, however, the outcome of the corri-

---

dors exercise makes this issue largely incapable of resolution: the system has essentially stopped issuing new "tickets of admission". Limitations on our enrolment may derive not just from financial stringency, or from government policy, but from physical conditions, concerns about the quality of life, and structural or organizational constraints. These will be explored next.

### THE PHYSICAL LIMITS TO YORK'S GROWTH

**T**he academic core of the Keele campus - roughly the area enclosed by the original ring road, and adjacent areas now used for university purposes - is physically large enough to accommodate almost any student population we might wish to enrol. In principle, we could grow to two or three times our present population and still have ample land left for compatible development, as contemplated by North York's recently-approved Secondary Plan for our campus.

This general observation must be qualified somewhat. Municipal concerns about the adequacy of services such as sewers and roads have threatened to restrict both academic and nonacademic development on campus, at least temporarily. However, recently announced plans to increase local sewer capacity have alleviated the former concerns, while the latter are under study, in connection with the development of a transportation strategy for the GTA.

In terms of campus land-use issues, none is potentially more difficult than that of parking. Significant increases in enrolment or the construction of major academic installations, such as a teaching hospital, would generate higher demand for on-campus parking. However, it would be difficult to accommodate greatly increased demand on our existing surface lots. In fact, our parking capacity might well be declining at the same time, since we plan to build over existing lots on the periphery of the campus for commercial development, and have already built over some internal lots for academic development.

Thus, we face something of a campus parking crisis, which can only be resolved if demand is diverted (e.g. by carpools or better mass transit) or satisfied in some other way than by surface parking (e.g. by multilevel parking structures).

Looking to the next ten or twenty years particularly, our ability to grow is now, and will likely continue to be, inhibited especially by our shortage of built space. Even assuming that a combination of government grants and development profits will ultimately permit us to house the desired growth, the rate at which we can generate capital from either source (or from fundraising) will not necessarily match the rate at which capital is required. It is possible to imagine that we might build more rapidly than funds come to hand; however, at some point the carrying charges generated by such a strategy make it unattractive.

Finally, we are likely to continue, by choice or necessity, our recent strategy of locating certain academic activities off-campus. Whether because of distance education such as that offered by Glendon and perhaps ultimately Atkinson, satellite operations such as those of Education, Atkinson, Osgoode and Continuing Education,

---

cooperative programs such as those of Science, or technological means as yet untried, we can predict that increasing numbers of our students will make fewer demands on the facilities of our main campus. But given our present and predicted numbers overall, the need of most students for access to libraries, laboratories and other specialized facilities, and the attractions of campus life, this shift will not radically diminish the daily population of the campus.

To recapitulate, our overall conclusion is that the campus is large enough to permit us to grow very considerably within the next 20-30 years. However, the rate of our physical expansion (and hence of on-campus population growth) will be moderated by the need to secure capital funds and to resolve our transportation and parking problems. Nonetheless, in the long term, our land development prospects are bright and the logic of transit to York compelling, so that we can expect both of these problems to be resolved ultimately.

On the Glendon campus, the picture is somewhat different: there are some limited possibilities for physical expansion. However, existing facilities can be enlarged to the extent necessary to accommodate existing programs and any additions likely to occur within the next twenty years or so.

### GROWTH AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE QUALITY OF CAMPUS LIFE

**I**s there a particular size of university which would take us past critical points at which the quality of academic and community life would be jeopardized?

History has answered that question already. We are committed to being a large, metropolitan university. This status implies a less-than-idyllic quality of life, which will not be dramatically affected by any further growth which might reasonably be contemplated.

However, we cannot abandon attempts to ensure that all future development enhances our communal existence, rather than detracts from it. Indeed, in some respects, future growth is the only way in which we will be able to make important gains, e.g. by using new buildings to fill in gaps amongst existing buildings, thereby creating attractive small scale landscapes and microclimates, and sheltering pedestrian movement in inclement weather.

But size does have costs. We accept, for example, that students will not always be able to move easily between any two points on the campus within a ten-minute class break, as was envisaged in the original - unrealized - campus master plan. The inconveniences of a large campus can be mitigated somewhat by the creation of precincts (fine arts, science, arts etc.) where students are likely to take most of their classes, with transitional public spaces serving important university-wide functions, including that of informal mixing of students from different areas.

Looking at other metropolitan campuses, however, we do suffer significant disadvantages at present. Unlike Berkeley, Harvard or the Sorbonne, no adjacent neighbourhood provides York with amenities such as shops, cafés, cinemas, or suitable stu-

---

dent accommodation. And unlike some other suburban campuses, York so far lacks access to the central city core by means of rapid transit.

Growth and diversification of both our academic and nonacademic activities and population may help in the end to solve these problems, rather than exacerbate them. A larger and more diverse community would in turn support a wider range of services, for example, and provide a more attractive destination for transit.

Finally, if growth has many positive implications for the quality of campus life, in at least one respect it requires careful attention. Growth - if uncontrolled - may force us to encroach unduly upon the undeveloped green space that surrounds the present campus core, although much of that green space is now unused and unusable by the York community, because it is cut off by roads and parking lots.

Fortunately, the importance of preserving and strengthening the key elements of a green campus is well recognized in our new campus master plan and in North York's Secondary Plan, and will be respected in our future land development strategy. This is not to deny that we may find ourselves engaged in controversy, from time to time, over environmental issues. But in the context of this Green Paper, suffice it to say that the anticipated growth of our student population will not generate excessive pressures. On the contrary, new needs for increased recreational and athletic space can be fully and generously accommodated.

### ORGANIZATIONAL, STRUCTURAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS OF GROWTH AND DIVERSIFICATION

**G**rowth and diversification will bring our organizational structures into question in two respects. On the one side, these structures - faculties and departments - tend to contain growth within themselves, rather than permit it to occur elsewhere; on the other, change may strain them, and demonstrate the need for modifications or repairs.

Significant reconfiguration of the university must not be so rapid as to endanger our academic interests. Our enrolment strategy, for example, should be driven by academic rather than financial considerations, and we should be careful to grow only to the extent that we reasonably anticipate increased enrolments being sustained at the levels of quality mandated by the UAP.

We also run academic risks, however, if we do not grow and diversify. In some faculties, existing programs suffer from the lack of a critical mass, and we do not yet have the full and balanced intellectual cadre necessary to ensure York a place in some important aspects of the emerging intellectual discourse of the next few decades.

Diversification and, to a lesser extent, growth thus throws up a number of important issues, extraneous to any specific proposal, but critical to its eventual implementation. Many of these issues are interrelated in a complex way, and it is difficult to disaggregate them. The following taxonomy should therefore be regarded as just one of many possible.

---

## ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

Existing Senate legislation easily encompasses proposals for new programs within existing faculties. But the legislation is silent on several important structural issues: the relationship between a program and a department, the requirements for departmental organization, the necessary conditions for the emergence of a new faculty, the definition of a "school", and how a school is related to a faculty.

These questions are largely formal, and do not appear to go to the substantive merits of decisions bearing upon diversification and growth. However, they have a way of becoming contentious, with the potential of deflecting attention from the pros and cons of important proposals.

Faculties seldom appear through a process of parthenogenesis. The emergence of a new faculty will almost certainly affect the organization and structure of an existing faculty, either by excision of some of its parts, or by preemption of its options for future development. These are matters specific to each case, but they need to be identified and resolved in timely fashion. Indeed, it is essential that they be identified early, so that the short- to medium-term planning of existing faculties can take into account the longer range enrolment plans of the entire university.

The possibilities of growth and diversification at the Keele campus, reinforcement of Glendon, and the possible development of a third campus also raise issues of governance. While York is, like most universities, highly decentralized in operational terms, it retains a single integrated corporate organization. Allowing for differences in local culture, tradition and style, each faculty is more or less the equivalent of the others in terms of its place within that corporate structure.

But if York is to grow in size and complexity, and especially if York is to grow by the development of an additional campus, there will be an increase in centrifugal forces. These forces may prompt calls for a more devolved, federal organization and mode of governance. Perhaps federal models should be examined in advance. If our organization is to move in that direction, it ought to do so by a process of conscious and controlled evolution, not in response to a political crisis.

Equally, academic growth and diversification imply potential administrative consequences. The senior administration of York is relatively compact, compared to that of other universities the same size. As we grow in size and complexity, there will be a temptation, and may be a need, to expand this administration. This may or may not be appropriate, but should follow, if at all, from a careful assessment of the merits of particular administrative structures.

## LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Any new academic endeavour will, of course, require the approval of Senate, and, in some cases (e.g. new faculties) the Board. Its involvement in at least a formal sense, suggests that the Board ought to be kept fairly closely informed of, and perhaps involved in, the development of long range enrolment plans, especially in relation to proposed major initiatives.

---

As noted, moreover, some proposals for new initiatives may impinge directly on existing faculties and will require their legislative consent. Such legislation may not be strictly necessary to license the creation of entirely new faculties, but there will usually be practical and political reasons for formal and informal ventilation of such initiatives by those they affect, in addition to a debate in Senate.

## FINANCIAL PLANNING

The development of new programs, departments or faculties requires careful financial planning, involving the identification of costs, and of sources of revenue to meet them.

In a chronically underfunded university, there is an obvious need to protect existing programs from being financially damaged by the development of new programs. But that principle can find various levels of expression.

For example, the eventual operating costs of any new endeavour might well be met by the revenue it generates, but there will be inevitable start-up costs. To the extent possible, such costs should obviously be met by external sources, such as foundations or special government grants, but some initial subsidy is almost inescapable. Or, to take another example, grants for new enrolments are typically paid on a "slip-year" basis, a year in arrears. The first year of even a self-sustaining new program must be laid off somewhere. Or to take a third example, faculty members for a new program may be recruited from within the existing complement, but they may require a period of leave for retooling or freedom from teaching, in order to prepare a new curriculum. Who will pay their salaries during this period? These examples, and others, suggest that there ought to be a central fund of renewable base money to use for the development and introduction of strategic initiatives.

More importantly, once established, these initiatives involve ongoing operating costs such as faculty, staff, equipment and central support systems. Frank recognition of this fact will lead strength to our efforts to secure adequate additional support from government for our new activities. However, over-anxiety about operating costs, understandable in difficult times, can effectively veto change forever.

Similarly, new programs may well require an initial capital investment in facilities. If, for example, there is a decision to develop a new campus, what will be the impact of that decision on capital planning on the Keele and Glendon campuses? Capital funding for our two existing campuses has for 15 years been flowing at a level well below demonstrated need; pursuit of capital allocations for a new satellite campus would, in effect, constitute competition against ourselves. This implies that a third campus, if any, should be planned on the assumption that space will be contributed by private or public sector donors, rather than built with Ministry grants.

But to extend the point about operating budgets to the capital side, by definition there will never be enough space for existing activities. Thus, if existing capital claims automatically preempt new ones, no innovation at York will ever be possible.

What we propose is that innovation be conducted in a spirit of prudence, of respectful concern for ongoing units and their needs, of sensible measures to avoid

---

overloading existing systems which are already overtaxed. What we cannot recommend is a series of absolute and total guarantees designed to protect all existing activities from any effects of new ones.

### NEW INITIATIVES: PRACTICAL PROPOSALS

As indicated at the outset of this Green Paper, we are proposing that York should diversify its programs and rebalance its population, as between graduate and undergraduate students. Diversification will likely result in some growth in campus population. Indeed, just such growth has occurred over the past few years as the result of the 1990 "corridors" negotiations, the effects of which are now almost fully manifest. Rebalancing could - but need not - result in a slight drop within existing faculties. This could occur through simple reductions in intake or - given differential funding arrangements - by a conscious redeployment from undergraduate to graduate enrolments. Taking the two processes together, we contemplate only relatively modest expansion - notionally, in the range of 10% - in the overall size of the current population on the two existing campuses.



Here are two amongst several plausible scenarios of growth and diversification.

	SCENARIO 1		SCENARIO 2	
<u>PRESENT PROGRAMS (90/91)</u>	41000	(32800 FTE)*	41000	(32800 FTE)
decline	-500	(-400 FTE)	0	0
growth	<u>2500</u>	<u>(2000 FTE)</u>	<u>3000</u>	<u>(2400 FTE)</u>
Net continuing	43000	(34400 FTE)	44000	(35200 FTE)
 <u>NEW PROGRAMS [Incl. Grad/UG]</u>				
Design/Communications	500	(400 FTE)	500	(400 FTE)
Health	1200	(960 FTE)	1000	(800 FTE)
Information Science	300	(240 FTE)	500	(400 FTE)
Other	<u>0</u>	<u></u>	<u>1000</u>	<u>(800 FTE)</u>
<b>TOTAL POSSIBLE</b>	<b>45000</b>	<b>(36000 FTE)</b>	<b>47000</b>	<b>(37600 FTE)</b>

We reiterate: these numbers reflect two amongst many possible scenarios, and are intended only to indicate an order of magnitude. Further, since we are essentially interested in gross numbers, we have not distinguished between graduate and undergraduate enrolments in respect of either ongoing or possible new programs.

\* full-time equivalent

---

As planning proceeds for various new programs - those indicated, or others which may be proposed - these estimates will have to be revisited and refined. That is a task for the future. For the present, we believe that our numbers are somewhere near right, for the following reasons.

First, as indicated earlier, we believe that capital and operating funds for Ontario universities are likely to increase only modestly and from time to time, in response to specific government policy initiatives. Thus, we would not be funded for a major program of growth even if we wished to embark on one.

Second, to the extent that additional resources become available for new initiatives, these are likely to occur in specialized areas rather than in the "core" arts subjects in which the bulk of enrolments are now located at York and across the system. Hence, as we diversify, we will grow - but only within a range of relatively small numbers.

Third, we have proposed above that our new initiatives will reside within a range of relatively small numbers. This reflects our assumption that below a minimum size, a given venture is not viable, but that above a modest maximum, growth is neither wise nor likely to be funded.

Fourth, there is a proposal, to which we have referred, that the Faculty of Arts - now over 40% of the university - should be modestly reduced in size so as to bring its commitments rather more nearly into line with its resources. If this were to occur, the reduction would offset the effects of growth elsewhere. To the extent that we would seek to achieve this redeployment without incurring significant extra costs, "net decline" in the Faculty of Arts is likely to be modest indeed.

Finally, in forecasting possible growth, we have not included any numbers for a possible third campus. While in principle, we could shift some students from the existing two campuses to a third, it is much more likely that enrolments at a third campus would have to be generated largely by the addition to the provincial system of new places, and to York of an increased share of those places. Such a development would be designed specifically to accommodate growing demand within the GTA, and would represent a major commitment by government.

For similar reasons, we have not accounted for changes in enrolment attributable to a realignment of responsibilities as between universities and community colleges. Nor have we taken account of any long-term change in government financial support which might convert distance education students, non-credit continuing education students, and similar constituencies into a major component of our enrolments. Barring a change in government and private support for higher education, it is hard to see how we will be able to assume such new responsibilities.

So much for the dimensions of change. What of its content?

Diversification might take place in any one of several ways in response to developments in the external world, in the discipline, in the dynamic of an existing academic unit, or in the process of academic planning.

In identifying certain opportunities below, we have indeed attempted to respond to external trends as we perceive them, as well as to internal needs that we identify

---

from our familiarity with York's present programs. In this respect, our not having particular disciplines or faculties at present may be a real advantage: new units or programs will not be constrained by vested intellectual interests or professional cultures; we can draw upon and improve upon state-of-the-art programs in other universities; we can attract dynamic new people with the challenge of building something unique; and we can use new programs to reinforce, or complement, existing academic units.

Before briefly describing some of these possible innovations, we must make a brief detour into a problem of nomenclature. In the following descriptions, we distinguished between new activities which expand and diversify the activities of existing faculties, and those which might require the establishment of new faculties. However, the change in nomenclature signals at most only the degree of innovation; we do not mean to prejudge the issue of which academic unit might best provide a home for our new activities. On the contrary, we believe that form should follow function.

As planning proceeds on various projects, those responsible will have to address the issue of faculty structure versus that of a department or program; their recommendations will have to be negotiated through Senate and, ultimately, the Board. Decisions will ultimately be taken by reference to such considerations as the possible costs and benefits of setting up a new faculty administration, the degree of academic affinity between new and existing activities, conventional appellations for similar activities at other universities, any special requirements of government and other supporting bodies, etc. For current purposes, however, we wish to reiterate that we are not committed to any particular structure.

With this understanding, what are our most attractive prospects for growth and diversification?

#### **(A) CHANGES WITHIN EXISTING PROGRAMS**

Most disciplines, most departments, do in fact change over time. At given moments, they may change quite rapidly and profoundly. The university must strive to encourage and support change within existing programs, as a sign of intellectual vitality. Such developments are fully consistent with York's ongoing commitment to liberal education, to interdisciplinarity, to the education of part-time and mature students, and to other distinctive features of our programs, as they have developed over the past thirty years. We do not dwell on them in this Green Paper, however, because we are confident that they will occur through normal processes of organic renewal, rooted in the culture of existing academic units. But, given our mandate, we must make special mention of the resulting fluctuations in departmental and faculty enrolments which will occur both in the short term and over the next thirty years. Under present funding arrangements, it is essential that enrolment change should be managed carefully, so as to avoid financial dislocations. We believe that the trend toward government management of the university system will only reinforce existing requirements.

---

## (B) EXTRAPOLATION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

Several of the most important changes that we foresee for the next two or three decades represent extrapolations of existing programs. Some have already been initiated, and their implementation is well advanced, following the recent corridor negotiations. Nonetheless, it is important that these developments be seen within an overall long-term plan for York.

### FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

We have proposed that York should become more intensively and extensively involved in graduate teaching. To the extent that this will be achieved by internal realignment of our activities, the effect on our overall numbers is minimal. Likewise, we have not attempted to allocate enrolments as between graduates and undergraduates in the areas we have proposed as appropriate for development.

However, we do anticipate that there will be some net growth of enrolment attributable to expanded graduate enrolments, and have made some allowance for this in the "other" category of our growth scenario. Whether, where and when such growth occurs is, of course, especially sensitive to financial and regulatory strategies adopted by the government and OCUA from time to time.

### FACULTY OF PURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

The recently-renamed Faculty of Pure and Applied Science is already embarked on a trajectory of growth and diversification supported, at least initially, by a specific adjustment in our enrolment corridor. The recent introduction of a number of modules collectively identified as Applied Science and Technology (AST) might well lead, in due course, to the emergence of a new faculty of the same name.

Regardless of its future organizational form, we feel that the growth and diversification of teaching and research in both the pure and applied sciences is desirable in itself, will contribute to the strengthening of York's intellectual community, and will promote greater interaction between science and other disciplines on campus, and science and the external world.

### ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

Environmental Studies, long our smallest faculty, is actively moving towards growth and diversification, through the addition of both an undergraduate program and a doctoral program to its highly innovative and successful MES program. This is a very appropriate development, in light of the growing recognition of the importance of environmental issues, and very suitable for York, because the broad conception of "environment" in FES enables that faculty to interact vigorously with virtually all other faculties in the university. A corridor adjustment has been secured which largely accommodates this growth.

The GTA, for the foreseeable future, is likely to be a major centre of urban growth and architectural development. For more than twenty years York has graduated a significant group of urban, regional, and environmental planners from its MES pro-

---

gram in the Faculty of Environmental Studies. Planning programs are also in existence at Ryerson and the University of Toronto. With regard to Architecture, however, the professional needs of the GTA are served only by Ryerson and the relatively small Faculty of Architecture at the University of Toronto.

Some FES graduates do go on to professional careers in the urban design area, and York's small Urban Studies program makes a modest contribution as well. However, there is considerable potential for an expansion of urban design and architectural programs in the GTA and this is an obvious area for York to address. Urban design and architectural teaching programs could originate in and be housed in FES and then, if thought appropriate, moved into the proposed partnership of Design and Communications. But to reiterate: the issue of organizational form is not meant to be resolved definitively in this Green Paper.

#### EDUCATION

York's Faculty of Education has grown very rapidly, especially in the past few years. However, at present it concentrates on Primary-Junior programs, and a relatively narrow range of Intermediate-Senior specialities.

Given the prospects for the future growth of school populations in the GTA, and the close nexus between education faculties and their "clients", there are obvious opportunities for both growth and diversification in this faculty, at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. One which has recently appeared is the development of a French as a First Language (FFL) component of Education, developed in cooperation with Glendon. Others may be imminent. It is anticipated that government will support these developments with appropriate corridor revisions.

Of course, Education will also wish to attend to its important agenda of scholarly and public policy concerns.

#### APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES

York is showing increasing ambition in the area of the applied social sciences. Business and Law are already very strong professional faculties. The School of Social Work seems likely to emerge as the next major professional unit in this area, and its growth beyond its present modest size should be actively encouraged.

Amongst the other candidates for growth are Health Studies and Communications, both of which are identified as possible components of new academic units proposed below. There has been some mention of a new initiative in the area of public administration, and additional ventures in the applied social sciences should be encouraged. The applied social sciences represent a natural evolution from, and complementary to, existing areas of intellectual strength at York, and at the same time respond to potential societal needs and student interests.

#### GLENDON

The current political context offers Glendon a special challenge to maintain its bilingual vision and modest growth. Glendon may respond by proactive recruitment

---

directed towards particular client constituencies, by developing and exploiting potential nation-wide interest in the College, or by other strategies such as distance education. Glendon may also wish to reexamine the range and balance of its programs, in cooperation with other York faculties, with public policy makers, and with the community groups it aspires to serve. The current Glendon-Education initiative in the area of FFL teacher training exemplifies these possibilities.

These new initiatives and relationships may in turn impart a special character to Glendon's financial and staffing arrangements, and invite further consideration of Glendon's resources and facilities.

### (C) NEW PROGRAMS

In proposing that York should become a "comprehensive university" we are not seeking to replicate all of the traditional academic structures which have evolved over the past several decades. Rather, our own record of innovation should provide both inspiration and reassurance as we set about the task of designing a university for the twenty-first century.

Developments which represent expansion or extrapolation of our current activities therefore will and should represent a major dimension of our growth and diversification, as suggested above. However, insofar as we wish to respond to new trends in scholarship, to new challenges derived from social, economic, technological and cultural change, we may also wish to develop entirely new units, building on our latent strengths if possible, but in some cases starting pretty much from the ground up.

To summarize, we imagine that new initiatives, including those we are proposing, will normally have the following characteristics:

- an identifiable constituency of strength and support within the university, manifest in terms of a strong, existing base of teaching and research (but leaving open in principle the possibility that we may have to begin without such a constituency)
- some definition of the nature of future academic enquiry and activity, which draws upon the scholarly literature and relates it to changes in the environment
- a projection of environmental circumstances and market demand, including international and national concerns and opportunities and those focused on the GTA in particular, emerging themes in public policy debates, employment opportunities for university-trained personnel, etc.
- reasonable prospects of attracting the resources necessary to sustain them.

We believe that it is reasonable for York to aspire to several such new initiatives, of significant proportions, in the next two or three decades. We have considered various possibilities, in part by scanning the environment in which we are likely to find ourselves, in part by considering our current academic profile to see where existing activities might logically lead to something which is both new and attractive.

Since we cannot hope to do everything, and certainly not to do everything new at once and well, we have focused on three areas of development which we find particularly promising. However, the Green Paper is to be reviewed at periodic inter-

---

vals, and can be reopened at any time if new ideas come forward or unanticipated circumstances develop which require speedy action. Thus, there is no closure in our proposals: other possibilities may emerge in the years ahead.

We anticipate, however, that by identifying prospects in three specific areas, we will provide an impetus for the proponents of each initiative to move them forward when opportunities arise, and in a manner which in their informed view, offers the most exciting, yet realistic, possibilities for them as well as for the university as a whole.

#### NEW INITIATIVE IN HEALTH

The health area is perhaps our most evolved example of a recognizable constituency of strength, with a critical mass of faculty, a substantial number of proponents, several defined areas of interest, and some cutting edge initiatives in teaching and research already under way. Health is also an excellent illustration of evolutionary development as envisaged by the Green Paper.

Perceptions of what constitutes "health" are changing dramatically - whether these be scholarly concerns, government strategies, professional views or attitudes within the broader community. As these perceptions change, so do expectations of health care, health education and health research.

York is in an excellent position to respond to these changing expectations. Our study on Health Teaching and Research (Taylor Report, 1988) identified the following six areas of concentration where faculty interest and/or curricular presence already exists and where new scholarship is being developed: (1) The Political Economy of Health; (2) Health Policy, Institutions and Professions; (3) Women and Health; (4) Culture, Ethnicity and Health; (5) Mental and Physical Fitness, and (6) Health and Environment. These areas represent a broad view of health, in its social, personal and clinical dimensions, and include initiatives which are distinct from those being offered elsewhere in the province.

Specific initiatives include the Liberal Studies/Health Studies program in Arts, the graduate program in Exercise and Sports Science, the program in Health Administration and a recently created department and degree in Nursing, both in Atkinson College, and pertinent courses in law, environmental studies and many other disciplines. As well, we now offer (or soon will) professional accreditation certificates in three health-related areas: Social Work, Nursing, and Clinical Psychology. Programs in other areas, including physical education, recreation and athletics might also contribute to such an initiative.

An early task will be to develop a number of clinical/practicum components associated with particular disciplines. For example, York's Social Work and Clinical Psychology programs already have clinical/practicum components. It is conceivable that similar components could be offered in a range of areas related to health issues, such as physical and occupational therapy, pharmacy or counselling services. The issue of professional accreditation also invites exploration. As noted above, we already offer several such professional certificates; over time, as the health initiative accelerates, so too will the need to define our relationship with licensing and professional bodies.

---

One of the key recommendations of the Taylor Report was the creation of an Organized Research Unit to serve as an institutional focus for ongoing and increasing health-related research activity. The recently-established Centre for Health Studies will concentrate in the near term on coordinating and assisting existing faculty research interests, and on obtaining funding for particular projects. Given the range of faculty interest and activity already present in the area, it is envisioned that the Centre will support a number of different discourses rather than being the proponent of a single ideology. As the health area evolves and health-related activities proliferate, the Centre will no doubt be called upon as well to coordinate the diverse teaching and research interests encompassed within the general rubric of "health".

In light of all of this activity, York will ultimately have to develop a coordinating structure which may or may not emerge one day as a Faculty of Health. Nomenclature to one side, some such structure is necessary if we are to develop the necessary active connections with a variety of external organizations in the health care field, and to participate effectively in debates, discussions and strategic planning in the university sector, within government and in the community more generally.

Turning to the likely environment and market demand for graduates in the general area of health, conditions are distinctly favourable to the development of a significant York initiative. The terms of public policy debate are now clearly discernible: the demographics of an aging population, sensitivity to social and cultural factors in health, the balance between health promotion and health care, the impact of technology and environmental conditions on health, the design of new delivery systems, etc. Looming over all these issues - and a fact which makes support for our efforts more likely - is the desire of all governments to contain the costs of the health care system.

Finally, it must be noted that this account of health-related activities at York does not directly encompass either the health sciences or a conventional medical school. As to the former, we expect that the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science will take note of the growth of health-related research and teaching, and will find ways to interact creatively and supportively with the other faculties in the field. As to the latter, we do not expect that another medical school will be established in Ontario during the next two or three decades. However, should circumstances change, York ought to consider staking its claim. The fact that we have developed distinctive, responsive and well-grounded research and teaching in the area of health will give that claim great credibility. The fact that a medical school would be inserted into a novel academic milieu would ensure that its graduates would be uniquely qualified to deal with the health issues of the twenty-first century. And the fact that we have developed respect and recognition for our efforts, and close working relationships within the health care community, would ensure support for our claim.

#### NEW INITIATIVE IN DESIGN AND COMMUNICATIONS

Technological change has irrevocably altered the theory and practice of design and communications. Explorations in these two fields have converged to the point that the affinity between them, always strong, has become an integral intellectual bond. Com-



---

puters and other electronic technologies have not only placed new tools in the hands of designers and writers, but have transformed, and are continuing to transform, the very nature of their activities. Designers now use the electronic tools of communication to create their "products"; likewise, those who study, work and do research in communications are required increasingly to rely on what have traditionally been considered "design" skills in handling the media of mass communication.

As the technologies have evolved, so has the concept of what constitutes design. Those in the discipline see it as a process rather than a specific field, a process which can be applied to an almost limitless range of objects and environments from furniture, to architectural spaces, to industrial objects and milieux, to the printed word, television and radio, to interactive multi-media, and so on. The common element in successful design of all types is that it communicates with its intended audience, whether that communication be in visual, written or verbal form, in two or three dimensions, via traditional print or electronic media. In this way design can be said to encompass most communication activities, and design's intellectual priority in the design/communications partnership is increasingly acknowledged by participants from both areas.

It is most encouraging that a number of disciplines at York are already exploiting these affinities, and that there is substantial enthusiasm from several quarters for the development of an initiative in design and communication; thus the existing strength and support within the university already bodes well for the development of this initiative.

Precursors for such a unit may be identified throughout Environmental Studies, Fine Arts (Departments of Film and Video and Visual Arts), Faculty of Arts (Program in Mass Communications) and in other faculties. And connections amongst them are growing: the Design area in the Faculty of Fine Arts already collaborates with the Faculty of Arts' interdisciplinary program in Mass Communications; Atkinson's Department of Social Science has established a group to examine the potential for more formal study in communications, based on existing faculty strength; and the Faculty of Environmental Studies is interested in exploring the new media being used by students in Mass Communications.

These are but a few manifestations of a potentially rich and extensive interdisciplinary faculty complement which might constitute the critical mass for a new design/communications initiative. Colleagues in business administration, the social sciences, and law might also participate in such an enterprise.

The balance between theoretical and applied concerns is one which would have to be carefully considered in the establishment of any new "professional" direction such as this. Though electronic tools are indispensable to communication and design alike, teaching in these fields is not merely a technocratic or practical exercise. It also must rest ultimately upon scholarly insights which encompass all the ways of thinking about, seeing, describing, analyzing and shaping - designing and communicating - our social and physical relationships.

---

Obviously, it would be premature to propose definitive arrangements for this prospective new unit, or indeed to conclude where such a unit might be situated or how it would interact with various stakeholders inside and outside the university. However, some themes can be identified.

One could anticipate theoretical and applied work in the full range of graphic, industrial, mechanical, architectural and urban design, involving communication as an intrinsic part of the design process at all levels. In the communications area, such a unit could concentrate on both scholarly and applied aspects of areas such as journalism, public relations and advertising. In architecture, and perhaps in other areas, we might wish to develop our programs with an eye to professional requirements (whether or not we ultimately decide to seek formal professional accreditation).

What is most important, however, in all areas, is that we mobilize to the full York's multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary strengths in the visual arts, computers, the social sciences and environmental studies. Further, all areas must offer their students, and afford their faculty, access to the full range of relevant new technologies and information systems.

To turn finally to environmental circumstances and market demand, these clearly favour the development of such an initiative. It is evident that many of the new jobs which will be created in the next 10-20 years in the GTA, across the continent, and around the industrialized world, will be in the service sector of the economy, which depends increasingly on the tools of design and communications. A unit devoted to training for, and research into the theory and practice of, design and communication would respond effectively to these demands.

Moreover, the GTA is one of the most dynamic conurbations on the continent, and is a major centre of both industrial innovation and communications. But the region is curiously underprovided in communication and design education. Our manufacturing, service and cultural sectors may ultimately suffer as a result. This is a clear instance where academic innovation may provide a stimulus to economic and cultural development.

These are powerful arguments for the level of government support which will clearly be needed if we are to bring together our many existing activities in design and communications, to expand into new activities, and to generate strong synergy amongst them. This would indeed be an initiative for the twenty-first century.

#### NEW INITIATIVE IN INFORMATION SCIENCE

As our knowledge base grows ever more rapidly so, too, does our dependence upon increasingly sophisticated technical information systems, which may be linked to regional, national or international networks. These networks encourage the exchange of information and ideas, and facilitate the handling of geographically dispersed information resources; they may well revolutionize academic communication and research, as well as other forms of private and public discourse.

Perhaps understandably, during the early decades of information science, much of the focus of that discipline has been on the technical aspects of information

---

exchange, with less attention being paid to issues of operational accessibility and the utility of information systems for human problem-solving and decision-making. By contrast, "information science", as we conceive of it, will in the future emphasize both of these relatively neglected aspects. The use of information technology to serve our needs - intellectual, economic, social and cultural - should be the defining characteristic of a proposed initiative in information science. This initiative would integrate two main foci: (1) the design and development of information technology, systems and networks; (2) the integration of user requirements into the design of the technology and systems; as well as (3) an examination of critical concerns - a "technology and values" aspect - which would analyse political and social issues in the field and provide the balance for the "hard" science-based study of technology. This unique integration of theoretical, technical and social concerns would provide a comprehensive perspective seldom offered by information technology programs.

Information science is developing rapidly. It seems to possess at least two of the characteristics identified earlier as being essential to the development of new initiatives. First, it is a promising area of intellectual enquiry. Second, it responds to economic and social needs, and offers valuable career prospects for its graduates. That, of course, is why computer science has grown so rapidly as a university discipline over the past twenty years, at York and elsewhere. However, if our proposed new initiative is to distinguish itself from existing programs responding to these same criteria, it must unambiguously encompass not only the "hard" side of the discipline but also the "soft" dimensions of human problem-solving and decision-making, of evaluation and reflection.

What of our present capacity to move in this direction? On the "hard" science side, our existing strength in computer science, and our increasing emphasis on applied mathematics and applied science and technology, position us well for this development. On the "soft" side, are latent and emerging strengths in areas such as the Science, Technology, Culture and Society program in the Faculty of Arts, Linguistics, Law, Administrative Studies, and Fine Arts. The prospects for interdisciplinarity are almost limitless: there is hardly a discipline concerned with human and social interaction which does not offer promising prospects for Information Science as we conceive it. Indeed, this proposal has intriguing possibilities for a new academic role for the Libraries.

It may be just this need for interdisciplinarity, historically a strength at York, which would allow us to move into this new area more easily than many of our counterparts burdened as they are with vested interests in the existing definitions, skills and curricula.

However, many questions remain before we can move forward. Who will champion Information Science? What is the most appropriate structure for its development, and how will the creation of that structure affect other parts of the university? How will we be able to afford the considerable start-up and ongoing equipment costs in this new field? These questions apply, in fact, to all of the new initiatives we have identified, but perhaps loom a little larger, so far, in relation to information science. We invite interested parties to begin to address them.

---

We can certainly foresee that if we do not move forward with such an initiative, some other institution might do so. This underlines the need for the careful development of a proposal, which will permit York to respond rapidly and credibly when an opportunity presents itself.

Finally, it remains to distinguish Information Science from Design and Communications, another proposed new initiative. Information scientists would provide what would be, in effect, some of the most important "tools" to be used by students and practitioners of design and communications. By contrast, designers and communications experts, in various roles, would focus primarily on the end-product - a building or magazine or industrial design. Obviously, these proposals are situated across a spectrum of related ideas, functions and programs; further investigation may show that there are ways of combining and dividing them which would be preferable to those we have proposed.

#### A POSSIBLE SCENARIO FOR GROWTH: A THIRD CAMPUS FOR YORK

The growth and diversification which we contemplate should, where possible, be concentrated on the York main campus in order to enhance the quality of both our academic and our nonacademic life. For diversification to achieve the goal of broadening our intellectual discourse, it ought to occur where our activities are principally conducted, not at some distant site. And we should try to focus future growth there as well, since the additional buildings required for existing and additional student populations will help us to realize our new campus Master Plan, which calls for infilling the campus to create moderate urban densities, for greater efficiency of land use, and for stimulation of a fuller range of collateral activities which in turn depend on a somewhat larger and more varied campus population.

However, for specific reasons, growth may also be justified at two other locations, provided it is carefully calibrated and forms part of an integrated overall plan for York's development.

First, the case of Glendon. It is quite possible that in order to achieve a critical mass and wider variety of academic disciplines, some growth of the student population on the Glendon campus may be justified. Further study will be needed to determine how much growth is academically desirable and physically possible.

Second, the possibility of a third campus for York. This is an option we should not consider unless and until we feel comfortable that we have grown enough on our two existing campuses, ideally perhaps two or three decades hence. But a third campus may find its way onto our agenda at a much earlier date if there should emerge a strong regional need or an irresistible local opportunity for such a facility.

In fact, studies suggest that a crisis of access to higher education may indeed be developing in the GTA, from which York presently draws 75% of its undergraduates.

A recent MCU analysis of long-term demand by high school graduates indicates that the enrolment pressure in York's catchment area will be about twice that of the rest of the system, especially after the year 2000 - and that we may be the focus for something like 80% of the net provincial growth in demand. A preliminary study

---

provided to OCUA suggests that two additional university campuses may be needed to meet demand within the GTA over the next twenty years or so. Specialized studies concerning, for example, anticipated teacher shortages in Metro, confirm these general trends.

Moreover, these indicators if anything underestimate our growth potential. On the one hand, York has always had a disproportionate share of the non-traditional and mature student market. This pattern will likely persist, and we will be expected to serve more and more such students. On the other, for a variety of social, economic, religious, and cultural reasons, GTA students seem to be less mobile than others. Thus the anticipated surplus demand from either mature students or high school graduates in the GTA is not likely to be deflected to institutions outside the region, absent a significant change in their demographic characteristics and in arrangements for student support.

Responding to this emerging demand, several units - Atkinson, Education, and the Centre for Continuing Education - have already begun to develop outreach initiatives at locations across the GTA. Indeed, Atkinson's evolving programs and its special mandate for nontraditional student constituencies may make it a logical candidate to play a leadership role in the evolution of a third campus.

However, we must be careful in our planning to avoid either or both of two undesirable academic outcomes: diluting the resources and activities on our two existing campuses, or creating a third facility which does not have the potential to evolve into a valued component of the university. These issues also bear on the selection of a site: on the one hand, we must be sure that we are bringing higher education to a community that wants and needs it; on the other, we must be sure that a new site is not populated primarily by students who would otherwise come to one of our existing campuses.

Of course, it is not inevitable that York should assume responsibility for the crisis of accessibility within the GTA. If circumstances or sentiment were to favour establishment of a new higher education facility in the GTA, and if government were prepared to fund it, we would still confront three options: to establish a new campus (ourselves or in cooperation with other institutions), to accept serious competition in our prime catchment area, or to propose some other means to meet the needs of the region.

The third option is always on the table, in the sense that our expansion over the past decades, and as proposed in this Green Paper, offers "other means", albeit means which are likely to be insufficient in themselves. The second option we view with some concern. York is not yet so firmly established, has not yet developed the range of programs it aspires to offer, does not yet possess the facilities it needs. We cannot sit by with equanimity while others preempt the opportunities and resources for which we have waited for so long. Nor does it make good sense, in policy terms, for the province to leave one university unfinished while launching another.

For some time, therefore, we have been studying the first option - creation of another campus. Specifically, a Presidential study group has been exploring the possibility of establishing a York University presence in York Region. The study has

---

included analysis of local markets, and discussions with officials of the GTA, the provincial treasury and Ministry of Colleges and Universities, and York Region, as well as a canvass of interested units of the university.

We have considered several models, but so far have reached no conclusions. York has no spare resources to invest at the present time, nor is it likely that the province will make any available in the near future. Nonetheless, the GTA accessibility crisis may be just over the horizon, and is almost sure to occur within the next 10-20 years. It is therefore not too soon to begin to position ourselves to secure the most favourable outcome of an imminent development. We also know that any short-term initiative towards a third campus is bound to be somewhat symbolic in nature and, in the absence of earmarked provincial funding, probably will have to be based on a core of existing activities now conducted elsewhere.

All of this suggests that we should tread carefully - but that we should begin to tread soon.

#### (D) RELATIONS WITH COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The relations between universities and community colleges is one of the main themes of a recent government report, *Vision 2000*. That report, and others, suggest the need for better articulation of the two systems within the higher education sector. In part, the concern is to achieve maximum flexibility and opportunity for students to find the combination of educational experiences which suits their talents, needs and interests; in part it is to secure the most efficient use of public resources committed to post-secondary education.

Universities are rightly anxious to avoid a loss of the reflective dimension of their academic programs, in favour of the colleges' more practical and occupational concerns. They are properly concerned about the maintenance of the higher academic standards and scholarly reputation which they now enjoy, relative to colleges. However, as our own experience demonstrates, neither of these concerns need prevent meaningful cooperation between universities and colleges.

In some programs, e.g. communications and nursing, complementarity exists between our programs and those of various colleges; we have already found that bridge-building is fully justified in the interests of our students and promotes efficient utilization of resources. In other instances, even when programmatic links are not strong, there may be reasons for us to share facilities with a college; this has been the case at Georgian College for many years. And new and imaginative forms of cooperation are being proposed, similar to the Durham Alliance for Training and Education (DATE) in which York (through Atkinson College) is a partner with Durham College, Trent and Ryerson. Even in the area of research, as the participation of Humber College in the Institute for Space and Terrestrial Science (ISTS) demonstrates, there are some possibilities of closer collaboration.

Thus, there is every reason to believe that we can work out the practical means for protecting our academic and other interests while expanding and reinforcing our network of alliances and partnerships within the college system. The one trouble-

---

some factor, whose appearance ironically coincides with that of *Vision 2000*, is the corridor system. In effect, some forms of cooperation which might otherwise seem attractive, such as the offering of university credit courses to college students, may now be less so, since they would effectively reduce the number of regular university students whom we are entitled to enrol. No doubt this problem will have to be addressed and resolved in due course.

Within the perspective of long-term developments at York, however, we can expect to see ourselves engaged more extensively with the community college system. We view this prospect as holding some attractive possibilities for York, and urge that the Vice President (Academic Affairs) define responsibility for managing it to ensure the best possible results.

### MOVING FORWARD

The endorsement of the Working Group's Green Paper by Senate and the Board of Governors will provide a context for ongoing academic planning looking towards the year 2020. This will permit, indeed stimulate, various academic and administrative bodies to revisit the assumptions upon which their planning activities are based and, in many cases, will legitimate assumptions which they already embrace.

For example, in some cases, there already exist faculty planning documents which propose the new ventures we have identified. Adoption of the Green Paper will do no more than signal that planning and preparation should move forward in the normal way.

In others, individual proponents of some of the initiatives we recommend (or of those which emerge hereafter) may meet together in order to consider how to work towards practical realization of their plans over the long term. This might involve several steps taken over several years:

- identification of interested participants
- articulation of objectives
- development of conceptual models for teaching and research
- discussions with interested deans, vice-presidents (and subsequent discussions at each stage)
- development of a prospectus
- preliminary presentation of conceptual models to APPC; introduction of possible initiative into academic planning documents
- development of detailed models for curriculum, research, staffing, equipment, infrastructure and building requirements, if any
- development of proposed structural arrangements (department, program, centre, faculty, etc.)

- 
- formal approvals process: faculty, Senate, Board

When proponents begin work on either a long-standing or a new initiative, they should alert the Vice President (Academic Affairs) and any interested Dean(s). This may result in the provision of some modest financial assistance or assistance in kind, if required, to support preliminary planning work. If alerted well in advance, moreover, the Dean(s) and Vice President might wish to insert the new needs for budgets, appointments etc. into their own long-term planning.

Apart from academic planning and budgeting, early notification of such academic initiatives would enable us to ensure, for example, that planning for the next thirty years of our campus construction program takes into account both the need adequately to house existing activities, and the possible requirement for new facilities to accommodate a known range of new academic ventures.

Finally, endorsement of the Green Paper will enable York's advocates to stake out our claims within government, community, and professional circles. People have to become used to the idea that York is the logical place to put a new faculty of X or a centre of Y, X and Y being initiatives identified through our academic planning processes, and especially in this Green Paper and its successors. Then, when the time comes for a high-level decision to expand the province's teaching or research capacity in one of our target areas, York's preliminary and advanced planning will make us credible candidates to achieve the desired results.



---

## APPENDIX A

### BACKGROUND TO THE GREEN PAPER'S DEVELOPMENT

The Enrolment Working Group is a cooperative effort of Senate's Academic Policy and Planning Committee (APPC), and the university administration. As its name implies, it is mainly concerned with enrolment-related issues, while acknowledging that these issues permeate virtually all aspects of university life.

In its first report, in May 1988, the Group began by canvassing and recording the enrolment aspirations of the existing faculties. As a result of the Group's efforts, in 1989 Senate amended the objectives of the *University Academic Plan* (UAP) dealing with admissions and enrolments, and committed the university to broadening its program offerings at all levels and to increasing the proportion of graduate to undergraduate students.

The present aim of the Enrolment Working Group is to develop a long-term perspective on the development of York University, using its student enrolment as the point of departure. The distribution of enrolment - the balance amongst the disciplines and academic units in which students are enrolled - is essentially an exercise in academic planning. The total enrolment - as a proxy for York's overall size - is a fundamental factor in administrative planning of our financial, physical and human resources: what buildings and facilities are needed? what faculty complement and staff? what services and equipment? And the two have obvious consequences for each other. Hence the logic of the partnership between APPC and the administration in the preparation of this Green Paper.

But is there a logic to the exercise itself? We believe there is.

It seems clear that for the mid-term future, higher education in Ontario will be more carefully planned, more pervasively regulated, than it once was. If York is to advance its own interests in such a context, to participate in public policy debates, to take advantage of opportunities, to avoid unnecessary risks, we must have some sense of where we wish to be twenty or thirty years hence. Even if we were to somehow achieve complete control over our own destiny, we would have to reflect carefully on how to use that control to build the kind of university we would find academically most attractive and the kind of community we would find most pleasant and workable.

Recent experience reinforces the point. In 1985, we accepted the report on *Academic Planning at York* (APAY), and have since adopted, and annually revised and updated, our *University Academic Plan* (UAP). With complementary faculty and unit plans, and several special planning documents, we were ready for the most comprehensive regulatory intervention to date in the Ontario university system, the so-called "corridor negotiations". In those negotiations, York attained many of its objectives partly (as the documentation revealed) because of the quality of our academic planning. The new corridor arrangements will determine the course of our development, not only through to 1994-95, their formal expiry date, but well beyond. The effects of our internal planning will be similarly long-lasting.

---

Likewise, our new campus master plan, adopted in 1988, is contributing to the development of the university. We have been able to take stock of our needs for new buildings and for a better campus infrastructure, to develop a strategy for meeting those needs, and to begin to implement that strategy. We are presently at the stage of discussing the implications of our master plan for the municipal and regional governments which control land use, roads and transit, and other services. A clear sense of where we are heading in terms of our campus population is crucial to the outcome of these discussions.

Thirdly, we are at the early stages of human resource planning. A White Paper on York's academic personnel was tabled late in 1990. With its appearance, interested campus constituencies began to address, and hopefully to move towards consensus on, another key factor in the university's future. Once again, the focus will be on the longer term, twenty years or so, during which our incumbent professoriate will largely retire and be replaced by a new academic generation.

These examples of our current attempts at planning - and they are not exhaustive - demonstrate the need for a planning document that develops a general sense of direction for the university over the next twenty or thirty years. This Green Paper thus addresses a longer time span than the UAP, is not as detailed, and is less tightly prescriptive. It seeks to articulate a general sense of direction for York, to identify the academic, resource and structural consequences of doing so, and to build a consensus which will help us to act rapidly and effectively, as opportunities present themselves, in order to achieve our general goals.

Of course, our fate is not entirely in our own hands. We have consulted, and acknowledge that we are profoundly affected by, general political, social and economic trends, as well as specific government initiatives in higher education. International, national, provincial and regional developments will influence our environment. And we have no power to bind future generations of decision-makers at York. All of this makes "planning" a rather problematic exercise. The only thing that is more problematic is not planning: that way, almost certainly, lies confusion and frustration.

## DISCUSSIONS AND CONSULTATIONS

The Enrolment Working Group initially proceeded on the basis of considerable internal discussion, informed by a careful consideration of the external environment, and by some important planning documents and experiences, including the 1989-90 corridors exercise, other OCUA initiatives, five successive UAPs, university and faculty planning reports on particular subjects, meetings with regional and provincial officials, and of course general familiarity with trends in and debates over higher education policy.

The Working Group considered, and after consultation amended, an environmental scan (see Appendix B) which sought to lay out the physical, economic, demographic, political and other influences which will affect our development. It had a considerable influence on our proposals, and should be read as background to them.

In November 1990, a draft Green Paper was circulated for comment and discussion. Briefings were provided to the planning bodies of Senate (APPC), the Board

---

(Strategic Planning Committee) and the administration (President's Policy Committee). Additional background documentation was distributed. An open forum was convened in February 1991. Written comments were received before and after the forum. Four further days of hearings on possible new initiatives were held in June, 1991, with all interested parties being invited. An open invitation to submit additional new proposals was extended to the community, though none had been received as of September 1991. We can say with some justification that we have consulted extensively and to our profit.

This version of the Green Paper takes into account the many thoughtful written and oral comments received in response to the first draft. Specifically, it attempts to address the concerns most frequently voiced: that expansionary forward planning is inconsistent with the present contraction of our resources, that the particular initiatives identified are inappropriate or impractical, and that various existing interests or constituencies have been ignored.

### WORKING WITH THE GREEN PAPER

The Green Paper proposes a set of common working assumptions to guide academic and administrative planning, and a vision of the university as it might develop over the next twenty or thirty years. These assumptions, this vision, will have to be revisited from time to time. The environment will change; York will change; higher education will change. And when at some future date we actually confront concrete decisions - the chance to make our vision a reality - we will have to be very alert to the consequences. At that point, the normal decision-making processes of the university will have to be fully respected, not just for constitutional reasons, but so that all interested parties can make their constructive contributions.

However, acknowledging that the Green Paper will be reviewed and amended, that its prescriptions will not compel automatic implementation or necessarily trump other initiatives, it will still serve some very useful purposes.

For example, the Green Paper identifies several major academic initiatives which would build on existing and evolving strengths at York, but which might in due course lead to the creation of significant new academic units. These initiatives are most likely to move forward if they have champions at York, but potential champions will not wish to invest considerable time in planning and organizing them unless there is some serious prospect that their efforts will enjoy support. Indeed, the proponents may be located in different faculties or disciplines, and may not even seek each other out unless prompted to do so by the prospect of working together towards a common goal.

During the preparation of the final draft of the Green Paper, we held discussions with individuals interested in four proposed major new initiatives. It is clear from those discussions that the Green Paper will help to support and legitimate their efforts, and presumably those of other individuals or units seeking to launch similar initiatives.

Moreover, most significant initiatives (even minor initiatives) will likely require provincial regulatory approval, additional provincial funding, and perhaps the coop-

---

eration and support of other institutions or community groups. It is very difficult for the university to explore prospects for approval, funding or cooperation until we have sent some sort of signal that we are interested in principle in a particular venture. On the other hand, without our prospects having been documented, there will be skepticism within the university concerning our capacity to move forward, even if we wish to do so. The Green Paper offers us the means of escaping from this double bind. And it does more: by signalling our intentions in a responsible manner, it may stimulate governments and communities to look to York as a solution to their problems, even as a partner in policy development, rather than merely as a petitioner.

Finally, there is the question of linking the physical development of the campus to its academic development. While these linkages must remain at a high level of generality, we at least have to know about how big the university is likely to be overall, what magnitude of capital demands we are likely to generate, what external communities we are likely to serve, which governments we will have to relate to. These arguments touch on very important issues: bringing public transit to the York campus, positioning York relative to new institutions planned to serve expanding regional needs, and our own decisions concerning campus green space and parking.

We have two choices. We are going to be asked to make long-term decisions about our future, such as those outlined above. We can make these decisions by default, in haste, without adequate planning, and on the basis of contradictory assumptions. Or we can make them in a careful, coherent fashion, as the Green Paper proposes. That is the fundamental argument for adopting the Green Paper.

## CONCERNS

During the course of our consultations, members of the community expressed concerns which were not directly related to the merits of the proposals in the Green Paper. We will respond to those concerns in this appendix, so that substantive debate on the Green Paper can be somewhat more focused.

### *What is the relationship of the Green Paper to the UAP and to faculty and departmental plans?*

The Green Paper provides a context, a background, for the UAP, which will continue to be the operational document defining York's immediate academic priorities. The Green Paper borrows from and validates a number of underlying assumptions of past UAP's, including:

- THE ENHANCEMENT OF QUALITY (General Objective 1)\*;
- OUR COMMITMENT TO REGIONAL ACCESSIBILITY (Objective 12);
- THE DELIVERY OF PROGRAMS TO OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS (Objectives 14 and 46);
- INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO TEACHING AND RESEARCH (Objective 6);
- DIVERSIFICATION OF OUR ACADEMIC BASE (Objective 17);
- THE PRINCIPLE OF BUILDING NEW PROGRAMS FROM EXISTING STRENGTHS (Objective 28).

\* objectives as stated in UAP 5, May 1990

---

Such goals deserve some long-term recognition, beyond that implied by their restatement (in one form or other) in successive iterations of the UAP.

However, the Green Paper looks forward well beyond the three-to-five year time horizon of the new UAP. For that reason it addresses some issues which have not yet surfaced for consideration within the UAP process, and is written in a somewhat more speculative vein than the UAP.

The Green Paper also builds on other planning documents, local and central, and generally identifies opportunities for future growth by extrapolating from our developed and developing strengths. To be sure, some initiatives proposed in the Green Paper have not yet received serious attention by units at York. But we could hardly operate twenty or thirty years down the road on the basis that the university would never do anything it was not doing already.

Of course, we expect that, over time, most units will adopt new concerns, new vocabularies, new pedagogies, new curricula, and new clienteles. Far from implicitly deprecating such developments by failing to mention them, we assume that they are inevitable and perhaps collectively more important than some of the developments we have addressed. But we did not feel that we should attempt to duplicate or displace normal processes of change in existing units. Rather, we focused on a limited set of proposed enrolment changes which, in our view, deserved special attention because of their size, cost, novelty, merit, or socio-economic ramifications.

*In light of our current and apparently chronic underfunding, how can we contemplate major new initiatives, especially those which are likely to involve heavy equipment and building costs? And if we launch new projects, will this not have an adverse effect on our ongoing programs?*

The proposals in the Green Paper can only be implemented by combining existing activities and resources under a new label, by attracting significant new resources, or by doing both of these things. Clearly, they cannot be funded by diverting funds from our existing activities, which have barely the resources they need at present.

Moreover, we are unlikely for the foreseeable future to be given operating funds which we can apply, at our choice, to the reinforcement of existing programs or the introduction of new ones. On the contrary, there is every indication that government funding for new initiatives will be made available only selectively and competitively, and in accordance with government plans and priorities. Similarly, although the position in regard to capital is not quite as clear, we have a greater chance of attracting grants for buildings which fit within government priorities than for those which do not.

In summary, there will be some new initiatives which can be mounted by rearrangement of existing budget lines and the activities they support. However, we are going to have to secure new operating and capital funds for most new projects, and are likely to be able to undertake only those new projects which are properly supported.

---

*Does this add up to our never being able to implement the Green Paper? and if so, why are we bothering with it now?*

By no means is innovation beyond our reach. Even in these difficult times, some new programs are being launched and some new funding is being introduced into the system.

The whole point of the Green Paper is to put us in a position where we can recognize and respond to opportunities, and indeed on occasion, create our own opportunities by advocacy or lobbying.

And finally, we should not make the mistake of assuming that for the next thirty years, we are going to suffer the same constraints as we have for the past twenty. At some point, even if briefly, some Ontario government is likely to treat universities as an important priority, at least to the extent of funding them up to the level of other Canadian and American systems.

*The Green Paper speaks in terms of the creation of new academic units. Would it not be preferable to avoid proliferation of bureaucracies, and the undermining of existing units?*

The Green Paper has no fixed view on which unit would be the appropriate home of any particular new venture. It may be possible to accommodate new programs within existing units, or it may be necessary to establish new units. In either event, to use the architectural maxim, form should follow function.

As to whether new units should take the form of faculties, departments, programs, or centres, again we have no *a priori* position. The size and complexity of the new offering, the possible need to reach across existing boundaries, and the strong pressures of conventional nomenclature at other universities will all be influential.

---

## APPENDIX B

### THE ENVIRONMENT FOR YORK'S DEVELOPMENT

The following is a series of "best guesses" concerning the environment within which we will be working over the next twenty or thirty years. While these guesses are informed by data and experience, they are by no means a certain guide to the future. Obviously, they should be revisited and revised from time to time, as we work our way through this period, and as concrete decisions have to be taken based on specific assumptions about near and middle term futures.

### DEMOGRAPHY

Across the Province, the 18-24 age cohort will be decreasing slightly through the 1990's, and recovering at the end of the decade; this decline may be reversed if heavy immigration (internal and foreign) persists. In the Greater Toronto Area (the GTA), enormous population growth has been experienced and is still projected north and west of Metro; further growth is also projected to the north and east. This is offset somewhat by stability or decline within Metro. Highside projections show the GTA with a population of 5,000,000 by the year 2000.

University participation rates have increased in recent years, especially among women and in rural areas. However, both of these may now be levelling off. Demand for university education will also be affected by the educational aspirations and attainments of children of recently-arrived immigrant groups, labour market demands for highly trained personnel, and fluctuations in demand from out-of-province and foreign sources.

A recent MCU study of long-term demand indicates that the enrolment pressures in York's catchment area will be about double those across the system, especially after the year 2000. Nonetheless, the study understates our growth potential. It is based solely on high school graduates, while we attract an atypically high percentage of mature students. And, it is based on the extrapolation of existing application patterns which in turn reflect our limited range of disciplines.

### STUDENT DEMAND

York draws approximately 75% of its undergraduates from its immediate catchment area, and is generally well situated to take advantage of demographically generated demand. Our principal competitor in the GTA is the University of Toronto, which draws 70% of its undergraduate students from the same local catchment area.

Student demand comprises a series of submarkets or sectors whose relative importance keeps shifting. Over the next ten years, several sectors are likely to experience considerably increased demand.

The impending shortage of teachers is already generating high levels of demand in the Faculty of Education. In due course, the focus of this pressure will likely shift from the primary to the secondary level, with the prospect ultimately of an after-mar-

---

ket in mid-career training. Likewise, the impending shortage of university faculty and other highly qualified personnel suggests that there will be a strong market-driven demand for admissions to graduate programs.

Arts demand will be sustained, but likely not increase significantly, except in certain areas: in applied and quasi-professional fields; perhaps in bilingual programs as more immersion students reach university age; and, in part-time and continuing education.

Science is a question mark. Labour market realities and the declared priorities of both senior levels of government ought to lead to greatly increased demand, especially for Applied Science and Technology. Possibly a massive shift of women to this area will account for the next major increase in demand, as it did in some other professional fields.

Other professional programs should experience some flattening of demand, unless they decide to pursue a larger national market. Law and Fine Arts both currently draw a significant number of non-Metro students. There is potential in the national marketplace for graduate programs as well. World-wide and dramatic concerns about the environment suggest that existing or new programs in environmental studies could be of increasing interest to both local students and those from other provinces and countries.

Based on recent trends, we should be able to sustain or improve our market position for high quality students. At the same time, our varied student body requires that we pay close attention to equity concerns. At the undergraduate level, a large constituency of part-time and mature students will be a continuing fact of life at York. Demand for part-time study at the graduate level and in professional programs has been largely unsatisfied and is expected to persist and increase.

What is much less clear is the extent of future demand for credit and non-credit courses as part of the trend to "life long learning". In principle, both students with general intellectual interests and those with specific job-related goals should make this a growing constituency to be served.

However, the role of the universities may not grow commensurately, because a number of other education providers are taking aim at it: employers offering programs to their employees; commercial providers offering programs to the general public or, on contract, to affinity groups; continuing education and public information programs by professional and community groups; home study through distance education, technology-delivered, and self-education programs; and government programs related to labour market adjustment, public sector employment, etc. - to name just a few.

Our main vulnerabilities in this generally positive market situation are three: to competition, largely from the University of Toronto; to shifts in market demand for programs which we do not offer; and to financial constraints which may make it impossible for us to provide the faculty, staff, infrastructure and facilities needed to sustain our activities at a high enough level.



---

## STRUCTURAL CHANGES IN ADVANCED AND HIGHER EDUCATION

As noted in connection with "life long learning", other providers are beginning to encroach on some of the territory now occupied by universities. These encroachments will continue and increase, and the public university sector will feel some impact of new private, religious, or possibly corporate providers of higher education. But the impact will be at the margins. Universities will not be displaced or seriously challenged by these new institutions, in part because of the dominant position of universities in the academic labour market and in the research culture.

What may happen, however, is that universities respond to challenges from outside the system by more aggressive investigation of new educational strategies. Already co-op education and work-study programs are becoming increasingly popular in areas well beyond engineering where they first took root. New, interactive video technology is beginning to make possible types of teaching which could not be imagined years ago. Electronic access to library resources will offer even the most distant distance student the chance to do research. And there is greater and greater willingness on the part of universities to deliver programs in workplaces, shopping centres and local or regional education centres.

All these changes presage a changing relationship between the university and some of its clientele. As universities are brought much more directly into contact with the individuals and interests they are serving, the almost certain result will be a much higher degree of "consumerism". This will create strains for institutions which have traditionally defined the terms of the learning contract on a unilateral, if well-intentioned, basis.

## PUBLIC POLICY

For most of the next 20-30 years, governments will continue to make verbal commitments to higher education in general, without commensurate resources. However, we will also see several episodes where significant injections of funds occur, both across the board and to advance specific public policy objectives, likely as part of election strategies.

There may well be a shift from populist to meritocratic rhetoric, and attempts to ensure that scarce resources are focused on "deserving" recipients, individual or institutional. Governments will also attempt, with little success, to link higher education policy to labour market policy and to economic strategies in general. Universities will make short-term adaptive moves to register themselves as labour market and economic actors, but these will not fundamentally alter their character over the long run.

Attempts will also be made to achieve coherence in the province's education policy (and savings in expenditure) by strategies of integration and rationalization. In an attempt to accommodate or forestall these strategies, universities will become more involved individually and collectively with other educational sectors. The most likely area of "rationalization" will involve relations between the universities and community colleges. Movement between the two sectors will be facilitated, and there will be greater cooperation in particular programs. Some significant part of the CAAT system

---

will most likely be subsumed into the skills development/job training sector and become more closely integrated with overall government labour market strategies.

Race and ethnic relations will enjoy considerable attention and universities will be one focus of an effort to secure/maintain social cohesion. Women and other constituencies will continue to secure important gains, with the costs being borne by employers, service providers, etc., including universities. At some point, a plateau may be reached, and closer involvement with the United States might even, to some extent, counterbalance this long-term liberal Canadian trend.

Environmental concerns will become very strong, with impacts on our land development, building costs, etc. And there is no reason to believe that health costs will be contained, or the costs of providing social services to an aging population avoided. Higher education will therefore not become a significant priority even in periods of relatively high public expenditures.

Social policy debates and changes in these areas of social concern may, however, offer the universities occasional opportunities to initiate both research and special teaching programs.

Subject to global economic trends, Ontario can expect to enjoy a reasonably favourable position within Canada and North America. However, it will likely fall backward rather than move forward, relative to Europe and Japan. This may make governments even more cautious in their commitment to social spending.

Market-driven philosophies will remain dominant for the next period of years, but ultimately there will be a series of reactions leading to demands for regulation. During this return to regulation, universities are likely to come back into favour, as contributors to the technology of regulation, and as potential constituents of its proponents.

Overall, universities can expect the public policy climate to be characterized by some fairly wide swings which will involve universities in a series of short-term challenges or crises, but which in the long-term will net out to something like the status quo.

#### FACULTY AND STAFF

York will soon start to experience the retirement of increasing numbers of faculty. We will have to compete nationally and internationally for new faculty with other universities, governments and the private sector which will all be facing the same phenomenon. The impending shortage of highly trained personnel - the mirror image of the rapid expansion of the sixties - will be exacerbated by the depressed graduate enrolments of the late seventies and eighties.

York is particularly vulnerable because, despite our competitive remuneration policies, we are an underfunded university in an underfunded system. This makes it difficult for us to offer adequate research support and other non-salary inducements to potential faculty recruits. In addition, we are in the most expensive housing market in the country.

The financial benefits of hiring junior faculty to replace senior faculty will likely be offset by the higher costs generated by the "sellers" market, and by the financial ero-

---

sion caused by the long-term failure of government grants to match salary settlements comprising (at minimum) the sum of inflation plus PTR (Progress through the Ranks).

A similar phenomenon will occur with non-academic staff. On the one hand, we will depend increasingly on highly trained support and service personnel to operate the complex technology of administration, research and teaching. On the other, the priority accorded to the academic culture, the limited range of career opportunities and the diminishing nonmonetary rewards of working at universities will make the attraction of highly qualified staff very difficult.

## UNIVERSITY FUNDING

The general condition of underfunding is likely to continue, and may deteriorate further. However, in response to various policy initiatives, there will be some occasions on which additional funds will be disbursed. Increasingly, new funding will be provided on a discretionary rather than a formulaic, basis.

York has emerged from the recent corridors negotiation with a higher student population, and is likely to benefit from improved grants per student from about the previous \$.90 to about \$.94, compared to the provincial average of \$1.00. OCUA has undertaken to study the anomaly of our discounted grants. This may yield a commitment to bring us closer to the average over an extended period of time. Over the decade of the 1990's, hopefully much sooner, we should be within the "normal" range, if on the low side. However, it must be remembered that this recent relative improvement coincides with a period of absolute decline, in which transfer payments to the university sector have not kept pace with rising costs and expanding obligations.

Capital expenditures for universities will be restrained by the overall need for capital investment in civic infrastructure and especially in housing. Within the university sector, the increasing need for retrofitting existing buildings will make the funding available for new construction even more difficult to secure. New building grants will more often be made to serve policy initiatives, which will make undifferentiated needs - such as York's 30% space deficit - more difficult to address. Universities which are able to identify themselves with regional interests may also be successful in gaining recognition of their capital claims.

The deregulation of fees is improbable, but the pressure to increase fees dramatically will remain. This pressure is likely to be resisted by the present government, but a reasonable increase can be anticipated at some moment when a secure government is not facing an imminent election.

Levels of support for university research will likely remain constant for some time, and may be increasingly targeted for areas deemed to be "strategic" and perceived to be vital to economic and technological advancement. Similarly, contracts to support university research can be expected to increase somewhat, but most likely in areas of interest to business and industry.

We are likely to see all parts of the voluntary sector competing vigorously for the limited amount of available private philanthropy. Corporate and individual giving

---

may bottom out or rise slightly, depending on the vagaries of the economy and tax laws. However, it is most unlikely to be adequate to meet most major needs. Our best prospects for sustaining support are alumni, friends and clients of the university.

Our primary financial asset will remain our lands. However, the pace of land development will be slow in the short-term due to unfavourable market conditions. The recent incorporation of our campus master plan in North York's Secondary Plan creates a positive context for future development; nonetheless, we should move slowly, since premature development would deprive us of the maximum long-term benefit of our major financial asset. In the long run, however, land development will bring us considerable benefit, particularly when rapid transit reaches the campus. We can expect the transit system to come closer to the main campus during the 1990's, and to reach it later if not sooner.

It is unlikely that the proceeds of land development will be available for operating purposes at any point in the near future, but it is possible that we can persuade the government to take an extended view of "capital" so as to ease somewhat the burdens on our operating budget.

#### LAND USE

Neither our land endowment nor the prescriptions of our new campus plan limit any aspiration we might identify in terms of enrolment. On the contrary, they can nicely accommodate any such reasonable aspiration. Specifically, we could increase our population considerably without strain, and by doing so would help to realize certain aspects of the campus plan: infilling and the proliferation and diversification of uses on campus. The most urgent issues to be addressed are those of transportation and parking.

#### RELATIONS WITH MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS AND NEIGHBOURING COMMUNITIES

We can expect to enjoy positive relations with local and regional governments and the ethnocultural communities, but will always have a degree of strain with nearby neighbourhoods which perceive us (wrongly) as an affluent institution which is insensitive to their needs. We wish to, and will have to, become more involved with local community concerns, albeit on very marginal dollars. Perhaps we can in turn look forward to more explicit support from community groups and local governments. In terms of enrolments, we will not be limited by developments in this area.

#### GLENDON AND BILINGUALISM

Glendon has a special "market niche" due to the character of its campus and its bilingual programs. The College has a challenge ahead of it in translating its distinctive mission and personality into a real attraction for students and financial support. It will have to build alliances with bilingual constituencies across the country and with elements of the francophone community who can perceive the positive aspects of such an alliance.