

1. **What do think is the correct balance between student tuition fees, donor money, and public funding in the financing of post-secondary education? That is, what do you think about the Province of Ontario's current funding model? What would you like to see instead? /**

Que pensez-vous est le bon équilibre entre les droits de scolarité des étudiants, l'argent des bailleurs de fonds, et le financement public dans le financement de l'éducation postsecondaire ? Autrement dit, qu'est-ce que vous pensez du modèle de financement actuel de la province de l'Ontario ? Que voudriez-vous voir à la place ?

Vicky Barham:

Tuition is presently too high: our students work too many hours in part-time jobs. It's also a matter of inter-generational equity: the current 'old' should invest more the education of the young if they expect payback via the financing of the health care system.

We must ensure that the new financing model for universities allows us to better cover the costs of bilingualism, and react intelligently to the incentives, so that we don't get pushed to close programs that contribute critically to our mission as a university.

La part actuelle des frais de scolarité est trop élevée : nos étudiants travaillent trop dans des emplois à temps partiel. Mais c'est aussi une question de justice intergénérationnelle : les vieux d'aujourd'hui devraient subventionner davantage l'éducation des jeunes s'ils s'attendent à un retour de l'ascenseur avec le financement du système des soins de santé.

Il faut absolument veiller à ce que le nouveau modèle de financement des universités nous permette de mieux financer notre bilinguisme et réagir aux incitants de façon intelligente, pour qu'on ne découvre pas par la suite que nous avons été poussés à fermer des programmes qui contribuent de façon intrinsèque à notre mission universitaire.

Steffany Bennett:

Our institutional public funding consists of (1) Enrollment-based funds, (2) Performance-based funds whose distribution is tied to indicators of access, quality, and accountability, and (3) Special purpose grants. I am in agreement with OCUFA that this system is essentially sound but that it is in need of updating, both in terms of dollar amount and in the metrics of success employed¹. It is my understanding that tuition exceeded provincial funding this year as the primary source of university operating revenue¹. Clearly, it is essential to reverse this balance. Because, we (Ontario) have the lowest per-student funding ratio, we have increased our class sizes, raised our tuition fees, and struggle with the associated financial challenges of infrastructure decline. In research support, across Canada, we have seen a 10% drop in base funding to SSHRC, 7% to CIHR, and 4% to NSERC². Perhaps most disturbingly, university value is being increasingly tied to applied labour market outcomes². It is unclear to me how institutional success can be judged in this manner. How do the number of graduates, and their 2 and 5 year employment rates, reflect the quality of education and research at a given institution? Equally concerning, how are these metrics accurately tracked? It is my view that the effectiveness of education and research must be evaluated by student-centric and knowledge-centric readouts and ensured by adequate (aka robust) public investment. Thus, as indicated in my statement of interest, while I seek to help weather the current storm by pursuing donor and industrial research and teaching support, I am dedicated to entrenching the true value of education and research in public funding models.

¹ OCUFA. Building on strengths, addressing weaknesses. OCUFA's submission to the University Funding Model Consultation. Weblink: <http://ocufa.on.ca/assets/OCUFA-Submission-to-the-University-Funding-Formula-Review-September-2015-FINAL.pdf> (2015).

² Turk, J.L. A chance to get science right. *Science* 350, 139 (2015).

David Bryce:

Ultimately, revenues for the University of Ottawa come from the taxpayer, from student tuition, or through private donations. The decreased per-student funding implemented by the Government of Ontario in recent years is not a step in the right direction, particularly in comparison to other provinces. I would like to see this trend reversed. While students can be reasonably expected to contribute to the cost of their education, students in Ontario already pay the highest average tuition in Canada, and tuition already covers over 40% of uOttawa's operating budget. Substantial increases in tuition therefore do not seem to be an appropriate long-term solution. In terms of donor money, the University of Ottawa has a shockingly small endowment particularly relative to comparator universities. This is clearly an area which needs attention and new donations must be actively pursued while guarding against corporatization of the university. The university must also continue the active recruitment of international students.

Rees Kassen:

The current funding model, of which close to 80% is tied to enrollment, either via the current formula for allocating Government funds or through tuition, is unsustainable. Enrollment is expected to plateau over the next few years, placing Universities and other post-secondary training institutions under increasing pressure to deliver high quality education and research programs. A new model for funding is needed. I am inclined to support the proposal of Roseanne O'Reilly Runte, President of Carleton University, that a new model be constructed on the basis of an incentive program involving government matching funds that support specific public good goals – access to education for under-privileged communities, for example, or public-private partnerships that co-locate research and development efforts of small and medium sized businesses on University campuses. This sort of program would ensure public support for education in Ontario and provide an opportunity to focus resources on sectors that need it most.

Cheryl McWatters:

As the Council of Ontario Universities notes (<http://cou.on.ca>), Ontario universities educate more students with less provincial funding compared to their counterparts in other provinces. Tuition fees move us up one place in these rankings¹. While there is not enough space to discuss adequately the current funding model and what might or should replace it, we should, both as a Board of Governors and as individual stakeholders, make the case for public education and the value of investment (and return on investment) in it. This case includes addressing the underfunding issue by making the public aware of the positive economic impacts of investment in higher education, as well as underscoring the returns in terms of a vibrant social and cultural fabric. Without public support, it is less easy to convince governments which are accountable to diverse interest groups. Besides, as we all know, there is only one taxpayer. It also requires us to balance tuition fees and the increased reliance on them with corresponding investments in student support. Importantly, we need to address the growing imbalance between the costs of university administration with the budgets allocated to the teaching and research mission. Finally, while investments by donors and alumni are a growing part of the university budget model, such funds need to be sought, accepted, and utilised in a transparent and accountable manner.

¹ Source: Council of Ontario Universities. "Interprovincial Comparison of University Revenue," 2012.

Michael Wolfson:

Let me preface my responses to the APUO questions with a few words on my motivation for seeking a seat on the Board of Governors of the University of Ottawa. I share the vision for our university to be intellectually stimulating and engaged with its broader social milieu. In exchange for the substantial resources provided to us, and our academic freedom, it is our responsibility to provide learning experiences that not only impart knowledge, enrich students' critical thinking, and generate new knowledge, but also adapt to the challenges of tomorrow. I look forward to working with members of the Board of Governors in articulating such a vision, and acting strategically to realize it.

The Board has a fundamental responsibility to oversee the financing and management of the University. There are conflicting views of our financial health. I have the background to understand these issues, and at least bring some clarity. I have also heard a range of views on how well or poorly key aspects of the university are managed. My experience is that the decision-making process can be opaque for those affected. This is not good practice.

The funding for the University of Ottawa, as part of the Ontario post-secondary education system, for undergraduates mainly involves tuition fees plus Ontario government grants on a per student basis. For graduate students, in addition to tuition fees and Ontario government per student funding, a significant source is research grants (both the monies that flow to investigators, and the overheads paid to the University). Further, tuition fees paid by students are, to a varying extent, offset by loans, grants and tax expenditures (the tuition and educational tax credits and RESPs in the Income Tax Act). On the other hand, from a student's perspective, the costs of university significantly exceed tuition, especially for living expenses if they are living away from home.

My main concern with the current Ontario PSE funding model is that it rewards enrolment rather than quality educational outcomes, though this may be changing with the new Strategic Mandate Agreements. Orienting the funding structure toward quality outcomes could also involve changes in the way funds are allocated internally, though any such changes should be subject to broad consultation and discussion.

There are longstanding concerns about the levels of tuition fees. But whether a young person will even want to attend university in the first place is substantially determined years earlier by parental attitudes and high school experiences. Lower tuition fees have no effect here. What should matter is the net cost of attending: tuition + books + living expenses – student aid of various sorts (to highlight the major elements). Instead of focusing on tuition fees in isolation, it would be better to take account of both tuition and various forms of student aid, so that the overall cost burdens of attending university were more equitable.

Permettez-moi de commencer mes réponses aux questions de l'APUO avec quelques mots sur ma motivation pour la recherche d'un mandat au Bureau des gouverneurs de l'Université d'Ottawa. Je partage la vision d'une université intellectuellement stimulante et engagée avec son milieu social plus large. En échange des ressources importantes qui nous sont fournies, et de notre liberté académique, notre responsabilité est d'offrir des expériences qui non seulement transmettent des connaissances d'apprentissage, enrichissent la pensée critique des élèves, génèrent de nouvelles connaissances, mais aussi s'adaptent aux défis de demain. Je suis motivé à travailler avec les membres du Bureau des gouverneurs pour articuler une telle vision, et agir de façon stratégique pour la réaliser.

Le Bureau a la responsabilité fondamentale de superviser le financement et la gestion de l'Université. Il y a des vues contradictoires quant à notre santé financière. J'ai les compétences pour comprendre ces questions, et au moins apporter un peu de clarté. J'ai également entendu une gamme de points de vue sur la façon dont les aspects clés de l'université sont bien ou mal gérés. Mon expérience est que les processus de prise de décision peuvent être opaques pour les personnes touchées. Ce ne sont pas là de bonnes pratiques.

Le financement de l'Université d'Ottawa, dans le cadre du système d'éducation postsecondaire de l'Ontario, repose principalement, pour les étudiants pré-diplômés, sur les frais de scolarité ainsi que les subventions du gouvernement de l'Ontario sur une base par étudiant. Pour les étudiants diplômés, en plus des frais de scolarité et du financement par étudiant du gouvernement de l'Ontario, une source importante vient des subventions de recherche (à la fois, les fonds octroyés aux chercheurs et les frais généraux indirects payés à l'Université). En outre, les frais de scolarité payés par les étudiants sont, à des degrés divers, compensés par des prêts, des bourses et des crédits fiscaux (crédits d'impôt pour études et frais de scolarité, et REEE, selon la loi de l'impôt sur le revenu). D'autre part, du point de vue étudiant, les coûts de l'université dépassent largement les frais de scolarité, en particulier pour les frais de subsistance si ils vivent loin de chez leurs parents.

Mon inquiétude principale avec le modèle actuel de financement de l'Ontario (PSE) est qu'il récompense les inscriptions plutôt que la qualité des résultats éducatifs, (quoique cela va peut-être changer avec les nouveaux Accords de mandat stratégique). Orienter la structure de financement vers des résultats de qualité pourrait également impliquer des changements dans la façon dont les fonds sont alloués à l'intérieur de l'université, bien que de telles modifications doivent faire l'objet d'une large consultation et discussion.

Il y a des préoccupations de longue date sur les niveaux de frais de scolarité. En premier lieu, le fait qu'un jeune veuille aller à l'université est déterminé principalement par les attitudes parentales et ses expériences au secondaire: des frais de scolarité moins élevés n'ont pas d'effet ici. Ce qui devrait compter est le coût net: scolarité + livres + frais de subsistance - aide aux étudiants de diverses sortes (pour mettre en évidence les principaux éléments). Au lieu de se concentrer seulement sur les frais de scolarité, il serait préférable de prendre en compte à la fois les frais de scolarité et les diverses formes d'aide aux étudiants, de sorte que les charges globales du coût des études universitaires soient plus équitables.

- 2. Please provide concrete examples of how you have demonstrated your commitment to transparency and accountability at the University of Ottawa, promoting the principles of collegial governance. /
Pouvez-vous fournir des exemples concrets de la façon dont vous avez fait preuve de votre engagement à la transparence, à la reddition de comptes à l'Université d'Ottawa et à la promotion des principes de la gouvernance collégiale ?**

Vicky Barham:

When the university relaunched the Campus Campaign I refused to contribute until funds provided to the previous campaign, which seemed to have disappeared, were accounted for. Subsequently, tens of thousands of dollars, contributed for projects which never saw life, were identified in 'dead' accounts. These funds were recovered by the different departments of the Faculty of Social Science, and invested in projects which are enriching the lives of students and faculty members.

Lorsque l'université a voulu relancer la 'Campagne campus' j'ai refusé de contribuer jusqu'à ce qu'on m'explique ce qui était advenu des fonds contribués à la campagne précédente, et qui semblaient avoir disparu. Par la suite, des dizaines de milliers de dollars ont été trouvés dans des fonds 'morts' qui avaient été contribués pour des projets qui n'ont jamais eu de suite. Ces fonds ont été récupérés par les différentes unités de la Faculté des sciences sociales, et ont été investis dans des projets qui enrichissent la vie des étudiants et des professeurs à l'université.

Steffany Bennett:

While a member of the Faculty of Medicine Tenure and Promotions Committee, I established a tracking system whereby scholarship and teaching statistics were collated from the successful promotion and tenure applications awarded between 2005-2010. The intent was to (1) provide transparent benchmarks for faculty members preparing their application dossiers, (2) enable the FTPC to monitor any real or perceived changes in the committee's expectations over time, and (3) evaluate the success of our research intensive trajectory in terms of scholarship and teaching over time. At the end of my terms, it was recorded in the minutes that these statistics would be (1) updated yearly, (2) reviewed periodically by the FTPC and leadership, and (3) provided to Faculty at large by the Departmental Chairs

David Bryce:

As a past and current member or chair of numerous committees at uOttawa, I have a great deal of experience in working with fellow APUO members in a transparent and collegial manner. I have been accountable for the management of two major facilities, the uOttawa Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Core Facility and Canada's National Ultrahigh-Field NMR Facility for Solids. Over the past decade, I have raised operational funds for these facilities in part through grant proposals which required the broad support of colleagues in the Faculty of Science as well as across the country. As Chair of our National Facility, I have overseen meetings of our national Steering Committee as well as our International Advisory Board, providing them with a transparent accounting of the facility's finances and operations. As Section Co-chair of the NSERC Chemistry Discovery Evaluation Group, I was accountable for helping to finalize budget decisions through discussions with other executive members.

Rees Kassen:

I actively promoted collegial governance during my time on the Working Group for the Academic Dimensions of the School of Government. When the Working Group began was first convened there was a palpable sense of antagonism to the idea of a School of Government among the Faculty, largely stemming from a lack of consultation and engagement from the broader University community. My colleagues and I on the Working Group worked hard to restore a sense of collegiality and purpose around this initiative by holding a series of University-wide consultations and interviews with Faculty, giving them the opportunity to comment on and inform the development of this project. Since submitting our report I have not been further involved in the School of Government initiative so it is difficult for me to say whether or not we were successful in our efforts. Nonetheless the process of engagement and information gathering that we undertook was certainly valuable in informing the final report and recommendations we eventually submitted.

Cheryl McWatters:

I have spent the bulk of my career at two other universities, McGill University and the University of Alberta. At both, I held a number of administrative and leadership positions. At the University of Ottawa, I have brought that experience with me in terms of promoting collegial governance. Two areas in which I have been working to encourage improved transparency are (1) the faculty hiring process by supporting initiatives to add greater input by faculty members into these critical decision-making processes; and (2) the faculty budgeting process. In my previous work as a faculty dean, we opened the budgeting process and model to all units which had budget responsibility to ensure that everyone in the faculty knew from where the money was coming and where it was going. Transparency and budgetary participation also enabled program, research, and service units to see clearly 'what they were paying for' and be involved in budgeting decisions, particularly when trade-offs had to be made. While we have a long way to go here, there is much that we could do at the University at all levels to enhance these processes, including our accountability to stakeholders. As a further way to foster and promote collegial governance at uOttawa, I have become active within the APUO as a member of the board, and various sub-committees.

Michael Wolfson:

Prior to joining the faculty of the University of Ottawa, I spent 25 years at Statistics Canada. This is an organization where the corporate culture placed tremendous emphasis on trustworthiness, quality, and service to the public – for all of which openness and transparency (subject to the confidentiality requirements of the Statistics Act) are fundamental. As the senior executive responsible for the central R&D function of Statistics Canada, as well as being a fellow researcher myself, my approach was always one where we set our project priorities and conducted research in a collegial manner. The reason is simple: to enable researchers to do their best work, the environment has to be supportive and has to provide substantial autonomy. I was also responsible for a much larger line operation, the

health statistics program. While this structure was more hierarchical, openness and clarity of direction were also essential.

My experience during the five years I've been a prof. at uOttawa has unfortunately been rather mixed with regard to transparency and accountability. It was disappointing to see the way the changes to the FGPS and the Institute of Population Health (of which I was a member) were handled. And in developing my response to the first question above, the best information I could find on uOttawa's financial statements was on the CAUBO web site, and the SMA on the ministry's web site; I could find neither on the University's web site (though I may not have looked deeply enough).

If I am elected to the Board of Governors, I will endeavor to make its proceedings more open, including if needed a blog post after each meeting. (Every Board, of course, has some items that must be discussed in camera.) Based on reading recent Board minutes, there could be more reporting of substance, not just process. I would also encourage meetings with interested groups of faculty, including our faculty union, to share views and discuss relevant items. I can be reached at mwolfson@uottawa.ca if you have any questions or comments. Thank you for your support.

Avant de me joindre à l'Université d'Ottawa, j'ai travaillé 25 ans à Statistique Canada. C'est une organisation où la culture d'entreprise met l'accent sur la fiabilité, la qualité et le service au public - ce qui exigent ouverture et transparence (sous réserve des exigences de confidentialité de la Loi sur la statistique). Comme cadre supérieur responsable de la R & D, fonction centrale de Statistique Canada, ainsi que chercheur, mon approche a toujours été de fixer nos priorités en matière de projets et recherches de manière collégiale. La raison est simple: pour permettre aux chercheurs de faire le meilleur travail, l'environnement doit être favorable et soutenir une autonomie substantielle. J'étais également responsable d'opérations en ligne de grande envergure, le programme de statistiques de santé. Bien que cette structure était plus hiérarchique, l'ouverture et la clarté de la direction étaient également essentielles.

Mon expérience depuis les cinq ans où je suis un prof. à l'Université d'Ottawa a malheureusement été plutôt mitigée à l'égard de la transparence et de la responsabilisation. La façon dont les changements à la FESP et l'Institut de santé de la population (dont je faisais partie) ont été traités, a été décevante. Et dans le développement de ma réponse à la première question ci-haut, la meilleure information que j'ai pu trouver sur les états financiers de l'Université d'Ottawa est en fait sur le site web de l'ACPAU, et les SMA sur le site web du ministère. Je n'ai pas pu les trouver aisément sur le site web de l'Université (bien que j'ai pu ne pas avoir cherché assez profondément).

Si je suis élu au Bureau des gouverneurs, je vais essayer de rendre ses procédures plus transparentes, y compris, si nécessaire un billet dans un blogue après chaque réunion. (Sachant, bien sûr, qu'il y a des éléments qui doivent être discutés à huis clos.) Basé sur la lecture des minutes du Bureau des gouverneurs, ces dernières pourraient avoir davantage de substance, et pas seulement faire rapport sur le processus. Je voudrais aussi encourager les rencontres avec des groupes de professeur-es intéressé-es, y compris notre syndicat, pour échanger des idées et discuter de points pertinents. Vous pouvez me contacter à mwolfson@uottawa.ca si vous avez des questions ou commentaires. Merci de votre soutien.