AGENDA

1. Chair’s Remarks

2. UTM Operating Budget, Themes & Priorities: Presentation by Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic & Dean, and Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer (for information)

3. Student Housing and Residence Life and Academic Supports: Presentation by Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs, Mr. Dale Mullings, Assistant Dean, Students & International Initiatives and Mr. Chad Nuttall, Director, Student Housing & Residence Life (for information)

4. Food Services at University of Toronto Mississauga: Presentation by Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer (for information)

5. Assessors’ Report

CONSENT AGENDA**

6. Date of Next Meeting – Thursday, January 8, 2015, 4:10 p.m.


8. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

9. Other Business

+ Confidential documentation included for members only
* Documentation included
** Documentation for consent item included. This item will be given individual consideration by the Campus Affairs Committee only if a members so requests. Members with questions or who would like a consent item to be discussed by the Campus Affairs Committee are invited to notify the Committee Secretary Mariam Ali at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting by telephone at 905-569-4358 or by email at mariam.ali@utoronto.ca
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TO: Campus Affairs Committee

SPONSOR: Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer
CONTACT INFO: 905-828-3707, paul.donoghue@utoronto.ca

PRESENTER: Mr. Paul Donoghue, CAO & Prof. Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic & Dean
CONTACT INFO: Academic & Dean

DATE: November 3, 2014 for November 10, 2014

AGENDA ITEM: 2

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

UTM Proposed Operating Budget: Themes and Priorities

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

Section 5.7 of Campus Affairs Committees’ Terms of Reference provides that the “annual budget is considered by the Committee for recommendation to the [UTM] Council for inclusion in the University’s annual operating budget.” Appendix A of the Terms notes that this responsibility is executed as part of the campus’ budget planning process.

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. UTM Campus Affairs Committee [For information] (November 10, 2014)
2. UTM Campus Council [For information] (December 8, 2014)

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

At meetings on September 15, 2014 and October 8, 2014, the Campus Affairs Committee and the Campus Council respectively received for information the Process for Consideration of Budget Matters by UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and Campus Affairs Committees. At the same meetings, both governance bodies received ‘step one’ in that process, namely a presentation on the Current Year Campus and Institutional Operating Budget.

HIGHLIGHTS:

The attached presentation is ‘step two’ in the process for consideration of budget matters by UTM governance, which comprises four components:

(1) an integrated budget presentation to the CCs and CACs,
(2) an overview of the proposed campus operating budgets (themes and priorities),
The attached presentation explores the priorities and key trends that inform decisions about proposed uses of the financial resources available to the campus. This “step two” discussion at the CAC will support UTM’s annual budget discussions with the Provost and the integration of campus budget plans into the University’s budget.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

n/a

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

Presentation: UTM Proposed Operating Budget: Themes and Priorities
Academic Plan

Enrolment

Expenses

Revenues

Reserves

Faculty/Staff Recruits

Debt

Master Plan

Space + Capital

TIGHTLY-WOVEN
The 4 Funds

Operating Fund

Capital Funds

Restricted Funds

Ancillary Operations
Relationship Between Four Funds

• Funds are segregated
• Most movements from Operating to Capital (via capital reserves)
• Minimal from Ancillaries to Operating historically Conference Services ($100k)
• Detailed Ancillary Budgets come to CAC in (January 8, 2015)
UTM Net Revenue
($ Millions 2014-15)

Gross Revenue $224.7

University Fund $22.4
University Wide Expenses $33.0
Student Aid $9.8

Net Revenue $167.9
(75% of gross)
Major Expense Categories

- Compensation: 60.6%
- Mortgages: 2.0%
- UTM Deficit: 1.5%
- Utilities: 2.9%
- Student Services Self-Funded: 8.3%
- Renovations Capital Plan: 9.7%
- Library Acquisitions: 0.8%
- Deferred Mtce: 0.5%
- Other Supplies & Services: 12.2%
- New Faculty Start Up: 1.5%
- Utilities: 2.9%
- UTM Deficit: 1.5%
- Mortgages: 2.0%
UTM Undergraduate Enrolment - Planned Growth

Proposed Enrolment (Total UG Headcount)

- 2013-14: 12,581
- 2014-15: 13,190
- 2015-16: 13,945
- 2016-17: 14,560
- 2017-18: 14,909
- 2018-19: 15,160
- 2019-20: 15,294

October 2014 Enrolment Plan
Priority: Enrolment

• Enrolment Growth + “Pause” Period

• Domestic Growth Considerations

• Demographics + Western GTA

• Shifting Areas of Interest/Demand
Percentage of International in Total Registrants 2004-2014

*2014 data as of Sep 3
International Students by Country

- China: 61.3%
- Hong Kong: 4.7%
- Korea (South): 4.0%
- India: 3.7%
- Nigeria: 3.4%
- Brazil: 3.2%
- Pakistan: 1.9%
- Taiwan: 1.8%
- U.S.A.: 1.1%
- Malaysia: 1.1%
- Russian Federation: 0.7%
- Vietnam: 0.7%
- Japan: 0.7%
- Kazakhstan: 0.6%
- Other: 11.1%
Priority: International Students

• Domestic/International Mix
  – Now at 21.1% intake; 17.3% total

• Diversification
  – Now at 61% to 66% single-source home country

• Base Budget & Vulnerability
Priority: Student:Faculty Ratio

- Now highest across University: 35.8
- Long-term target: 30.0
- Target: 34 searches 2014-15 (21 “growth”)
  35 searches 2015-16 (25 “growth”)
Priority: Faculty Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Professoriate</th>
<th>Teaching Stream</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Teaching %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>729.9</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>848.1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSC</td>
<td>220.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>313.9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM</td>
<td>237.1</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>299.5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mix of Rank/Category
- Success Rate: 2011-12 = 85%; 2013-14 = 74%
- Search Costs; time and money
Related Recruitment Challenges

- Renovations and Start-up Funding
- Teaching Space/FTE: 1.71 nasm (A&S 2.02)
  - Rank 12th of 18 (within UofT)
- Research/Office Space/FTE Faculty 50.11 nasm (A&S 97.76)
  - Rank 12th of 19 (within UofT)
- Capital Plan
Capital Plan

Opened 2014/15
  • Deerfield Hall & Innovation Complex
Underway
  • Teaching/Research Laboratory Renovations
  • Research Greenhouse
  • Supporting Infrastructure
Major Planned
  • North2 (To open September, 2017)
Priority: Enhancing the Student Experience

- Transition Programs

- Experiential Learning

- Active Learning Classrooms
  - North2 + Davis Prototypes/Retrofit
Priority: Enhancing the Student Experience (2)

- Flexibility for Academic Departments
- Base budget enhancements
- Range of initiatives (e.g. Science, Humanities, Social Sciences)
Academic Budget Review: 5-Year Plan
(December 9, 2014)
Strategic Topic: Student Housing and Residence Life and Academic Support

CAC: Monday, November 10, 2014
1. Academic Achievement  
2. Faculty & Student Interaction  
3. Co-curricular Learning and Enhancement of First Nations Cultural Awareness  
4. Civic Engagement  
5. Student Retention and Awards
1353 Total Residence

718 1st Years
541 Upper Year
48 Graduate Students
37 Families

46% who live in Residence at UTM are international

Diverse student populations from 67 COUNTRIES

1:15.5 Staff to Student ratio including Dons, Residence Experience Coaches (RECs) and Peer Assistants (PAs)

Academic Living Communities 77% of students found it very important to live in an academically focused community.
ACADEMIC CULTURE & ENGLISH

55% PASS RATE
ACE STUDENTS

69% PASS RATE
ACE RESIDENCE STUDENTS

HOW
1. Academic Living Communities
2. Residence ACE Orientation
3. Student Staff
Faculty & Resident Interaction

Faculty in Residence Program

• Catalyst was NSSE Data – Encourage Student-Faculty interactions

• Faculty-in-Residence live-in component
• Lunch with a Faculty
• The “Real Lives Of ...”
“This program allowed me to make a new connection with my favourite professor. I gained a new friend who also became my reference for law school applications.”

“It made professors more approachable. I realized through conversations with professors steps I can take for academic success and how to move forward with my personal and professional aspirations.”

Living in residence enhanced my ability to connect with faculty - 37.5% agreed, strongly agreed.
Enhancement of First Nations Cultural Awareness

Waawaahnte Northern Lights Initiative (WNLI)

• In the Fall students attend Traditional Anishnaabe ceremonies. Students participate in Biinaakwe Giizis (Falling Leaves Moon) ceremonies - a one-day thanksgiving ceremony.

• In the spring students attend a four-day immersive trip engaging with First Nations Elders and teachings. Student work on behalf of the community and help prepare for the Spring Fasting Camp.

• First Nations and Metis background participate, as well as residence students from all over the world.
Civic Engagement

Energy Exchange Experience (Alternative Reading Week)

• 3 days
  February 18, 29, 20 2014

• Over 90 Residence Students
  Representing 21 different academic disciplines

• 14 Community Partner Organizations
  Big Brothers Big Sisters, EcoSource, Eden Community Food Bank, Erin Mills Youth Center, Family Education Center, Interim Place, Nexus Youth Center, Our Place Peel, Peel Aboriginal Network, Safe City Mississauga, Seva Food Bank, United Way of Peel Region, Vita Centre, Volunteer MBC

Over 60% of participants agreed that: as a result of the Energy Exchange Experience . . . I was able to make connections between classroom and out-of-classroom learning

“The various schools of thought that the students bring in helps innovative thinking.”
60% Agree/Strongly Agree Living in residence
Impacted Students Ability to: Live Independently

10% Student Population

29% Campus Leadership Awards
EXPERIENCE

UTM RESIDENCE EXCELLENCE LIVES HERE
Campus Affairs Committee
November 10, 2014

UTM Food Services:
Changes, Progress, Prospects, Plans
Overview of Current Operations

INSTRUCTIONAL BLDG
Café and Lounge

DEERFIELD HALL
North Side Bistro

OSCAR PETERSON HALL
Colman Commons

CCT BLDG
Circuit
Break Cafe

UTM Campus Affairs Committee - Food Services at University of Toronto Mississauga: Presentation by Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer
• Long-term plan to deal with food service space*

• Accommodate enrolment growth/increasing demand with high-quality services

• Comprehensive range of “types” of food service (eating, dining)

• Develop variety of concepts/foods to reflect demands

*Major Limitation: Space
Overview of Current Operations

• **Single, contracted provider** (Chartwells)
  • Blind Duck Pub independently operated by UTMSU

• **Oversight & Contract Management by Hospitality Services**

• **Two Active Advisory Committees**
  • Food Service Advisory Committee (N=13)
  • Residence Dining Committee (N=11)
Membership:
• Chair
• Residence Students (2)
• Full Time Students - UTMSU (2)
• Graduate Student (1)
• Student Affairs Staff (1)
• UTM Faculty (3)
• UTM Staff (1)
• Hospitality and Retail Staff (2)
• Chartwells GM (as resource)

Food Service Advisory Committee website:
http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/hospitality/CFSAC

Available information:
• Research and Feasibility Study (Kaizen)
• Request for Quotation (Consultant)
• Minutes of meetings (plus status reports)
Recent Developments

- Contract with Chartwells expired April 30, 2014
  - Similar and different contract provisions
- Consultants re: Request for Proposal (RFP) Timeline
- Two Options:
  - Option 1 – Shortcut process
  - Option 2 – Request short-term extension of contract
  - Focus on viable transition date
- Reviewed by UTM Food Service Advisory Committee December, 2013
- Agreed to proceed with 1-year contract extension
- Agreed to engage consultant
Recent Developments (2)

- March 2014: Committee Interviews
- April 2014: Kaizen Foodservice Planning and Design Inc. engaged
- May 2014: Self-Operating Feasibility Study begun by Kaizen
- August 2014: Self-Operating findings presented
Findings (Phase 1):

- The food service ancillary is required to adhere to existing Ancillary Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Food Services</th>
<th>Conference Services</th>
<th>Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operate without subsidy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide for capital renewal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% operating reserve</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to operating</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent Developments (3)

- In order to meet criteria of *Ancillary Guidelines*, UTM would need to:
  - Increase retail and meal plan prices,
  - Charge all vendors commission internally,
  - Increase the price for all catering,
  - Likely refrain from building new locations,
  - Reduced service levels.

- Cost associated with self operating provision is prohibitive.

- Recommend: contract management approach be maintained
Recent Developments (4)

• August 2014 – UTM would not pursue a Self-Op Food Service Model based on consultation and discussion with Food Service Advisory Committee.
  • Would need a $400k to $500k subsidy per year to cover the increase in annual operating costs in a self-op model (+250k, one-time)
  • Contrary to first principle of Ancillary Guidelines
  • Subsidy would only sustain the food service operation and not provide for further improvements, expansion or even renewal
Recent Developments (5)
Phase 2 Food Service Contractor RFP Development Timeline
### Feedback and Results (Excerpts)

#### Key highlights / comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>High demand for Asian concepts including Chinese, Thai and Vietnamese. Branded concepts would be welcomed however there is a desire for in-house versions of these offerings. (international station)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High demand for a gourmet burger, deli and Greek concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The food truck program has been very well received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand for a served salad bar, where greens are pre-portioned and customers modify with toppings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Bistro at Deerfield has been well received by all groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a fair amount of fatigue on campus, specifically with branded concepts and at Colman Commons. A greater variety of in-house offerings where possible is desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a strong opinion that the Colman Commons menu cycle is too short and contains too many fried and heavy options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All day breakfast options would be welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value/Pricing</td>
<td>All groups felt that prices were too high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value/Pricing</td>
<td>The overall perceived value of offering is very low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value/Pricing</td>
<td><strong>Pricing does not match the quality of food received (57%).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value/Pricing</td>
<td>Lower priced options, or half sizes are desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value/Pricing</td>
<td>Combo meal pricing, or Meal of the Day options are desired at TFC and Colman Commons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| National Brands | The most desired national brands currently not on campus include: |

- [Thailand Express](#)
- [Manchu Wok](#)
- [Jimmy the Greek](#)
- [Chipotle](#)
## Feedback and Results (Excerpts)

### Key highlights / comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Overall impression of quality is low. TFC Chartwells brands were often considered to be the poorest quality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is the impression that the offering at Booster Juice and Pizza Pizza is not equivalent to that of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Training</td>
<td>Many complaints about rude staff at Tim Horton's, Colman Commons and TFC. High praise for staff at Deerfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff use the same utensils to cut pork and other products promoting cross-contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some staff are not aware of which products are Halal, and which aren’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of service</td>
<td>There are frequent complaints of slow service, especially at Tim’s during peak periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Options and Availability of Information</td>
<td>Healthy options are lacking throughout campus and where they are available, high pricing prevents frequent purchases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a desire for a greater number of non-pasta based vegetarian options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students would like to see nutritional information at the point of service where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Users attempt to find information on the foodservice website but find it difficult to navigate and often lacking in information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusivity - Catering</td>
<td>There is a strong desire to loosen the exclusivity rules, especially with student clubs. Forcing student funded clubs to purchase catering in-house often proves to be cost prohibitive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions and Recommendations
Key Recommendations/Considerations

• Key concepts to consider in the future include Chinese, Thai, Gourmet Burger, Greek and Mexican either through National brands or in-house programs with a focus on freshness and quality.

• An expansion of healthy food offerings throughout campus including non-pasta based vegetarian options, and build to order salad options should be considered.

• The menu cycle and late night offerings at Colman Commons should be expanded in order to alleviate menu fatigue. Further, Colman commons should be aggressively marketed to non-meal plan participants.

• Venue hours of operations to be reviewed and adjusted as necessary venue in order to ensure that students are served as broadly as possible.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Key Recommendations/Considerations

- A limited exclusivity arrangement for catering services on campus should be considered, whereby the on-site operator is one of a select group of approved caterers.

- Ensure that the future operator implements a comprehensive training and development program to address future staffing issues and concerns as well as to empower the operator and university to take corrective action.

- Ensure that the future operator has infrastructure and programs in place to properly and continuously market events, promotions, initiatives, programs and offerings on an ongoing basis both with traditional marketing, online and through social media.

- Structure the future foodservice contract to include measurable minimum KPI’s relating to service and offering and develop and implement a scorecard measurement tool to ensure ongoing contract compliance.
### RFP Timeline

| RFP & Pre-Qualification Document Preparation | November 7, 2014  
|                                            | December 19, 2014 |
|                                           |                  |
| Community Feedback Presentation           |                  |
| Final RFP Document Ready for Release      |                  |

| RFP Release                              | January 5, 2015  
|                                           | February 9, 2015 |
| Issue to Market                           |                  |
| Bids Due from Proponents                 |                  |

| Bid Evaluation and Proponent Selection   | February 9 - March 9, 2015  
|                                        | March 16 - March 17, 2015 |
| Internal Evaluation of Bids              | By March 20, 2015     |
| Short List Presentations                 |                  |
| Final Selection                          |                  |

| Contract Negotiation and Contract Signing| By April 3, 2015      |

| Transition                               | April to June 2015   |
Food Service Improvements for 2014

- Deerfield Hall:
  - North Side Bistro – Opened August, 2014

- Innovation Complex
  - Second Cup – Opened September, 2014

- Oscar Peterson Hall:
  - Renovated Colman Commons – Opened August, 2014

- Expanded Colman Commons – Opening November, 2014
  (7:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.)

- Food Trucks

- Focus on Quality, Diversification, Service
  - Halal, Vegetarian & Vegan, Healthy choices, International choices

Hours of Operation

- UTM Campus Affairs Committee - Food Services at University of Toronto Mississauga: Presentation by Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer
Food Service Improvements for 2015

- Push Contractor for “Fair-Trade” Designation
- Rigorous Staff Training Program
- Nutritional + Cooking Classes in Coleman Commons
- Improved Hospitality Web-site & Communications
- Design of Permanent Food Court – prepare for tender
Conclusions

• Pleased with 24 month improvements?

• More to do?

• Right road to get there?

• Equation of Opportunity: Contract Expiry + Feedback to inform RFP + Space Available + Design Work
Deerfield Hall
North Side Bistro
Innovation Complex
Second Cup
Colman Commons
Renovation
Colman Commons
Expansion (Opens late November, 2014)
Thank You

Questions?
To the Campus Council,
University of Toronto Mississauga

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on September 15, 2014 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chambers, William G. Davis Building, at which the following were present:

Dr. Joseph Leydon, Chair
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk, Vice-Chair
Professor Deep Saini, Vice-President & Principal
Professor Jennifer Carlson
Mr. Jeff Collins
Ms Donna Coulson
Mr. Dario Di Censo
Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer
Dr. Giovanni Facciponte
Professor Hugh Gunz
Ms Melissa Holmes
Ms Megan Jamieson
Ms Simone Laughton
Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean
Mr. Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs
Ms Judith Poë
Mr. Moe Qureshi
Mr. Andy Semine
Professor Jumi Shin
Ms Amber Shoebridge
Professor Steven Short
Ms Anya Todic
Dr. Gerhard Trippen
Professor Anthony Wensley

Non-Voting Assessors:
Ms Christine Capewell, Director, Business Services

Regrets:
Ms Noura Afify
Mr. Arthur Birkenbergs
Professor Philip Clark
Mr. Taeho Lee
Ms Minahil Minhas

In Attendance:
Mr. Chad Jankowski, Health & Counseling Centre
Mr. Chad Nuttall, Student Housing and Residence Life

Secretariat:
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Mr. Lee Hamilton, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Cindy Ferencz Hammond, Director of Governance, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Mariam Ali, Committee Secretary

1. Chair’s Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the Campus Affairs Committee for the 2014-15 academic year. He introduced Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk, an alumni governor and Vice-Chair of the Committee; Professor Deep Saini, Vice-President and Principal; and the Committee’s voting assessors, Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, Mr. Paul Donoghue, the Chief Administrative Officer and Mr. Mark Overton, the Dean of Student Affairs. The Committee’s non-voting assessors were also introduced: Ms. Christine Capewell, Director of Business Services and Mr. Dale Mullings, Assistant Dean, Students and International Initiatives.
2. Orientation

The Chair and Ms Cindy Ferencz-Hammond, Director of Governance, UTM and Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council gave an Orientation presentation and Members were directed to Orientation Resources available at http://uoft.me/OrientationResources.

The presentation included a visual representation of the governance path for the consideration of a capital project, compulsory non-academic incidental fees, as well as the campus and institutional budget. The Chair explained that the Committee was concerned with matters that directly related to the quality of student and campus life. Ms Ferencz-Hammond explained that cover sheets were designed to enhance the focus of members on the major elements of proposals and that they were a valuable tool in providing guidance with respect to the responsibilities of the relevant governance body for each item of business. She also advised on the role of the Secretariat and provided an overview of the agenda planning process.

The Chair invited Mr. Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer and Mr. Overton, Dean of Student Affairs to present an overview of the Campus and their respective roles as administrative assessors. The presentation outlined senior administrative structures at UTM and assessor priorities for the 2014-15 academic year.

3. Calendar of Business, 2014-15

The Chair referred members to the Calendar of Business, and advised that the document would be updated on the Office of the Campus Council website every Friday; he encouraged members to review the Calendar on a regular basis.

4. Current Year Campus and Institutional Budget: Presentation by Professor Scott Mabury, Vice President, University Operations and Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer, UTM

The Chair invited Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council, to address the consideration of budget matters by the UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and Campus Affairs Committees. In the preceding year, the Campus Councils and the Governing Council resolved to defer implementation of the governance consideration path of budget matters, and undertook to work collectively with governance and administration to develop appropriate administrative processes that respect the Terms of Reference of the relevant bodies, while meeting the required planning timelines leading up to the presentation of the University’s Operating Budget to governance. He explained that in the fall budget presentations would be provided to the Campus Councils and Campus Affairs Committees, parallel to the established budget process, and that those bodies would be asked to consider the overall goals of the budget with respect to existing academic plans.

Mr. Charpentier pointed to the “process map” that was made available with the meeting documentation and summarized the approach discussed, which delineated the following four components:

1. an integrated budget presentation to the CACs and CCs,
2. an overview of the proposed campus operating budgets at CACs and CCs,

---

1 A copy of the Orientation Presentation is attached as Attachment A.
2 A copy of the Assessor Presentation and the Assessor Handout is attached as Attachment B and C respectively.
(3) the Provost’s budget review meetings, and
(4) governance consideration of the University’s operating budget.

The Chair then invited Professor Scott Mabury, Vice President, University Operations, Mr. Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer and Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget Office to present. The presentation included the following key points:\(^{3}\):

- The broader context for the University’s Operating Budget involved several factors, including low interest rates, the declining Canadian dollar, differentiation of priorities among Canadian universities, tuition framework, declining public investment, internationalization and a provincial deficit of approximately $12 billion;
- The Provincial operating grant as a share of total operating revenue had decreased from 44% in 2006-07 to 32% in 2014-15, and would continue on its downward trend to 28% by 2018-19;
- That a balanced budget was projected at the institutional level ($2.0 billion) in 2014-15;
- The budget model principles were: to minimize administrative costs of the model; to provide incentives; that revenues and expenses would not be balanced at the faculty level; and that inter-divisional activity would be encouraged and supported;
- The University Fund was created by a 10% deduction from gross revenues that would be allocated by the Provost based on academic plans and institutional priorities;
- $164 million in financial assistance was provided by the University to its students in 2012-2013 and $147 million in external funding and employment income for graduate students;
- OSAP-eligible undergraduate students at UofT paid an average of 48% net tuition in 2012-13 after accounting for OSAP, University bursaries and the Ontario Tuition Grant;
- Allocations to Shared Services totalled 16% of the 2013-14 budget. Priorities for 2014-15 included Student Services, deferred maintenance, divisional campaign support, library collections, copyright compliance and IT upgrades;
- Structural budget challenge: Weighted average increase in revenue was 2.6% while weighted average increase in expense was 4.1%, producing a structural deficit of 1.5% driven primarily by compensation increases;
- The Academic Divisions’ priorities for 2014-15 included UTM’s and UTSC’s expansion in space, services; tenure and teaching stream hiring, curriculum changes, online course delivery, capital projects (Law, Engineering, Architecture) and experiential learning;
- University Fund allocations totaled $10.5 million for 2014-15, including a one-time-only $4.0 million capital matching for UTM and UTSC;
- The 2014-15 total revenue budget for UTM was $218.7 million, after allocations towards the University Fund, University-wide costs, and Student Aid, net revenue for UTM was $167.9 million;
- UTM campus-related costs included occupancy costs (largest item), library, student life, Admin/Finance and Human Resources and Information Technology;
- There was strong undergraduate growth at UTM, and represented 57% of overall undergraduate enrolment growth at UofT;
- That to create sustainable growth and provide a rich academic experience, the strategy employed at UTM was to use additional revenue towards one-time capital investments and increasing space to allow for additional faculty hires.

\(^{3}\) A copy of the Budget Presentation is attached as Attachment D.
A member asked for clarification on the allocation of UTM revenues towards the University Fund referring to the slide on University Fund allocations as a percentage of the expense budget. Professor Mabury responded that both the UTM and UTSC campuses contributed more than other divisions and that the Faculties of Dentistry and Forestry were among the net-recipients of this Fund, which were regarded as within-university subsidies. However, he noted that over the past eight years UTM had received an increasingly greater share of the university fund relative to its net revenue position.

In response to a member’s question, Mr. Donoghue responded that the $3.0 million accumulated operating deficit repayment indicated as part of the UTM 2014-15 Budget, would end in 2015-16.

Professor Mabury noted that UTM had become a model for managing growth in a judicious and well planned manner, working exceptionally well within the current difficult fiscal context of universities.

5. Committee to Review the UTM and UTSC Campus Council: Consultation

Mr. Charpentier advised members that the mandate of the Committee to Review Campus Councils (CRCC) was three-part: to evaluate the efficacy of the model and its implementation, report findings and recommend refinements. Mr. Charpentier advised that there would be a broad call for advice as well as consultations with senior administrators, voting assessors and public in-person consultation sessions. He noted that the Committee included membership from both UTM and UTSC Campus Councils and was mandated to report its findings to the Governing Council at its December meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and that Item 7 - Report of the Previous Meeting, be approved.

6. Date of Next Meeting – Monday, November 10, 2014, 4:10 p.m.


8. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

9. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

_________________________________    _______________________
Secretary                        Chair
September 18, 2014
University of Toronto Mississauga
Campus Affairs Committee
Orientation
September 15, 2014

Role of Governance vs. Administration

• Administration manages the University
• Primary Functions of Governance: Oversight; Advice; Approval
• Governance is a receiver of proposals and reports from the administration
• Functions of governance: advancing and sustaining the University’s purpose, strength and well-being
Member Resources

- [http://uoft.me/OrientationResources](http://uoft.me/OrientationResources)
- Quick access to frequently used member resources (membership lists, assessors, COB, schedules, TOR, portal)
Key Elements of the CAC
Terms of Reference
– Budget
– Campus and student services
– Campus Master Plans
– Campus security
– Capital plans, projects and space
– Child care
– Co-curricular programs, services, and facilities
– Compulsory non-academic incidental fees
– Extra-Departmental Units (planning and resource implications)
– Relations with the campus’ external community
– Student societies and campus organizations

CAC Membership

• Total membership: 35
• 7 students; 9 teaching staff; 4 community members; 4 administrative staff; 1 librarian; additional ex-officio members
• Voting Assessors: CAO (Paul Donoghue); VP Academic & Dean (Amy Mullin); Dean of Student Affairs (Mark Overton);
Agenda Structure

1. Reports and Presentations
2. Items for Approval
3. Assessor’s report (standing item for each meeting)
4. Consent agenda: routine/transactional items; given individual consideration if a member requests
5. Other Business
6. In camera session

Committee Members: tips for effective participation

Informed participation ➔ review materials in advance (attention to cover sheets)

Oversight: Reports from Administration provide opportunity for monitoring and oversight role

Advice:
• Adding value:
  – provide feedback/advice to assessors in preliminary stages of a proposal
  – make suggestions for improvements to presentations for subsequent bodies in the governance process
  – ask questions (if answers will require preparation it is best practice to alert assessors in advance so that they can be prepared)
  – ask about consultation process (if appropriate)
The Governance Portal: Diligent Boardbooks

- Only tool used to distribute confidential meeting documentation to members, and therefore the expectation is that all members make use of it
- Password protected
- Instructions for setup: [http://uoft.me/DBBInstructions](http://uoft.me/DBBInstructions)
- User Name: “Firstname Lastname” and the temporary Password is “July2014”.
Responsibilities of Members

• Principles
  – Members act in the best interests of the institution as a whole
  – Reflect the perspectives of their estate, as appropriate
  – Refer to “Expectations and Attributes of Governors & Key Principles of Ethical Conduct” in the quick reference guide

Decisions and Conduct of Meetings

Proposals may be:
• Approved
• Rejected
• Referred back to the administration with advice.

Motions may be:
• For Approval; Recommendation for approval; For Confirmation

Conduct of Meetings: Bourinot’s Rules of Order and the Governing Council’s By-Law Number 2
APPROVAL OF CAPITAL PROJECTS

Level 2 ($1 - $10 million)

Project Planning Committee → Capital Projects and Space Allocation Committee → UTM Campus Affairs Committee → UTM Campus Council → Academic Board → Executive Committee (for confirmation)

Level 3 (> $10 million)

Project Planning Committee → Capital Projects and Space Allocation Committee → UTM Campus Affairs Committee → UTM Campus Council → Academic Board → Executive Committee (for confirmation) → Governing Council

Execution of the Approved Project/Borrowing

Business Board (considers execution + expenditures) → Project Committee (for implementation)

COMPULSORY NON-ACADEMIC INCIDENTAL FEES

Unit Process → QSS → UTM Campus Affairs Committee → UTM Campus Council → Executive Committee (confirmation)

For Information → University Affairs Board

ANCILLARY BUDGETS

Unit Process → UTM Campus Affairs Committee → UTM Campus Council → Executive Committee (confirmation)

For Information → University Affairs Board
BUDGET

Role of the Secretariat

• History and Context
• Facilitate governance process: neutrality
• Expert resource to members, administration
• Gaps in Documentation: Ensure documentation and Cover Sheets are complete
• Maintain Calendar of Business
• Support the Chair and the Committee
Agenda Planning

- Agenda planning is the “hand-off” from the administration to governance.
- Agenda planning group includes the Chair, Vice-Chair, and the assessors.
- The guiding principle is that the agenda is set by the Chair following advice from the appropriate assessors.

Agenda Planning Timelines

- Draft Agenda Created from COB and circulated to Assessors 7-10 days prior to AP meeting
- Documentation is posted to Governance Portal for AP meeting 3-4 days prior to AP meeting
- Agenda Planning (AP) Meeting
- Distribution of Documentation to Members and online 7 days prior to Committee meeting
- Committee Meeting
- Meeting Follow-Up meeting report/next levels of gov.
Calendar of Business: what business will be brought to CAC this year?

- Developed annually for all Governing Council bodies
- Key point of reference – an overview of all anticipated business to be transacted in the year
- New items are added (updated every Friday) as they arise from the administration

Role of Administration / Assessors

- “Assessors” bring forward proposals from the administration for consideration
- Assessors also provide reports for information
- Introduce item before discussion and vote
- The roles of the assessors to this committee reflect the terms of reference
Questions
A DECADE OF CHANGE
## TOTAL HEAD COUNT (INTERNATIONAL & DOMESTIC) 2004-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>8365</td>
<td>8794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>8837</td>
<td>9368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>9413</td>
<td>10009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>9534</td>
<td>10169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>9701</td>
<td>10506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>10109</td>
<td>10547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>10296</td>
<td>11047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>10582</td>
<td>11977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>10601</td>
<td>12288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>10732</td>
<td>12583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>11023</td>
<td>13230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DATA UPDATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2014*

---

**Senior Administrative Structure**

- **Vice-President & Principal**
  - Vice-Principal Academic & Dean
  - Chief Administrative Officer
  - Dean of Student Affairs
  - Registrar and Director of Enrolment Management
  - Vice-Principal Research
  - Vice-Principal Special Initiatives
  - Chief Librarian
  - Executive Director, Office of Advancement
  - Equity and Diversity Officer
ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE:
OFFICE OF THE DEAN

Vice-Principal
Academic &
Dean

Vice-Dean
Graduate
Vice-Dean
Undergraduate
Academic
Integrity
Academic
Departments
(15 Departments + 2
Institutes)

FACTS & FIGURES

15 DISTINCT ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS
AN INSTITUTE OF COMMUNICATION, CULTURE AND INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY & AN INSTITUTE FOR MANAGEMENT AND
INNOVATION

OFFERING 145 PROGRAMS AND 88 AREAS OF STUDY

OVER 13,000 STUDENTS (UNDERGRADUATE + GRADUATE)
OVER 2000 FULL-TIME & PART-TIME EMPLOYEES, INCLUDING 857
FACULTY & STAFF OVER 47000 ALUMNI

U OF TORONTO IS RANKED FIRST IN CANADA FOR ITS RESEARCH
- UTM IS A VITAL PART OF THAT SUCCESS
QSS Process and Timing

Quality Service to Students Committee (QSS) → Campus Affairs Committee → Campus Council → Executive Committee → Governing Council

Advisory groups on health services, physical education and student service fee components meet 2-3 times throughout October and November with open student membership

CAO FOCUS FOR 2014/15

Financial
- Budget + Long Term Fiscal Planning (ABR)
- De-centralizing of budget
- Long Term Capital Plan
- Ancillary Performance (Parking, Food, Residence, Conference)

Capital Construction
- Continuing Projects (e.g. teaching labs, research greenhouse, infrastructure upgrades)
- New (e.g. parking deck; North2)
CAO FOCUS FOR 2014/15

IITS
• Continuing re-alignment; “service first”
• Prototype Active Learning Classrooms
• Infrastructure/coverage improvements

Hospitality & Retail Services
• Food Master Plan Initiatives
• New Food Services Contract

Professionalism amongst Staff

DSA FOCUS FOR 2014/15

• Expanding in-person service with online options
• Exploring international learning partnerships
• Supporting referrals related to mental health
QUESTIONS?
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSESSORS SUMMARY OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND HIGHLIGHTS FOR 2014-15

Prof. Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean (VPA)

The role of the Vice Principal and Academic with respect to campus governance includes oversight of the academic departments, engaging in periodic external review of those departments, and evaluating and supporting their plans for curricular innovations, along with developing initiatives that support the research, teaching and learning on our campus.

In the 2014-15 academic year, the Office of the Dean will sponsor new programs, program closures, development of additional combined programs, and the introduction of new courses to serve our existing programs. Most of these items sponsored by the Office of the Dean will be submitted for Academic Affairs Committee consideration. The planning and resource implications of the establishment, termination or restructuring of academic units and proposals for Extra-Departmental Units are within the responsibility of the Campus Affairs Committee and will be submitted to this committee.

Paul Donoghue, Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)

The Chief Administrative Officer is responsible for providing leadership to a broad range of non-academic functions in support of UTM's academic mission of teaching, research and scholarship. Principal areas include: budgeting, finance and accounting; parking & transportation; facilities management & planning; capital construction; information and instructional technology; human resources; hospitality & retail operations; occupational health & safety; and, security and emergency management. The CAO also supports the VP & Principal, Principal's Table and academic colleagues in the design and implementation of new initiatives.

As an administrative assessor to the Campus Affairs Committee, the CAO will be sponsoring UTM's integrated, 5-year financial plan and operating budget for 2015-16 (including ancillary operating plans/fees); the multi-year capital plan; and, several major capital project reports during the 2014-15 academic year.

Key objectives include:

- Ensuring that UTM continues to meet its fiscal objective of balanced budgets during a period of enrolment/facilities expansion and continuing to develop break-even fiscal strategies in response to changing financial constraints and evolving priorities/new initiatives.
• Managing, from planning to completion, major capital projects arising from UTM’s multi-year construction plan, ensuring all projects are completed on-time and on-budget.
• Continuing to raise the bar for professionalism among UTM staff based upon the principles of tolerance and mutual respect with a focus toward customer service and the public image of UTM.

Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs (DSA)

The Dean of Student Affairs, through the Student Affairs division’s departments (AccessAbility Resource Centre, Career Centre, Health & Counselling Centre, International Centre, Physical Education, Athletics & Recreation Department, and Student Housing & Residence Life Department) and more broadly through campus and university student services, promotes holistic student learning and development.

As an administrative assessor to the Campus Affairs Committee, the DSA will sponsor proposals for UTM student services and student societies funded by compulsory non-tuition related fees, and bring attention to the following key topics during the 2014-15 academic year:

• Modeling and assessing on-line delivery of some student services while retaining in-person services as well
• Increasing academic program-related international opportunities for students
• Supporting faculty, staff, TA and student-peer in referring students for help with mental health issues
Budget Information Session

University of Toronto Mississauga
September 15, 2014

UofT Budget Context

Provincial deficit ~$12 billion
Low interest rates
Declining Canadian dollar
Declining public investment
Internationalization
Tuition framework
Differentiation

1
The 4 Funds

Operating Fund

Capital Fund

Restricted Fund

Ancillary Operations

2014-15: a Balanced Budget
Revenue $2.0 billion

For-Credit Tuition Fees 46%
Other 13%
Operating Grants 32%
Anc. & Cont./Excc. Ed. Fees 9%
Sales, Services & Sundry Income 4%
Endowments 3%
Indirect Costs of Research 2%
CRC 2%
Investment Income 2%
Provincial Operating Grant as a Share of Total Operating Revenue

Revenue Growth at UTM
2014-15
Expenditure $2.0 billion

Structural Budget Challenge at Steady State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Total Revenue / Expense</th>
<th>Avg incr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees (Domestic)</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue &amp; Recoveries</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fees (International)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Avg Rev increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Avg Exp increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL DEFICIT</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate of Growth
Revenue vs. UTFA Salary and Benefits

Budget Model Principles

- **Minimize** administrative costs of the model
- Provide **incentives**
- Faculties should **strive** to generate revenues to cover their costs and share of central costs
- Revenue and expense cannot and **should not** be balanced at faculty or program level
- Support and encourage **inter-departmental** activity
Net Revenue to Academic Divisions

Gross Revenue

| University Fund |
| University Wide Expenses |
| Student Aid |
| Net Revenue to Academic Divisions |

### University Fund

- Created by a 10% deduction from gross revenues, excluding segregated funds
- Intended to strengthen quality and provide stability, consistent with academic priorities
- Allocations based on academic plans and institutional priorities; not tied to revenues and costs
In 2012-13 graduate students also received $147M in external funding and employment income.
What do students pay? 2012-13
The OSAP Population by Program Area and %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Tuition funded by UofT/OSAP grant/OTC</th>
<th>Tuition paid by student</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>$12,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science St G</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$6,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSC</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>$6,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$6,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Direct Entry</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$7,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Undergrad</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>$8,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student services
IT Upgrades
Deferred maintenance
Copyright compliance
Shared Service Priorities 2014-15
Divisional campaign support
Library collections
### University Wide Costs by Bin 2013-14 to 2014-15

(excluding Federated Block Grant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension (Acad)</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Tech</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Res.</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER includes legal, audit, debt service, academic funds, governing council, university regent, finance.

#### Academic Division Priorities 2014-15

- UTSC & UTM: expansion in positions, space, services
- Capital projects: Law, Engineering, Architecture
- Tenure and teaching stream hiring
- Curriculum changes
- Experiential learning
- Online course delivery
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University Fund Allocations 2014-15 $10.5M

- $4.0M OTO capital matching for UTM and UTSC
- $3.3M tri-campus A&S tuition framework relief
- $1.0M expansion of UCDF
- $0.8M matching funds for Music student levy
- $0.6M for ongoing grad expansion success in APSE
- $0.25M for program expansion in Dentistry
- $0.55M net adjustments to prior year
UF Allocations as % of Expense Budget

- UTM allocations since 2006-07 = $11.3 (18.0%) of $62.7M total.
- Relative metric: 2014-15 UTM net revenue is 15% of total university net revenue.

2014-15 CAMPUS BUDGET
### UTM 2014-15 Budget (in $ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Grant revenue</td>
<td>$218.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment and other income</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$224.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Fund Contribution (10%)</td>
<td>$(22.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other attributed revenue (net)</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide costs</td>
<td>$(33.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid</td>
<td>$(9.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Fund Allocation</td>
<td>$6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adjustments</td>
<td>$0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Net revenue&quot; to UTM</td>
<td>$167.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2014-15 University-Wide Costs for UTM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-related UWC</td>
<td>$20.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-related UWC (incl. Pension)</td>
<td>$10.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-related UWC</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UWC</td>
<td>$0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University-Wide Costs</td>
<td>$33.0M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UTM Must Also Fund Costs as a Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Cost</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>$ 16.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>5.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>1.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin, Finance and HR</td>
<td>1.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>0.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 26.1M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UTM 2014-15 Budget (in $ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Net revenue&quot; to UTM</td>
<td>$167.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional revenue &amp; recoveries</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (excluding self-funded student services)</td>
<td>(119.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgages</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM deficit repayment</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-funded student services (including compensation)</td>
<td>(16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovations and capital projects</td>
<td>(19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library acquisitions</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New faculty start-up funding</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred maintenance</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other supplies and services</td>
<td>(24.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net result</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014-15 Major Expense Categories
Total $197.1M

- Compensation 60.6%
- Mortgages 2.0%
- UTM Deficit 1.5%
- Utilities 2.9%
- Student Services Self-Funded 8.3%
- Renovations Capital Plan 9.7%
- Other Supplies & Services 12.2%
- Deferred Mtce 0.5%
- New Faculty Start Up 1.5%
- Library Acquisitions 0.8%
- Library - long term 1.1%
- Alumni House 1.0%
- Terrence Donnelly Health Science Complex 8.2%
- UTM CCIT Building 2.5%
- UTM Wellness Centre Match 7.0%
- Total $197.1M

Capital Debt Carried on Operating
($47.3 + $17.0)

Existing Debt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Athletics and Wellness Centre</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis - Phase 1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Smith Patio</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Gates</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiller</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library - long term</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni House</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence Donnelly Health Science Complex</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM CCIT Building</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM Wellness Centre Match</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Balance at April 30, 2014 = $36.6)

Approved Debt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield Hall (Fall, 2014)</td>
<td>$17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013-14 UTM Undergraduate Enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>2013-14 FTE</th>
<th>% International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sciences</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,642</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2013-14 UTM Graduate Enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>2013-14 FTE</th>
<th>Projected 2018-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Masters</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS Masters *</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD *</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>530</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As per self-declared code in student system

## Longer Range View of Undergraduate Tri-Campus Enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>2013 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Plan</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UTM Undergrad</td>
<td>10,642</td>
<td>12,895</td>
<td>2,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSC Undergrad</td>
<td>9,680</td>
<td>11,539</td>
<td>1,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St G Undergrad</td>
<td>37,205</td>
<td>36,979</td>
<td>(226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total UG</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,527</strong></td>
<td><strong>61,413</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,886</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Summary

- Declining provincial support
- Campus expansion
- Differentiation/graduate
- International enrolment risk
- Structural budget challenge
- Decisions matter