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 Poé
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\(^1\) 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\(^2\).

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:

- 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
- 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 ($3 - $10 million)

Project Planning Committee → Capital Project 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 Project 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 [consider executive & expenditures] → Project Committee (for implementation)

COMPULSORY NON-ACADEMIC INCIDENTAL FEES

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

ANCILLARY BUDGETS

Unit Process → UTM Campus Affairs Committee → UTM Campus Council → Executive Committee (confirmation)
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
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
CONSTELLATION OF STUDENT SERVICES

THROUGH ANY DOOR

Student

Librarians
Peer Leaders
Instructors
Staff
Teaching Assistants

Student

Child Care Centre
Campus Police
AccessAbility Resource Centre
International Education Centre
Library
Academic Skills Centre
Financial Aid

Student Life

First Year Programs
Academic Skills Centre
Health & Counselling Centre

Peer Leaders

& many more…
**QSS Process and Timing**

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
- Internationalization
- Declining public investment
- Low interest rates
- Declining Canadian dollar
- Tuition framework
- Differentiation
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%
Anc. & Cont./Exec. Ed. Fees 9%
Other 13%
Operating Grants 32%

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>27.9%</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>67.7%</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>
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 ‐ divisional** activity
Net Revenue to Academic Divisions

- 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
University Fund Relative to Total Expense Budget ($ millions)

In 2012-13 graduate students also received $147M in external funding and employment income.

University of Toronto Student Assistance 2012-2013 Total = $164M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTAPS and Bursaries</th>
<th>65M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Fellowships</td>
<td>41M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Awards</td>
<td>34M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGS/OGSST</td>
<td>16M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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/OTG</th>
<th>Tuition paid by student</th>
<th>Amount</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>

### Shared Service Priorities 2014-15
- Student services
- IT Upgrades
- Deferred maintenance
- Copyright compliance
- 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 Cost Bin Total</th>
<th>2014-15 Increment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension (Acad)</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Tech</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Res.</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other includes legal, audit, debt service, academic funds, governing council, university mgmt., finance.
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>“Net revenue” to UTM</td>
<td>$167.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2014-15 University-Wide Costs for UTM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</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><strong>-</strong></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 Acquisitions: 0.8%
- New Faculty Student Services: 8.3%
- Renovations Capital Plan: 9.7%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Debt</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>Total</td>
<td>$47.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Balance at April 30, 2014 = $36.6)

Approved Debt:
Deerfield Hall (Fall, 2014) $17.0
Total Head Count (International & Domestic) 2004-2014

*DATA UPDATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2014

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>Total</td>
<td>530</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>Total UG</td>
<td>57,527</td>
<td>61,413</td>
<td>3,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Summary

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