



**THE ONTARIO OPERATING FUNDS  
DISTRIBUTION MANUAL**

***A Manual Governing the Distribution of Ontario  
Government Operating Grants to Ontario Universities and  
University-Related Institutions (Formula Manual)***

***2009-10 FISCAL YEAR***

***Postsecondary Finance & Information Management Branch  
Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities  
Toronto, Ontario***

***October 2009***

## **FOREWORD**

In case of conflict, rulings and interpretations in this manual take precedence over those contained in any other document referred to by this manual; however, any such conflict should be brought to the attention of the Director, Postsecondary Finance and Information Management Branch, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

Under no circumstances should a university make decisions unilaterally on matters requiring an interpretation of the distribution mechanism. Whether the problem is one of definition, one of programs not specifically identified in the categorization scheme, or one of exceptional circumstances requiring special consideration, the matter should be raised formally--prior to completion and submission of enrolment reports--by writing to the Director, Postsecondary Finance and Information Management Branch.

The Ministry fiscal year covered by this edition of the manual is 2009-10. Unless otherwise indicated, the rulings, procedures and definitions, etc., contained herein apply to the whole of this fiscal year and for fiscal years beyond 2009-10 until superseded.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. GENERAL INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Definitions.....	2
1.1.1. Institution.....	2
1.1.2. Program.....	2
1.1.3. Transfer.....	2
1.1.4. Program Level.....	2
1.1.5. Professional.....	3
1.1.6. One Full Term or its Full-Time Equivalent.....	3
1.1.7. Dependents.....	3
1.1.8. Dependent Child.....	3
1.2. Historical Background.....	4
1.2.1. Funding Formula Overview .....	4
1.2.2. Funding Formula Development .....	5
1.2.3. Reaching Higher Investments and Multi-Year Accountability Agreements .....	6
1.3. Distribution Mechanism .....	6
1.3.1. Outline of Distribution Mechanism for 1987-88 and Beyond .....	6
1.3.2. Basic Grants Envelope.....	8
1.3.2.1. Adjustments to the Corridor 2007-08 to 2011-12 .....	9
1.3.3. Accessibility Fund for Students with Disabilities.....	9
1.3.4. Performance Fund.....	9
1.3.5. Quality Assurance Fund .....	9
1.3.6. Accessibility/Expansion Funds .....	11
1.3.6.1. Undergraduate Enrolment Growth.....	11
1.3.6.2. Graduate Enrolment Growth.....	12
1.3.6.3. Undergraduate Medical Enrolment Expansion .....	13
1.3.6.4. Postgraduate Medical Enrolment .....	15
1.3.6.5. Nursing Enrolment Expansion: Collaborative Nursing Programs .....	15
1.3.6.6. Graduate Nursing Expansion .....	16
1.3.6.7. Nursing Faculty Fund .....	16
1.3.6.8. Compressed Nursing Degree Programs .....	17
1.3.6.9. Second Entry Nursing.....	17
1.3.6.10. Teacher Education Expansion.....	17
1.3.7. Mission-Related Institution-Specific Envelope .....	18
1.3.7.1. Northern Ontario Grants.....	18
1.3.7.2. Northern Ontario Operations Grants .....	18
1.3.7.3. Northern Ontario Mission Grants.....	19
1.3.7.4. Bilingualism Grants.....	19
1.3.7.5. Differentiation Grants.....	20
1.3.7.6. Extraordinary Grant to Algoma .....	21
1.3.7.7. Extraordinary Grant to Hearst.....	22
1.3.8. Research Overheads/Infrastructure Envelope (ROIE) .....	22
1.3.9. Special Purpose Grants .....	23
1.3.10. Institution-Specific Envelopes .....	23
1.3.11. Learning Disabilities Initiatives .....	23
1.3.12. Partnership Grants .....	24
1.3.12.1. Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP).....	24
1.3.12.2. Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology (OGSST).....	25
1.3.13. Funding Rolled into the Basic Operating Grant Envelope.....	26
1.3.13.1. Enrolment Adjustment/Accessibility Envelope.....	26
1.3.13.2. Transition Grants Envelope .....	28
1.3.13.3. Program Adjustment Envelope.....	28

1.3.13.4.	Library Enhancement and Student Equipment Fund.....	29
1.3.13.5.	Pay Equity Assistance .....	29
1.3.13.6.	Fair Funding For Universities Grant .....	29
<b>2.</b>	<b>ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS.....</b>	<b>30</b>
2.1.	Provincially Assisted Institutions.....	30
2.2.	Church-Related and Federated or Affiliated Institutions.....	31
2.2.1.	Conditions for Funding Eligibility: Students .....	32
2.2.2.	Conditions for Funding Eligibility: Non-Theological Programs.....	32
2.2.3.	Conditions for Funding Eligibility: Theological Programs .....	32
<b>3.</b>	<b>ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS.....</b>	<b>33</b>
3.1.	Program Approval Policy .....	33
3.1.1.	Historical Record .....	33
3.1.1.1.	Undergraduate Programs: 1974 to November 1, 1981 .....	33
3.1.1.2.	Undergraduate Programs: November 2, 1981 to December 15, 1982.....	33
3.1.1.3.	Undergraduate Programs: December 16, 1982 to November 7, 1996.....	33
3.1.2.	Current Policy: Undergraduate Programs .....	34
3.1.2.1.	Basic "Core" Arts and Science Programs.....	34
3.1.2.2.	All Other New Undergraduate Programs.....	34
3.1.2.3.	Graduate Programs .....	35
3.1.3.	Current Policy: Graduate Programs .....	35
3.1.3.1.	New Graduate Programs.....	35
3.1.3.2.	Existing Graduate Programs .....	35
3.1.4.	Closed, Merged, Rationalized/Restructured Programs .....	35
3.1.5.	Full-Cost Recovery Programs .....	36
3.1.6.	Additional Cost Recovery Programs .....	36
3.1.7.	College- University Collaborative Programs.....	37
3.1.8.	Comparator Information on Tuition Fees per Program.....	37
3.2.	Categorization and Weighting .....	37
3.2.1.	General.....	37
3.2.2.	Undergraduate: Diploma and First Degree .....	38
3.2.3.	Undergraduate: Miscellaneous.....	39
3.2.4.	Graduate Programs.....	41
3.2.5.	Special Notes .....	43
<b>4.</b>	<b>ENROLMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>44</b>
4.1.	Eligible Students.....	44
4.1.1.	Citizens.....	44
4.1.2.	Permanent Residents.....	44
4.1.3.	Eligible International Students .....	45
4.1.4.	Protected Persons.....	45
4.2.	Ineligible Students .....	46
4.2.1.	Student Auditing Courses.....	46
4.2.2.	Full-Cost Recovery Programs .....	46
4.2.3.	Ineligible Church-Related Institutions.....	46
4.2.4.	Ineligible International Students .....	47
4.2.5.	Ineligible Students: Miscellaneous .....	47
4.2.5.1.	Ineligible Undergraduate Students .....	47
4.2.5.2.	Ineligible Graduate Students .....	47
4.3.	Part-Time Studies.....	48
4.3.1.	Faculty and Teaching Staff.....	48

4.3.2.	Academic Structure .....	48
4.3.3.	Admissions, Examinations and Academic Regulations.....	48
4.3.4.	Scheduling.....	48
4.3.5.	Interpretation .....	48
4.4.	Reporting of Undergraduate Level Students .....	49
4.4.1.	Definitions.....	49
4.4.1.1.	Term .....	49
4.4.1.2.	Academic Year .....	49
4.4.1.3.	Normal Full-Time Study Load.....	49
4.4.1.4.	Unit of Study.....	49
4.4.1.5.	Registration Level.....	49
4.4.1.6.	Fiscal Full-Time Equivalent (FFTE).....	49
4.4.2.	Application of Definitions .....	50
4.4.2.1.	FFTE of Programs Defined by Unit of Study .....	50
4.4.2.2.	FFTE of Programs Defined by Academic Year .....	50
4.4.2.3.	FFTE of Programs Incorporating Normal Full-Time Study Load .....	50
4.4.2.4.	FFTE of Students in Credit Courses/Units of Study .....	50
4.4.2.5.	FFTE of Students in Summer Session .....	51
4.4.3.	Concurrent Programs .....	51
4.4.4.	Eligibility of Courses/Units of Study.....	51
4.4.5.	Diploma or Certificate Programs .....	51
4.4.6.	Certificate Programs at Ryerson .....	51
4.4.7.	Additional Qualification Courses for Teachers .....	52
4.4.8.	Differentiating Enrolment Between Honours and General Programs in Arts and Science ...	52
4.4.8.1.	Student Declarations .....	52
4.4.8.2.	Initial Student Declarations:.....	52
4.4.8.3.	Subsequent Student Declarations:.....	53
4.4.8.4.	University Attestations .....	53
4.4.8.5.	Implementation .....	54
4.4.9.	Arts and Science Programs Not Differentiated Between General and Honours .....	55
4.4.10.	Imputing Procedure for Undifferentiated First Year Programs .....	56
4.5.	Reporting of Graduate Level Students .....	56
4.5.1.	Graduate Student Status .....	56
4.5.2.	Full-Time Graduate Student .....	57
4.5.3.	Part-Time Graduate Students .....	57
4.5.4.	Counting of Graduate Student FTE.....	57
4.5.5.	Minima-Maxima Provisions .....	58
4.5.5.1.	Effective Dates .....	58
4.5.5.2.	Minima Provisions .....	58
4.5.5.3.	Maxima Provisions .....	59
4.5.5.4.	Claiming (or Deducting) of BIUs Under Minima/Maxima Provisions .....	59
4.5.5.5.	Transfer of Entitlement .....	59
4.6.	Joint/Collaborative Programs .....	60
4.6.1.	College-University Joint/Collaborative Programs .....	60
4.6.2.	Multi-University Joint/Collaborative Programs.....	60
4.7.	Enrolment Related Submissions .....	60
4.7.1.	USER Enrolment Counts.....	61
4.7.2.	Anticipated Actuals Winter Form .....	61
4.7.3.	Minima/Maxima Adjustments Claim Form.....	61
4.7.4.	Imputing Adjustments Claim Form .....	61
4.7.5.	Degrees Awarded Data .....	61
4.7.6.	Undergraduate & Graduate Projections .....	61
4.7.7.	Submitting Enrolment Data to MTCU .....	61

<b>5.</b>	<b>SPECIAL PROVISIONS .....</b>	<b>62</b>
5.1.	Tuition Fees.....	62
5.1.1.	Regular Tuition Fees.....	62
5.1.2.	Discretionary Fees .....	62
5.1.2.1.	Additional Cost Recovery Fees .....	64
5.1.2.2.	College-University Collaborative Programs Fees.....	65
5.1.3.	Tuition Fee Set-Aside.....	65
5.1.3.1.	Student Access Guarantee .....	66
5.1.4.	International Student Tuition Fees .....	67
5.2.	Compulsory Ancillary Fees.....	67
5.3.	Exchange Programs and Study Abroad Courses/Programs .....	69
5.4.	Students Enrolled at Unrelated Institutions .....	70
5.4.1.	Cooperative Programs .....	70
5.4.2.	Letter of Permission .....	70
5.4.3.	Visiting Graduate Students.....	71
<b>6.</b>	<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>72</b>
	APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF MAJOR CHANGES IN THE FORMULA 1967-68 TO 1986-87.....	72
	APPENDIX 2: GRANT TABLES.....	76
	APPENDIX 2.1: ENROLMENT ADJUSTMENT/ACCESSIBILITY/ENHANCED ACCESS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ENVELOPE (\$).....	76
	APPENDIX 2.2: PERFORMANCE FUND.....	76
	APPENDIX 2.3: QUALITY ASSURANCE FUND.....	77
	APPENDIX 2.4: ACCESSIBILITY ENVELOPE (\$).....	77
	APPENDIX 2.5: MEDICAL ENROLMENT EXPANSION (\$).....	77
	APPENDIX 2.6: NURSING ENROLMENT EXPANSION (\$).....	78
	APPENDIX 2.7: TEACHER EDUCATION EXPANSION (\$).....	78
	APPENDIX 2.8: NORTHERN ONTARIO OPERATIONS GRANTS (\$).....	79
	APPENDIX 2.9: BILINGUALISM GRANTS (\$).....	81
	APPENDIX 2.10: DIFFERENTIATION GRANTS (\$).....	83
	APPENDIX 2.11: EXTRAORDINARY GRANT (\$).....	84
	APPENDIX 2.12: RESEARCH OVERHEADS/INFRASTRUCTURE ENVELOPE (ROIE) (\$).....	85
	APPENDIX 2.13: SPECIAL PURPOSE AND INSTITUTION SPECIFIC GRANT (\$).....	85
	APPENDIX 2.14: LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES TASK FORCE (\$).....	86
	APPENDIX 2.15: ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM (\$).....	86
	APPENDIX 2.16: ONTARIO GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECH. (OGSST) (\$).....	86
	APPENDIX 2.17: TRANSITION ENVELOPE (\$).....	87
	APPENDIX 2.18: PAY EQUITY ENVELOPE (\$000).....	87
	APPENDIX 2.19: FAIR FUNDING FOR UNIVERSITIES GRANT (\$).....	87
	APPENDIX 3: Program Approvals Process .....	88
	APPENDIX 4: University Enrolment.....	100
	APPENDIX 5: Sample letters of “approval-in-principle” for permanent resident status.....	101
	APPENDIX 6: Enrolment Audit.....	104
	APPENDIX 7: Enrolment reporting Forms .....	126
	APPENDIX 8: Study Abroad Programs and Courses .....	129
	APPENDIX 9: Procedures To Be Used in Connection with International Student Tuition Fees .....	131
	APPENDIX 10: Ontario University Standard Fee Schedule, Regular 2008-09.....	132
	APPENDIX 11: Ontario University Regular Tuition Fee Rates (2002-03 and 2003-04).....	134
	APPENDIX 12: Requirements for Protocols – Compulsory Non-Tuition – Related Ancillary Fees.....	135
	APPENDIX 13: OGSST Program Guidelines, 2008-09.....	139

## 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

The purpose of a funding distribution mechanism or formula is to provide an objective method for determining the share of the provincial operating grant to be allocated to each institution. The Ontario distribution mechanism aims to ensure a reasonable degree of equity in the distribution of available government support. It does not in itself provide the basis for determining the level of such support.

It should be noted that the distribution mechanism is not intended to limit or control the expenditure of funds granted to the institutions, except in the case of specifically-targeted special purpose grants.

The non-targeted university operating grants may be applied to any eligible university operating expenditure. Eligible expenditures include all operating expenditures except those related to:

- (a) assisted/sponsored research,
- (b) principal and interest payments on capital indebtedness,<sup>1</sup>
- (c) student aid,
- (d) ancillary enterprises,
- (e) capital projects.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is recognized that a portion of total university operating income, which includes provincial operating grants, may be allocated to support principal and interest payments on capital indebtedness, as some institutions have done to finance projects under the SuperBuild capital program.

## **1.1. DEFINITIONS**

A series of definitions used generally throughout this manual follows. Detailed definitions used in the calculation and reporting of enrolment for funding purposes are contained in Section 4 (Enrolment Reporting Requirements).

### **1.1.1. Institution**

For the purposes of this manual, "institution" means an eligible university level institution as listed in Section 2.

### **1.1.2. Program**

For the purposes of this manual, a program is defined as a sequence of courses or other units of study prescribed by an institution for the fulfillment of the requirements of a particular degree, diploma or certificate.

### **1.1.3. Transfer**

A transfer is defined as a change from one sequence of courses or other units of study that fulfils the requirements of a degree, diploma or certificate to another sequence of courses that fulfill the requirements of a different degree, diploma or certificate, even if course credits are transferred from one program to the other.

### **1.1.4. Program Level**

For the purposes of this manual, the program levels are defined as follows:

- preliminary or qualifying year
- diploma
- certificate
- undergraduate baccalaureate
- professional
- master's
- doctoral
- special or unclassified



### 1.1.5. Professional

As used in this manual, "professional" refers to programs leading to diplomas or degrees in the following disciplines:

Agriculture	Library Science
Architecture	Medicine
Commerce & Business	Music
Administration	Nursing
Dentistry	Optometry
Divinity/Theology	Pharmacy
Education	Physical and Health Education and Recreation
Engineering	Physical and Occupational
Forestry	Therapy
Household and Food Science	Social Work
Hygiene and Public Health	Veterinary Medicine and Animal Science
Secretarial Science	
Journalism	
Law	

### 1.1.6. One Full Term or its Full-Time Equivalent

This is defined in detail in Section 4 (Enrolment Reporting Requirements). For undergraduate work, this means at least 0.5 Fiscal Full-Time Equivalent (FFTE). For graduate work, this means a minimum of a 1.0 term Full-time Equivalent (FTE).

### 1.1.7. Dependents

Dependents are defined as (refer to section 1.1.8 for definition of 'dependent child'):

- a) a spouse;
- b) a common-law partner<sup>2</sup>
- c) a dependent child or the dependent child of a spouse or common-law partner;
- d) a dependent child of the dependent child referred to above.

### 1.1.8. Dependent Child

A dependent child is a child who is a biological child who has not been adopted by a person other than the spouse or common-law partner, or an adopted child; and who is in one of the following situations of dependency:

- a) under age 22 and not a spouse or common-law partner;
- b) enrolled continuously at a college, university or other educational institution and dependent substantially on the financial support of the parent since before age 22 or since becoming a spouse

---

<sup>2</sup> An affidavit signed by both spouses, confirming that they are living together in a conjugal relationship for not less than three years, or that they are living together in a conjugal relationship and are raising any children of whom they both are the natural or adoptive parent, is required to verify their common-law status.

or common-law partner if that occurred before age 22<sup>3</sup>; or

- c) a person with a disability who has been financially supported substantially by his or her parents, and who is unable to be self-supporting because of the disability.

## 1.2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

### 1.2.1. Funding Formula Overview

The purpose of a funding distribution mechanism or formula is to provide an objective method for determining the share of the provincial operating grant to be allocated to each institution. The Ontario distribution mechanism aims to ensure a reasonable degree of equity in the distribution of available government support. It does not in itself provide the basis for determining the level of such support.

The Ontario government annually allocates a global amount to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for operating support for the institutions. Factors considered in determining the university allocation include enrolment pressures and government priorities, balanced against other budget pressures.

The largest component of provincial operating grant is the Basic Grants Envelope. Funding from this grant envelope, also known as basic operating grant, or BOG, is enrolment-based and a non-targeted, block grant to the institutions.

The Basic Grant (BOG) envelope is distributed on the basis of Basic Operating Income (BOI) for all universities. BOI is the amount of operating grants provided by the government plus eligible fees, also known as Standard Fees<sup>4</sup>.

$BOI = BOG + \text{Standard Fees}$

An institution's Basic Operating Grant is the difference between its BOI and its Standard Fees.

Each institution receives a fixed share of BOI based on historical weighted enrolment levels referred to as Basic Income Units (BIUs). Each institution's BIUs are arrived at by multiplying full-time equivalent enrolment by a weighting factor. The weighting factor varies by program and level of study and is a rough measure of how costs vary by program and by level of study. Program weights were established in 1966-67 and only slight modifications have been made to them since.

It should be noted that the distribution mechanism is not intended to limit or control the expenditure of funds granted to the institutions, except in the case of specifically-targeted special purpose grants.

The non-targeted, block grant nature of the basic operating grant recognizes the institutional autonomy of grant recipients. The funding distribution formula that has evolved since its inception in 1967 has maintained its focus to promote funding stability and predictability, subject to the Ministry's global allocation.

<sup>3</sup> The terms under which such a student is considered to be enrolled continuously are determined at the institution level according to the institution's internal policies.

<sup>4</sup> The standard fee is set by MTCU and was last increased in 1996-97. Standard fees represent only a portion of the total tuition fee paid by students. Actual tuition fees are higher than standard fees.

### 1.2.2. Funding Formula Development

The idea of devising an objective mechanism to allocate operating grants to Ontario universities was deliberated for many years. A strong endorsement of this principle came from the 1965 Bladen Commission report.

The distribution of operating funds to Ontario universities by means of an enrolment-based formula was first introduced for the 1967-68 fiscal year. The various programs were weighted to approximate relative costs. Basic Income Unit (BIU) counts were generated by multiplying full-time equivalent (FTE) enrolment by the appropriate program weights. (The weights range from 1.0 to 7.5). To calculate the grant entitlement for each institution, the value of the basic income unit was determined by government, on the advice of the Committee on University Affairs. The dollar amounts of basic operating income (BOI) were calculated by multiplying the BIU counts by the BIU value. Formula fee rates were set for each program by the government, and reviewed each year. The full-time equivalent enrolment was multiplied by these fee rates to calculate total formula fee income. These formula fees were subtracted from basic operating income to determine each institution's operating grants.

Appendix 1 summarizes the changes in the formula between 1967-68 and 1986-87. The first version of the formula was used to determine the allocation of operating grants from 1967-68 through to 1972-73, with only some minor adjustments in weighting schemes and in the calculation of full-time equivalency. However, during this period, a change in policy occurred, whereby the government determined the total available operating grant dollars, rather than the BIU value for the year. This resulted in the formula becoming purely a mechanism for determining the distribution of grants between institutions, rather than the determining factor for the total amount of operating support provided. The BIU value was thereafter merely an artifact, determined by dividing the total available dollars by the total number of funding units in the system.

For the 1973-74 fiscal year, in response to representations from institutions, "slip-year" financing was introduced. Under this scheme, grants were distributed on the basis of the previous, rather than the current year's enrolment, thus permitting more effective planning in the institutions. Grants for the years 1973-74 through to 1975-76 were calculated in this way, with a few more minor changes in weighting and FTE calculation.

For the 1976-77 fiscal year there was a major change in the way that students were counted, with the simultaneous introduction of fractional unit counting and multiple term reporting for all students at the undergraduate level. Also in that year, a freeze was introduced on the graduate counts for funding purposes: the 1975-76 level was to be used for three years. Moreover, to reduce the sensitivity of the distribution mechanism to changes in enrolment at all levels the formula now took into consideration more than one year of enrolment data: in 1976-77 the grants were based on one-third 1974-75 and two-thirds 1975-76 undergraduate data; in 1977-78 an average of the previous three years was used.

For the distribution of 1978-79 operating grants, the formula was amended again: the notion of enrolment averaging to reduce sensitivity to enrolment fluctuations was retained, and the concept of base (or "fixed cost") and moving average (or "variable cost") was introduced. The base years were set at 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77; the moving average consisted of the three years immediately prior to the grant year. To further reduce sensitivity to enrolment changes a factor was introduced which effectively discounted increases or decreases in enrolment beyond the base levels.

This formula remained in operation for grant distribution up to and including grants for 1983-84. The freeze on graduate student counts for funding purposes was lifted for grants distributed in 1979-80. The discount factors employed were fifty per cent at the undergraduate and master's graduate levels, and sixty-six and two-thirds per cent at the doctoral graduate level.

Operating grants for 1984-85, 1985-86 and 1986-87 were distributed on the basis of an "interim formula", consisting of two-thirds of the "old" formula and one-third of the "new" formula.

This "new" formula attempted further to reduce sensitivity to enrolment fluctuations, and to combat some concerns about the use of 1974-76 enrolment levels as a base. The "new" base funding BIU and formula fee counts consisted of the average of the old base years (1974-75, 1975-76, and 1976-77) together with the three years having the highest BIU counts between 1974-75 and 1982-83. This average was thus based on different years depending on the institution concerned. Moving-average BIU and fee counts were calculated from the latest three years, as before, but were the basis for only twenty-five per cent of the grant distributed by the "new" formula, at all levels.

### **1.2.3. Reaching Higher Investments and Multi-Year Accountability Agreements**

In the 2005 Budget, the government announced the Reaching Higher Plan for postsecondary education. The plan included substantial additional operating funding for universities. Total operating grants to universities were increased to \$2,861.1M in 2006-07, \$3,036.6 million in 2007-08 and to \$3,109.9M in 2008-09. The majority of the program is scheduled to be fully implemented by 2009-10 – one exception is the Graduate Expansion component which will extend to 2011-12.

Introduced in 2006-07, the Multi-Year Accountability Agreements for 2006-07 to 2008-09 were signed by the Minister and all publicly-funded colleges and universities. The objective of the agreements is to ensure that government funding is focused on achieving the government's goals for postsecondary education: access, quality and accountability.

## **1.3. DISTRIBUTION MECHANISM**

### **1.3.1. Outline of Distribution Mechanism for 1987-88 and Beyond**

On December 17, 1986, the Chairman of the Ontario Council on University Affairs delivered Advisory Memorandum 86-VII, "Modification of the Operating Grants Formula" to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. This advisory memorandum recommended a new operating grants allocation mechanism for 1987-88 and beyond.

Council reaffirmed its objectives for the operating grants distribution mechanism, as outlined previously in Advisory Memorandum 77-VII, "The Ontario System: A Statement of Issues", and re-iterated in Advisory Memorandum 82-XV. The objectives were to provide:

- 1) funding stability by preventing extreme fluctuations in institutional income;
- 2) funding predictability to assist institutions in their planning efforts;
- 3) equitable allocations among institutions;
- 4) accountability to the public by linking funds to some quantifiable factor; and
- 5) a method that is simple to use, understandable and practical to implement.

Earlier in 1986, the Council had consulted with the institutions on the priority that should be attached to each of these objectives. In general, institutions attached highest priority to funding stability and/or equitable allocation rather than to the other objectives. The primary direction for formula revision chosen

by the Council was, therefore, enhanced funding stability, in order to achieve the following aims:

- a) protect institutions' funding from the impact of the actions of other institutions;
- b) reduce the incentive for institutions to use growth only for the purpose of increasing their share of total operating grants;
- c) provide the opportunity for quality considerations as well as for quantity considerations in academic decisions; and
- d) reduce short-term variations in funding which may result from fluctuating enrolment patterns in future years.

A secondary direction undertaken in this formula revision was to address some of the concerns raised by institutions about the fairness of the existing formula in recognizing individual institutional needs. The Council undertook to address those concerns only if there were new funds available to support adjustments. Such adjustments were not to be made in a zero-sum situation where they would result in reductions in funding for other institutions. The Minister, on November 3, 1986, announced that funds had been made available for the Council to address concerns about the recognition of expanded instructional and research activity, and the special needs of the northern institutions. The Council, therefore, had two additional aims for its formula revision related to instructional concerns:

- a) to provide appropriate recognition for relative changes in past levels of activity by adjusting the level of funding with due regard to the past legacy of funding patterns; and
- b) to adjust institutional funding over the long term, in relation to changing levels of activity.

The Council's recommended formula revision was a multi-faceted system of operating grant distributive mechanisms, with a number of different functions, but integrated in total impact. It is based on an "envelope" approach to operating grants allocation.

Five separate envelopes were designated for 1987-88:

- 1) Basic Grants Envelope;
- 2) Enrolment Adjustment/Accessibility Envelope;
- 3) Mission-Related Institution-Specific Envelope for:
  - a. Northern Mission,
  - b. Institutional Weights (Ryerson and OCAD),
  - c. Bilingualism,
  - d. Differentiation;
- 4) Research Overheads/Infrastructure Envelope; and
- 5) Program Adjustment Envelope.

In April 1988, the Minister requested that the OCUA provide advice on a new approach to funding for 1990-91 and subsequent years, to take into account the enrolment growth in 1989-90 and previous years, and to promote a planned and coordinated approach to future growth.

On March 30, 1989, the Council provided its advice<sup>5</sup>, and the Minister accepted a plan for the modification of the corridor mid-points to accommodate growth in the system.

<sup>5</sup> The Ontario Council on University Affairs, Advisory Memorandum 89-II, "Modification of the Operating Grants Formula".

On March 31, 1990, the Council provided advice on the new corridor mid-point levels<sup>6</sup>.

On May 29, 1996, in response to the Woods Task Force Recommendations on Agencies, Boards and Commissions, the Minister announced OCUA and the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) would be disbanded as of August 31, 1996.

Changes have been made to the envelope structure, as required, since 1987-88. The various grant envelopes are described in the following sections.

### 1.3.2. Basic Grants Envelope

The basic grants allocation mechanism operates in the following manner:

- 1) To begin with, each institution's share of the total basic grant equals its share of 1986-87 formula grants.
- 2) Institutions continue to receive approximately this level of "real" basic grants, so long as their "moving-average" of basic income units (BIUs) remains in a corridor of +/- 3 percent. The only variation in an institution's funding would be the tuition fees gained or lost by varying levels of enrolment.<sup>7</sup>
- 3) When an institution's moving-average BIUs fall below its corridor, it would have its BOI, and hence basic grants, reduced in line with the decline in BIUs. Under the terms of the formula devised by the Ontario Council on University Affairs, the institution may negotiate for the establishment of a new corridor lower than its current one at a lower level of basic grants to avail itself of the funding stability inherent within a corridor. A new corridor would be based on an agreed plan. The institution would be able to approach the Ministry prior to, or after, going below its floor.
- 4) When an institution's moving-average BIUs go above its corridor, it would receive no automatic increase in basic grants, but would retain all incremental tuition fees. With the agreement of the Ministry, and if it approaches the Ministry prior to going above its ceiling, the institution may negotiate the establishment of a new corridor above its current level at a higher level of basic grants. A new corridor would be based on an agreed plan.
- 5) The 1987-88 basic grants entitlements were adjusted as the enrolment/accessibility and institutional weight adjustments were applied.
- 6) Between 1990-91 and 1995-96, the basic grants entitlements were adjusted to reflect the revised corridor mid-points which had been negotiated by the institutions with OCUA during 1989-90. The adjustments were made via a temporary "transition grant" envelope and provided added funding based on revised moving-average enrolment counts. In 1996-97, funding allocated under the transition envelope was integrated with the basic grant envelope allocation.

This process allows the funding formula to bring stability and predictability to public funding for both universities and the Ministry. Additionally, the corridor adapts and changes either through negotiated

<sup>6</sup> The Ontario Council on University Affairs, Advisory Memorandum 90-I, "Revisions to Universities Formula Grants Envelope Corridor Mid-Points as a Result of the 1989-90 Corridor Negotiations".

<sup>7</sup> This assumes that total basic grants and formula fee rates increase annually at the same rate. If the percentage increases in total basic grants and formula fee rates differ, the rate of increase in basic grants may vary among institutions according to the proportion of BOI funded by fees at each institution. In this context "real" basic grants refers to the 1986-87 formula grants escalated by the annual increase in system-wide formula grants.

adjustments of the mid-point corridor or by rolling funding increases into Basic Operating Grant.

Grants are “rolled into base” and become part of the Basic Operating Grant (BOG) that is flowed through bi-weekly transfers to universities. Each time a grant is rolled into base the annual BOG envelope increases and the mid-point corridor for the affected institutions shifts if the rolled in grant has associated enrolments. (See Transition Grant Envelope section 1.3.13.2 for envelopes that have been rolled into Basic Operating Grant.)

#### **1.3.2.1. Adjustments to the Corridor 2007-08 to 2011-12**

During the double cohort period of accelerated growth, it was recognized that under the existing corridor mechanism, some institutions might fall below their corridor floor as their corridor mid-point rose faster than their 5 year moving average. In response, the Ministry temporarily held BIUs associated with growth over 2004-05 outside the corridor while developing a solution.

Further information on this adjustment will be provided in the next release of this manual.

#### **1.3.3. Accessibility Fund for Students with Disabilities**

This envelope grew out of the Enrolment Adjustment/Accessibility Envelope. Funding specifically targeted to assisting students with disabilities commenced 1989-90 (see Appendix 2.1). Until 1994-95, grants were allocated on the basis of each institution’s share of base BIUs, subject to a funding floor provision that was established to ensure staffing of an office dedicated to serving persons with disabilities. Funding is distributed according to a three-year moving average of full-time equivalent student enrolments plus a slip year, again with a funding floor provision.

#### **1.3.4. Performance Fund**

On March 14th 2000, the Ministry announced that beginning in 2000-01, new operating fund of \$16.5 million or 1 percent of the total operating grant would be allocated to institutions according to their performance on the following three indicators:

- graduate employment rate six-months after graduation;
- graduate employment rate two-years after graduation; and
- graduation rates.

For each indicator, institutions were ranked according to their score and divided into three categories: top third, middle third and bottom third. Allocations were based on their performance weighted by size (eligible undergraduate BIUs) and institutions in the top third received twice as much funding as an institution in the middle third. An institution in the bottom third did not receive any funding.

Effective 2001-02, the performance fund allocation increased to \$23.2 million. The methodology used to distribute the funds changed; however, the indicators remain unchanged. A benchmark was established for each of the three indicators, set at 10 percent below the system average for the particular indicator. For example, if the system average is 95 percent, the 10 percent benchmark is 9.5 percent. The benchmark level which institutions must achieve to qualify for performance funding would be 85.5 percent. Institutions at or above the benchmark were allocated funding in proportion to their performance from the benchmark and their size (eligible total BIUs). Institutions below the benchmark level did not receive funding.

Performance Funding provided since 2000-01 is shown in Appendix 2.2.

#### **1.3.5. Quality Assurance Fund**

In the March 2003 Budget, the Minister of Finance announced the creation of the Quality Assurance Fund

(QAF) for colleges of applied arts and technology and universities. The purpose of the QAF is to provide funding in support of quality at postsecondary institutions.

On July 25, 2003, the Ministry issued guidelines governing the operational framework of the QAF. For 2003-04, the universities received in total \$74.9 million. Institutions submitted Quality Plans specifying areas of expenditures targeted by the institution for quality improvement, based on their assessment of most critical quality needs. The Ministry allocated the available QAF funding to the institutions based on approval of the quality plans submitted.

Eligible expenditures were related directly to maintaining and/or improving the quality of student education. The eligible expenditures for the QAF are:

- Investment in new faculty/academic staff and graduate teaching assistants: i.e. salaries and benefits, supplies, equipment and professional development costs related to these new hires.
- Investment in education resources: i.e. salaries and benefits of new staffing (e.g. specialized staff such as librarians, IT specialists, laboratory technicians); supplies and equipment to support such staff; books, computer hardware and software, instructional supplies and equipment for classroom, library and laboratory use.
- Investment in student services and student retention: i.e. salaries and benefits of new staffing, supplies and equipment in areas of:
  - Career planning and employment preparation initiatives
  - Academic counseling
  - Student remediation and retention strategies
  - Student health services
- Investment in new program development or existing program development: i.e. salaries and benefits of new staffing, supplies and equipment related to program development

QAF cannot be used to duplicate institutional investments in already-funded activities or replace non-Ontario Government funding sources already committed to projects such as the Strategic Skill Initiatives, the College Equipment and Renewal Fund and SuperBuild Capital Funding.

QAF is intended to enhance an institution's general operating requirements and, as such, major site renovations, capital projects and the costs of leasing premises are not eligible expenditures under this program.

QAF funding continues to be flowed at the 2003-04 rate to universities. Funds are distributed using the 2003-04 methodology allocation. This level of funding allows universities to continue to fund existing commitments such as faculty and academic staff that were acquired through the fund in 2003-04. In 2008-09, QAF funding was added to the Basic Operating Grant.

Quality Assurance funding provided since 2003-04 is shown in Appendix 2.3.



### 1.3.6. Accessibility/Expansion Funds

#### 1.3.6.1. Undergraduate Enrolment Growth

In 2000-01, the government introduced a \$16.5 million Accessibility Fund to ensure that universities were able to accommodate all students who applied for admission in September 2000. Universities were only eligible to access the fund if their admissions to first year entry-level programs in Fall 2000 were equal to or greater than those for Fall 1999. The Accessibility Fund of \$16.5 million was rolled into the basic grants envelope in 2001-02.

In 2001-02, the Ministry announced a three-year funding envelope to provide full-average grant funding<sup>8</sup> for the anticipated increase in university enrolment resulting from the implementation of the new four-year secondary school curriculum.

The Ministry provided \$20 million through the undergraduate Accessibility Fund in the first year of the envelope. Funding was distributed on the basis of each institution's positive year-over-year eligible BIU growth in first-entry undergraduate programs<sup>9</sup> (defined as undergraduate programs with a funding weight of 2.0 or less, excluding pharmacy and law.) This funding was rolled into the Basic Operating Grants envelope in 2002-03.

In 2002-03, the Ministry provided new funding of \$117.0 million in the undergraduate Accessibility Fund. Of this amount, \$30.7 million was allocated to fully fund growth from 2001-02<sup>10</sup> and \$86.3 million was allocated to fund new growth in 2002-03.

The 2002-03 Undergraduate Accessibility Fund was distributed on the basis of each institution's positive year-over-year BIU growth in all undergraduate programs (including second-entry and professional programs), but excluding growth in programs that were funded through other sources in 2002-03. These programs were:

- undergraduate consecutive education enrolment funded through the Teacher Education Expansion program;
- medical enrolment funded through the Medical Expansion Grant; and,
- nursing programs, including collaborative nursing (FORPOS 171) and compressed and basic nursing, Post-RN and nurse practitioner programs (FORPOS 118).

For 2003-04, \$30.7 million was rolled into the Basic Operating Grant and \$82.0 million was distributed through the bi-weekly payments. The total amount was not rolled into the Basic Operating Grant envelope as a result of the implications to the corridor system of rolling these funds into base funding<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>8</sup> Full average funding is defined as the year over year increase in BIUs multiplied by the system- wide average BOI per BIU less the year over year increase in standard fees.

<sup>9</sup> Second-entry and professional programs (defined as undergraduate programs with a funding weight of more than 2.0, plus pharmacy and law) were excluded from this funding envelope and included in the graduate

<sup>10</sup> Total system-wide growth for 2001-02 was \$50.7million.

<sup>11</sup> The 2002-03 enrolment growth, combined with a commitment to full-average grant funding for undergraduate enrolment growth triggered the following:

- sharp year-over-year increase in base BIUs for most institutions;
- matching increase in the corridor floor in 2003-04, calculated at 3% below the Base BIU count; and,
- institutions with a five-year moving average close to their corridor floor were forced out of their corridor by their 2002-03 enrolment growth.

In 2003-04, the Ministry provided new funding of \$195.5 million in the Undergraduate Accessibility Fund. Of this amount, \$8.6 million was allocated to fully fund growth from 2002-03, \$141.0 million was allocated to fund new growth in 2003-04 and \$45.9 million was allocated to compensate universities for previous in-year funding shortfalls<sup>12</sup>.

Consistent with the previous year, the 2003-04 Accessibility Fund was distributed on the basis of each institution's positive year-over-year BIU growth in all undergraduate programs (including second-entry and professional programs), but excluding growth in programs that were funded through other sources in 2003-04. These programs were:

- all nursing programs, including collaborative nursing (FORPOS 171) and compressed and basic nursing, post-RN and nurse practitioner programs (FORPOS 118);
- growth in medical programs funded through the Medical Expansion Grant; and
- institutions that received program approval to move their Occupational Therapy/Physiotherapy (OT/PT), from the undergraduate to the graduate level.

The 2004-05 Undergraduate Accessibility Fund was distributed on the basis of each institution's positive BIU growth over 2003-04, net of growth in the programs noted above (nursing, medicine and selected OT/PT programs).

Starting in 2005-06, the base year for the Undergraduate Accessibility Fund calculations was fixed to 2004-05. For each subsequent year, the distribution of this fund is calculated based on positive BIU growth over 2004-05 net of growth in nursing, medicine, medical residents and selected OT/PT programs as outlined above.

### 1.3.6.2. Graduate Enrolment Growth

In 2001-02, the Ministry provided \$5.8 million through Graduate Accessibility envelope to support second-entry professional and graduate programs. The fund was distributed according to each university's share of second-entry professional and graduate BIUs, slipped one year. Universities had to grow in order to access this fund.

In 2002-03, the distribution of funds was changed to a performance-based formula. In response to a Ministry request for a performance-based approach to allocating the funds, the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) submitted a consensus proposal with recommendations supported by all universities. The Ministry accepted the COU consensus proposal to allocate the 2002-03 and 2003-04 graduate accessibility envelope.

As a key component of the recommended formula, the following five indicators, each with an equal weight, and averaged over three years, were used to allocate Graduate Accessibility Envelopes<sup>13</sup>:

- Graduate FTE Enrolment as an indicator of existing capacity and hence the ability to sustain

<sup>12</sup> In the 2002 Ontario Budget, the government announced it would provide full average grant funding to universities for enrolment growth. However, there was a gap between projected and actual enrolment growth in 2001-02 and in the available Accessibility Funding in 2001-02. Following the 2002 Budget announcement, the Ministry decided to fund this gap on a slip-year basis, using funds from subsequent years' undergraduate Accessibility Fund, until it was fully funded. The slip-year funding based on final data totaled \$45.9 million.

<sup>13</sup> Memo dated March 25, 2003 and April 4, 2003 from Kevin French, Director, Universities Branch, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities to Executive Heads.

expansion in graduate studies;

- Graduate Basic Income Unit (BIU) which not only provides an indication of existing capacity, but also recognizes the difference in BIU weighting between master's and doctoral programs, and also provides a measure of institution's ability to sustain expansion in graduate studies;
- Research Funding from the federal government's research granting councils<sup>14</sup> to provide an indicator of peer-reviewed, competitive funding support for research, and indirectly, an indicator of funding available to support graduate students;
- Graduate Degrees Granted, to provide an indicator for output adjusted for Masters and Doctoral FTEs; and
- Graduate Awards to provide an indicator of success in attracting top graduate students.

As well, consistent with the COU proposal, the following provisions were also implemented in the funding allocation for 2002-03 and 2003-04:

- Second-entry undergraduate professional programs were excluded from the graduate envelope, and were accounted for in the regular undergraduate enrolment growth fund;
- A portion of the total funding available for graduate enrolment growth was set aside for capacity building at institutions with the smallest current graduate enrolments;
- New graduate programs must be approved through Ontario Council of Graduate Studies appraisal process to be eligible for funding by the Ministry;
- Universities had to have enrolment growth to qualify for funding.

The graduate Accessibility Fund for 2001-02 and 2002-03 was respectively rolled into the basic grants envelope in 2002-03 and 2003-04. The graduate Accessibility Fund provided since 2000-01 is shown in Appendix 2.4.

In 2004-05, as part of the Reaching Higher plan, the Ministry announced the goal of expanding graduate enrolment by 14,000 student spaces (measured in FTEs) by 2009-10 compared to 2002-03. In February 2009 this target was modified to 15,000 spaces by 2011-12 compared to 2002-03. Additional funding of \$15.6 million (2005-06), \$45.8 million (2006-07), \$118.7 million (2007-08) and \$164 million (2008-09) was provided to institutions for actual enrolment growth achieved under this program. In 2008-09, growth to 2007-08 was rolled into base.

### **1.3.6.3. Undergraduate Medical Enrolment Expansion**

#### **2009-10 to 2011-12 100 Medical Spaces Expansion:**

The 2007 Ontario Budget announced a commitment to increase first year medical spaces by 100. This expansion is being implemented beginning in 2009-10 with 24 spaces, 67 spaces in 2010-11, and 9 spaces in 2011-12. New spaces at the University of Toronto, Western and year 3 at McMaster will be funded at a rate of \$49,526 per student. Year 1 and Year 2 at McMaster will be funded at a rate of \$74,289 per student owing to its compressed 3-year program, and Ottawa will be funded at a rate of \$52,526 to

<sup>14</sup> Social Science and Humanities Research Council, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and the Canadian Institute for Health Research (formerly the Medical Research Council).

help support its bilingual medical program. NOSM undergraduate medical expansion spaces will be funded at a rate of \$78,979 per student.

### **2005-06 to 2008-09 First Year Undergraduate Medical Expansion:**

The 2005 Ontario Budget announced a 15 percent increase to first year undergraduate medical enrolment above 2004-05 levels, to help address the physician shortage in Ontario. The 2005-06 to 2008-09 expansion of 104 new first-year undergraduate medical spaces, when combined with the 56 new first-year spaces at Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM), represents a 23 percent increase of total new first year medical spaces over 2004-05.

The 104 new first year spaces were implemented over four years. In the academic year starting September 2005, three medical schools introduced 32 new first year undergraduate spaces, followed by an additional 20 new first year spaces at two medical schools in September 2006 and an additional 26 new first year spaces at 3 medical schools in September 2007, and a remaining 26 first year spaces at two medical schools in September 2008, totaling 104 new first year undergraduate spaces across Ontario's southern medical schools.

New spaces at the University of Toronto, Western and year 3 at McMaster are funded at a rate of \$49,526 per student, versus the 2004-05 nominal rate of \$22,526 per student. Year 1 and Year 2 at McMaster are funded at a rate of \$74,289 per student owing to its compressed 3-year program, and Ottawa is funded at a rate of \$52,526 to help support its bilingual medical program. NOSM undergraduate medical spaces are funded at a rate of \$78,979 per student.

It is important to note that a significant number of these new undergraduate medical spaces will support new undergraduate Medical Education Campuses (MECs) in communities that do not currently host a medical school, including:

- University of Toronto will establish a medical education campus in Mississauga, opening September 2010;
- University of Western Ontario established a medical education campus in Windsor in September 2008;
- McMaster University established a medical education campus in Kitchener-Waterloo with students transferred there in January 2008; and
- McMaster University established a medical education campus in St. Catharines with students transferring there in January 2009.

### **2000-01 to 2002-03 First Year Undergraduate Medical Expansion:**

In August, 2000, the government approved the expansion of medical undergraduate enrolment by 160 first-year positions in response to the recommendations of the Expert Panel on Health Professional Human Resources. This enrolment expansion was in response to concerns about current and future shortages of physicians in Ontario.

The 160 additional first-year positions represented 30 percent of the 1999-00 base number of entry positions, and were implemented over three years. In the academic year starting September 2000, the medical schools introduced 40 new entry undergraduate positions, followed by 73 additional entry positions in September 2001 and a remaining 47 additional entry positions in September 2002. Medical undergraduate enrolment growth is projected to total to an estimated 602 spaces at maturity in 2005-06.

Effective 2000-01, to support the implementation of the medical undergraduate expansion, the Ministry approved the following grant per new FTE:

\$33,266 for first and second years of the three-year undergraduate medical program at McMaster University. The funding rate is based on \$5,114 per BIU for the assigned annual weight of 7.5 BIUs, net of the program standard (formula) fee;

\$22,177 for the four-year undergraduate medical program at the Universities of Ottawa, Queen's, Toronto and Western Ontario and the third year of the three-year program at McMaster University. The funding rate is based on \$5,114 per BIU for the assigned annual weight of five BIUs, net of the program standard (formula) fee.

### **Enhanced Funding:**

The 2005-06 Budget included enhanced funding for the previous 30 percent undergraduate medical enrolment expansion, to help support the quality and relevancy of undergraduate medicine at Ontario's southern medical schools. In 2005-06, this amounted to \$12.4 million, or an additional \$19,244 per new student space. In 2006-07 this figure rose to \$17.7 million, or an additional \$27,000 per new student space.

This will bring the on-going funding for these 30 percent expansion spaces to \$49,526 per student at the medical schools at Queen's University, University of Toronto, Western, and \$74,289 per student for Year 1 and Year 2 at McMaster University and \$52,526 per student at the University of Ottawa.

### **Existing Medical Spaces, 1999-2000 and earlier:**

All existing medical school spaces, before the first wave of increases in undergraduate medicine from 2000-01 to 2002-03 and the second wave of increases in undergraduate medicine from 2005-06–2008-09, are funded in a similar manner as all other regular operating grant programs. The funding rate is based on a per student BIU assignment, at an annual weight of 5 BIUs (7.5 BIUs for Year 1 and Year 2 of McMaster's compressed medicine program), net of the program standard (formula) fee.

#### **1.3.6.4. Postgraduate Medical Enrolment**

As part of the provincial response to the recommendations of the Physician Fact Finder and the Expert Panel on Health Professional Human Resources reports, the government also approved expansion of various postgraduate medical training programs, including the flow-through at the postgraduate level of the expansion of undergraduate medicine, the physician re-entry program and the international medical graduates training programs. Since 2003-04, the Ministry has been supporting these positions at the average rate of funding for a 2.5 BIU weight

The undergraduate and postgraduate medical expansion program grant funded since 2000-01 is shown in Appendix 2.5.

#### **1.3.6.5. Nursing Enrolment Expansion: Collaborative Nursing Programs**

In 2000, the regulation under the Nursing Act, 1991, was changed requiring all RN nursing education in Ontario to be restructured to the baccalaureate (degree) level. A baccalaureate education is now required for registration as a registered nurse effective January 1, 2005. The last graduates of the three year diploma program completed their studies in 2004.

At the recommendation of government, colleges and universities developed new collaborative baccalaureate programs that began admitting students in September 2001. The first students from these programs graduated by Spring 2005.

**Operating Funds:** Universities participating in a collaborative nursing program must report for funding purposes each year a number of baccalaureate nursing students (collaborative, stand-alone or Post-RN/degree-completion), expressed in BIUs that is greater than or equal to the average number of baccalaureate nursing BIUs reported in the three-year period 1997-98 to 1999-00. Two universities received funding based on enrolment growth above a one-year base of 1999-00. Operating funding is provided for enrolment growth reported in both the collaborative and Post-RN nursing program, at the university level of funding for two BIUs per FTE.

Any of the partners in the collaborative partnership may choose to report the enrolments to the Ministry for funding purposes, provided that enrolments are only reported once for funding purposes. The operating grant is flowed to the college partner designated by the partnership to receive the funding on behalf of the partnership. The partnership then has responsibility to allocate the grant between the college and university level partners.

**Start-up and Expansion Funds:** The Ministry approved \$20 million start-up and expansion funds over three years to support the implementation of the collaborative nursing programs as follows:

- in 2000-01, a budget of \$10 million was provided with collaborative partners receiving \$3,000 for each first year full-time nursing student expected to enroll in a collaborative degree program in September 2001;
- in 2001-02, a budget of \$4.6 million was allocated with collaborative partners receiving \$1,630 for each actual full-time basic nursing student enrolled in the first year of a collaborative program as of November 1, 2001;
- in 2002-03, an allocation of \$5.6 million was funded. The collaborative partnerships received \$875 for each actual full-time basic nursing student enrolment in first year of the program, as of November 1, 2002, and an additional \$875 for each actual full-time student enrolled in the second year as of that date.

The Collaborative Nursing fund provided since 2000-01 is shown in Appendix 2.6.

#### **1.3.6.6. Graduate Nursing Expansion**

In 2000, to support the transition to baccalaureate nursing, the province made an investment of \$12.6 million in graduate nursing programs. The budget was allocated over seven years, beginning in 2001-02 and ending in 2007-08 to support increased enrolment in the Master of Science in Nursing or equivalent and provide a tuition waiver for college nursing faculty enrolled in these programs in Ontario universities.

The funding of \$10.5 million was allocated on a pro-rata basis to the universities who applied for it. The six main universities offering the program received a percentage share of the available funding, based on their share of the enrolment baseline. Ten percent of the budget was allocated for the new Master's programs at Laurentian and Lakehead universities, which began after 2001.

The tuition waiver grant of \$2.1 million was restricted to college faculty. The grant reimburses the universities for their actual costs incurred in waiving tuition and mandatory ancillary fees for college nursing faculty enrolled in the Master of Science in Nursing or equivalent.

The Graduate Nursing Expansion fund provided since 2001-02 is shown in Appendix 2.6.

#### **1.3.6.7. Nursing Faculty Fund**

The 2004 Ontario Budget contained a Nursing Faculty Fund, which committed \$1M in 2004-05, growing to \$4M in 2007-08 and future years, for a further expansion of graduate nursing programs, both Masters and

the PhD in Nursing. This fund also provided for a waiver of tuition and mandatory ancillary fees for Ontario college and university nursing faculty enrolled in a PhD in Nursing in an Ontario university.

At the end of 2007-08, enrolment growth in graduate nursing was added permanently to the universities' base funding, while they continue to be eligible to apply for growth in graduate nursing through the Graduate Accessibility Fund which supports growth in all graduate programs.

MTCU continues to provide a tuition waiver for Ontario college and university nursing faculty enrolled in a Masters or a PhD in Nursing in an Ontario university.

#### **1.3.6.8. Compressed Nursing Degree Programs**

In Fall 2000, upon receipt of applications to offer collaborative nursing 2001, a "partially-missing cohort" of graduates was projected to appear in 2003-04, due to the elimination of the three-year college diploma program in favour of the four-year degree.

In January 2001, Government announced \$39 million in new funding for time-limited programs designed to produce nursing graduates in the years leading to the missing cohort. Colleges were invited to offer a final diploma and universities were asked to offer "compressed" nursing degree programs.

Since university based compressed programs in nursing degree had to produce their final graduates by December 2004, the grant was made available to universities over four years from 2001-02 to 2004-05. A compressed program was defined as producing graduates in less than the normal four-year, eight semester program with summer breaks.

Funding is provided at the rate of \$7,700 per FTE, the dollar value of two BIUs in 2000-01 when the funding was announced. The compressed nursing program funds provided since 2001-02 are shown in Appendix 2.6.

#### **1.3.6.9. Second Entry Nursing**

Compressed Programs were initially funded for a limited time only to respond to the partially-missing cohort created by the introduction of the four-year baccalaureate programs. However, many institutions, including some who were unable to respond initially, indicated a strong interest in their continuation. To further increase the number of nursing students, MTCU secured approval for funding that would support Second-Entry Nursing programs on an on-going basis beginning in 2005-06,. This was intended to provide an alternative nursing education route for students with some prior postsecondary education. Programs designed to allow diploma-prepared Registered Practical Nurses to upgrade to a B. ScN or equivalents are eligible for Second Entry Nursing Funding. Programs that have received funding approval are funded at the rate of 2 BIUs per FTE, with funding flowed in-year.

#### **1.3.6.10. Teacher Education Expansion**

In 1999, in response to teacher shortages identified by the Minister's Task Force on Teacher Recruitment and Renewal, the government approved \$3.75 million annually for an additional 500 spaces in consecutive education programs in the ten Ontario universities that at the time were offering the consecutive program. The additional spaces were allocated to each university based on its percentage share of eligible enrolment in the consecutive program in 1998-99. The 500 additional spaces represented an increase of 10 percent over 1998-99 and brought the total annual number of funded consecutive teacher education spaces to 5,500 in 1999-00. Each new space was funded at the rate of \$7,500, the value of two BIUs in

1998-99. As the Task Force had identified a high demand for teachers in subject specialties, faculties were requested to target high-demand areas (science, math, French, and technological studies).

The \$3.75 million for the initial 500 spaces was rolled into the basic grants as a permanent addition to the base in 2000-01.

In 2000, to alleviate further concerns of teacher shortages, the government approved an additional expansion of 1,000 spaces for \$7.5 million through to the end of 2003-04. Similar to the allocation of the first 500 spaces, each university received its share of the additional spaces based on its percentage of share of eligible enrolment in the consecutive program in 1998-99. Effective 2001-02, the number of funded spaces in the consecutive Education Programs increased to 6,500. These spaces have been maintained through 2008-09.

The Teacher Education Expansion fund provided since 1999-00 is listed in Appendix 2.7.

### **1.3.7. Mission-Related Institution-Specific Envelope**

This envelope comprises the former category of operating grants known as "extra formula" which incorporated the special northern grants. Extraordinary grants are included in this envelope from time to time.

#### **1.3.7.1. Northern Ontario Grants**

In 1997-98, as a result of the dissolution of the Ontario Council on University Affairs and the need to streamline funding related activity within a down-sized Ministry, the former Northern Ontario Operations Grants, the Northern Ontario Mission Grants, and the Off-Campus special grants were combined into one Northern Ontario Grant. Special reporting requirements for the Off-Campus and Northern Mission Grants were discontinued, and the allocation of Northern Grants for 1997-98 and subsequent years is to be made in the same proportion as the sum of its predecessor grant allocations.<sup>15</sup> The purpose of the grant program remains that of its predecessor programs, described below.

In recognition of the unique role of northern institutions, a 50 percent increase to Northern Grants was announced in the 2002 Budget and implemented in 2002-03.

The allocations of Northern Ontario Grants are detailed in Appendix 2.8.

#### **1.3.7.2. Northern Ontario Operations Grants**

Northern Ontario grants are provided to the northern institutions to offset the extra costs faced by these universities. Besides those due to environmental factors, costs include those due to the isolation of northern universities, and the consequent need to maintain a more varied minimum range of programs than would be feasible without extra support. Support levels were determined by OCUA as a percentage of prior year's basic operating income, or in terms of the percentage increase in prior year's basic operating income. The "mini-formula" used for the calculation was outlined in OCUA Advisory Memorandum 75-VII. In Advisory Memorandum 88-III "Northern Ontario Grants Review", the Council recommended that this grant continue to be distributed according to the same mini-formula. This advice was accepted by the Minister, and grants were allocated in this manner until 1992-93. In response to restricted grants in 1992-93 and subsequent reductions in grant levels, OCUA advised that use of the mini-

<sup>15</sup> In the case of Off-Campus grants the amount which was rolled in to the Northern Grant was an average of the enrolment based grants over the previous five years. This compensated for annual variations in grant levels between institutions which occurred because of the enrolment based nature of the funding.



formula be suspended and grants were allocated annually according to the shares in effect in 1991-92 since that year.

The allocation of the northern Ontario operations grants from their inception in 1975-76 up to the 1996-97 year is detailed in Appendix 2.8.

### **1.3.7.3. Northern Ontario Mission Grants**

Starting in 1987-88, a special annual grant allocation was made to the northern institutions to address particular needs in providing mission-related university-level education "for the north" in northern Ontario. In Advisory Memorandum 88-III, the Council advised that this grant be distributed to the northern institutions in the same proportions as the northern Ontario operations grants.

The Council recommended that the institutions at the beginning of each fiscal year be required to report to the Council how these funds were to be spent to support activities related to their northern Ontario mission and that they be required to report to the Ministry three months after the end of each fiscal year as to how the funds were spent. The need for an evaluation was re-affirmed in Advisory Memorandum 89-III. The evaluation was undertaken in 1992-93, and the resultant recommendations, accepted by the Minister, were put forward in Advisory Memorandum 92-XI. In summary, Council recommended that the grant recipients establish separate and specific accounting for funds that were expended under the terms of this envelope and that the definition of eligible expenditures excluded:

- all activities that could be eligible for funding under the Off-Campus Grant Envelope which was administered by the Ministry;
- practice teaching and related costs normally provided for through the weight of 2 that were allocated to teacher education;
- all off-campus activities not directly related to the Northern Mission teaching and research functions of the university or college;
- sabbaticals; and,
- library expenditures not directly related to activities that were unique to Northern Ontario Mission Grants.

The Ministry undertook to perform both pre- and post-fiscal year monitoring. At the beginning of each fiscal year, eligible institutions seeking Northern Ontario Mission grants were required to submit to the Ministry a planned expenditure report indicating how the funds were to be spent to support activities related to their northern Ontario mission. In addition, three months after the end of the fiscal year, grant recipients were required to submit to the Ministry a report of how the funds were actually spent.

### **1.3.7.4. Bilingualism Grants**

The Government of Ontario has provided special bilingualism grants since 1967-68, in recognition of the costs incurred for this purpose by various institutions. These grants finance three main objectives: first, to provide educational opportunities in their own language to Franco-Ontarians; second, to make available in institutions of different sizes parallel course streams in a bicultural ambience for both English and French language groups; third, to provide bilingual and bicultural exposure to anglophone and/or francophone groups.<sup>16</sup>

In Advisory Memorandum 83-IX, the Ontario Council on University Affairs documented the incremental cost of existing bilingualism programs using 1981-82 cost data. On the basis of the study's findings, the level and distribution of bilingualism grants were adjusted in 1984-85 to reflect more accurately the

<sup>16</sup> Ref. First Annual Report, Ontario Council on University Affairs, 1974-75.

incremental costs of bilingualism. This distribution among institutions formed the basis of bilingual grant allocations for the period 1984-85 through to 1988-89. The Ontario Council on University Affairs completed its third cost study of bilingualism in 1988-89, using 1987-88 data. The methodology was revised to include associated computer costs. The recommendations were presented in Advisory Memorandum 89-III and they incorporated the recommendation in Advisory Memorandum 88-IV, that an additional \$5.0 million be provided for bilingualism programs in 1989-90. The total funds available for annual distribution within this program are equal to the previous year's grants increased by the percentage increase in the total university-system basic operating grants. The amounts allocated each year since 1967-68 are contained in Appendix 2.9.

On January 9, 1992 the Minister of Education and Training asked that the Advisory Committee on Francophone Affairs (ACFA/CCAF) assess the extent to which the bilingualism grants envelope and the start-up/development and maintenance grants from the special purpose grants envelope contribute to the development of a complete range of French language programs and services at the university level<sup>17</sup>. Before its dissolution in December, 1993, ACFA/CCAF submitted its report to the Minister. The report was passed on to the Franco-Ontarian Education and Training Council (FOETC), which was mandated to make recommendations on French-language education. With the dissolution of FOETC in August, 1996, the responsibility for recommendations for French-language programs and services at the university level was transferred to the Consortium des universités de la francophonie ontarienne (CUFO).

In 1997, the start-up/development and maintenance grants were eliminated and the maintenance grant was amalgamated with the bilingualism grants. CUFO has developed an accountability framework for the bilingualism grants that includes an inventory of all courses offered in French. This report is submitted annually in March to the Ministry.

In 2006-07, the Ontario Government introduced the French-Language Targeted Quality Fund. This fund aims to enhance the quality of French-language programming at Ontario's bilingual universities and to complement the projects under the Canada-Ontario Agreement on Minority-Language Education and Second Language Instruction 2005-09 and the Canada-Ontario Agreement on Complementary Projects Relating to Minority-Language Education 2005-06 to 2007-08. This fund was created to support program enhancement by offering more courses in French in order to encourage students to continue their university education in French. It also supports the completion of programs that are not offered entirely in French and promotes French-language postsecondary education as a valuable pathway (access strategy). Additionally, this fund promotes ways to improve recruitment and retention of French-language graduates into French-language postsecondary education.

As of 2006-07, the \$4.7 million in French-Language Targeted Quality Funding is an ongoing base addition to the Bilingualism Grant.

### **1.3.7.5. Differentiation Grants**

In 1981-82, a new category of operating fund grants was introduced: differentiation grants. In prior years, the Ontario Council on University Affairs had repeatedly stated its belief that there was a need for system-wide rationalization. This, it was felt, should be achieved primarily through institutional role differentiation. The Council believed that each institution must identify its existing strengths as a basis for planning and development, and channel its initiatives in relation to those strengths. The Council considered that differentiation grants were appropriate when an institution accepted a clearly differentiated role, demonstrated its intention to pursue its strengths efficiently and effectively, and required special funding to do so. The renewal or continuation of such a grant depends entirely on the progress the institution makes

<sup>17</sup> Letter from the Honourable Richard Allen, Minister of Colleges and Universities, to Ms Dyane Adam, Chair, Advisory Committee on Francophone Affairs.

towards attaining its goals over the period for which the grant is awarded.<sup>18</sup> In 1987-88, the principle of a continuing differentiation grant was established. This new phase in the differentiation grant is geared towards maintaining a previously established differentiated role.<sup>19</sup>

Trent University was the first recipient of a differentiation grant. In the course of its development, Trent has chosen to differentiate itself from the other institutions in the Ontario university system and has a particular role to play as the only institution in the province engaged almost entirely in undergraduate Arts and Science instruction.

In 1988-89, the Ontario Council on University Affairs initiated a thorough review to identify and estimate the incremental costs of Trent's differentiation. The findings are documented in Advisory Memorandum 89-IV. As a result of the findings, it was recommended in Advisory Memorandum 89-III that the level of the differentiation grant should be increased or decreased annually by the percentage increase or decrease in basic funding. However, since Trent's differentiation grant was flat-lined beginning in 1999-00, this grant was increased by \$1 million to \$2.359 million, effective 2006-07. Since 1996-97 Trent's differentiation grant has been flat-lined.

In 1998-99, Nipissing University became the second university to be awarded a differentiation grant. Nipissing's grant, similar to Trent's, was given to support Nipissing's differentiated role as a primarily undergraduate university.<sup>20</sup>

In 2007-08, OCAD began receiving a differentiation grant to support its role of focusing on fine arts programs.

The differentiation grants awarded since 1981-82 are detailed in Appendix 2.10.

#### **1.3.7.6. Extraordinary Grant to Algoma**

In Advisory Memorandum 88-VIII, the Ontario Council on University Affairs responded to the Minister's May 27, 1987 request for advice regarding the appropriateness of Algoma College's mission, range of programs and course offerings, and also Algoma's capital and operating support requirements. Upon acceptance of Council's advice, the Minister awarded Algoma College an extraordinary operating grant for the first time in 1989-90, subject to the conditions noted in the advisory memorandum. Follow-up cost studies and reviews were carried out by OCUA to determine/recommend annual allocations.<sup>21</sup> The level of funding allocated each year is shown in Appendix 2.11.

In the 2002 Budget, in recognition of the unique role of northern institutions, a 50 percent increase in Northern Grants was announced. Starting in 2002-03, the Ministry increased the Extraordinary Grant to Algoma by 50 percent to \$899,810. In 2004-05 a residual amount of \$11,394 from the 2002-03 increase was split between Algoma and Hearst and a retroactive payment of \$6,836 was made for 2003-04. As a result, Algoma's extraordinary grant is \$906,746 on an annual ongoing basis.

<sup>18</sup> The Ontario Council on University Affairs, in Advisory Memorandum 80-VI, "The Allocation of the Government's Operating Support for the University System in 1981-82".

<sup>19</sup> The Ontario Council on University Affairs in Advisory Memorandum 87-I, "The Allocation of the Government's Operating Support for the University System in 1987-88".

<sup>20</sup> Advisement Letter from B. James Mackay, Director Universities Branch dated March 30, 1999 to Executive Heads.

<sup>21</sup> The Ontario Council on University Affairs in Advisory Memorandum 90-VII, "Extraordinary Grant for Algoma College 1990-91" and Advisory Memorandum 92-XI, "The Allocation of the Government's Operating Support for the University System in 1993-94". The annual change in funding level has been tied to the annual adjustment (increase or decrease) to the basic operating grant envelope.

### 1.3.7.7. Extraordinary Grant to Hearst

In 2000-01, Hearst was provided with a one-time special grant of \$400,000 from the Official Languages in Education Program (OLE) envelope, of which \$200,000 was provided by the federal government. The grant was provided to help Hearst deal with its financial situation.

In 2001-02, the government made a commitment to provide Hearst with an extraordinary grant in the amount of \$400,000 annually to help them deal with their projected deficit.

In the 2002 Budget, in recognition of the unique role of northern institutions, a 50 percent increase in Northern Ontario Grants was announced. The Ministry increased the Extraordinary Grant to Hearst by 50 percent to \$600,000 starting in 2002-03.

The level of funding allocated each year is shown in Appendix 2.11.

### 1.3.8. Research Overheads/Infrastructure Envelope (ROIE)

During the discussions which took place in 1985-86 surrounding the modification of the university operating grants formula, concern was expressed about the level of funding provided for the overhead costs of sponsored research through the existing formula grant mechanism. It was pointed out that sponsored research activity and direct funding had increased significantly in recent years. The support of the indirect or overhead costs of this research through operating grants had not kept pace. This had a particularly negative impact on the research infrastructure and other areas of university operations at institutions heavily involved in resource-intensive research.<sup>22</sup>

In 1986-87, under the auspices of the University Excellence Fund program, a total of \$15 million was allocated to enhance the research resources of the universities. This money was targeted to assisting with the acquisition of research equipment, specialized experimental facilities and highly skilled technical and professional support staff.

The research overheads/infrastructure envelope provides continuing assistance in the funding of research overheads. The bulk of funding for research infrastructure and overheads continues to be provided through the basic grants envelope. The additional envelope must be considered a marginal funding source for research activity. As such, it should be responsive to changes in the level of sponsored research activity at each university and should reflect the relative levels of costs incurred at each institution.

Since 1987-88, the research overheads/infrastructure grants were allocated on the basis of each institution's proportion of peer-adjudicated sponsored research funding awarded to Ontario universities by the federal government's three granting agencies: the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC); the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC); and the Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR, formerly Medical Research Council).

A review of the appropriate long-term mechanism for supporting overhead and infrastructure costs of sponsored research was undertaken by the Ontario Council on University Affairs in 1988<sup>23</sup>. The Council recommended<sup>24</sup> that the allocation be made in future years on a similar basis to that made in 1987-88. Therefore, the distribution is made on the basis of a three-year moving average, and the total available

<sup>22</sup> The Ontario Council on University Affairs, in Advisory Memorandum 86-VII, "Modification of the Operating Grants Formula".

<sup>23</sup> The Ontario Council on University Affairs, in Advisory Memorandum 87-I, "The Allocation of the Government's Operating Support for the University System in 1987-88".

<sup>24</sup> The Ontario Council on University Affairs, in Advisory Memorandum 87-XV, "Research Overheads/Infrastructure Funding Envelope Allocative Mechanism".

grants are adjusted annually by the same percentage change as the basic operating grants.

To ensure that possible delays in obtaining research funding data from the federal granting councils do not postpone the allocative advice, Council recommended in Advisory Memorandum 91-XII that the allocation formula for distributing the ROIE funds be modified so that the years included in the three-year moving average are slipped two years instead of one. The Minister agreed and the revision became effective commencing the 1992-93 funding year. Research overheads/infrastructure funding provided since 1986-87 is shown in Appendix 2.12.

Since 2000-01, the Ministry has provided annual funding of \$27.75 million for the research overheads/infrastructure envelope.

### **1.3.9. Special Purpose Grants**

A number of operating grant payments are made to Ontario universities and related institutions which are targeted to system needs and Ministry priorities. Examples of programs for which special purpose grants are provided include:

- Aboriginal Education and Training Strategy (which supports programs and services for Aboriginal people);
- Francophone Programs (which assist, for example, with the start-up costs of the French as a Minority Language program and Ontario-Quebec faculty and student exchanges); and

Special Purpose Grants provided since 1995-96 are shown in Appendix 2.13.

### **1.3.10. Institution-Specific Envelopes**

A number of operating grant payments are made to specific Ontario universities or related institutions which are intended to fund a specific purpose or need.

Total Institution Specific Grants provided since 1995-96 are shown in Appendix 2.13.

### **1.3.11. Learning Disabilities Initiatives**

In the 1997 Budget, the Minister of Finance announced that the government would provide \$30 million over five years, to establish the Learning Opportunities Task Force (LOTF) and to support the Task Force recommended pilot projects. The Task Force was established to provide advice to the Minister on the design and implementation of pilot projects that assist students with learning disabilities to make the transition from secondary school to college or university.

The Task Force established and evaluated eight pilot projects at ten institutions over five years from 1998 to summer 2003. In February 2002, the government responded to the Task Force's interim recommendations by announcing that up to \$5 million in base funding would be available through the Enhanced Services Fund (ESF), to support learning strategists (LSs) and assistive technologists (ATs) at all publicly-funded colleges and universities.

In 2003-04 and as announced in the April 2003 Budget, the government committed funding to implement the following in response to the Task Force's final report:

- continuation of the Enhanced Services Fund;
- the establishment of two Regional Assessment and Resources Centres;
- 25 percent increase over 2002-03 funding levels for the Accessibility Fund for Students with Disabilities; and, other programs which may be introduced from time to time.

Funding provided since 1998-99 under the Learning Opportunities Task Force initiatives is shown in Appendix 2.14.

### **1.3.12. Partnership Grants**

#### **1.3.12.1. Access to Opportunities Program (ATOP)**

In the 1998 Budget, the Minister of Finance announced the establishment of a fund for increasing enrolment in computer science and high-demand engineering programs at universities and colleges. On May 29, 1998, the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities announced the initial design of the program. Detailed guidelines were released in October 1998, and universities submitted applications under the program on November 16, 1998.

The objective of the ATOP program was to double entry-level domestic student enrolment over 1995-96 levels in undergraduate degree programs in high-demand engineering disciplines and/or computer science, by the end of 2000-01. At the graduate level, the approvals were to support an increase of up to 50 percent of 1997-98 total enrolment in core ATOP disciplines. Growth was to be achieved in existing core disciplines and in approved new core and non-core programs as outlined in the institution's multi-year plans. It was expected that by program maturity in 2004-05, ATOP would create up to 23,000 additional student spaces in high-demand engineering and/or computer science programs. By 2002-03, this target had been surpassed, with over 25,800 student spaces created in both colleges and universities (over 14,000 for universities).

In March 1999, universities were advised of the first stage of multi-year approval which provided \$34.3 million to universities for 1998-99. Universities were provided with one-time start-up funds of up to \$102.7 million, along with \$62.5 million in on-going operating grants, over the first three years of the program.

For the one-time start-up funding, institutions were required to raise 50 percent of their start-up costs from the private sector. The province then provided one-time funding to match dollar-for-dollar private sector in-kind and/or cash contributions towards eligible one-time start-up costs. The maximum provincial start-up funding per incremental FTE was:

- \$9,800 for high-demand undergraduate engineering;
- \$6,800 for undergraduate computer science;
- \$9,800 annually, or \$3,267 per term, for graduate students;

Universities had until November 30, 1999 to secure private sector donations and/or pledges. All donations had to have been received by the end of the institution's fiscal year 2000-01. Each university was required to submit an annual report outlining the revenues and expenditures related to the one-time start-up funding, as part of its annual audited financial statement.

Ongoing operating funds were provided for actual enrolment growth over the average of total undergraduate enrolments in 1995-96, 1996-97 and 1997-98, flowed on a slip year basis. Universities disadvantaged by the use of this three-year average and/or slip year funding are funded on total undergraduate growth over 1997-98 levels and receive in-year funding. For graduate programs, ongoing operating funds are provided for incremental growth over 1997-98 levels, flowed on a slip year basis.

The rates for ongoing operating funding per incremental FTE were:

- \$5,000 for high-demand engineering;

- \$3,500 for computer science;
- \$10,000 annually or \$3,333 per term for Masters students;
- \$15,000 annually or \$5,000 per term for Doctoral students.

Participating institutions were allowed to set their own tuition fees in computer science and engineering programs.

At maturity universities which received in year funding received \$53 million in 2004-05. The remaining universities received ATOP slip year funds totaling \$35.5 million in 2005-06.

In 2005-06, ATOP funding was included as part of the basic operating funding provided to universities.

Funding provided to universities for the Access to Opportunities Program from 1998-99 to 2005-06 shown in Appendix 2.15.

### **1.3.12.2. Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology (OGSST)**

Since 1998, Ontario, in partnership with the private sector, has rewarded excellence in graduate studies in science and technology. Under the original design of the program, the Ontario Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology (OGSST) has awarded seventy-five million dollars to graduate students over a ten year period beginning in 1998-99 and ending in 2007-08. This program is in addition to and distinct from the Ontario Graduate Scholarship (OGS) program.

On August 4, 2006, the Ministry informed eligible institutions that the OGSST program was extended by one year, to 2008-09. The Government has decided to extend the OGSST program for an additional year to 2009-10, an additional investment of \$5.01 million. Universities are expected to raise \$2.5 million, from the private sector in 2009-10 towards the cost of scholarships provided to graduate students.

The scholarship value will be to a maximum of \$15,000 annually, or \$5,000 per term. Consistent with the 2:1 ratio of government funding to institutional funding for this program, the Ontario government portion of the award to an individual student will be to a maximum of \$10,000 annually, or \$3,333 per term. The remaining funds are to be provided by the institution, through fund-raising from the private sector. Individual universities can determine the actual value of the scholarships awarded, up to the maximum per term, based on the number of students they wish to support.

The scholarships are administered centrally within universities, with each university selecting recipient graduate students exhibiting overall academic excellence and research potential and abilities. Detailed program guidelines are distributed annually to universities, outlining eligibility criteria, selection criteria, eligible disciplines, accountability and reporting requirements. Please see Appendix 13 for the 2009-10 OGSST Guidelines.

#### **Allocation of Funds**

OGSST funds from the Government are allocated to the universities on a formulaic basis. The allocation mechanism relates directly to the purpose of the program, which is to reward excellence in graduate studies in science and technology. The provincial funds are distributed according to each university's share of eligible<sup>25</sup> full-time domestic graduate enrolments in applied sciences, biological sciences, and physical sciences. To account for changes in enrolment levels among institutions and for the introduction of new graduate programs over the ten year period, the allocation is re-calculated each year, based on a three-year moving average of enrolment, slipped two years.

---

<sup>25</sup> Enrolments eligible for provincial funding ("BIU eligible").

A three year average of graduate enrolments (full-time, eligible, domestic enrolment in applied, biological, and physical sciences) is used in determining annual OGSST allocations. For example, in the 2009-10 allocations, the average of 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 graduate enrolments (full-time, eligible, domestic students in applied, biological and physical sciences) were used as the basis for allocating \$5,010,000.

Please see Appendix 2.16 for the Ontario Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology funding and Appendix 13 for the 2009-10 OGSST Guidelines.

### **1.3.13. Funding Rolled into the Basic Operating Grant Envelope**

This section lists a series of grants which were discontinued prior to 2003-04 and have been rolled into the Basic Operating Grant in earlier years:

#### **1.3.13.1. Enrolment Adjustment/Accessibility Envelope**

In 1987-88, this envelope operated as an adjustment for funding anomalies which developed over the latter years of operation of the previous formula as a result of differences in the patterns of enrolment growth among Ontario universities. In 1988-89, this envelope was designated for the recognition of enrolment growth in 1987-88 beyond 1986-87 levels. In 1988-89, this envelope funded additional enrolment growth in 1988-89 over 1987-88 levels, as well as the flow-through of the 1987-88 over 1986-87 growth, and also provided special funding to encourage participation by currently under-represented groups.

##### **Enrolment Adjustment: 1987-88 Grants**

In 1987-88, a total of \$25 million in enrolment adjustment grants was allocated in the following manner:

\$12.5 million was allocated according to each institution's proportion of weighted growth BIUs. Growth BIUs were defined as the gap between an institution's undiscounted and discounted BIUs and were calculated by subtracting each institution's 1986-87 funding BIUs (i.e., discounted BIUs) from the average of its 1983-84, 1984-85, and 1985-86 BIUs (i.e., undiscounted BIUs). Each institution's growth BIUs were weighted according to the proportion of its growth BIUs to its undiscounted BIUs (the three-year average indicated above).

\$12.5 million was allocated according to each institution's proportion of the university system's unweighted growth BIUs.

For 1988-89, the grant amounts so generated were included in each institution's base grants and base BOI, for the purposes of calculating subsequent base grant entitlements.

##### **Accessibility Envelope: 1988-89 Grants**

The accessibility envelope recognized incremental enrolment growth in 1987-88 by funding, in 1988-89, the positive difference between each institution's 1987-88 and 1986-87 BIUs (at a rate equal to the 1988-89 base BOI per base BIU), less the positive difference in formula fees between the same two years.



### **Accessibility Envelope: 1989-90 Grants**

To address the government's commitment to fully fund the incremental growth identified in 1987-88 in future years, in 1989-90 the positive difference between each institution's 1987-88 BIUs and its 1986-87 BIUs was funded at a rate equal to the 1989-90 base BOI per base BIU, less the associated incremental formula fees.

The government agreed to fund the positive difference between an institution's 1988-89 BIUs and its 1987-88 BIUs, at a rate determined by the total of the positive increases in BIUs between 1987-88 and 1988-89, to a maximum rate not more than the 1989-90 base BOI per base BIU less the associated incremental formula fees.

Total funding under the accessibility envelope in 1989-90 amounted to \$88 million. Approximately \$37.4 million was allocated to fund the flow-through of 1987-88 growth. A further \$4 million was reserved to promote access for disabled persons and the remaining balance of approximately \$46.6 million was allocated to fund the enrolment growth between 1987-88 and 1988-89.

### **Accessibility Envelope: 1990-91 Grants**

In 1990-91, phasing down of the funding provided within the accessibility envelope commenced, with accessibility funds being transferred via the temporary "transition grants envelope" to the basic grants envelope (see Appendix 2.1). In 1990-91, universities received 70 percent of the funding related to enrolment growth in 1987 over 1986 levels, and 85 percent of the funding related to enrolment growth in 1988 over 1987 levels. The funds thus freed up were used to fund recent enrolment growth within the transition grants envelope.

### **Accessibility Envelope: 1991-92 Grants**

In 1991-92, universities received 40 percent of the funding related to enrolment growth in 1987 over 1986 levels, and 70 percent of the funding related to enrolment growth in 1988 over 1987 levels. The funds thus freed up were incorporated into the transition grants envelope to fund recent enrolment growth up to the new corridor mid-points.

### **Accessibility Envelope: 1992-93 Grants**

In 1992-93, universities received 40 percent of the funding related to enrolment growth in 1988 over 1987 levels. The balance of the funding originally associated with this envelope was transferred to the transition grants envelope to fund the planned enrolment growth up to the new corridor midpoints.

### 1.3.13.2. Transition Grants Envelope

This envelope funded the movement to new, higher enrolment levels negotiated by the universities with the Ontario Council on University Affairs in 1989. Funds allocated to the envelope were, in part, those freed up from the accessibility envelope as that envelope was phased out, as well as other funds allocated to enrolment growth (see Appendix 2.17). Government undertook to add \$91.1 million to the university operating allocation over the years 1990-91 through to 1994-95 in order to accommodate new, planned enrolment levels.

Distribution of the funds within this envelope was based on the difference between the current moving-average of weighted enrolment (moving-average BIU counts) which was implemented in 1990-91 and base BIU counts. The moving-average was a five-year average, slipped one year.

BIUs funded under this envelope were capped at the level of the new, negotiated, corridor mid-points, and were net of any BIUs funded under the accessibility envelope. Associated standard (formula) fees were taken into account in the grant calculations.

In 1996-97, funding allocated under the transition envelope was integrated with the basic grants envelope.

### 1.3.13.3. Program Adjustment Envelope

The government's allocation for university operating support announced in November 1986<sup>26</sup> included provision for funds to assist in meeting the costs associated with program closure, program start-up in areas of critical need, moving capacity from one institution to another or initiating co-operative efforts or joint programs in order to facilitate desired program adjustments--the overall objective being to enhance quality and to encourage rationalization and differentiation.

The program adjustment envelope began in 1987-88, as a pro-rata distribution of \$7 million. From 1988-89 onwards, the program operated on a quasi-competitive basis, with institutions submitting project proposals to OCUA for assessment and recommendation to the Minister.

Two competitions were held. The first resulted in the allocation of funds in 1988-89 and in 1989-90, the second in the allocation of funds in 1990-91 and 1991-92.

When the results of the second competition were assessed, concern was expressed<sup>27</sup> that the projects submitted, while meeting the minimum criteria for the envelope, did not accomplish the true objectives of the program, principal among them the initiation of significant change. A constraint of \$2.3 million was imposed on the program adjustment envelope for 1991-92. This, coupled with the concerns expressed about the significance of the proposed projects, resulted in a reduced number of projects being funded. Complete funding for the approved projects was flowed to the institutions in 1990-91 and 1991-92, leaving no carry-over commitments for subsequent years.

On October 11, 1991 the Minister announced<sup>28</sup> that the program adjustment envelope would wind down at the end of the 1991-92 fiscal year, and the funds freed up from the termination of the program would be added to the basic grants envelope.

<sup>26</sup> Letter from the Honourable Gregory Sorbara, Minister of Colleges and Universities to Mrs. Marnie Paikin, Chairman, Ontario Council on University Affairs, November 3, 1986, announcing operating support for 1987-88.

<sup>27</sup> Letters of March 25 and April 30, 1991 from the Honourable Richard Allen, Minister of Colleges and Universities to Dr. H. V. Nelles, Chair, Ontario Council on University Affairs.

<sup>28</sup> Letter from the Honourable Richard Allen, Minister of Colleges and Universities to Dr. H. V. Nelles, Chair, Ontario Council on University Affairs.

#### **1.3.13.4. Library Enhancement and Student Equipment Fund**

Funds originally allocated in 1986-87, and an additional amount allocated in 1990-91, specifically targeted towards the purchase of modern equipment and enhancement of library materials, have been rolled into the basic grants envelope.

#### **1.3.13.5. Pay Equity Assistance**

The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities provided Pay Equity Assistance to postsecondary institutions since 1991-92, to support the implementation of the Pay Equity Act of January 1, 1988. The Pay Equity Act aimed to eliminate wage gaps created by the undervaluing of women's jobs compared to men's jobs. Institutions were required to post their pay equity plans and begin making salary adjustments commencing January 1990.

The targeted funding in the postsecondary sector applied to job and/or proportional value pay equity plans.

Generally, the Ministry surveyed universities to determine their actual pay equity costs for the previous calendar year. Pay equity allocations were paid to institutions at government support rates. However, there was no pay equity survey for the 1997-98 calendar years. The Pay Equity allocation for 1998-99 and 1999-2000 was based on survey costs for the 1996 calendar year, and institutions received exactly the same allocations in 1998-99 and 1999-2000 as they did in 1997-98. See Appendix 2.18 for historical Pay Equity funding amounts.

Beginning in 2001-02, Pay Equity was included in Basic Operating Income and each institution received their fixed share of the Pay Equity allocation.

#### **1.3.13.6. Fair Funding For Universities Grant**

In the budget of May 1998, the government announced that an additional \$29 million would be allocated to universities to reduce the variations in funding per student which had developed over the years. Funding was allocated based on the corridor midpoints used for the 1998-99 funding year. An estimate of discretionary fee revenue was added to the income from standard (formula) fees and basic grants for 1998-99, and the fair funding grants was calculated based on the difference in revenue per corridor midpoint BIU from \$5,704 multiplied by the number of units in each institution's corridor midpoint count.

The additional funding was phased in over three years, \$10 million in 1998-99, \$20 million in 1999-00 and \$29 million in 2000-01 (see Appendix 2.19). Grant recipients were required to provide a five year plan to hire new faculty and to provide professional development to existing faculty, with a view of enhancing the quality of undergraduate education.

The Fair Funding for Universities Grant was rolled into the Basic Operating Grant in 2001-02.

## 2. ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS

### 2.1. PROVINCIALLY ASSISTED INSTITUTIONS

The following university level institutions are eligible to claim support for various grants as outlined in this manual, subject to any limitations that may be imposed by the Minister as a condition for eligibility for each grant. Eligible enrolment in the federated or affiliated colleges listed in Section 2.2 may be claimed by the institutions below:

Algoma University  
 Brock University  
 Carleton University  
 College of the Dominican or Friar Preachers of Ottawa (Collège Dominicain)  
 University of Guelph  
 Lakehead University  
 Laurentian University  
 Le Collège de Hearst  
 McMaster University  
 Northern Ontario School of Medicine  
 Nipissing University  
 Ontario College of Art & Design  
 University of Ontario Institute of Technology  
 University of Ottawa  
 Queen's University  
 Ryerson University  
 University of Toronto  
 Trent University  
 University of Waterloo  
 The University of Western Ontario  
 Wilfrid Laurier University  
 University of Windsor  
 York University

#### **New Institutions**

**Algoma University:** On June 18, 2008, the Algoma University Act came into force establishing Algoma University as an independent, degree granting institution. Currently, Algoma University has the authority to offer undergraduate degrees in the programs it formerly offered in affiliation with Laurentian University. Additional degree granting authority may come into effect at a later date to be determined by government.

**Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM):** The Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM) opened its doors to the first 56 undergraduate students in September 2005, 36 students at the Laurentian University NOSM campus, and 24 students at the Lakehead University NOSM campus. At undergraduate maturity in 2008-09, there are 224 students total enrolled at NOSM (i.e. 56 students per year, for four years of undergraduate studies). The new medical school will ensure that medical students can study and live in Northern Ontario while learning first-hand about the unique health care needs of the region, and help ease physician shortages in Northern and rural communities.

In 2010-11, NOSM will expand by 8 new first year spaces as part of the 100 Medical Spaces Expansion, announced May 21, 2009 (see section 1.3.6.3).

**University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT):** In the April 29, 2001 Throne Speech, the Government outlined its intention to establish a new postsecondary institution. Subsequently, the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT) was created through an act of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario on June 27, 2002. UOIT was funded through a specific grant in 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2003-04. This arrangement continued from 2004-05 to 2006-07. Starting from 2007-08, UOIT's specific grant was included in the Basic Grants Envelope without affecting other institutions' share of the total basic grant. UOIT's share of basic grant will continue to be based on its in-year actual enrolment until undergraduate steady-state enrolment level is achieved. Funding for UOIT's graduate enrolment is provided by the graduate accessibility envelope from 2006-07 onwards.

**Nipissing University:** In 1992, the Nipissing University Act, 1992 came into force establishing Nipissing University with a special mission to be a teaching-oriented institution that offers programs in education, liberal arts and science programs that specifically address the needs of northern Ontario. Prior to that, Nipissing had been an affiliate of Laurentian University. In 2001, its legislation was amended allowing Nipissing to grant any and all degrees.

**Ontario College of Art & Design (OCAD):** In 2002, OCAD's legislation amending its legislation came into force giving the college limited degree-granting authority. In addition to offering a diploma of Associate of the Ontario College of Art & Design, OCAD was granted the authority to offer: Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Design, Master of Arts, Master of Fine Arts and Master of Design.

**College of the Dominican or Friar Preachers of Ottawa:** Dominican College became eligible for 50 percent provincial support commencing in September 1973. Any program introduced after September 1, 1967 must have met, or must meet, the same requirements for program approval as they apply to the provincially assisted institutions as set out in Section 3.1.

## 2.2. CHURCH-RELATED AND FEDERATED OR AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS

Institutions listed in Section 2.1 may claim full operating support<sup>29</sup> for eligible enrolment in eligible programs in the following church-related institutions<sup>30</sup> which are federated or affiliated with them, subject to the criteria detailed below.

Assumption University	(University of Windsor)
Brescia University College	(The University of Western Ontario)
Canterbury College	(University of Windsor)
Concordia Lutheran Seminary	(Brock University)
Conrad Grebel University College	(University of Waterloo)
Huntington University	(Laurentian University)
Huron College	(The University of Western Ontario)
Iona College	(University of Windsor)
King's University College	(The University of Western Ontario)
Knox College	(University of Toronto)
McMaster Divinity College	(McMaster University)
Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies	(University of Toronto)
Queen's Theological College	(Queen's University)
Regis College	(University of Toronto)
Renison University College	(University of Waterloo)

<sup>29</sup> Church related and federated or affiliated institutions listed in Section 2.2 and Dominican College are not eligible to apply for direct capital funding from the province.

<sup>30</sup> Federated/affiliated institutions are shown with corresponding provincially assisted universities in brackets.

St. Augustine's Seminary <sup>31</sup>	(University of Toronto)
St. Jerome's University	(University of Waterloo)
St. Michael's College	(University of Toronto)
St. Paul University	(University of Ottawa)
St. Paul's United College	(University of Waterloo)
St. Peter's Seminary	(The University of Western Ontario)
University of Sudbury	(Laurentian University)
Thorneloe University	(Laurentian University)
Trinity College	(University of Toronto)
Victoria University	(University of Toronto)
Waterloo Lutheran Seminary	(Wilfrid Laurier University)
Wycliffe College	(University of Toronto)

### 2.2.1. Conditions for Funding Eligibility: Students

The conditions for eligibility for full support for enrolment in institutions listed in section 2 are:

- a) that any student for whom operating eligibility is claimed be registered at one of the provincially assisted universities named in section 2.1 and the degree awarded be that of the provincially assisted university; and
- b) that the standards of admission, curriculum, graduation, etc. be established and regulated by the appropriate academic bodies of the provincially assisted university.

### 2.2.2. Conditions for Funding Eligibility: Non-Theological Programs

Only those non-theological programs in existence at the federated and affiliated colleges when the 100 percent support policy was introduced on September 1, 1974 become automatically eligible. All other non-theological programs must have met, or must meet, the same requirements for program approval as those which apply to the provincially assisted institutions as set out in Section 3.1.

### 2.2.3. Conditions for Funding Eligibility: Theological Programs

Only those theological programs in existence on September 1, 1967 became automatically eligible for 100 percent support on April 1, 1976. Any program introduced after September 1, 1967 must have met, or must meet, the same requirements for program approval as those which apply to the provincially assisted institutions as set out in Section 3.1.

---

<sup>31</sup> St. Augustine Seminary terminated its initial affiliation agreement with the University of Toronto on July 1, 1988. Thus the University of Toronto did not include enrolment associated with the seminary in its 1988-89 eligible enrolment reports. All enrolment associated with the seminary was removed from the University of Toronto totals, effective for funding in 1989-90 (Enrolment based portions of 1989-90 funding are based on enrolment in the years up to and including 1988-89.) A new affiliation agreement was signed in July 1989 and funding was re-instated for 1990-91, at which time eligible enrolment was re-introduced to the University of Toronto totals.

### **3. ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS**

#### **3.1. PROGRAM APPROVAL POLICY**

##### **3.1.1. Historical Record**

###### **3.1.1.1. Undergraduate Programs: 1974 to November 1, 1981**

With the approval of their senates, institutions were free to establish new undergraduate programs and have them funded automatically. Only undergraduate programs of the following types required Ministry approval:

- new professional programs,
- new health sciences programs,
- new Ryerson and Ontario College of Art programs,
- new programs requiring extra formula support,
- new programs not included in existing weight categories for which a formula weight above 1.0 was required.

###### **3.1.1.2. Undergraduate Programs: November 2, 1981 to December 15, 1982**

On November 2, 1981, the Minister announced a freeze on all new undergraduate programs under which:

- 1) universities were asked to introduce no new undergraduate programs without prior consultation with the Ontario Council on University Affairs (OCUA);
- 2) universities could report enrolment in a new program for formula grant purposes only if the new program had received:
  - a) OCUA's recommendation to the Minister for funding; and
  - b) the Minister's funding approval.

The freeze applied to any undergraduate program offered by a university after November 1, 1981, which in content, format, or mode of presentation differed significantly from any of the programs previously offered by that university in which students were enrolled. Wherever clarification was required on the application of this general definition to particular cases, it was the university's responsibility to obtain it from OCUA.

Enrolment in new programs not approved for funding was to be reported as ineligible for formula grants. These freeze requirements terminated in December, 1982.

###### **3.1.1.3. Undergraduate Programs: December 16, 1982 to November 7, 1996**

In 1982, a new process was created for the review of new undergraduate programs. New programs in basic and "core" Arts and Science disciplines could be reported as eligible for grant purposes without having to obtain specific ministerial approval, while new professional, quasi-professional and special undergraduate programs were required to undergo review by OCUA and receive minister's approval in order to be counted as eligible for funding purposes. On May 29, 1996, in response to the Woods Task Force Recommendations on Agencies, Boards and Commissions, the Minister announced OCUA and the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) would be disbanded as of August 31, 1996. OCUA's and AAC's responsibilities with regard to academic program approvals were to be assumed by the Ministry.

### **3.1.2. Current Policy: Undergraduate Programs**

On November 8, 1996 the Ministry announced an interim policy of self-administered regulation for 1996-97 to apply to both undergraduate and graduate programs (see Appendix 3).

Effective 2002-03, the Ministry adapted the program approval cycle to increase flexibility for institutions. Submissions were accepted twice a year, in April and November. This was modified in 2006-07, when submissions began to be accepted four times per year. Through a memo, institutions are informed of submission dates each summer for the upcoming year.

As part of the program approval process, institutions are required to include proposed tuition fees for each program submitted for approval, including examples of comparator programs used to set the tuition fee level.

#### **3.1.2.1. Basic "Core" Arts and Science Programs**

New programs in basic "core" Arts and Science disciplines may be reported as eligible for grant purposes without having to obtain specific ministerial approval, except where such a new program:

- a) does not have a formula weight already assigned and a weight greater than 1.0 is sought; or
- b) will require extra operating support; or
- c) cannot be accommodated within existing available university facilities.

Programs in basic "core" Arts and Sciences disciplines are:

Biological Sciences (including Biotechnology)  
 English Language and Literature  
 French Language and Literature  
 General Arts and Science  
 Humanities (including ancient and classical languages)  
 Mathematical Sciences and Computer Studies  
 Physical Sciences  
 Social Sciences (including Women's Studies)  
 Theology

New "core" Arts and Science programs should be reported to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities in the Program Developments Report (see Appendix 3) requested each spring.

#### **3.1.2.2. All Other New Undergraduate Programs**

All other new university programs at the undergraduate level (i.e., all programs outside the category defined as basic "core" Arts and Science) may be reported as eligible for operating grants only after review and approval by the Minister.

Further guidance regarding the Ministry's program approval procedures and review criteria can be found in Appendix 3.



### **3.1.2.3. Graduate Programs**

Concern with the proliferation of new graduate programs led the government to impose an embargo on new graduate program developments in 1970, followed by a suspension of the formula for graduate program funding in 1976.

In 1978, a program approvals process administered by the Ontario Council on University Affairs, including evaluative criteria, was established to advise the Ministry on the funding of new graduate programs. The Academic Advisory Committee (AAC) was later established in 1981 to apply the criteria and provide independent academic advice to OCUA regarding program submissions. New graduate programs could be reported as eligible for operating grant funding only after successful quality appraisal by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies; review and recommendation by the OCUA; and approval for funding eligibility by the Minister.

On May 29, 1996, in response to the Woods Task Force Recommendations on Agencies, Boards and Commissions, the Minister announced OCUA and AAC would be disbanded as of August 31, 1996. OCUA's and AAC's responsibilities with regard to academic program approvals were to be assumed by the Ministry.

### **3.1.3. Current Policy: Graduate Programs**

On November 8, 1996 the Ministry announced an interim policy of self-administered regulation for 1996-97 to apply to both undergraduate and graduate programs (see Appendix 3).

#### **3.1.3.1. New Graduate Programs**

New graduate programs may be reported as eligible for operating grants only after (a) successful quality appraisal by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) and (b) review and approval for funding eligibility by the Minister.

#### **3.1.3.2. Existing Graduate Programs**

Existing graduate programs (i.e., those which already have been approved by the Minister for funding eligibility) must maintain an acceptable level of quality, as defined and appraised by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS), in order to continue to be eligible for operating grants. Graduate programs are currently subject to periodic appraisal on a seven-year cycle. Any program that is considered by OCGS to have fallen below an acceptable level of quality, or that has been withdrawn from appraisal, must be reported by OCGS to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities which must, in turn, consider whether the program be withdrawn from funding eligibility.

Further guidance regarding the Ministry's program approval procedures and review criteria can be found in Appendix 3.

#### **3.1.4. Closed, Merged, Rationalized/Restructured Programs**

All closed, merged, and rationalized/restructured programs in the upcoming academic year are to be reported to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities in the Program Developments Report (see Appendix 3) requested each spring.

### 3.1.5. Full-Cost Recovery Programs

Completely new programs<sup>32</sup> that are to be operated solely on a full-cost recovery basis are not subject to Ministry program approval procedures. However, the Ministry does wish to be kept informed of these program developments and the enrolments associated with them. Students in full-cost recovery programs should be reported to the Ministry as ineligible for funding on the required enrolment reports. The programs should be reported in the institution's annual Program Developments Report (see Appendix 3) each Spring.

Any new initiatives whereby students are enrolled on a full-cost recovery basis within regular, publicly-supported programs must be approved by the Ministry in advance of start up. Also, any initiative to convert an existing publicly supported program to full-cost recovery must be approved by the Ministry in advance. No university may simply declare a student who is enrolled in a regular, publicly-supported program ineligible to generate operating formula support.<sup>33</sup>

Normally, full-cost recovery sections within a publicly-supported program will not be considered for approval unless they are similar to existing programs such as the one provided to supernumerary post-graduate medical trainees who are sponsored by foreign governments.

### 3.1.6. Additional Cost Recovery Programs

From 1998-99<sup>34</sup> to 2003-04, universities had the discretion to set additional cost recovery fees for the following programs:

- i. graduate programs;
- ii. undergraduate programs in Business/Commerce (second-entry programs only), Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Optometry, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine; and,
- iii. undergraduate engineering and/or computer science under the Access to Opportunities Program, following Ministerial approval by outlining the university's plan to double the number of entry-level spaces in computer science and/or high-demand fields of engineering by September 2000, with the expectation that there would be a doubling of total enrolment in these programs by program maturity in 2004-05.

Additional cost recovery programs were subject to the same program approval requirement as regular programs (both at the undergraduate and graduate levels).

In 2004-05 and 2005-06 a tuition fee freeze took effect, and as a result no new additional cost recovery fees were introduced over this period.

In April 2006, a Tuition Framework was introduced for 2006-07 to 2009-10 that regulates maximum tuition fee increases in all publicly funded programs, including the above-listed types of programs.

Refer to Section 5.1.2.1 for more historical information on Cost Recovery Fees.

<sup>32</sup> Simply mounting a version of a program "off site" does not in itself constitute a new program for cost-recovery purposes.

<sup>33</sup> International students enrolled in regular, publicly-supported programs may be declared ineligible under the international student tuition fee deregulation policy (see Section 5.1.3).

<sup>33</sup> Letter dated May 6, 1998 from David Trick, Assistant Deputy Minister Postsecondary Division, University Tuition Fee Guidelines, Effective 1998-99.

### **3.1.7. College- University Collaborative Programs**

College-university collaborative programs may be reported as eligible for university operating grants, only after review and approval by the Minister. Universities must comply with the Program Approvals Process as outlined in Appendix 3.

### **3.1.8. Comparator Information on Tuition Fees per Program**

Institutions must indicate in their program approvals submission to the Ministry the proposed fee rate for any new program. As per the tuition fee guidelines, institutions may set the tuition fee for new programs up to a level commensurate with the tuition charged for comparable university programs in Ontario. Fees should not exceed the maximum fee rates charged by other comparable Ontario university programs. Institutions should provide information on the comparator programs used to set the tuition fee level. Comparability is based on factors such as course and program design, credential outcome and assigned BIU weight.

The Ministry will review the appropriateness of the comparator programs chosen to set the tuition fee rate and has the final authority on all decisions of comparability. This information should be submitted in the Program Approval Summary form (Attachment 5 of the program approval submission package outlined in Appendix 3).

## **3.2. CATEGORIZATION AND WEIGHTING**

### **3.2.1. General**

One full-time undergraduate student enrolled for two terms of general degree work offered in a liberal arts program generates one basic income unit. Work in honours, professional and graduate programs is related on a rough cost basis to this basic core.

The categorization scheme does not pretend to reflect precisely the relative costs or the relative importance of each program at each university. There is no intention that the relationship in the categorization table should be reflected in detail in the spending of any university. The formula weights do not necessarily reflect differences in costs among various subjects within a given program or among program years. The formula for which the weights were initially devised was designed merely to produce a reasonably equitable overall distribution of basic grants. Use of weighted enrolment, or basic income units, generated by this categorization scheme in various envelopes of the current distribution mechanism reflects the general belief that relative overall program costs continue to be reasonably well defined by the existing categorization scheme.

The calculation of basic income units (BIUs) from full-time equivalents (FTEs) and formula program of study (FORPOS) weights differs slightly at the undergraduate and graduate levels. A full description of the calculation of FTEs is contained in the USER Reporting Guide. The procedure at the undergraduate level involves multiplying a term FTE count (otherwise known as an FFTE or fiscal full-time equivalent) by an annual weight for the undergraduate FORPOS to come up with the BIU count generated by the student for the term in question. At the graduate level, for fall, winter and spring terms, an annual FTE (1.0 for a full-time student, 0.3 for a part-time student) is multiplied by a term weight for the graduate FORPOS to produce the BIU count generated by the student for the particular term. For the summer session, graduate students are considered to be full-time for one half of a term, and therefore count for 0.5 FTE each. At both levels the BIUs for each term in which the student is present are then summed over the fiscal year to produce the BIU count generated for that fiscal year. See Appendix 4 for annual FTEs and BIUs.

### 3.2.2. Undergraduate: Diploma and First Degree

#### Category 1

#### Annual Weight 1.0

- Administration (Lakehead)
- Arts, First Year Honours
- Arts, General
- Arts and Science, First Year
- Education 5 Year Arts Concurrent, First Year (Toronto)
- Education 5 Year Arts and Science Concentration, First Year (Toronto)
- Education 5 Year Science Concurrent, First Year (Toronto)
- Environmental Studies/Science, First Year Honours
- Environmental Studies/Science, General
- Journalism, First Year
- Science, First Year Honours
- Science, General
- Social Work, First Year
- Theology
- Translators & Interpreters, First Year (Laurentian)
- Undergraduate diploma programs (other than those specifically listed in other categories or otherwise provided for in the USER Reporting Guide).

#### Category 2

#### Annual Weight 1.5

- Accounting - Post BA Diploma
- Art-As-Applied-To-Medicine (Toronto)
- Arts, Upper Years Honours (including Master's level "make-up" year)
- Commerce and Business Administration
- Education, Make-Up
- Education 5 Year Physical or Health Education Concentration, First Year (Toronto)
- Engineering & Management, Management Focused Years (McMaster, Ottawa, UOIT)
- Fine and Applied Arts
- Fine and Applied Arts, Diploma (OCAD only)
- Health Administration (Toronto)
- Law (Professional Program)
- Library Science
- Physical & Health Education
- Physical and Occupational Therapy, Diploma & Degree
- Public Administration, Degree (Ryerson)
- Public Administration, Diploma (Laurentian, Ryerson)
- Social Work, Upper Years only
- Translators & Interpreters, Upper Years (Laurentian)

**Category 3****Annual Weight 2.0**

- Agriculture
- Architecture
- Collaborative Nursing
- Education, Elementary and Secondary
- Education 5 Year Music Concurrent (Toronto)
- Education 5 Year Science Concurrent Upper Years (Toronto)
- Engineering
- Engineering & Management, Engineering Focused Years (McMaster, UOIT)
- Environmental Studies/Science, Upper Years Honours
- Food and Household Sciences
- Forestry
- Hotel and Food Administration (Guelph, Ryerson)
- Hygiene and Public Health
- Industrial Design (Carleton)
- Landscape Architecture, Diploma and Degree
- Music, Diploma and Degree
- Nursing
- Pharmacy (Professional Program)
- Public Health Nursing, Diploma
- Science, Upper Years Honours (including Master's level "make-up" year)

**Category 4****Annual Weight 5.0**

- Dentistry
- Medicine M.D. (except years 1 and 2 of McMaster's 3-year program; see Undergraduate Miscellaneous section)
- Veterinary Medicine

**3.2.3. Undergraduate: Miscellaneous**

Undergraduate programs which do not fall into the previous categories are shown in the following list. For a more complete list of institution-specific programs and the weights assigned to them, refer to the USER Reporting Guide.

	Annual Weight
Arts & Science Combined Program (upper years)	1.75
Dentistry Residents	2.5
Education 5 Year Arts or Phys/Health Conc., Upper Years (Toronto)	1.625
Education 5 Year Arts or Science Conc. (Lakehead)	1.65
Education 5 Year Phys/Health Conc. (Laurentian)	1.6
Engineering and Forestry Technology, Diploma (Lakehead)	1.2
Journalism:	
Honours, Years 2 to 4 and the one-year post-baccalaureate degree (All Year 1 are Category 1, Weight 1)	1.5
Medical Interns and Residents (3 terms)	2.5
Medicine, three years (McMaster)	

Years 1 and 2 only (Year 3 is Category 4, Weight 5.0)	7.5
Pharm D (Toronto)	2.25
Science & Management 5 year Program (UOIT)	1.7
OISE/UT Programs	
Certificate in Adult Education (qualifying or make-up year)	1.0
Master of Arts	1.5
Master of Education (10 units, without honours)	2.0
Ontario College of Art & Design – General Arts Program:	
1976-77 to 1986-87	1.3
1987-88 to 2002-03	1.35
2003-04 to present	1.5
Optometry (4 years, i.e., excluding pre-optometry)	3.0
Physician Assistant Education Program (McMaster)	3.0
Ryerson - All Programs:	
1974-75 to 1976-77	1.34
1977-78 to 1979-80	1.38
1980-81 to 1986-87	1.36
1987-88 to 1993-94	1.42
(Regular weighting applied commencing 1994-95)	
Teacher Education Program (4-year concurrent)	1.25
Undergraduate programs, excluding Law (York)	
1976-77 to 1978-79 only (Regular weighting applied before 1976-77 and after 1978-79.)	1.284
Undifferentiated undergraduate programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science (University of Toronto, Scarborough College and Erindale College):	
1972-73 to 1975-76	1.24
1976-77 to 1977-78	1.279
1978-79 to 1980-81	1.326
1981-82 to 1982-83	1.334
1983-84 to 1985-86	1.37
1986-87 to 1987-88	1.391
1988-89 to 1995-96	1.419
(Fully differentiated reporting commenced 1996-97).	

### 3.2.4. Graduate Programs<sup>35</sup>

#### Category 5

**Annualized Weight 2<sup>36</sup>, Term Weight 1**

Master's level and First Year Ph.D direct from a baccalaureate.

- Commerce and Business Administration
- Hospital Administration
- Journalism
- Public Administration

#### Category 6

**Annualized Weight 3, Term Weight 1**

Master's level and First Year Ph.D direct from baccalaureate.

- Criminology
- Education
- Fine and Applied Arts
- Humanities
- Library Science (other than "make-up" year)
- Law
- Mathematics
- Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.)
- Physical and Health Education
- Social Sciences
- All specialist Graduate Diploma Courses
- Graduate programs not elsewhere specified ( See Section 3.2.5 (2))

#### Category 7

**Annual Weight 4, Term Weight 1.333**

Master's level and First Year Ph.D direct from a baccalaureate.

- Agriculture
- Architecture
- Art Conservation
- Child Study
- Dentistry
- Engineering
- Environmental Studies
- Food and Household Science
- Forestry
- Geography

<sup>35</sup> Annualized weight for graduate programs is based on the term weight multiplied by the number of terms per year in the normal, full-time program.

<sup>36</sup> The Ministry recognizes that some programs in the Category 5 list are run for three terms per year. These programs would be considered Category 6 with an annualized weight of 3.0.

- Hygiene and Public Health
- Medicine
- Music
- Nursing
- Pharmacy
- Physical and Occupational Therapy
- Physiological Optics
- Psychology
- Science (Physical and Biological)
- Social Work
- Urban and Regional Planning
- Veterinary Medicine

### Category 8

**Annual Weight 6, Term Weight 2**

All Ph.D (except First Year Ph.D. direct from a baccalaureate).

### Theology

For theology graduate programs to be considered for an increase in weight to 1.0 for Master's level and 2.0 for Ph. D level (categories 6 and 8), they must be offered under the jurisdiction of the graduate school of the university, and thereby subject to all of the rules and regulations that this implies, in addition to passing the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies quality appraisal process.<sup>37</sup>

The weight for theology graduate programs which are not able to satisfy the conditions stated, will remain at their current level of 0.5 per term for both the Master's and Ph. D levels.

### Graduate: Miscellaneous

Graduate programs which do not fall into the categories defined on page 45 are shown in the following list. For a more complete list of institution-specific programs and the weights assigned to them, refer to the USER Reporting Guide.

	Term Weight
Compressed MBA (Western Ontario)	1.25
Dental Specialty - 3 Years (Toronto)	1.333
Dental Specialty - 4 Years (Toronto)	1.333
Compressed M.Eng. & Public Policy (McMaster)	1.25
Master of Architecture (Toronto)	1.333

<sup>37</sup> Ontario Council on University Affairs Advisory Memorandum, 91-IX "Review of the Formula Weighting for Theology Programs".



### 3.2.5. Special Notes

1. Students in the upper years of honours undergraduate work in psychology, geography and mathematics shall be included in Category 3 (annual weight 2.0) because costs of undergraduate work in these subjects appear to be, on the average, similar to costs in honours science. At the master's level, however, mathematics would seem to be more appropriately grouped with the humanities and social sciences, and is therefore included in Category 6 (annual weight 3.0), while psychology and geography, because of laboratory and field work requirements, are again classed with science and engineering in Category 7 (annual weight 4.0).
2. Graduate programs "not elsewhere specified", as shown in Category 6, include all graduate degree and diploma programs not specifically covered in other categories mentioned in the above categories, or in the USER Reporting Guide.

## 4. ENROLMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Ontario universities are required to submit a series of enrolment reports to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities annually. Each university must report all students who are registered in courses or programs normally credited to a degree, diploma, or certificate of the university, whether or not those students are eligible to be considered in the determination of the Ontario government's operating grant support. This enrolment information is then processed and stored in the Ministry's USER system. Details on the submission of enrolment reports, including schedules and file layouts, are contained in the USER Reporting Guide.

The Ministry requires an audit of the enrolment data of institutions that are eligible to receive Ontario operating grants. The objective of the audit is to render an audit report in the form prescribed in Appendix 5.

A university must bear the adverse consequences of its own errors in enrolment reporting, but will suffer no grant loss in respect of eligible enrolment under-reported if the situation arose because of an oversight on the part of the Ministry. It is the responsibility of the universities to see that no eligible students are unclaimed. Ministry policy with regard to adjustments is contained in the USER Reporting Guide.

Commencing in 2006-07, the Ministry assumed the role of collecting and summarizing data on degrees awarded at Ontario universities and related institutions. Details on the preparation and submission of this information can be found in the USER Reporting Guide.

### 4.1. ELIGIBLE STUDENTS

A student is eligible to be counted for operating grants if that student:

- a) is enrolled at an eligible institution (see Section 2); and
- b) is enrolled in a publicly-supported program (see Section 3); and
- c) is enrolled in a program that meets the specific eligibility criteria for undergraduate courses/units of study discussed in Section 4.4 (only applicable to undergraduate students); or
- d) meets the eligibility criteria for graduate students discussed in Section 4.5 (only applicable to graduate students)

and falls into any of the categories outlined below:

#### 4.1.1. Citizens

A citizen of Canada within the meaning of the Citizenship Act, or a person registered as an Indian within the meaning of the Indian Act.

#### 4.1.2. Permanent Residents

A permanent resident within the meaning of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act:

- a) a person who has been granted "permanent resident" status and has not had that status revoked; or
- b) a person who has been approved "in-principle" for permanent resident status in Canada. Evidence of this is a letter which confirms that Citizenship and Immigration Canada has determined that he/she is eligible for immigration to Canada or meets the eligibility requirements to apply for permanent resident status in Canada. Such letters must be dated prior to the enrolment count date and presented prior to the enrolment report due date. Please see Appendix 5 for examples of accepted letters.

### 4.1.3. Eligible International Students

The status of all international students who are eligible to be counted for operating grant purposes must be fully documented and valid during the academic period for which they are being counted.<sup>38</sup>

An international student is eligible to be counted for operating grant purposes if that student falls within any of the following categories:

- a) A person who is the dependent (see Section 1.1.7 for definition) of a Canadian citizen or permanent resident of Canada.
- b) A visitor, and his/her dependents (see Section 1.1.7 for definition), who is authorized to work in Canada having been issued a work permit. The following students are excluded from this category:
  - i. A visitor who is a graduate teaching assistant;
  - ii. An international student holding a work permit to complete his/her co-op, internship or medical residency employment;
  - iii. An international student holding an open work permit for post-graduate work (usually for up to three years of work opportunities upon graduation);
  - iv. An international student whose spouse or common-law partner has received a work permit as a result of the international student holding a valid Study Permit;
  - v. An international student holding an "Off-Campus Work Permit".
- c) A visitor who is admitted to and remaining in Canada with official accreditation from the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, who has entered Canada, or is in Canada, to carry out her/his official duties as:
  - i. a diplomatic or consular officer;
  - ii. or as a Canadian government-accredited representative or official of a country other than Canada, of the United Nations or any of its agencies, of any intergovernmental organizations of which Canada is a member;
  - iii. or as a dependent (see Section 1.1.7 for definition) or a member of the staff of any such diplomat, consular officer; representative or official accredited to Canada by the Canadian government;
  - iv. or a member of a foreign military force or of a civilian component; thereof admitted to Canada under the Visiting Forces Act or any dependents of such personnel.

### 4.1.4. Protected Persons

A person, and his/her dependents, who:

- a) has been determined to be a protected person, including a Convention refugee or a person in need of protection, within the meaning of subsection 95(2) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act by the Immigration and Refugee Board (IRB) or the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Canada. A protected person document issued under section 31(1) of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act or a "notice of decision" issued by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Canada or by the IRB must be presented.
- b) is a refugee claimant who applied to the federal government for Convention refugee status prior to January 1, 1989, and can provide documentation from Citizenship and Immigration Canada to that effect.

---

<sup>38</sup> Where the status of an eligible international student changes part way through his/her program of study due to circumstances beyond the student's control (e.g., the dependent of a diplomat whose parent is reassigned to another country), the student may be reported as eligible until completion of that program, at which time this grandparenting provision will end. The terms under which such a student is still considered to be in a program are determined at the institutional level.

## 4.2. INELIGIBLE STUDENTS

No university may simply declare a student who is enrolled in a regular publicly-supported program ineligible to be counted for operating grant purposes without consulting the Ministry. This policy was effective beginning with the 1994 winter term.<sup>39, 40</sup>

Students who are properly determined to be ineligible for operating grant purposes are not subject to the fee regulations described in Section 5, with the exception of ineligible international students who are grandparented under the provisions of the international student fee deregulation which took place in 1996-97.<sup>41</sup>

A student is ineligible to be counted for operating grants purposes if that student falls in any of the categories outlined below:

### 4.2.1. Student Auditing Courses

A student who is "auditing" a university credit course (possibly registered in the course, but not taking the course for credit standing) is ineligible. To be claimed as eligible, a student must have taken a course for credit standing. Mere registration in a course does not mean eligibility for operating grant purposes.

### 4.2.2. Full-Cost Recovery Programs

A student who is enrolled on a full-cost recovery basis in a program is ineligible. (See Section 3 for program approval procedures regarding full-cost recovery programs.)

A student, such as a supernumerary post-graduate medical trainee sponsored by a foreign government, who is enrolled on a full-cost recovery basis in a regular, publicly-funded program under a special agreement with a government or corporate sponsor is ineligible. (See Section 3 for program approval procedures regarding full-cost recovery programs).

### 4.2.3. Ineligible Church-Related Institutions

A student who is enrolled in a church-related institution which does not meet the criteria outlined by the Minister's letter June 26, 1975 concerning affiliation with a provincially assisted degree granting institution is ineligible.<sup>42</sup> (See Section 2.2 for more details).

A student who is enrolled in an affiliated church-related institution in a theological program of study introduced after September 1, 1967, which has not met the requirements for program approval as set out in Section 3.1, or in a theological program that was ineligible under the former federal scheme of grants for universities and colleges is ineligible.

A student who is in an affiliated church-related institution in a non-theological program introduced after September 1, 1974, which has not yet met the requirements for program approval set out in Section 3.1 is ineligible.

---

<sup>39</sup> Memorandum of April 21, 1994 from the Honourable Dave Cooke, Minister of Education and Training, to the Executive Heads of the provincially assisted universities and related institutions.

<sup>40</sup> Graduate students who have exceeded the maxima BIU provision are ineligible.

<sup>41</sup> Effective 1996-97, international students enrolled in regular, publicly-supported programs could be declared ineligible under the international student tuition fee deregulation policy that began that year.

<sup>42</sup> Dominican College has special status in this regard. See Section 2.1.1.

#### 4.2.4. Ineligible International Students

An international student who does not fall in any of the categories listed in Section 4.1 is ineligible. An international student studying in Ontario under the terms of a formal exchange agreement may not be claimed as eligible for operating support purposes as per Section 5.3.

#### 4.2.5. Ineligible Students: Miscellaneous

##### 4.2.5.1. Ineligible Undergraduate Students

An ineligible undergraduate student is one who:

- a) is enrolled in an undergraduate program of study for which Ministry funding approval is required but has not been obtained;
- b) is enrolled in a joint/collaborative program with a college or another university where that student is counted fully by the other institution.
- c) is registered in the first year of undergraduate degree program and, on the applicable count date, has not successfully completed the requirements for the Ontario Secondary School Honour Graduation Diploma (SSHGD) or the Ontario Secondary School Diploma with six Ontario Academic Credits (OSSD with 6 OACs) or the Ontario Secondary School Diploma (OSS) with six Grade 12 U or M courses (or a combination of Grade 12 U, M or OAC courses) or the equivalent, with the exception of:
  - i. a mature student;
  - ii. a student registered in Music at the University of Toronto who has completed the requirements for the Ontario Secondary School Graduation Diploma (SSGD) or the Ontario Secondary School Diploma (OSSD) or the equivalent from other educational jurisdictions and has certain additional qualifications in music;
  - iii. a student who is registered in the transitional year program at the University of Toronto or York University who lacks the ordinary entrance qualifications because of economic, social, cultural or ethnic factors; or
  - iv. a student who is registered in a collaborative nursing program that has been approved by the Ministry.

##### 4.2.5.2. Ineligible Graduate Students

An ineligible graduate student is one who:

- a) is enrolled in a graduate program introduced after Spring, 1971 which has not received approval in writing from the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities or for which funding approval has been withdrawn;
- b) is enrolled in a program of study that has not been favourably appraised by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies; (Note that appraisal is mandatory for Ph.D. programs established after January 1, 1969 and Master's programs established after July 1, 1967);
- c) for whom the maximum number of BIUs have already been reported (see Section 4.5); or

- d) is registered but inactive. (This would include a student working on his/her thesis and not making substantial demands on the resources of the institution.)
- e) is enrolled in a joint/collaborative program with a college or another university where that student is counted fully by the other institution.

### **4.3. PART-TIME STUDIES**

Any university claiming support for students not engaged in studies on a full-time basis will be expected to meet the following criteria:

#### **4.3.1. Faculty and Teaching Staff**

Instructors of part-time students are full members of the appropriate department and faculty with the full privileges and responsibilities of any regular or part-time faculty member. Appointments to the faculty, terms and conditions of work, including remuneration, should be consistent within the institution irrespective of whether a faculty member is teaching full-time or part-time students. Payment for services rendered should be based upon a regular teaching load, without regard to the time of day at which courses are taught. Overload teaching is not precluded in special circumstances.

#### **4.3.2. Academic Structure**

The development of courses of study for part-time students should be handled within the normal university structure under the direction of the senate or appropriate academic governing body. In universities where a college system is operative, it may be deemed appropriate to establish or maintain a special college having specific responsibility for part-time students. In such cases, the college itself, as well as the members of the teaching faculty and students, should have the same relationship to the university, including participation in the governing structure, as would prevail with any other college.

#### **4.3.3. Admissions, Examinations and Academic Regulations**

Regulations for part-time students should be built into the overall academic structure in such a way that the requirements for admission, promotion, degrees, etc., applying to part-time students are identical with those for full-time students. Special regulations for mature students, for example, should be university-wide or faculty-wide, without respect to whether a student is proceeding towards a degree on a part-time or full-time basis. While it is recognized that some special academic regulations for part-time students in particular may be required, these and academic regulations of a similar nature not specially for part-time students should be developed and administered by the same bodies and in the same manner.

#### **4.3.4. Scheduling**

The university should schedule its classes on an integrated extended day program basis which allows part-time students to enroll in classes offered during either day or evening hours and full-time students to attend classes specifically scheduled for part-time students when practical. The foregoing does not apply to work done through correspondence courses.

#### **4.3.5. Interpretation**

Any question with respect to the eligibility of part-time students at university should be submitted in writing to the Director, Postsecondary Finance and Information Management Branch, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

#### **4.4. REPORTING OF UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL STUDENTS**

For purposes of calculating and reporting fiscal FTEs (FFTEs) for undergraduate students, a number of specialized definitions apply:

##### **4.4.1. Definitions**

###### **4.4.1.1. Term**

A period of studies (including examinations) at a university, of about 15 to 17 weeks in length; or one half an academic year; or a semester; or the equivalent, as determined by a university. The terms are deemed to be: spring term (May - August); fall term (September - December); winter term (January - April). At some institutions, summer sessions and/or intersessions also exist. These sessions are about six weeks in length, and provide the equivalent of a term of study in a limited number of courses. These sessions normally take place between May and September.

###### **4.4.1.2. Academic Year**

An academic year consists of a period of studies (including examinations) normally comprising the months of September to April/May inclusive, or the equivalent<sup>43</sup>.

###### **4.4.1.3. Normal Full-Time Study Load**

The normal full-time study load of an academic year in a program is that which would enable qualified persons whose principal activity is study at a university, to qualify for the university's degree or diploma in a specified normal number of academic years or terms for that program, assuming for purposes of definition, no more than one attempt at any part of those studies.

###### **4.4.1.4. Unit of Study**

A course, credit, credit hour or other unit of measurement established by a university to represent one part of the total requirements for completion of a degree or diploma program.

###### **4.4.1.5. Registration Level**

The ordinal number of years, terms, semesters, etc. employed by a university to indicate the standing of a student in the various stages or levels of a program (e.g. first year student, second year student, first semester student, etc.).

###### **4.4.1.6. Fiscal Full-Time Equivalent (FFTE)**

One FFTE is represented by a student whose study load in the fiscal year is equal to the normal full-time study load for his or her program and level of registration in the academic year.

---

<sup>43</sup> However, academic program structures that require co-op or internship periods could span different fiscal years.

#### **4.4.2. Application of Definitions**

The great variety of programs leading to degrees and diplomas means that the calculation of FFTEs by each institution will be determined by the nature of the program itself while, at the same time, complying with the intent of the above definitions provided in Section 4.4. Some examples are provided as guidelines:

##### **4.4.2.1. FFTE of Programs Defined by Unit of Study**

Some programs measure progress toward the degree or diploma and express requirements for completing the program in exact numbers of units of study. For such programs, the "normal full-time study load" for an academic year is the total number of units of study required to complete the program, divided by the number of academic years of full-time study specified for that program. The FFTEs for a term are calculated by dividing the number of units of study registered by students in the program on the term count date, by the "normal full-time study load" for the academic year.

##### **4.4.2.2. FFTE of Programs Defined by Academic Year**

Some programs measure student progress toward the degree or diploma in "blocks" of study, usually of an academic year in duration. All work prescribed is compulsory, and promotion is from one "registration level" to the next rather than by discrete units of study. There is no part-time study, and students are not permitted to complete the degree or diploma requirements in less than the specified number of academic years or terms of full-time study. The only instance where a study overload is taken is for repeating failed work. In this case, the "normal full-time study load" is the total work of the academic year. The FFTEs for the term are equal to half the number of students registered in the program on the count date of the term.

##### **4.4.2.3. FFTE of Programs Incorporating Normal Full-Time Study Load**

Some programs, particularly some honour and professional programs, prescribe variable "normal full-time study loads" reflecting the fact that within the same program there may be differences in the work expected of individual students for the same degree or diploma. This arises because of differences in enrichment or emphasis. For such programs the "normal full-time study load" is any amount of work within the range prescribed. For students whose study loads are outside the range, the "normal full-time study load" would be the mid-point of the range, unless the institution identifies a point more representative of the loads of students engaged in full-time study in that program. The FFTEs for a term would be equal to half the number of students within the range of the "normal full-time study load" and, for students whose study loads are outside the range, the FFTEs would be determined by the sum of the study loads taken by such students in the term, divided by the normal full-time study load for the academic year. The total FFTEs for the term is the sum of the two situations above.

##### **4.4.2.4. FFTE of Students in Credit Courses/Units of Study**

In the case of students not registered in programs leading to degrees or diplomas but enrolled in units of study which are normally credited toward degrees or diplomas, the "normal full-time study load" and the method of calculating the FFTEs is governed by the program to which the units of study are usually credited.



#### 4.4.2.5. FFTE of Students in Summer Session

The FFTEs for students registered on the applicable count dates in the summer sessions or intersessions are calculated by multiplying the number of student registrants by the fraction, in credit value, that the unit of study represents of the "normal full time study load" of the program for the academic year.

#### 4.4.3. Concurrent Programs

Students concurrently registered in two distinct programs of study at the same institution may be reported in both programs. However, the FFTEs claimed under each program should reflect the course load for only that program. In the event that a student is registered in a course which could be equally well applied to either program of study, it is up to the institution to decide under which program the course will be counted. The course may not be counted under more than one program for that student at any one count date.

#### 4.4.4. Eligibility of Courses/Units of Study

For a course or other unit of study to be eligible to be included in the calculation of eligible FFTEs:

- a) it must be taken for credit;
- b) it must normally be acceptable for credit as fulfilling in part the requirements for a degree or diploma of that institution; and
- c) the student must be held academically responsible for his or her achievement in it (i.e., success, failure, etc. must be noted on the student's permanent record) in a way consistent with treatment of all courses or other units of study in that program.

A course or other unit of study normally credited toward a diploma may not be regarded as eligible to be included in the calculation of eligible FFTEs in a degree program unless it is normally accepted by the institution as fulfilling in part the requirements for a degree.

#### 4.4.5. Diploma or Certificate Programs

Effective May 1, 1986, courses or other units of study within undergraduate diploma or certificate programs at Ontario universities may be included in the calculation of eligible FFTEs only if:

- a) the course is eligible for credit toward a degree as approved by a senate or governing Council;
- b) the minimum admission requirements for the certificate or diploma program are the same as those for degree students; and
- c) similar methods of academic assessment are employed for degree, diploma and certificate students.<sup>44</sup>

#### 4.4.6. Certificate Programs at Ryerson

Effective May 1, 1986, courses or other units of study within certificate programs at Ryerson may be included in the calculation of eligible FFTEs only if:

- a) the course has been approved as part of an existing degree or diploma program and is transferable for full credit towards a degree or diploma program;
- b) minimum admission requirements are the same as for degree or diploma students;
- c) similar methods of academic assessment are employed for degree, diploma and certificate students.

---

<sup>44</sup> Ontario Council on University Affairs Advisory Memorandum 85-1.

#### 4.4.7. Additional Qualification Courses for Teachers

The Treasurer of Ontario announced on April 23, 1993, as part of the government's expenditure control plan measures, that government funding of enrolments in additional qualification courses for teachers would be phased out during a four-year period, 1993-94 to 1996-97. Commencing 1997-98, these courses were no longer eligible for any government support.

#### 4.4.8. Differentiating Enrolment Between Honours and General Programs in Arts and Science

The following guidelines were adopted by the Ministry<sup>45</sup> following acceptance of the recommendations put forward by the Ontario Council on University Affairs in Advisory Memorandum 90-V, "Differentiation Between honours and general Programs in Arts and Science".

The guidelines were developed in response to the Minister's request for advice as to whether there should be a uniform system to differentiate honours and general students for enrolment reporting purposes.<sup>46</sup> The basic aims of the guidelines are to ensure fair and consistent reporting practices. A common approach in differentiating between honours and general programs is employed. In general:

- a) all institutions must use the students' own declarations of the programs the students are pursuing in order to support honours/general reporting;
- b) institutions must test the student declarations against their own academic policies and procedures in order to ensure that the courses the students have completed and those in which they are currently registered and their academic records support the reasonableness of institutional claims; and
- c) institutions are held accountable for their application of these tests through the audit of enrolment.

##### 4.4.8.1. Student Declarations

Procedures for obtaining/maintaining student declarations should be as simple and straightforward as possible, and yet provide accurate, up-to-date information.

Procedures and documentation requirements may vary among institutions; however, the information required on the declaration should be collected systematically and fairly.

A student declaration is required for each student that the institution proposes to report in Arts or Science at a weight greater than one and it must indicate that the student is pursuing a four-year, honours or specialist degree in a specified discipline or disciplines.

##### 4.4.8.2. Initial Student Declarations:

The students, who are the primary agents in deciding what degree and program they are pursuing, must make an active initial declaration of intent, that is to say:

- a) the first declaration must be the individual student's own statement -- or a similar act of volition in the case of electronic registration, such as choosing from a list of unbiased options and then

<sup>45</sup> Letter of November 21, 1990 from the Honourable Richard Allen, Minister of Colleges and Universities, to Dr. H.V. Nelles, Chairman, Ontario Council on University Affairs.

<sup>46</sup> Letters of February 15 and May 29, 1989 from the Honourable Lyn McLeod, Minister of Colleges and Universities, to Dr. H.V. Nelles, Interim Chairman, Ontario Council on University Affairs.

- entering an appropriate selection -- not that of the university or any other party;
- b) this declaration must be made at the time that the student has the first opportunity to enter a four-year honours or specialist program;
- c) this declaration must be freely made -- the student must not be led into making this statement by such devices as a pre-printed response; and
- d) the student's signature (or a bona fide proxy, approved in writing by the Ministry, in the case of electronic registration) is required.

#### 4.4.8.3. Subsequent Student Declarations:

Student declarations, subsequent to the initial one, are required each time the student is asked to register his or her program of courses. These declarations:

- a) are to be made in a formal manner;
- b) must be "active" in nature (as indicated above) when a change is required of such magnitude as to alter the student's program or honours/general classification;
- c) may be simply a confirmation of the student's registration status, if not subject to the "active" provision above (e.g., no change at all or merely a course drop/add change).

The university must have on file, for each applicable count date, a current and accurate record of the student declaration for each student in Arts or Science at a weight greater than one for whom the institution is seeking formula funding.

#### 4.4.8.4. University Attestations

As with student declarations, university attestation procedures and documentation requirements may vary among institutions. Although each university's attestation procedure may be developed independently of the other universities and is to be based on the institution's own academic policies, the attestation must contain at least the following elements:

- a) The student must have successfully completed the university's first year requirements and the requirements for entry into an honours or a four-year specialist program in Arts or Science. (In the case of universities on credit systems, this would normally mean that a student must have successfully completed at least four full courses or eight half courses before he/she may be reported in the upper years honours category.)
- b) The procedure must assess whether the student had met, or could reasonably be expected to meet, the university's requirements for a specialist or honours degree in the specified discipline(s), given the courses enrolled in and the work completed to date. This examination of the students' records must include:
  - The courses completed and registered in with regard to the subject of specialization;
  - The seniority of the courses of the subjects(s) of specialization completed or registered in; and
  - The academic record of the students, all in relation to the university's own academic requirements.

The attestation procedure must also verify whether the student has obtained all necessary approvals from appropriate authorities in the university.

The institution's external auditor must ensure that the above minimums, at the very least, are met.

Students may be categorized as honours/specialists for enrolment reporting purposes only if:

- a) their declarations indicate that they are pursuing a specialized or honours program leading to a four-year degree, and
- b) they state the subject(s) of specialization, and
- c) the institution's test of the students' declaration substantiate the reasonableness of the students' claim.

The university must have on file, for each applicable count date, a current and accurate record of the university attestation for each student in Arts or Science at a weight greater than one for whom the institution is seeking formula funding.

A detailed description of each university's specific methodology for obtaining and verifying student declarations is to be sent to the Ministry, in writing, prior to implementation of the methodology under the guidelines outlined here. After reviewing the submission, the Ministry will provide written confirmation regarding the compliance of the methodology to these guidelines. What is sent to the Ministry must be the description that the institution's external auditor will use to verify that the institution has adhered to its own regulations. (Any significant change to this description requires Ministry confirmation.)

Each institution's description of the specific methodology for verifying student declarations (and any subsequent changes) will be circulated by the Ministry to the other universities for their information.

#### **4.4.8.5. Implementation**

In keeping with the concept of openness and fairness, matters requiring Ministry interpretation/clarification will be transacted in writing by both the institution concerned and the Ministry; the outcome(s) of this procedure will be made known to the other institutions by the Ministry.

Enrolment reporting under the guidelines became effective in 1992-93. The effects of the guidelines on reported BIU counts were phased-in over a five-year period, to be fully implemented by the end of 1996-97.

Institutions were permitted to omit the phase-in process, if they so chose and were able to demonstrate that reporting all applicable Arts and Science enrolment under the new guidelines would result in a reduction or no change in applicable BIU counts. Institutions were to advise the Ministry, in writing, of their intentions in this regard when they submitted the initial enrolment report using these (new) guidelines.<sup>47</sup>

For those institutions opting to phase-in the effects of the guidelines, their "blended" Arts and Science BIU counts are to be used for funding purposes. These "blended" counts are based on one-fifth of the enrolment reported under the new reporting requirements and four-fifths under the old reporting requirements in 1992-93, two-fifths "new" and three-fifths "old" in 1993-94, and so forth until 1996-97 when all Arts and Science BIU counts will be based on enrolment reported under the new guidelines only, i.e., with no blending.

---

<sup>47</sup> Letter of March 25, 1991 from the Honourable Richard Allen, Minister of Colleges and Universities, to the Executive Heads of the provincially assisted universities and related institutions.

For funding in 1993-94, the first funding year of the phase-in period, each institution will have included in its moving average the greater of:

- a) its "blended" Arts and Science BIUs calculated for 1992-93, or
- b) its Arts and Science BIUs reported for 1992-93 under the old guidelines minus 1 per cent.

For funding in 1994-95, each institution will have included in its moving average the greater of:

- a) its "blended" Arts and Science BIUs calculated for 1993-94, or
- b) its "blended" Arts and Science BIUs calculated for 1992-93 minus 1 per cent,

and so on, by updating calculations for successive years up to and including funding year 1997-98, the last funding year of the phase-in period.

Commencing funding year 1998-99, BIUs for each new year to be added to the moving average will incorporate Arts and Science BIUs reported only under the new guidelines.

This methodology will ensure an orderly progression to the new guidelines for the few institutions significantly affected by the changes and, at the same time, allow institutions to adapt, as appropriate, during the phase-in period.

Enrolment and associated major trends will be monitored in order to provide confidence in the data reported under the guidelines, i.e., to ensure that there is a reasonable degree of inter-institutional consistency in enrolment reporting and to ensure satisfaction of the fairness and comparability of the enrolment data used.

#### **4.4.9. Arts and Science Programs Not Differentiated Between General and Honours**

All students in undifferentiated programs in Arts and in Science not assigned a special weight (that is, a weight greater than 1.0) should be reported as if they were enrolled in the general course, except in the case of fourth year students (who are readily acknowledged as being in the honours category) and except for students in lower years who by virtue of academic standing, or other appropriate criteria embodied in university regulations, may reasonably be considered honours students.

Criteria for such differentiation, if they affect the calculation of funding BIUs, are subject to approval by the Ministry. Universities reporting second and third year students in Arts and in Science as honours should have a clearly differentiated honours program of study in Arts and/or in Science which is clearly distinct from the general program of study, or should have a record on file of the Ministry's approval of the academic criteria in use by the university for the differentiation of honours students for reporting purposes.

Commencing 1992-93, the criteria for differentiating honours and general enrolment in Arts and Science programs must conform to Ministry guidelines.

#### 4.4.10. Imputing Procedure for Undifferentiated First Year Programs

Where a university employs an undifferentiated program, it is usually impossible to determine first year enrolments which would carry a weight in excess of 1.0 for first year, as first year students are not differentiated until they pass into their second year. In these circumstances, for purposes of calculating the BIU counts which would be generated by these students, enrolments in such programs shall be imputed as follows:

For each program carrying a weight in excess of 1.0 for first year:

- a) Determine for year A, the ratio of second-year enrolment in that program to total second year enrolment.
- b) Calculate provisional first year enrolment in that program by applying this ratio to total first year enrolment.
- c) A year later, on the basis of programs actually taken by the former first year students now in second year, redetermine the ratio.
- d) Apply the amended ratio to year A's total first year enrolment. The result, for BIU count purposes, will be the final first year enrolment in that program for year A.
- e) An imputing adjustment in year B will be reported for the difference between provisional and final first year enrolment in that program in year A.

The above procedure can be extended to the second year of programs whose students are not identifiable as being enrolled in them until the third year. Ministry approval is required to claim imputed BIUs for funding. Such BIUs will be treated as normal BIUs for the purpose of financing.

### 4.5. REPORTING OF GRADUATE LEVEL STUDENTS

#### 4.5.1. Graduate Student Status

A graduate student claimed for operating grant purposes must:

- 1) be engaged in studies requiring an honours undergraduate degree, or its equivalent, as a prerequisite for admission -- except for students enrolled in Category 5<sup>48</sup> graduate programs where the honours degree admission requirement does not apply. (Students holding an undergraduate general degree, or its equivalent, and enrolled in programs listed under Categories 6, 7 and 8 should be identified as "qualifying year" or "make-up" students and reported as undergraduates.)
- 2) be making substantial demands upon the resources of the university where registered;
- 3) not be enrolled in a baccalaureate program in any of the following professional fields: social work, library science, law, medicine, teacher education (even if such a student possesses an honours undergraduate degree, he or she is not considered to be a graduate student);
- 4) not be ineligible for any of the reasons outlined in Section 4.2.

---

<sup>48</sup> See Section 3.2.4 for a listing of categories.

#### 4.5.2. Full-Time Graduate Student

A full-time graduate student must:

- 1) be pursuing his or her studies as a full-time occupation;
- 2) identify himself or herself as a full-time graduate student;
- 3) be designated by the university as a full-time graduate student;
- 4) be geographically available and visit the campus regularly. Without forfeiting full-time status, graduate student, while still under supervision, may be absent from the university (e.g., visiting libraries, doing field work, attending a graduate course at another institution, etc.) provided that, if any such period of absence exceeds four weeks in any one term, written evidence shall be available in the Graduate Studies Office to the effect that the absence has the approval of the Chairman of the Department and the Dean of Graduate Studies;<sup>49</sup>
- 5) be considered to be a full-time graduate student by his/her supervisor or equivalent (designated by the university);

As well as meeting the requirements for full-time status listed above, a student reported as belonging to the special category known as "summer school graduate student", must have been enrolled in a graduate full-time summer program of not less than six week's duration. The full-time equivalents of summer school graduate students are arrived at by multiplying student numbers by a conversion factor of 0.50.

If reported as a full-time summer school graduate student in the enrolment for a term report, a student could not also, for that term, be reported as a part-time student. The general rule is that no student may be counted in more than one basic category (full-time, part-time or summer school) in any one term.

#### 4.5.3. Part-Time Graduate Students

All active graduate students other than full-time graduate students as defined above are part-time graduate students.

#### 4.5.4. Counting of Graduate Student FTE

Graduate enrolment is counted on a per term basis, as for undergraduates. Enrolment for two terms is required for the completion of a "year" for students in Category 5 (annualized weight 2)<sup>50</sup>, while three terms would be required for each full "year" in Categories 6 (annualized weight 3), 7 (annualized weight 4) and 8 (annualized weight 6). Accordingly, students in Category 5 and Category 6 will earn a weight of 1.000 for each term of attendance, while Category 7 and 8 students will earn, per term, weights of 1.333 and 2.000 respectively.

The requirements for graduate student status are detailed in Section 4.5.

---

<sup>49</sup> Written evidence of approved absence for full-time graduate students is not required for students who are attending another university as part of a Ministry approved collaborative program in accordance with Section 4.6.2.

<sup>50</sup> See Section 3.2.4 for a listing of categories.

Minimum and maximum limits apply to the number of BIUs which a graduate student can generate for a university. See Section 4.5.5.

Counting for graduate students should be as follows: 1 full-time graduate student equals 1.000 FTE per term; 1 part-time graduate student equals 0.300 FTE per term in the spring, fall and winter terms and 0.500 in the summer sessions.<sup>51</sup>

#### 4.5.5. Minima-Maxima Provisions

The purpose of the minima/maxima provisions is to ensure that the total of funding units claimed for a graduate student fall within a defined range, independent of the actual number of years required by the individual student to complete his or her program of study. These ranges are as follows:

FORPOS Category <sup>52</sup>	Minima	Maxima
Category 6 (Annualized Weight 3.0)	3 BIUs	6 BIUs
Category 7 (Annualized Weight 4.0)	4 BIUs	8 BIUs
Category 8 (Annualized Weight 6.0) <sup>53</sup>	21 BIUs	27 BIUs

The minima/maxima provisions are intended to apply only to programs involving a dissertation and ordinarily extending beyond a single academic session. It is for this reason that enrolment in Category 5 programs and in graduate diploma courses are excluded from the minima/maxima provisions. Theology programs reported at a weight of 0.5 per term are considered to fall within Category 5 for purposes of the minima/maxima provisions.

Minima and maxima provisions for graduate enrolment in education programs apply to students first registering after June 30, 1971.

##### 4.5.5.1. Effective Dates

The limits shown above came into effect commencing with the 1968-69 academic session, which was the first year for accumulating units to be counted against individual students (1971-72 for students in education programs). The minima entitlement provisions apply only to students whose graduate studies began in 1968-69 or later (1971-72 in the case of students in education programs).

##### 4.5.5.2. Minima Provisions

If, upon graduation, the total units claimed for a student fall short of the indicated minimum for his or her program, the shortfall may then be claimed as a minimum adjustment. Since it is not possible to predict on given reporting dates whether particular students will in fact be graduating at the conclusion of the semester being reported on, claims for students under the minimum provision should be made after they graduate.

<sup>51</sup> Graduate FTE counting differs from undergraduate FFTE counting. Undergraduate students are counted as portions of a normal full-time load for the academic year as outlined in Section 4.4.

<sup>52</sup> See Section 3.2.4 for a listing of categories.

<sup>53</sup> Calculation of claims under these provisions must take into account all units claimed for students while they were in Category 6 or 7 programs.



#### **4.5.5.3. Maxima Provisions**

Students who are still in attendance and who have reached their maximum limit in total BIUs should be reported as ineligible to be counted for operating grant purposes, and no further BIUs may be claimed on their behalf.

#### **4.5.5.4. Claiming (or Deducting) of BIUs Under Minima/Maxima Provisions**

The report of BIUs claimed or deducted under these provisions should be submitted to the Ministry on the prescribed form along with the enrolment submissions. Claims under the minima provisions should be made on the form submitted immediately following the graduation of the student for whom entitlement is being claimed.

Students partially exceeding the maximum in the term being reported should be shown on the enrolment submission so as to generate the full BIU count in that term, and then the appropriate reduction to attain the maximum should be shown on the minima/maxima form; formula fees will be deducted for all such students. Students who are still in attendance and who have entirely exceeded their maximum limit should be reported as ineligible for grant purposes. Students for whom no units are claimed will not have formula fees charged against them.

#### **4.5.5.5. Transfer of Entitlement**

Students transferring into the Ontario system with advanced graduate standing shall have the number of BIUs ordinarily associated with the obtaining of such standing attributed to them.

Ineligible international students who become eligible shall have the number of BIUs attributed to them as if they had always been an eligible student.

Students in ineligible graduate programs that become eligible graduate programs shall have the number of BIUs attributed to them as if they had always been in an eligible program.

A graduate student transferring from one university to another within the Ontario system shall transfer only the remainder of his or her maximum total units.

Graduate students who transfer to graduate programs other than those originally embarked upon and on which units were earned will be dealt with as follows:

- a) where advanced standing was granted, the units ordinarily associated with the obtaining of such standing should be attributed to the student; and
- b) where no advanced standing was granted, no units previously claimed for the student need be carried forward.

## **4.6. JOINT/COLLABORATIVE PROGRAMS**

### **4.6.1. College-University Joint/Collaborative Programs**

Institutions should report students registered in joint/collaborative college of applied arts & technology - university programs eligible for funding in one of the following ways:

- a) in an academic year where students are studying simultaneously at both the community college and the university, the institutions may report their respective proportions of the total student course (without double counting enrolment activity) as eligible to be counted for operating grant purposes;
- b) where a student is taking the program sequentially at one institution and then the other, changing after each complete term or set of terms, each institution may report the student as eligible to be counted for operating grant purposes for the term or terms that the student is studying there;
- c) one institution may report the student as eligible for operating grant purposes for the entire duration of the program.

### **4.6.2. Multi-University Joint/Collaborative Programs**

Institutions should report students registered in joint/collaborative eligible for funding programs with other universities in one of the following ways:

- a) in an academic year where students are studying simultaneously at two or more universities, each institution may report their respective proportions of the total student course (without double counting enrolment activity) as eligible to be counted for operating grant purposes;
- b) where a student is taking the program sequentially at one university and then another, changing after each complete term or set of terms, each institution may report the student as eligible to be counted for operating grant purposes for the term or terms that the student is studying there;
- c) one institution may report the student as eligible for operating grant support for the entire duration of the program.

When more than one university is reporting students in a multi-university joint/collaborative program, all universities must report the students using the same FORPOS code(s) and weight(s) as assigned by the Ministry during the program approval process and must be in compliance with the tuition fee guidelines in effect at that time.

Commencing in 2008-09, institutions are required to identify joint/collaborative programs with other institutions in their USER enrolment. For more information, please refer to the COLLAB element in the USER Reporting Guide.

## **4.7. ENROLMENT RELATED SUBMISSIONS**

The following enrolment related reports and data are required to be submitted to the Ministry throughout the year.

#### **4.7.1. USER Enrolment Counts**

Enrolment count data files are to be submitted electronically using the format/layout defined in and in accordance with the schedule outlined in the latest version of the USER Reporting Guide. Files are to be transmitted to the Ministry via the Secure Online Data Transmission (SODT) utility (see below for connection details).

Separate enrolment data files must be submitted for each academic term.

#### **4.7.2. Anticipated Actuals Winter Form**

An Anticipated Actuals Winter form that summarizes winter enrolment estimates is due on 15 December. This form can be found in Appendix 6 and will be distributed electronically.

#### **4.7.3. Minima/Maxima Adjustments Claim Form**

One Minima/Maxima claim form is to be submitted for each term at the same time as the enrolment data. This form can be found in Appendix 6 and will be distributed electronically.

#### **4.7.4. Imputing Adjustments Claim Form**

One Imputing Adjustments claim form is to be submitted for each term at the same time as the enrolment data. This form can be found in Appendix 6 and will be distributed electronically.

#### **4.7.5. Degrees Awarded Data**

Commencing in 2006-07, the Ministry assumed the role of collecting and summarizing data on degrees awarded at Ontario universities and related institutions.

Degrees awarded data files are to be submitted electronically once per year in accordance with the format/layout and schedule outlined in the latest version of the USER Reporting Guide. Files are to be transmitted to the Ministry via the Secure Online Data Transmission (SODT) utility (see below for connection details).

#### **4.7.6. Undergraduate & Graduate Projections**

Institutions are required to provide undergraduate and graduate enrolment projections as well as details on collaborative programs in October/November. Forms, guidelines and the specific due date for this requirement are distributed in advance of the deadline.

#### **4.7.7. Submitting Enrolment Data to MTCU**

All enrolment data reports should be submitted to MTCU through the Ministry's Secure Online Data Transmission service (SODT). This service is accessible via an Internet browser at the following address: <https://www.psa.qsa.gov.on.ca>

(For log-in-account details and instructions, please contact the Universities Finance Unit)

## **5. SPECIAL PROVISIONS**

### **5.1. TUITION FEES**

#### **5.1.1. Regular Tuition Fees**

Standard ("formula") tuition fee levels are taken into account in the calculation of the operating grant entitlements for each institution. In setting its own support levels, the government considers the basic operating income of the institutions, of which fees are a part. Current standard fee rates are listed in Appendix 10.

#### **5.1.2. Discretionary Fees**

Through their individual acts of incorporation, Ontario universities have full legal authority to establish their own fee levels. The government's tuition fee policy guidelines provide for a penalty in the form of a grant reduction for fees charged above permitted levels. This applies only to students who are in programs eligible for government support.

The government introduced a provision in 1980-81 allowing institutions to charge a discretionary portion, in addition to standard tuition fees, without a reduction in government operating grants. The revenue accruing from the discretionary portion of the fees is not considered to form part of basic operating income and thus may be applied to any category of expenditure, with the exception noted below for 1996-97.

Commencing 1980-81, the discretionary portion was set at 10 percent, allowing institutions to charge up to 110 percent of the standard fee without grant penalty.

Commencing 1987-88, as a result of changes in policy governing ancillary fee structures, the discretionary portion was increased to 13 percent, providing for tuition fee rates of up to 113 percent of the standard fees without a reduction in operating grants.

For 1996-97, the discretionary portion was increased by an additional 10 percent. Universities could apply the additional 10 percent discretionary fee on an institution-wide basis. Provided that the revenue generated across all programs did not exceed 123 percent of the total standard fee revenue across all programs and no single increase from the discretionary component exceeded 20 percent, (or 33 percent above the standard fee rate) no grant penalty would be assessed. Appendix 10 shows the implications of this policy on standard fee rates. Ten percent of the additional tuition fee revenues were to be reserved for local student aid (calculated as 10 percent of the difference between the 1995-96 and 1996-97 fee levels, including the discretionary portion, applied to 1996-97 FTE eligible enrolments).

In 1997-98 the discretionary portion was increased by an additional 10 percent. Universities had the option of increasing average fees by zero to 10 percent (or 35.3 percent above the standard fee rate) to a maximum increase of 20 percent (or 59.6 percent above the standard fee rate) for any single program without a grant penalty being assessed.

In 1998-99 the discretionary portion was increased on average by up to 5 percent to improve the quality of students' programs and an additional 5 percent to invest in additional education program improvements (or in total 48.83 percent above the standard fee rate) to a maximum increase of 20 percent (or 75.56 percent above the standard fee rate) for any single program without a grant penalty being assessed.

For 1999-00, the discretionary portion was increased by an additional 9.09 percent. Universities had the option of increasing average tuition fees for all regulated programs by 0 percent to 9.09 percent (or up to

62.36 percent above the standard fee rate) to a maximum increase of 20 percent (or 91.52 percent above the standard fee rate) for any single program, without a grant penalty being assessed. Institutions were allowed to apply the additional 9.09 percent discretionary fee on an institution-wide basis.

On March 14, 2000, a five-year tuition fee policy for 2000-01 through 2004-05 was announced. Under this policy, universities could choose to increase tuition fees by a maximum average increase of 10 percent for most programs over the years 2000-01 through 2004-05. During this period, average fees could be increased annually by an amount equal to no more than 2 percent of 1999-2000 average tuition levels. Year-over-year percentage increases may not be compounded. Institutions may increase regulated tuition fee rates by an annual maximum of 20 per cent for any single program, as long as the average increase is no more than 2 percent.

Institutions that had not increased fees by the maximum allowable prior to 2000-01 were permitted to “catch up” to the maximum average fee.

In 2000-01, the first year of the five-year policy was implemented through an increase of 2 percent in the discretionary portion. Universities had the option of increasing average fees for all regulated programs by 0 percent to 2 percent (or 65.61 percent above the standard fee rate) to a maximum increase of 20% (or 129.82 percent above the standard fee rate) for any single program without a grant penalty being assessed.

For 2001-02, the second year of the five-year policy was implemented through an additional increase of 1.96 percent in the discretionary portion. Universities had the option of increasing average fees for all regulated programs by 0 percent to 1.96 percent (or up to 68.85 percent above the standard fee rate) to a maximum increase of 20 percent (or 175.79 percent above the standard fee rate) for any single program, without a grant penalty being assessed. Institutions were allowed to apply the additional 1.96 percent discretionary fee on an institution-wide basis.

For 2002-03, the third year of the five-year policy, the discretionary portion was increased by an additional 1.92 percent. Universities had the option of increasing average fees for all regulated programs by 0 percent to 1.92 percent (or up to 72.10 percent above the standard fee rate) to a maximum increase of 20 percent (or 181.09 percent above the standard fee rate) for any single program, without a grant penalty being assessed. Institutions were allowed to apply the additional 1.92 percent discretionary fee on an institution-wide basis.

For 2003-04, the fourth year of the five-year policy, the discretionary portion was increased by an additional 1.89 percent. Universities had the option of increasing average fees for all regulated programs by 0 percent to 1.89 percent (or up to 75.35 percent above the standard fee rate) to a maximum increase of 20 percent (or 186.4 percent above the standard fee rate) for any single program, without a grant penalty being assessed. Universities could apply the additional 1.89 percent discretionary fee on an institution-wide basis.

The average and maximum tuition fee levels for 2002-03 and 2003-04 are shown in Appendix 11.

Whether or not the institutions levied tuition fees in accordance with the schedule shown in Appendix 10 of this manual the Ministry deemed fees to have been levied by the institutions at the standard rates for the purpose of calculating their grant entitlements.

In 2004-05 and 2005-06 a tuition fee freeze took effect, replacing the 5-year tuition fee policy announced on March 14, 2000. As a result the discretionary portion of the tuition fees remained at the 2003-04 levels during the duration of the tuition freeze.

In April 2006, a new Tuition Fee Framework was introduced for 2006-07 to 2009-10 that regulates maximum tuition fee increases in all publicly funded programs. This new Tuition Fee Framework allows for tuition fee differentiation based on program and program year of study, and was based on the principle that tuition fees may increase annually within specified limits beginning with 2006-07 tuition fee levels over 2005-06, with the average tuition fees not to exceed 5% annually, excluding changes in enrolment.

During the early years of "formula" funding of Ontario universities, some special provisions applied to graduate students. A tuition fee exemption was allowed to full-time graduate students in respect of the third of three terms consecutively attended. This exemption was discontinued effective September 1, 1972. Further, permission to use government grants and fees to offset the third term fee was discontinued effective September 1, 1975. The standard fee is now deducted for each term of attendance for all graduate students, including the full-time equivalents of part-time students.

#### **5.1.2.1. Additional Cost Recovery Fees**

From 1998-99 to 2003-04, universities were given discretion to set tuition fees in these additional cost recovery programs:

- graduate programs;
- undergraduate programs in Business/Commerce (second-entry programs only), Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Optometry, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine; and,
- undergraduate engineering and/or computer science programs, under the Access to Opportunities Program and following the approval of the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities of a plan from the university that doubled the number of entry-level spaces in computer science and/or high-demand fields of engineering by September 2000, with the expectation of doubling total enrolment in these programs by program maturity in 2004-05.

Tuition fees for students enrolled in 1997-98 in these programs were to be protected from annual increases exceeding 20 percent, until such time as they could reasonably have been expected to have graduated from their 1997-98 program. All domestic students in the same program and year of study were required to be charged the same tuition fee rate.

In 2004-05 and 2005-06 a tuition fee freeze took effect, and as a result no new additional cost recovery fees were introduced over this period.

In April 2006, a Tuition Fee Framework was introduced for 2006-07 to 2009-10 that regulates maximum tuition fee increases in all publicly funded programs, including the above-listed types of programs.

From 1998-99 to 2006-07, for programs where additional cost recovery had been introduced, institutions were required to make available financial aid to Ontario students who would otherwise face financial need (as defined by the OSAP needs assessment) for the amount of tuition and ancillary fees above \$4,500 (\$5,350 for co-op programs). An institution's share of student support could be drawn from the 30 per cent tuition fee set-aside, Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Funds or other institutional resources.

In 2007-08, the above special requirement for aid to students in additional cost recovery programs was discontinued, and replaced by the Ministry's requirements for institutional participation in the Student Access Guarantee.

Refer to Section 5.1.3.1 for more information on the Student Access Guarantee.

### 5.1.2.2. College-University Collaborative Programs Fees

Tuition fees for programs that are jointly offered by a college of applied arts and technology and university may be determined by the institution and based on the following cases:<sup>54</sup>

In cases where students are studying simultaneously at both a college and university, the applicable annual tuition fee will be the weighted average of the sum of the normal full-time fees of the respective institutions, based on the respective proportion of the total student enrolment at each institution. The collaborative partners will decide which institution is to collect the tuition fees.

In cases where the student is taking the program sequentially at one institution and then the other, the applicable tuition fee in a year will be that of the institution where the student is counted for funding purposes. The institution claiming the student for funding purposes will collect the student fees.

In cases where one institution is claiming the student for operating grant support for the entire duration of the program, the applicable tuition fee rate for students in the program at that institution is to be charged. The institution claiming the student for funding purposes will collect the student fees.

Further information on the enrolment reporting options for collaborative programs can be found in Section 4.6.

### 5.1.3. Tuition Fee Set-Aside

Beginning in 1996-97, 10 percent of additional revenue due to increases in tuition fee rates was to be reserved for local student aid (calculated as 10 percent of the difference between the 1995-96 and 1996-97 fee levels, including the discretionary portion, applied to 1996-97 FTE eligible enrolments). For 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-00, any institution that chose to increase fees was required to set-aside 30 percent of the additional revenue due to increases in tuition fee rates to assist students in financial need. The 2000-01 to 2004-05 tuition fee policy announced on March 14, 2000, required that universities set-aside 30 percent of the annual increase in fee revenue for student assistance.

The set-aside was cumulative. In addition to the current year's set-aside amounts, all previous years' set-aside amounts were included in the current year's total set-aside calculation, dating back to 1996-97, when the set-aside policy was introduced.

In 2004-05 and 2005-06 a tuition fee freeze took effect. During the period of the freeze, universities were not expected to reserve any incremental amounts as there was no increase in tuition fees. Universities were required to continue to assess the tuition fee set-aside on the incremental tuition increases on all regulated and additional cost recovery programs from 1996-97 to 2003-04, and on enrolments in 2004-05 and 2005-06.

In April 2006, a Tuition Fee Framework was introduced for 2006-07 to 2009-10 that regulates maximum tuition fee increases in all publicly funded programs. The Guidelines for Implementation of the Tuition Fee Policy for Publicly-Assisted Universities, 2006-07 to 2009-10 identify that the tuition fee set-aside policy continues to be in effect with the following modification. The amount of tuition fee set-aside funding to be disbursed annually will be frozen at the 2005-06 levels, with adjustments to be made for annual enrolment changes.

---

<sup>54</sup> Institutions may consult the Ministry for alternative tuition fee arrangements.

Tuition set-aside amounts are based on the final 2005-06 tuition set-aside reports, with adjustment to increase/decrease the amount of set-aside by the annual percentage increase/decrease in final audited full time equivalent (FTE) enrolment.

Institutions should direct set-aside assistance to the following types of eligible expenses: provision of required aid under the Student Access Guarantee and other expenditures to assist Ontario students that financial aid offices determine to be in financial need. The set-aside assistance should be in addition to the institutional funds provided for student assistance prior to introduction of the set-aside.

Assistance should be in the form of bursaries, student scholarships, work study and/or employment between academic terms (e.g. summer).

- Bursaries are non repayable funds used to supplement OSAP assistance received by students if they still have a shortfall in resources, or to assist other students with demonstrated financial need (as determined using the OSAP assessment process or other budget calculation).
- Student scholarships are non-repayable funds given, based on merit, to supplement OSAP assistance received by students if they still have a shortfall in resources, or to assist other students with demonstrated financial need. Effective 2001-02, the matching funds for the Ontario Graduate Scholarship program cannot be drawn from set-aside funds.
- Work study programs consist of part-time employment for students on or near campus while enrolled in a program of instruction to supplement OSAP assistance, or to assist other students with demonstrated financial need. Universities are to ensure that work study programs encourage self-help and self-development and give students a way of enhancing their resumes in preparation for the transition to full time employment and loan repayment. The institution's matching funds for the Ontario Work Study Program cannot be drawn from set-aside funds.
- Employment programs between academic terms (e.g. summer) provide eligible students with work on campus during the period between academic terms. Students must be in receipt of OSAP assistance during the prior academic year OR must have demonstrated financial need. The demonstrated financial need is to be determined using the OSAP assessment or other comparable financial need assessment tool. Students must also be returning to the postsecondary institution in the subsequent study period.

Ineligible uses of set-aside funds include: loans for students (however, this does not preclude bursaries to offset in-school interest); allocation to a student without proof of need; co-op placements with employers other than the university; and bursary program(s) that target programs, faculties and/or specific students.

International students whose enrolment is not reported for funding purposes (ineligible students) do not qualify for set-aside assistance. Enrolment and fee rates associated with these students have not been included for purposes of calculating set-aside obligations.

#### **5.1.3.1. Student Access Guarantee**

As part of the Tuition Framework for 2006-07 to 2009-10, the Province is partnering with publicly-assisted universities and colleges to offer a Student Access Guarantee. As a condition of increasing tuition, all publicly-assisted institutions must participate in this initiative.



The Student Access Guarantee co-ordinates Government and institutional student financial aid to support access.

Where a students' personal and family resources are not sufficient to cover their costs, students are expected to apply to the Ontario Student Assistance Program first. Under the Student Access Guarantee, it will be the responsibility of institutions to ensure that students are able to get enough additional aid to cover their costs for tuition, books, compulsory fees, equipment and supplies, when these are above the usual range of costs covered by OSAP.

The Ministry provides financial aid offices with calculations of OSAP recipients' "tuition/book shortfalls" to assist them in identifying where supplementary aid is needed to cover costs for tuition, book, compulsory fee, equipment and supply.

In 2008-09, the tuition/book shortfall is calculated as, a student's remaining financial need after receipt of available OSAP assistance, that is due to tuition and compulsory ancillary fees above \$4,700/year (\$5,560 for co-op programs) and/or book, equipment and supply costs above \$1,020/year.

The details of the Student Access Guarantee requirements are set out in annual *Student Access Guarantee Guidelines*.

#### **5.1.4. International Student Tuition Fees**

Ministry-regulated differential fees for international students were instituted in 1977-78 and continued until 1995-96. Effective 1996-97, government funding for the majority of international students was discontinued and tuition fees for these students was deregulated. Since then, institutions have been allowed to set tuition fees for all international students who are ineligible to be claimed for funding purposes. Certain categories of international students may qualify as eligible for funding. Those students should be charged a maximum of the domestic fee rate. The categories of international students that are eligible or ineligible to be counted for funding purposes are listed in Section 4.1 and 4.2, respectively.

With regard to international students who are claimed as eligible for government funding under Section 4.1, institutions are expected to have documented procedures in place and implemented that will substantiate the eligible funding status.

#### **5.2. COMPULSORY ANCILLARY FEES**

A compulsory ancillary fee is defined as a fee imposed or administered by a given institution, or one of its constituent parts or its federated or affiliated institutions, in addition to regular tuition fees, which a student is required to pay in order to enroll in, or successfully complete, any credit course.

Compulsory courses are defined by the Ministry as those courses which a student is required to take in order to fulfill the requirements of his or her program or degree. This definition is of specific concern with respect to field trip fees (see Appendix 11, Part B).

A tuition-related compulsory ancillary fee is a fee which is levied to cover the costs of items normally paid for out of operating or capital revenue (operating and capital grants and tuition fees). Effective May 1, 1987, all "tuition-related" compulsory ancillary fees for items normally paid for out of operating revenue were prohibited. Effective September 1, 1991, all compulsory ancillary fees for items eligible for capital grants were also prohibited. Any revenue resulting from such fees will be considered to be tuition fee revenue. [Note: Fees associated with the cost of buildings, such as student centers or other facilities which are not normally eligible for capital grants, are permitted, whether collected as independent fees or

as part of student activity fees.]

A non-tuition-related compulsory ancillary fee is a fee which is levied in order to cover the costs of items which are not normally paid for out of operating or capital revenue.

For the purposes of this policy guideline, the term student governments is defined as follows:

the minimum number of student organizations which have both elected leadership and by-laws setting out their methods of operation and which, when viewed in combination at an individual institution, represent all students who are eligible to vote for a student organization.

The term student government representatives is defined as one representative from each of the above-defined student governments.

All compulsory ancillary fees levied by a university or related institution must:

- i. be non-tuition-related, as defined above;
- ii. be approved by the governing body; and
- iii. be announced prior to collection through the institution's calendar and/or published fee schedule(s). [The fee announcements must provide a breakdown of all compulsory non-tuition-related ancillary fees, which explains their purpose(s) sufficiently to allow the student to understand clearly what materials, services or facilities have been made available through payment of the fee(s)].

Compulsory non-tuition-related ancillary fees which were in effect during the 1993-94 academic year<sup>55</sup> can neither be increased above 1993-94 levels, nor expanded to include new fees, except through the implementation of a protocol which has been agreed to by representatives of the institution's administration and student government representatives in light of the announcement of March 23, 1994 by the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities and which has received approval from the institution's governing body.

The protocol(s) will set out the means by which students will be involved in decisions to increase the existing compulsory non-tuition-related ancillary fees or to introduce new ones.

The minimum requirements for a protocol document are provided in Appendix 11, Part A - Section I. Examples of some of the non-tuition-related compulsory ancillary fees which might be introduced or increased through the operation of a protocol are found in Appendix 11, Part A - Section II.

All approved protocols, showing the approval signatures and the dates of approval, must be submitted to the Director, Postsecondary Finance and Information Management Branch, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

Compulsory non-tuition-related ancillary fees which are exempt from the provisions are limited to those that follow:

- i. Existing and future fees established by student governments, including those resulting from referenda sponsored by them;
- ii. Existing fees established through referenda where the sponsor of the referenda was the university administration or a combination of the university administration and students; [University administrations cannot proceed with referenda concerning compulsory non-tuition-related ancillary fees, unless provided for within a protocol.]

---

<sup>55</sup> The academic year will be that defined in each institution's academic calendar.

- iii. Existing and future system-wide fees. System-wide fees are those where, through a formal agreement, the students affected at all Ontario universities pay a comparable fee for a comparable service; [In the case of provincial-based system-wide fees established in the future, the Ministry hopes that students can be involved in the determination of these fees.]
- iv. Existing and future fees for the materials and services listed in Appendix 11, Part B;
- v. Existing and future fees for the total costs of placing students in jobs for work terms. The types of placement costs that are considered eligible for this fee are described in Appendix 11, Part C.

In regard to the compulsory non-tuition-related ancillary fees referenced in item (iv) and item (v) above (Section 5.2), institutions must comply with the following provisions:

- i. Institutions must provide a full rationale for each fee, including the reasons for its compulsory nature, at the time it is submitted to the governing body for approval;
- ii. institutions must provide the above rationale to student governments, as well as any other information necessary for student governments to understand the purpose of the fee, the costs included in calculating the fee level, the students for whom the fee will be compulsory, the total revenue available from the fee and the process used for developing the fee; and,
- iii. Institutions must respond with a full explanation to inquiries made by student governments in connection with concerns about any of these fees.

Should an institution levy a compulsory ancillary fee or institute an ancillary fee increase which is contrary to the provisions outlined above and should, in the case of fees covered under Section 5.2, no resolution be achieved through discussions among signatories to a protocol, then the institution's operating grant will be reduced by an amount which corresponds to the revenue raised by the fee or the fee increase.

### **5.3. EXCHANGE PROGRAMS AND STUDY ABROAD COURSES/PROGRAMS**

Ministry policy concerning exchange programs and study abroad courses and programs has been essentially the same since 1981-82 (as noted below), with the exception of modifications necessitated by the deregulation of international student fees in 1996-97.

With regard to exchange programs or study courses/programs offered abroad, operating support is intended only for domestic students enrolled in credit courses: <sup>56</sup>

- a) which are recognized as integral parts of specific degree programs at the Ontario institution, and
- b) where duration in contact hours or equivalent is not less than comparable courses or programs offered at the Ontario institution during the same session.

Summary information on all study abroad courses and programs claimed for operating grants and all the necessary supporting data should be submitted annually by the responsible deans to the institution's registrar, who should see that they are cross-referenced to individual student records and kept on file to be made available to university auditors during the course of their audits of enrolment. See Appendix 6 for audit guidelines.

---

<sup>56</sup> Excluding any courses offered as part of a holiday package.

An eligible student abroad may be claimed for operating support if he/she is registered in an Ontario institution and enrolled for credit in a degree program described in its official calendar, and is either:

- (1) An exchange student studying abroad under the terms of a formal exchange agreement, or
- (2) A student not part of an exchange program who has:
  - a) been assessed the regular academic fee for the course or program being taken;
  - b) received instruction paid for by the Ontario institution, regardless of whether the course or program is:
    - i. offered by the institution's own faculty;
    - ii. provided by faculty hired by the Ontario institution; or
    - iii. purchased from a university abroad attended by the student and leading to academic credit, and where the direct cost (including only items on which provincial operating grants and fees can normally be spent) is similar to that which would be incurred if the student were receiving instruction at the home institution.

An international student studying in Ontario under the terms of a formal exchange agreement may not be claimed as eligible for operating support purposes.

The Ontario government has established exchange programs managed by a consortium of Ontario universities including Ontario- Baden-Württemberg, Ontario Rhone-Alpes, Ontario-Jiangsu and Ontario Maharastra-Goa, and may establish other similar agreements in the future. Funding is provided to partially offset the costs of participating in the program and is distributed to the Exchange Office acting as the coordinating body for the program.

#### **5.4. STUDENTS ENROLLED AT UNRELATED INSTITUTIONS**

##### **5.4.1. Cooperative Programs**

Wherever a student registered in a program at one institution receives some instruction in that program from another unrelated institution, the following rules apply:

No matter where the student is taught, BIUs may only be claimed by the student's home university (i.e., the university where the student is registered). Fees will be deducted from the university claiming the Basic Income Units.

The arrangement made for payment between the home and host universities should not be reflected in the enrolment reports. Such matters are internal to the institutions involved.

##### **5.4.2. Letter of Permission**

When a student receives a formal letter of permission to register in a course or courses at another unrelated institution, each institution may only claim BIUs for those courses for which the student is actually registered at that institution.

### **5.4.3. Visiting Graduate Students**

When a graduate student is registered in a program at one institution and receives some instruction in that program at another unrelated institution, BIUs may be claimed only by the student's home university, i.e., the university where the student is actually registered. The arrangement made for payment between home and host universities should not be reflected in the enrolment reports as it is a matter internal to the institutions involved.

## 6. APPENDICES

## APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF MAJOR CHANGES IN THE FORMULA 1967-68 TO 1986-87

GRANTS FOR FISCAL YEAR	BIU VALUE	FORMULA WEIGHT CHANGES	COMMENTS
1967-68	\$1,320		
1968-69	\$1,450 + \$24 computer grant		
1969-70	\$1,530 + \$26 computer grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) undergraduate medicine: 3.0 to 5.0</li> <li>(ii) undergraduate dentistry: 3.0 to 5.0</li> <li>(iii) undergraduate veterinary medicine: 3.0 to 5.0</li> <li>(iv) interns and residents: 1.5 to 2.5</li> <li>(v) thesis only category (wt. 1.0) discontinued. Students to be claimed either as full or part-time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) definition of graduate students for category 5 requires only general (not honours) degree plus other new conditions.</li> <li>(ii) FTE of part-time graduates including graduate summer school changed from a division of course registrations by 5 to a multiplication of part-time numbers by 0.30 reported and weighted on a trimester bases.</li> </ul>
1970-71	\$1,650 (computer grant incorporated in BIU value)	(i) optometry from 2.0 to 3.0	(i) Graduate summer school conversion factor changed from 0.30 to 0.50.
1971-72	\$1,730		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) 10 month fiscal year</li> <li>(ii) Graduate formula fee increased from \$133 per term to \$242.50 per term; free third term introduced.</li> </ul>
1972-73	\$1,765		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Conversion factor for part-time undergraduates changed from course registration divided by 6.0 to division by 5.5 for institutions with integrated full and part-time programs.</li> <li>(ii) \$100 increase in formula fee for two terms.</li> <li>(iii) free third term ended; graduate bursary introduced.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

GRANTS FOR FISCAL YEAR	BIU VALUE	FORMULA WEIGHT CHANGES	COMMENTS
1973-74	\$1,825		(i) Slip year introduced. (ii) Part-time undergraduate conversion factor to 5.0.
1974-75	\$1,955	(i) Upper years undergraduate social work: 1.0 to 1.5 (ii) Masters social work: 3.0 to 4.0 (iii) Forestry technology: 1.0 to 1.2 (iv) Engineering technology: 1.0 to 1.2	
1975-76	\$2,111	(i) Ryerson weight established at 1.30	(i) Graduate bursary terminated.
1976-77	\$2,312 undergraduate \$2,255 graduate	(i) Ontario College of Art weight established at 1.30	(i) Undergraduate enrolment based on 1/3 1974-75 and 2/3 1975-76; graduate based on 1975-76 actual with 3 year freeze. (ii) International student fee of \$750 per term based on current enrolment. (iii) Fractional unit counting introduced. (iv) Three term undergraduate reporting.
1977-78	\$2,542 undergraduate \$2,478 graduate		(i) Undergraduate enrolment based on 1/3 1974-75, 1/3 1975-76 and 1/3 1976-77. (ii) \$100 increase in formula fee for two terms except for international students.
1978-79	\$2,678 undergraduate \$2,611 graduate		(i) Undergraduate count based on Undergraduate Funding Base plus 1/2 (Moving Average less U.F.B.)

## APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

GRANTS FOR FISCAL YEAR	BIU VALUE	FORMULA WEIGHT CHANGES	COMMENTS
1979-80	\$2,833 undergraduate \$2,762 graduate		(i) Graduate Funding Base (average of 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77) plus for Masters 1/2 (Moving Average - GFB) and for Doctoral 1/3 (Moving Average - GFB). (ii) Formula fee increased by 5% overall.
1980-81	\$3,061 undergraduate \$2,985 graduate	(i) Ryerson Moving Average Weight changed from 1.30 to 1.38	(i) Formula fee increased by 7.5% overall. (ii) Limit of 10% above formula fee set for actual tuition fees; charges above 10% to result in formula grant reductions.
1981-82	\$3,368 undergraduate \$3,284 graduate	(i) Changes to Ryerson's institutional weights as follows: Funding base from 1.3 to 1.34 Moving average from 1.38 to 1.36	(i) New policy introduced on exchanges and study abroad. (ii) Freeze introduced on new undergraduate programs. (iii) Formula fee increased by 10% overall.
1982-83	\$3,749 undergraduate \$3,656 graduate		(i) Freeze is lifted and new program approval policy is introduced re new undergraduate programs. (ii) Extraordinary formula fee increases for "new registrant" foreign students to \$1,350 and \$2,200 per term, for Type A and Type B programs respectively. Effective September 1, 1982. (iii) All other formula fees increased by 12.2%.



## APPENDIX 1 (Continued)

GRANTS FOR FISCAL YEAR	BIU VALUE	FORMULA WEIGHT CHANGES	COMMENTS
1983-84	\$3,962 undergraduate \$3,864 graduate		(i) Second and final stage of extraordinary formula fee increases for "new registrant" foreign students. New Rates: \$1,890 and \$3,080 per term for Type A and Type B undergraduate programs respectively. \$2,310 for graduate programs. (ii) All other formula fee rates increased by 5% overall.
1984-85	1983-84 (Old) Formula: \$4,128 undergraduate \$4,026 graduate New Formula: \$3,124 Base \$ 977 Moving Average		(i) Combination of 2 formulae used: 2/3 grant calculated with 1983-84 formula and 1/3 grant calculated with new formula. (ii) Special provision to ensure that no institution's formula grant increases by less than 5% over 1983-84 level. (iii) All formula fee rates increased by 5%.
1985-86	Old Formula: \$4,162 undergraduate \$4,059 graduate New Formula: \$3,187 Base \$ 975 Moving Average		(i) All formula fee rates increased by 5%. (ii) Combination of two formulae used again: 2/3 grant calculated using "old" formula, 1/3 grant calculated using "new" formula.
1986-87	Old Formula: \$4,039 undergraduate \$4,203 graduate New Formula: \$3,312 Base \$1,006 Moving Average		(i) All formula fee rates increased by 4%. (ii) Special provisions to ensure that no institution's formula and extra formula grant increased by less than 3.5% over 1985-86.

## APPENDIX 2: GRANT TABLES

### APPENDIX 2.1: ENROLMENT ADJUSTMENT/ACCESSIBILITY/ENHANCED ACCESS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ENVELOPE (\$)

Year	General Enrolment	Students With Disabilities	Total
1987-88	25,000,000		25,000,000
1988-89	36,014,154		36,014,154
1989-90	84,000,000	4,000,000	88,000,000
1990-91	65,522,000	4,188,000	69,710,000
1991-92	52,951,023	4,848,600	57,799,623
1992-93	23,352,000	4,892,000	28,244,000
1993-94		4,892,000	4,892,000
1994-95		4,892,000	4,892,000
1995-96		4,892,000	4,892,000
1996-97		4,892,000	4,892,000
1997-98		4,892,000	4,892,000
1998-99		5,752,200	5,752,200
1999-00		5,752,200	5,752,200
2000-01		5,752,000	5,752,000
2001-02		5,752,000	5,752,000
2002-03		5,752,000	5,752,000
2003-04		7,257,000	7,257,000
2004-05		7,197,004	7,197,004
2005-06		11,148,476	11,148,476
2006-07		12,598,644	12,598,644
2007-08		12,047,565	12,047,565

### APPENDIX 2.2: PERFORMANCE FUND

Year	Total
2000-01	16,500,000
2001-02	23,160,000
2002-03	23,160,000
2003-04	23,160,000
2004-05	23,160,000
2005-06	23,160,000
2006-07	23,160,000
2007-08	23,276,704
2008-09	23,280,368

**APPENDIX 2.3: QUALITY ASSURANCE FUND**

Year	Total
2003-04	74,884,410
2004-05	74,598,001
2005-06	74,598,001
2006-07	74,409,916
2007-08	74,786,086
2008-09	74,786,086

**APPENDIX 2.4: ACCESSIBILITY ENVELOPE (\$)**

Year	Undergraduate	Graduate	Total
2000-01	16,500,000	-	16,500,000
2001-02	20,000,000	5,800,000	25,800,000
2002-03	117,000,000	5,100,000	122,100,000
2003-04	193,000,000	20,200,000	213,200,000
2004-05	112,406,147	17,527,941	129,934,087
005-06	72,729,765	15,566,590	88,296,355
2006-07	103,189,285	45,876,519	149,065,804
2007-08	116,653,369	118,693,212	235,346,581
2008-09*	152,942,796	46,863,831	199,806,627

**APPENDIX 2.5: MEDICAL ENROLMENT EXPANSION (\$)**

Year	Undergraduate Operating*	Post Graduate Operating	Total
2000-01	975,792		975,792
2001-02	3,792,285		3,792,285
2002-03	7,673,275		7,673,275
2003-04	11,155,069	3,746,005	14,901,074
2004-05	13,372,769	5,790,873	19,163,642
2005-06	28,479,745	7,865,810	36,345,555
2006-07	36,692,762	10,669,596	47,362,358
2007-08	40,918,657	14,479,624	55,398,281
2008-09*	46,533,233	15,744,003	62,277,236

\*Includes funding for 30% expansion (existing and enhanced), as well as funding for the 15% expansion.

**APPENDIX 2.6: NURSING ENROLMENT EXPANSION (\$)**

Year	Collaborative Nursing: Start-up and Expansion Grants <sup>1</sup>	Collaborative Nursing: Operating Grant <sup>1</sup>	Graduate Expansion: Operating Grant for Masters Expansion	Graduate Expansion: Operating Grant for PhD Expansion	Graduate Expansion: Tuition Waiver (Includes PhD beginning in 2004-05)	Comp. Nursing/ Second Entry Nursing <sup>2</sup>
2000-01	\$10,000,000					
2001-02	\$4,370,000		\$608,165		\$93,636	\$1,239,700
2002-03	\$5,630,000	\$10,600,000	\$1,269,982		\$144,651	\$3,565,000
2003-04	0	\$26,370,000	\$1,218,778		\$192,745	\$3,334,000
2004-05	0	\$45,634,298	\$1,641,676	\$1,660,279	\$313,341	\$4,555,247
2005-06	0	\$61,363,004	\$2,920,774	\$1,022,518	\$621,450	\$5,338,611
2006-07	0	\$70,599,162	\$3,797,050	\$1,467,068	\$804,093	\$6,994,359
2007-08	0	\$72,444,586	\$4,727,889	\$1,824,755	\$1,063,914	\$9,421,128
2008-09		\$77,219,677	\$4,560,053	\$1,850,111	\$1,205,663	\$11,973,818

- a. Funding provided to Collaborative Nursing Program Partners which have responsibility to allocate funds among college and university partners.
- b. Beginning in 2007-08, colleges received grants for second-entry nursing (\$325,707 in 2007-08 and \$1,093,108 in 2008-09).

**APPENDIX 2.7: TEACHER EDUCATION EXPANSION (\$)**

Year	Total
1999-00	3,750,000
2000-01	7,500,000
2001-02	11,250,000
2002-03	11,250,000
2003-04	11,250,000
2004-05	11,250,000
2005-06	11,250,000
2007-08	11,250,000
2008-09	11,250,000

**APPENDIX 2.8: NORTHERN ONTARIO OPERATIONS GRANTS (\$)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Lakehead</b>	<b>Laurentian</b>	<b>Algoma</b>	<b>Hearst</b>	<b>Nipissing</b>	<b>Total</b>
1975-76	550,000	550,000	90,000	30,000	60,000	1,280,000
1976-77	1,075,000	1,085,000	150,000	90,000	141,000	2,541,000
1977-78	1,257,000	1,223,000	158,000	92,000	187,000	2,917,000
1978-79	1,380,000	1,356,000	166,000	97,000	214,000	3,213,000
1979-80	1,484,000	1,434,000	167,000	93,000	238,000	3,416,000
1980-81	1,572,000	1,508,000	170,000	96,000	245,000	3,591,000
1981-82	1,668,000	1,618,000	170,000	98,000	250,000	3,804,000
1982-83	1,805,000	1,772,000	177,000	102,000	274,000	4,130,000
1983-84	2,027,000	2,018,000	185,000	102,000	340,000	4,672,000
1984-85	2,233,000	2,247,000	191,000	101,000	404,000	5,176,000
1985-86	2,423,000	2,480,000	210,000	110,000	453,000	5,676,000
1986-87	2,598,000	2,671,000	226,000	115,000	478,000	6,088,000
1987-88	2,721,000	2,826,000	237,000	120,000	485,000	6,389,000
1988-89	2,883,000	3,001,000	241,000	117,000	518,000	6,760,000
1989-90	3,156,000	3,353,000	239,000	123,000	583,000	7,454,000
1990-91	3,303,000	3,504,000	252,000	128,000	613,000	7,800,000
1991-92	3,476,000	3,688,000	266,000	135,000	645,000	8,210,000
1992-93	3,612,000	3,834,000	276,000	141,000	670,000	8,533,000
1993-94*	3,347,000	3,307,000	256,000	219,000	781,000	7,910,000
1994-95	3,288,000	3,249,000	252,000	215,000	767,000	7,771,000
1995-96	3,245,000	3,207,000	249,000	212,000	757,000	7,670,000
1996-97	2,715,000	2,684,000	208,000	177,000	633,000	6,417,000

## APPENDIX 2.8 (continued)

## NORTHERN ONTARIO MISSION GRANTS (\$)

Year	Lakehead	Laurentian	Algoma	Hearst	Nipissing	Total
1987-88	1,278,000	1,327,000	111,000	56,000	228,000	3,000,000
1988-89	1,279,000	1,332,000	107,000	52,000	230,000	3,000,000
1989-90	1,270,000	1,349,000	96,000	50,000	235,000	3,000,000
1990-91	1,270,000	1,348,000	97,000	49,000	236,000	3,000,000
1991-92	1,270,000	1,347,000	97,000	50,000	236,000	3,000,000
1992-93	1,270,000	1,347,000	97,000	50,000	236,000	3,000,000
1993-94*	1,177,000	1,162,000	90,000	77,000	275,000	2,781,000
1994-95	1,156,000	1,142,000	89,000	75,000	270,000	2,732,000
1995-96	1,141,000	1,127,000	87,000	75,000	266,000	2,696,000
1996-97	954,000	943,000	73,000	62,000	223,000	2,255,000

\* Pseudo campuses of Laurentian at Hearst and Nipissing are included with the Hearst affiliate or Nipissing University, as appropriate, commencing 1993-94.

## NORTHERN ONTARIO GRANTS\* (\$)

Year	Lakehead	Laurentian	Algoma	Hearst	Nipissing	Total
1997-98	4,045,654	3,755,635	281,000	287,751	1,114,331	9,484,371
1998-99	4,045,654	3,755,635	281,000	287,751	1,114,331	9,484,371
1999-00	4,086,111	3,793,191	283,810	290,629	1,125,474	9,579,215
2000-01	4,086,111	3,793,191	283,810	290,629	1,125,474	9,579,215
2001-02	4,494,721	4,172,511	312,191	319,691	1,238,022	10,537,136
2002-03	6,742,082	6,123,857	603,197	479,537	1,857,033	15,805,704
2003-04	6,742,082	6,123,857	603,197	479,537	1,857,033	15,805,704
2004-05	6,844,513	6,216,897	612,361	486,823	1,885,247	16,045,841
2005-06	6,793,298	6,170,376	607,779	483,179	1,871,140	15,925,772
2006-07	6,793,298	6,170,376	607,779	483,179	1,871,140	15,925,772
2007-08	6,793,298	6,170,376	607,779	483,179	1,871,140	15,925,772
2008-09	6,793,298	6,170,376	607,779	483,179	1,871,140	15,925,772

\* This grant encompasses both previous grants. (Northern Ontario Operations Grant and Northern Ontario Mission Grant)

**APPENDIX 2.9: BILINGUALISM GRANTS (\$)**

Year	Ottawa	Laurentian	York	Hearst	Sudbury	St. Paul	Total
1967-68	1,080,000	155,000					1,235,000
1968-69	1,390,083	219,880					1,609,963
1969-70	1,575,323	278,653					1,853,976
1970-71	1,500,000	390,000					1,890,000
1971-72	1,500,000	450,000	100,000	18,000			2,068,000
1972-73	1,500,000	540,000	100,000	20,000			2,160,000
1973-74	1,887,000	540,000	128,000	13,600	10,700	19,300	2,598,600
1974-75	2,100,000	540,000	128,000	15,000	12,000	23,000	2,818,000
1975-76	2,310,000	600,000	140,000	20,000	25,000	25,000	3,120,000
1976-77	2,888,000	690,000	161,000	23,000	29,000	58,000	3,849,000
1977-78	3,172,000	758,000	177,000	25,000	32,000	64,000	4,228,000
1978-79	3,345,000	813,000	146,000	34,000	25,000	114,000	4,477,000
1979-80	4,657,000	1,142,000	176,000	52,000	27,000	192,000	6,246,000
1980-81	4,988,000	1,228,000	173,000	59,000	26,000	223,000	6,697,000
1981-82	5,486,000	1,356,000	173,000	68,000	25,000	264,000	7,372,000
1982-83	6,155,000	1,521,000	194,000	76,000	28,000	296,000	8,270,000
1983-84	6,885,000	1,702,000	217,000	85,000	31,000	331,000	9,251,000
1984-85	9,904,000	2,015,000	832,000	106,000	129,000	828,000	13,814,000
1985-86	10,399,000	2,116,000	874,000	111,000	135,000	869,000	14,504,000
1986-87	10,815,000	2,201,000	909,000	115,000	140,000	904,000	15,084,000
1987-88	11,248,000	2,289,000	945,000	120,000	146,000	940,000	15,688,000
1988-89	11,754,000	2,392,000	988,000	125,000	153,000	982,000	16,394,000
1989-90	14,109,000	3,651,000	1,833,00	140,000	196,000	1,465,000	21,394,000
1990-91	14,772,000	3,822,000	1,919,00	147,000	205,000	1,534,000	22,399,000
1991-92	16,960,000	4,388,000	2,203,00	168,000	235,000	1,762,000	25,716,000
1992-93	17,112,000	4,427,000	2,223,00	170,000	238,000	1,777,000	25,947,000
1993-94	15,863,000	4,104,000	2,060,00	158,000	220,000	1,648,000	24,053,000
1994-95	15,584,000	4,032,000	2,024,00	155,000	216,000	1,619,000	23,630,000
1995-96	15,381,000	3,980,000	1,998,00	153,000	213,000	1,598,000	23,323,000
1996-97	12,869,000	3,330,000	1,671,00	128,000	179,000	1,337,000	19,514,000

**APPENDIX 2.9 (continued)**

Year	Ottawa	Laurentian	York	Hearst	Sudbury	St. Paul	Total
1997-98	16,954,658	5,698,325	2,985,836	565,543	355,471	1,468,197	28,028,030
1998-99	16,954,658	5,698,325	2,985,836	565,543	355,471	1,468,197	28,028,030
1999-00	17,124,205	5,755,308	3,015,694	571,198	359,026	1,482,879	28,308,310
2000-01	17,124,205	5,755,308	3,015,694	571,198	359,026	1,482,879	28,308,310
2001-02	17,124,205	5,755,308	3,015,694	571,198	359,026	1,482,879	28,308,310

**BILINGUALISM GRANTS (\$) 2002-03 Onwards**

Year	Ottawa*	Laurentian**	York	Hearst	Dominican***	Total
2002-03	18,557,785	6,098,135	3,007,704	569,686	75,000	28,308,310
2003-04	18,557,785	6,098,135	3,007,704	569,686	75,000	28,308,310
2004-05	18,557,785	6,098,135	3,007,704	569,686	75,000	28,308,310
2005-06	18,557,785	6,098,135	3,007,704	569,686	75,000	28,308,310
2006-07	18,557,785	6,098,135	3,007,704	569,686	75,000	28,308,310
2007-08	23,354,198	8,359,228	3,923,421	893,635	87,440	36,617,922
2008-09	22,811,446	8,321,792	3,186,965	802,635	87,440	35,210,278

\* Includes St. Paul

\*\* Includes Sudbury

\*\*\* Dominican started receiving Bilingualism Grants in 2002



**APPENDIX 2.10: DIFFERENTIATION GRANTS (\$)**

Year	Trent	Nipissing	OCAD	Total
1981-82	1,400,000	0	0	1,400,000
1982-83	1,400,000	0	0	1,400,000
1983-84	1,500,000	0	0	1,500,000
1984-85	1,500,000	0	0	1,500,000
1985-86	1,500,000	0	0	1,500,000
1986-87	1,500,000	0	0	1,500,000
1987-88	1,500,000	0	0	1,500,000
1988-89	1,500,000	0	0	1,500,000
1989-90	1,590,000	0	0	1,590,000
1990-91	1,665,000	0	0	1,665,000
1991-92	1,773,000	0	0	1,773,000
1992-93	1,789,000	0	0	1,789,000
1993-94	1,658,000	0	0	1,658,000
1994-95	1,629,000	0	0	1,629,000
1995-96	1,608,000	0	0	1,608,000
1996-97	1,346,000	0	0	1,346,000
1997-98	1,346,000	0	0	1,346,000
1998-99*	1,346,000	530,000	0	1,876,000
1999-00	1,359,460	535,300	0	1,894,760
2000-01	1,359,460	535,300	0	1,894,760
2001-02	1,359,460	535,300	0	1,894,760
2002-03	1,359,460	535,300	0	1,894,760
2003-04	1,359,460	535,300	0	1,894,760
2004-05	1,359,460	535,300	0	1,894,760
2005-06	1,359,460	535,300	0	1,894,760
2006-07	1,359,460	535,300	0	1,894,760
2007-08	4,359,460	535,300	2,000,000**	6,894,760
2008-09	4,359,460	535,300	2,000,000	6,894,760

\* Beginning in 1998-99 Nipissing become the second recipient for the Differentiation Grant

\*\* Additional \$1M for Trent and \$2M for OCAD that were introduced in 2007-08 have been incorporated into this envelope leading to an increase in the total. Effective 2007-08 Trent's Differentiation was increased by \$2M and the Trent at UOIT grant of \$2M was discontinued.

**APPENDIX 2.11: EXTRAORDINARY GRANT (\$)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Algoma</b>	<b>Hearst</b>
1989-90	760,000	
1990-91	760,000	
1991-92	760,000	
1992-93	760,000	
1993-94	665,000	
1994-95	653,000	
1995-96	645,000	
1996-97	540,000	
1997-98	540,000	
1998-99	540,000	
1999-00	545,400	
2000-01	545,400	400,000
2001-02	599,940	400,000
2002-03	899,910	600,000
2003-04	899,910	600,000
2004-05	913,582	609,116
2005-06	906,746	604,558
2006-07	906,746	604,558
2007-08	906,746	604,558
2008-09	906,746	604,558

**APPENDIX 2.12: RESEARCH OVERHEADS/INFRASTRUCTURE ENVELOPE (ROIE) (\$)**

Year	Total
1986-87*	15,000,000
1987-88	25,000,000
1988-89	25,125,000
1989-90	27,170,000
1990-91	28,447,000
1991-92	30,296,000
1992-93	30,569,000
1993-94	28,337,000
1994-95	27,839,000
1995-96	27,477,000
1996-97	22,990,000
1997-98	27,477,000
1998-99	27,477,000
1999-00	27,751,773
2000-01	27,751,770
2001-02	27,751,770
2002-03	27,751,770
2003-04	27,751,770
2004-05	27,751,770
2005-06	27,751,770
2006-07	27,751,769
2007-08	27,807,966
2008-09	27,751,770

\*1986-87 funding provided under the auspices of the University Excellence Fund program.

**APPENDIX 2.13: SPECIAL PURPOSE AND INSTITUTION SPECIFIC GRANT (\$)**

Year	Special Purpose <sup>1</sup>	Institution Specific <sup>2</sup>	Total
1995-96	61,382,098	0	61,382,098
1996-97	49,852,951	0	49,852,951
1997-98	12,975,915	33,852,959	46,828,874
1998-99	12,045,191	34,260,108	46,305,299
1999-00	17,173,608	17,075,136	34,248,744
2000-01	19,033,219	15,850,057	34,883,276
2001-02	14,048,228	13,517,911	27,566,139
2002-03	13,175,135	11,092,217	24,267,352
2003-04	19,735,160	11,016,189	30,751,349
2004-05	143,539,890	12,734,017	156,273,907
2005-06	26,618,201	34,504,140	61,122,341
2006-07	59,327,993	33,119,839	92,447,832
2007-08	58,184,054	31,283,063	89,467,117
2008-09	64,976,901	49,944,597	114,921,498

**Notes:**

1. Contains All Special Purpose, Ministry initiative and all other grants that are not specifically for an institution.
2. In 1995-96 and 1996-97, Institution Specific grants were combined with Special Purpose Grants.

**APPENDIX 2.14: LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES TASK FORCE (\$)**

Year	Total
1998-99	5,239,087
1999-00	5,536,156
2000-01	5,327,663
2001-02	8,612,098
2002-03	4,594,314
2003-04	6,470,566

**APPENDIX 2.15: ACCESS TO OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM (\$)**

Year	Start- Up	On-going	Total
1998-99	30,429,746	3,870,254	34,300,000
1999-00	23,103,317	22,393,037	45,496,354
2000-01	48,704,752	35,933,448	84,638,200
2001-02		46,551,035	46,551,035
2002-03		56,737,596	56,737,596
2003-04		60,600,000	60,600,000
2004-05			53,000,001
2005-06			35,478,000

**APPENDIX 2.16: ONTARIO GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECH. (OGSST) (\$)**

Year	Total
1998-99	2,840,000
1999-00	6,080,000
2000-01	6,080,000
2001-02	5,000,000
2002-03	5,000,000
2003-04	5,000,000
2004-05	4,999,960
2005-06	5,000,000
2006-07	5,010,000
2007-08	5,010,000
2008-09	5,010,000
2009-10	5,010,000

**APPENDIX 2.17: TRANSITION ENVELOPE (\$)**

Year	Accessibility Envelope (General Enrolment) Phase-Out	Additional Growth Fund	Total
1990-91	18,459,288	52,400,000 <sup>57</sup>	70,859,288
1991-92	31,048,977	78,377,889	109,426,866
1992-93	60,648,000	88,878,000	149,526,000
1993-94		172,138,043	172,138,043
1994-95		169,112,000	169,112,000
1995-96 <sup>58</sup>		171,725,890	171,725,890

**APPENDIX 2.18: PAY EQUITY ENVELOPE (\$000)**

Year	Total
1991-92	4,998.4
1992-93	14,482.5
1993-94	18,910.0
1994-95	21,549.9
1995-96	18,961.3
1996-97	18,961.3
1997-98	18,961.3
1998-99	18,961.3

**APPENDIX 2.19: FAIR FUNDING FOR UNIVERSITIES GRANT (\$)**

Year	Total
1998-99	10,000,000
1999-00	20,000,000
2000-01	28,999,999

\* The Fair Funding for Universities Grant was rolled into the Basic Operating Grant in 2001-02.

<sup>57</sup> Includes \$4.7 million that was added to the original allotment.

<sup>58</sup> Last year for separate Transition Envelope; funding integrated with Basic Grants Envelope commencing 1996-97.

## APPENDIX 3: PROGRAM APPROVALS PROCESS

### Appendix 3.1 Historical Memorandum

MEMORANDUM TO: Executive Heads of Provincially-Assisted Universities, OCA, Algoma and Hearst

Information copies to: COU, CFSO, OCUFA, COUSA, OEICC, CUEW, FOETC, OPSEU

FROM: David Trick

DATE: November 8, 1996

SUBJECT: **Program Approvals Process**

---

I am writing further to the Minister's letter of May 29, 1996 announcing the closing of the Ontario Council on University Affairs (OCUA) and the Academic Advisory Committee (AAC). At that time, you were advised that the Ministry was reviewing the program approvals process to determine how it would be handled without the involvement of these two bodies. I am pleased to advise you that an interim process of self-administered regulation will replace the current program approvals process for the 1996-97 academic year.

The key features of the new process are:

- self-administered regulation by each university;
- a focus on new programs rather than those that are simply restructured or rationalized;
- a streamlined and standardized set of criteria to be used by universities in evaluating program proposals;
- an exemption on undergraduate core Arts and Science programs from review, as in the past;
- a simplified reporting process; and,
- final determination by the Minister on whether enrolments in new programs are approved for the purposes of funding, as is the case at present.

The Minister has accepted OCUA's recommendation to streamline and standardize the existing evaluative criteria. Group A and B undergraduate and Group C graduate programs (see Attachment 1) will all be reviewed against the following seven criteria:

1. Certification that the program has undergone a nomenclature confirmation review by the University Senate for Group A and Group B undergraduate programs and by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) for Group C graduate programs.
2. Certification of program quality by the University Senate for Group A and Group B undergraduate programs and by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) for Group C graduate programs.
3. Certification by the governing body of the institution that the program can be financed by institutional resources or that the Minister has given prior approval of additional funding to cover any portion of program costs that cannot be absorbed by the institution.
4. Certification by the executive head that the program is consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of the institution.
5. Certification by the executive head that there is convincing evidence of student demand.

6. Certification by the executive head that there is convincing evidence of societal need.
7. Convincing evidence that any duplicative similarities to existing programs in Ontario or Canada are justifiable for reasons of public funding.

More details regarding the information universities should consider in certifying the criteria have been met are attached (see Attachment 2).

Institutions must certify to the Ministry that the proposed new program meets criteria 1-6 (see Attachment 3). For graduate programs, certification by OCGS that the proposed new program meets criteria 1 and 2 must also be provided by the institution.

The Ministry will evaluate criterion 7. The Ministry will seek comments related to this criterion from institutions on new undergraduate program proposals.

New program developments which are products of restructuring/rationalization or based on existing programs need only be reported each Spring to the Ministry. Institutions will also be asked each Spring to report other annual program developments including program closures and mergers.

Additional information will be obtained annually by the Ministry from OCGS on the quality appraisal of new and existing graduate programs and from the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) on the results of its audits.

All programs to be reviewed within the 1996-97 approvals cycle should be submitted on or before December 15, 1996. For those institutions who have already submitted programs, please complete the attached certification form (see Attachment 3). Program submissions and any questions should be directed to the attention of :

The Director, Universities Branch  
Postsecondary Education Division  
Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities and Training  
9th Floor, Mowat Block  
900 Bay St.  
Toronto, Ontario  
M7A 1L2  
(416) 325-1952

In making this decision, the Minister has acknowledged with thanks the Academic Advisory Committee for its hard work and the input it provided on the revised process. I too would like to thank the members of the Committee for the important and substantial contributions they have made to the quality of academic programs at Ontario's universities.

*Original signed by*

David Trick  
Assistant Deputy Minister  
Postsecondary Education Division

## Appendix 3.2 2008-09 Program Approvals Cycle Memorandum

**MEMORANDUM TO:** Executive Heads of Provincially-Assisted Universities, Dominican, Hearst, and OCAD

**CC:** Council on University Planning and Analysis

**FROM:** Martin Hicks  
Director

**DATE:** August 14, 2009

**RE:** **Call for 2009-10 Program Approval Submissions**

---

Since 1996, new "non-core" undergraduate programs (Group A Category) and all graduate programs (Group B Category) for which enrolment is eligible to be counted for funding purposes must be approved by the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU). "Core" undergraduate Arts and Science programs are exempt from this process (see Attachment 1 for listing of program approval categories).

New programs, once approved, will generate basic income units (BIUs) that are eligible to be counted for funding purposes through operating grants subject to the level of funding the government makes annually. New programs must also be ministry-approved in order for students who are enrolling in these programs to be eligible to receive assistance from the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP).

Proposed Group A and B programs will be assessed for similarities to pre-existing programs in Ontario which may affect eligibility for public funding (see criterion 7 of Attachments 2 and 3). Universities must identify the extent to which their proposed new undergraduate or graduate programs may duplicate other programs offered in Ontario universities.

If duplication exists, justification and supporting documentation must be provided (see institutional checklist in Attachment 3). If the program is unique, it is essential to satisfy criterion 5 (societal need) and criterion 6 (student demand). Please include the proposed calendar entry and other descriptive documentation for each program, as well as a suggested program weight and Formula Program of Study (FORPOS) code.

Where a new program submission contains incomplete or insufficient rationale to support justifiable duplication, the new program will not be approved and will be held pending receipt of the additional documentation. Delays in providing the appropriate documentation before the deadlines may result in the program slipping to the next opportunity for review in the cycle.

As part of the review process, the ministry will fax or e-mail information about proposed Group A undergraduate programs to University Vice-Presidents, Academic, who will have an opportunity to comment on the extent to which these programs may duplicate an existing program. The ministry will consult the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care in relation to proposed new programs in the health related and professional fields.

### Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP):

Starting in 2009-10, MTCU is incorporating the CIP codes into our enrolment reporting system. In preparation for this and to assist our understanding of how the CIP codes are being assigned, we are



requesting that institutions provide their suggested CIP code in Attachment 5.

Information on Tuition Fees per Program:

Institutions must indicate in their new program approvals submission to the ministry the proposed fee rate for any new program. As per the tuition fee guidelines, institutions may set the tuition fee for new programs up to a level commensurate with the tuition charged for comparable university programs in Ontario. Fees should not exceed the maximum fee rates charged by other comparable Ontario university programs. Institutions should provide information on the comparator programs used to set the tuition fee level. Comparability is based on factors such as course and program design, credential outcome and assigned BIU weight.

The ministry will review the appropriateness of the comparator programs chosen to set the tuition fee rate and has the final authority on all decisions of comparability. This information should be submitted in the Program Approval Summary form (Attachment 5).

Institutions should identify how the tuition fees are charged, for example, by program, by “flat fee”, or by course/credit. Institutions must also provide the tuition fee information as an annualized fee.

Information on Collaborative Programs:

The ministry requests that institutions submit further information on collaborative programs. Please ensure that each program submission which includes one or more institutional partner, from either the college/university sector, includes information on the enrolment reporting arrangement between partners, and with the ministry. This information can be placed in Attachment 5.

2009-2010 Program Approval Submission Schedule:

<b>PROGRAM APPROVAL SUBMISSION DUE DATES</b>
October 1, 2009
January 12, 2010
March 3, 2010
June 2, 2010
<b>Program Development Report Due Date: May 3, 2010</b>

Each program proposal submitted must include the following attachments:

- 1) **Program Approvals Certification Form (Attachment 3):** must be completed for each proposed new program.
- 2) **OCGS Approval Form:** for every Group B graduate program, proof of approval from the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies (OCGS) must be submitted before it can be considered by the Minister.
- 3) **Program Approval Summary Form (Attachment 5):** use the attached Program Approval Summary form for each program.
- 4) **Program Calendar Information:** please attach the list of credits per program each year with corresponding course credits.

The annual Program Development Report (Attachment 4) that reports on program developments (i.e., restructured, merged and closed programs) should be received by fax by **May 3, 2010**. All universities are required to submit this report, regardless of whether there are any program changes to report. The risk of not submitting a report is that the ministry may not recognize students for funding purposes in programs that have changed without the ministry's knowledge.

Your program approval submissions, annual program development report, and any questions can be

directed to:

Nadira Ramkissoon, Research Policy Analyst  
Universities Unit, Postsecondary Accountability Branch  
Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities  
900 Bay Street, 9th Floor Mowat Block  
Toronto, ON M7A 1L2  
Phone: 416-325-8925 Fax: 416-325-0108  
Email: nadira.ramkissoon@ontario.ca

Thank you for your co-operation.

*original signed by*

Martin Hicks  
Director

## Attachment 1: Program Approval Categories

### Undergraduate “Core Arts and Science Programs,” Group A - “Non-Core” Undergraduate Programs, and Group B - All Graduate Programs

#### Undergraduate “Core Arts and Science” Programs

*Programs that are in basic disciplines which might be expected to be offered at any university... (and are) appropriate to the academic ethos and character of any university.*

Biological Sciences (including Biotechnology)	Mathematical Sciences & Computer Studies
English Language & Literature	Physical Sciences
French Language & Literature	Social Sciences (including Women’s Studies)
General Arts and Science	Theology
Humanities (including ancient and classical languages)	

**\*Note: Core Arts and Science programs are exempt from the program approval process.**

#### Group A - “Non-Core” Programs

Accounting, Accountancy	Forestry	Physical Education
Actuarial Science	Gerontology	Planning
Agricultural Business	Health Studies	Public Administration
Agriculture	Home Economics, Food Studies	Public Service Studies
Architecture	Horticulture	Radiation Therapy
Area Studies	Industrial, Labour Relations	Recreation
Art Education, Conservation, Art Therapy	Journalism	Resource Management
Clothing, Textiles, Design and Fashion	Kinesiology	Social Work
Commerce	Labour Studies	Speech Pathology and Audiology
Communications	Landscape Architecture	Survey Science
Community, Urban and Regional	Language and Literature Studies	Systems Design
Planning	Law	Theatre Arts
Criminology	Law Enforcement	Translation, Interpretation
Dance	Legal Studies	Urban Studies, Urbanism
Dental Surgery	Library Science	Veterinary Medicine
Dentistry	Linguistics	War Studies
Dietetics	Management, Business Management	
Drama	Marketing	
Education	Medical Illustration	
- Primary-Junior	Medicine	
- Junior-Intermediate	Midwifery	
- Intermediate-Senior	Municipal Administration	
- Technological Studies	Music	
- French as a First Language (FFL)	Native Studies	
Engineering	Nursing	
Environmental Studies, Environmental	Nursing Education	
Science	Occupational Therapy	
Family Studies, Family Science	Optometry	
Film, Cinema	Personnel and Administrative Studies	
Finance	Pharmacology	
Fine Art, Studio Art, Painting	Pharmacy	
Forest Technology	Physical Therapy, Physiotherapy	

#### Group B – Graduate Programs

All graduate programs

## Attachment 2: Information the University Should Consider in Certifying Criteria Have Been Met

Criteria	Institutional Check List
<b>1. Program Nomenclature (“Truth-in-Advertising”)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The University Senate or equivalent academic body should ensure that the program name and degree designation are appropriate to program content and consistent with current usage in the discipline.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Academic Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Undergraduate: the University should ensure that the Senate or equivalent academic body has approved the undergraduate program.</li> <li>➤ Graduate: the University should ensure that the Dean of Graduate Studies (or equivalent) has received a letter indicating the date program passed OCGS appraisal without requiring improvements.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Financial Viability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Board of Governors or equivalent body should ensure the university has in hand the requisite resources to introduce the program within existing funding levels and is prepared to maintain the program for a reasonable period of time (The approval of a program is not grounds for a request for additional funding from the Ministry to initiate or sustain the program).</li> <li>➤ Where there is an increase in the minimum length of time required to complete an existing approved degree program, the institution should be able to justify the additional costs incurred to the institution, government and the student.</li> <li>➤ In making these determinations, institutions should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the impact of the program on funding and how the institution intends to finance and staff the proposed program</li> <li>○ the additional costs (capital expenditures, additional faculty, etc), and the sources of additional funds (external grants, donations, government grants)</li> <li>○ how other programs will be affected (joint offerings, closure, rationalization, decreased in size, etc.), including how and whether or not any cost savings will be involved</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Criteria	Institutional Check List
<b>4. Institutional Appropriateness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The university should ensure the program is related to institutional mission, academic plans, and/or departmental plans.</li> <li>➤ The university should ensure the program fits into the broader array of program offerings, particularly areas of teaching and research strength, collateral areas of study, etc.</li> <li>➤ In making these determinations, institutions should consider:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ notable resources available to the program demonstrating institutional appropriateness e.g. Chairs, institutes, centres; unique library collections or resources; facilities such as computer, laboratory, other acquisitions, etc.</li> <li>○ external financial support demonstrating strength such as facility/equipment donations, other external donations, grants, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>5. Student Demand</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The University should ensure there is convincing evidence of student demand for the program.</li> <li>➤ In making these determinations, institutions should consider:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ projected enrolment levels for the first five years of operation (If the program is in operation, use actual and projected data)</li> <li>○ intended steady-state annual enrolment and steady-state total enrolment projections and the year(s) in which they will be achieved</li> <li>○ evidence of student demand through application statistics, for example: number of enquiries, applications received, number of qualified applicants, use of macro-indicator data (graduate only)</li> <li>○ origin of student demand (% domestic and visa students; graduate only - the undergraduate or master's programs from which students would be drawn)</li> <li>○ duration of the projected demand (e.g. short, medium or long-term demand from specified sources)</li> <li>○ evidence of review and comment by appropriate student organization(s)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Criteria	Institutional Check List
<b>6. Societal Need</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The University should ensure there is convincing evidence that graduates of the program are needed in specifically identified fields (academic, public and/or private sector).</li> <li>➤ For professional program areas, the university should ensure congruence with current regulatory requirements of the profession.</li> <li>➤ In making these determinations, institutions should consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ dimensions of the societal need for graduates (e.g. socio-cultural, economic, scientific, technological)</li> <li>○ geographic scope of the societal need for graduates (e.g. local, regional, provincial, national)</li> <li>○ trends in societal need for graduates</li> <li>○ duration of the societal need (e.g. short, medium, or long-term)</li> <li>○ examples of evidence for the above would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ letters from a variety of potential employers of graduates who have seen the curriculum and commented upon the need for graduates within their organization and, more broadly, in their field of endeavour</li> <li>▪ professional society and/or association comments about the need for graduates based on a review of the curriculum</li> <li>▪ employment surveys, survey of the number of positions advertised in, for example, the CAUT Bulletin, AUCC University Affairs, etc.</li> <li>▪ statistics related to the number of Ontario students leaving the province to study in the same field elsewhere in Canada or abroad</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>7. Duplication</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The University should cite similar programs offered by other institutions in the Ontario university system.</li> <li>➤ The University should provide evidence of justifiable duplication based on societal need and/or student demand in cases where there are programs in the system that are the same or similar (Comments from other institutions regarding proposed new undergraduate programs will be sought by the Ministry. Comments regarding Health Science programs will also be sought from the Ministry of Health).</li> <li>➤ The University should indicate innovative and distinguishing aspects of the program.</li> <li>➤ The University should indicate why the institution is offering the program on a “stand-alone” basis rather than merging its resources with another institution in a joint program.</li> </ul>

### Attachment 3: 2009-10 Program Approvals Certification Form

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Program Name and Degree Designation  
 (Please attach the Program's Calendar Entry)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Institution

The university certifies that the following six criteria have been evaluated and met for the above proposed new program:

- The program has undergone a nomenclature confirmation review by the University Senate for Group A undergraduate programs and by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for Group B graduate programs.
- Senate has certified program quality for Group A undergraduate programs and the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies has done so for Group B graduate programs. **(For graduate programs, a copy of OCGS approval is required)**
- The governing body of the institution has certified that the program can be financed by institutional resources unless the Minister has given prior approval of additional funding to cover any portion of program costs that cannot be absorbed by the institution.
- The program is consistent with the aims, objectives and existing strengths of the institution.
- There is convincing evidence of student demand.
- There is convincing evidence of societal need.

The university submits the attached information as evidence that any duplicative similarities to existing programs in Ontario or Canada are justifiable for reasons of public funding.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Signature of President)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Date)

**Attachment 4: 2009-10 Program Developments Report      FAXBACK**

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Institutional Contact: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**A. Rationalized / Restructured Programs**

Program Name	Degree Designation	Date Effective	Additional Information (e.g. existing program based on)

**B. Merged Programs / Departments**

Program/Department Name	Degree Designation	Date Effective	Additional Information (e.g. existing program/department based on)

**C. Closed Programs**

Program Name	Degree Designation	Date Effective	Additional Information

Please fax the Annual Development Report, also referred to as the Faxback Report, to Nadira Ramkissoon, Universities Unit, Postsecondary Accountability Branch, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities to 416-325-0108 by **May 3, 2010**. You may also email the report to [nadira.ramkissoon@ontario.ca](mailto:nadira.ramkissoon@ontario.ca)

Relevant calendar copy information should also be provided (Attach additional pages if necessary).



## Attachment 5: Program Approval Summary

<b>2009-2010 PROGRAM APPROVAL SUMMARY</b>	
Please submit one form per program and attach the following:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Program Approval Certification Form</li> <li>2) Program Calendar Information (including a list of courses offered each year with credits attached to each course)</li> <li>3) OCGS approval if required</li> </ol>	
<b>Institution:</b>	
<b>Name of Program:</b>	
<b>Length of Program:</b>	<b># of Semesters/Year:</b>
<b>Expected Start Date for Program:</b>	
<b>Suggested FORPOS Code &amp; Program Weight:</b>	
<b>Suggested CIP code:</b>	
<b>Proposed Tuition Fee &amp; Explanation</b>	
<p><b>Include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of comparator programs used to set the tuition level (internal and/or external)</li> <li>• How tuition fees are charged (flat or program fee, or by course/credit)</li> <li>• Annualized tuition fee</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> Tuition fee should exclude all centrally collected ancillary fees and student referenda fees.</p>	
<b>Does this program include a thesis option?</b>	
<b>In addition to the checklist provided by the ministry, please describe the following criteria below:</b>	
<b>Brief Program Description:</b>	
<b>Certification by the executive head that there is convincing evidence of societal need:</b>	
<b>Convincing evidence that any duplicative similarities to existing programs in Ontario/Canada are justifiable for reasons of public funding (please list/briefly describe similar programs):</b>	
<b>If this is a collaborative program with another college/university, please identify partners, and describe the arrangement by which institutions report enrolments as eligible to be counted for funding purposes.</b>	
<b>Institutional Contact Person:</b>	

## APPENDIX 4: UNIVERSITY ENROLMENT

(Source: MTCU USER)

	<b>FTEs</b>	<b>BIUs</b>
<b>1983-84</b>	220,821	375,796
<b>1984-85</b>	221,914	377,853
<b>1985-86</b>	220,201	375,784
<b>1986-87</b>	221,020	376,720
<b>1987-88</b>	227,241	387,358
<b>1988-89</b>	235,903	402,392
<b>1989-90</b>	243,734	415,840
<b>1990-91</b>	253,384	433,463
<b>1991-92</b>	263,467	451,398
<b>1992-93</b>	267,031	457,578
<b>1993-94</b>	264,017	452,345
<b>1994-95</b>	258,278	445,556
<b>1995-96</b>	255,667	440,179
<b>1996-97</b>	242,131	411,798
<b>1997-98</b>	241,916	412,838
<b>1998-99</b>	242,889	415,773
<b>1999-00</b>	248,688	425,823
<b>2000-01</b>	252,727	434,912
<b>2001-02</b>	263,492	456,398
<b>2002-03</b>	283,512	493,500
<b>2003-04</b>	315,258	545,587
<b>2004-05</b>	330,374	580,836
<b>2005-06</b>	344,521	607,841
<b>2006-07</b>	354,349	631,862
<b>2007-08</b>	357,936	646,913
<b>2008-09</b>	363,867	667,092

## **APPENDIX 5: SAMPLE LETTERS OF “APPROVAL-IN-PRINCIPLE” FOR PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS**

### **Appendix 5.1: LIVE-IN CAREGIVER APPROVED**

This letter acknowledges receipt of your application for permanent resident status in Canada.

It has been determined that you meet the eligibility requirements to apply for permanent resident status as a member of the live-in caregiver class. However, a final decision will not be made until all remaining requirements for becoming a permanent resident have been met. If applicable, all of your family members, both in Canada and abroad, must pass medical and background checks. Even if your family members abroad are not applying to join you in Canada at this time, they must pass medical and background checks. You cannot become a permanent resident until you and your family members have passed medical and background checks.

If you are not already in possession of an open work permit and you wish to work elsewhere, or do not possess a valid study permit and wish to attend school for more than six months, you may apply for either or both. If you wish to apply for a study permit, be sure to include a letter from the educational institution you plan to attend. The letter should outline the type of course or program you are registered for, the start date and the expected completion date. Please contact an Immigration Call Centre in your area and request an application kit.

The client number shown in the upper right corner of this letter is your personal identification number. This number provides access to information on your file and, as such, for your own protection, you should not allow any other person to use this number. If sending correspondence to Citizenship and Immigration Canada, please include your personal identification number. Failure to include this number could result in the return of your correspondence unanswered.

If you require further assistance, please telephone your local Call Centre at the number indicated below and be prepared to quote your client number and your date of birth. General information and application kits may also be obtained through our Web site at <http://www.cic.gc.ca>.

Montréal 514-496-1010  
Toronto 416-973-4444  
Vancouver 604-666-2171

### **Appendix 5.2: PRELIMINARY/INITIAL APPROVAL TEMPLATE DRAFT – In Land Spouse**

This letter acknowledges receipt of your application for permanent resident status in Canada.

It has been determined that you meet the eligibility requirements to apply for permanent resident status as a member of the spouse or common-law partner in Canada class. However, a final decision will not be made until all remaining requirements for becoming a permanent resident have been met. These requirements include medical, security and background checks for you and, if applicable, all of your family members, both in Canada and abroad, even if they are not applying to join you in Canada at this time. You cannot become a permanent resident until you and all your family members have met these requirements.

If you are not already in possession of a valid work permit or you have a work permit but wish to work elsewhere, or do not possess a valid study permit and you wish to attend school for more than six months,

you may apply for either or both.

If you wish to apply for a study permit, be sure to include a letter from the educational institution you plan to attend. The letter should outline the type of course or program you are registered for, the start date and the expected completion date.

The client number shown in the upper right corner of this letter is your personal identification number. This number provides access to information on your file and, as such, for your own protection, you should not allow any other person to use this number. Please include your personal identification number in any correspondence with Citizenship and Immigration Canada. Failure to include this number could result in the return of your correspondence unanswered.

If you require further assistance, please telephone the Call Centre at 1- 888- 242-2100 (Toll Free). Be prepared to quote your client number and your date of birth. General information and application kits may also be obtained through our Web site at <http://www.cic.gc.ca>.

### Appendix 5.3: IMMIGRANT APPLICATIONS IN CANADA MADE ON HUMANITARIAN OR COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS

This refers to your application for permanent residence from within Canada on humanitarian and compassionate grounds. This is a two-step decision-making process.

First, humanitarian and compassionate factors are assessed to decide whether to grant an exemption from certain legislative requirements to allow your application for permanent residence to be processed from within Canada. On (date), a representative of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration approved your request for an exemption from these requirements for the purpose of processing this application.

Second, you must meet all other statutory requirements of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, for example, medical, security and passport considerations and arrangements for your care and support. As your application is processed, separate decisions will be made about whether you meet these other requirements. If more information is required, you will be sent a letter and asked to provide a reply within 30 days from the date the letter is sent to you.

Please note your application for permanent residence could be refused if:

- you and your family members do not meet all statutory requirements of the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act.
- you receive a letter asking for a reply within 30 days and do not respond.
- you fail to advise this office of any changes to your address. You may do so by writing to this office at the address shown at the top of this letter, by telephoning the CIC Call Centre or online at <http://www.cic.gc.ca>.
- you are not self-supporting. Persons in receipt of social assistance or welfare benefits, either directly or indirectly, are defined in the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act as inadmissible persons.

If preliminary information indicates that you probably meet all statutory requirements of the Immigration

and Refugee Protection Act, you will receive a letter asking that you attend an interview at the Canada Immigration Centre in your area. A final determination on your application for permanent residence will be made at this interview. This usually occurs about nine months after the date your exemption was approved (see paragraph two of this letter). If you do not attend this interview, it could be interpreted as a lack of interest in permanent residence and your application could be refused.

If you wish to work or study in Canada while awaiting finalization of your application for permanent residence, you must request and receive an employment or student authorization. You will need the application kit titled "Application to Change Conditions or Extend My Stay in Canada" which can be obtained by telephoning the CIC Call Centre or visiting our Web site at <http://www.cic.gc.ca>.

If your marital status or personal situation changes, please write to this office immediately or telephone the CIC Call Centre.

Your exemption was granted, in part, due to the hardship you would face if you had to leave Canada and apply from outside of the country as usually required.

Please note if you leave Canada, there is no guarantee that you will be re-admitted so that you can continue with this application.

If you require clarification, more information, wish to provide a change of address or other information, please write to us at the address at the top of this letter, visit the CIC Web site at <http://www.cic.gc.ca> or telephone the CIC Call Centre:

Anywhere in Canada (toll-free) 1-888-242-2100

The client number in the upper right corner of this letter is your personal identification number and it provides access to information on your file. For your own protection, do not allow any other person to use this number.

## APPENDIX 6: ENROLMENT AUDIT

The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities requires an audit of the enrolment data of institutions which are eligible for support under the Ontario formula for operating grants and under the program of support for church-related universities and colleges. The objective of the audit shall be to render an audit report in the prescribed form.

### 1. Responsibility of Auditors

Auditors are responsible for providing an opinion on institutions' enrolment reports to the Deputy Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities in keeping with the spirit of Section 5805 of the CICA Handbook-- Special Reports, explaining an audit opinion on financial information other than financial statements:

#### AUDITOR'S REPORT

TO: THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF TRAINING, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

At the request of (*name of institution*) we have examined the attached enrolment reports totalling (*number*) basic income units and formula fees of \$ (*amount*) for the academic year 20 \_\_\_/\_\_\_ which have been submitted to us by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included a general review of the records and procedures by which the above enrolment reports were prepared and such tests of the records of (*name of institution*) and other supporting evidence as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, the attached enrolment reports present fairly the weighted enrolment and formula fees of (*name of institution*) for 20 \_\_\_/\_\_\_ for funding purposes, in accordance with instructions issued by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities in the most recent edition of the "Ontario Operating Funds Distribution Manual," dated (*month*), 20 \_\_\_/\_\_\_ and "Essential Notes and Reporting Instructions," dated (*month*), 20 \_\_\_/\_\_\_ or through correspondence.

City \_\_\_\_\_ (Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

Auditor

Date \_\_\_\_\_

If the auditor is able to complete the audit report without qualification (because adequate assurance has been obtained from the audit work that the upper limit of errors throughout the enrolment reports does not exceed the materiality limit), it will not be necessary to disclose any known or projected errors to the Ministry; reporting requirements will, in these circumstances, be fully met by the submission of a signed audit report in the prescribed form.

If, on the other hand, based upon the results of the examination, the auditor is not able to complete the prescribed report without qualification(s) then he or she shall report these findings to the Deputy Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities explaining fully the circumstances involved, and will await further direction as to how to proceed with the examination.

It is recognized that during the course of the examination the auditor may wish to seek clarification or direction in regard to such matters as ambiguities arising from applying the categorization scheme.

Clarifications and interpretations of the formula for operating grants are the responsibility of the Ministry. If, therefore, the auditor wishes to consult, or to seek clarification or direction with respect to the examination, it should be done by writing to the Director, Postsecondary Finance and Information Management Branch, Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

The auditor of each reporting institution will provide the Deputy Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities with the enrolment audit report by December 31 following the conclusion of the academic year concerned and will provide a copy of all correspondence in this connection to the President (or the equivalent) of the university or college concerned.

## **2. Responsibility of Institutions**

Each university or college must formally advise the firm of public accountants retained by it that an audit of enrolment is a condition for payment of enrolment-related operating grants and that the required examination for this purpose has been authorized. A copy of this letter should be forwarded to the Ministry, where it will serve as authorization for direct communication with the auditors.

## **3. Responsibility of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities**

The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities will provide the following to the auditor of each institution:

- 3.1 A summary of enrolment data received from the institution. (The auditor to confirm with the president and enrolment reporting officer their acceptance of it as a correct summary).

The enrolment data submitted will have been carefully reviewed and their arithmetical accuracy proven. Changes, if any, to the data submitted will have been noted and agreed to by the reporting institution.

- 3.2 An updated version of the "Ontario Operating Funds Distribution Manual".
- 3.3 An updated version of the "USER Reporting Guide".

## **4. Guidance for Auditors**

Determination of appropriate procedures and the scope of the audit necessary to support an opinion is a responsibility of the auditor. In making this determination, the procedures selected will not be limited to, but should include, the following factors traditionally considered essential to any enrolment audit:

- 4.1 A general review of student records and related procedures to ensure their adequacy for satisfactory completion of the enrolment reports.
- 4.2 A choice of either statistical sampling or judgmental testing as the audit approach most appropriate in the circumstances.

- 4.2.1 Item 6 of this appendix provides guidance with respect to statistical sampling techniques as applied to the audit of enrolment. The Ministry has prescribed a sampling confidence level of 95% and a materiality limit of 2% (with respect to the upper limit of net overstatements). That is, the statistical results yielded by a random sample must be such as to give the auditor at least 95% confidence that the total BIU's reported on the year's enrolment reports are not overstated by a net amount of more than 2%.
- 4.2.2 If, instead, judgemental testing procedures are used, the auditor should be satisfied that the audit tests of BIU records provide evidence at least equivalent to that required for an unqualified opinion where statistical sampling techniques are used.
- 4.3 The audit should highlight any areas of ambiguity encountered in applying the formula categorization scheme or the rules for determining eligibility for funding of programs or students and obtain a satisfactory authority reference for the manner in which the institution has dealt with situations not explicitly provided for in the "Ontario Operating Funds Distribution Manual."
- 4.4 The audit should include an examination of the reasons for changes between enrolment as reported and as approved by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities. Procedural weaknesses should be noted so that the institution may take appropriate action to prevent their recurrence.
- 4.5 The audit should satisfactorily reconcile total fees computed, using reported enrolment data and the fee schedule of the institution, with academic fees as reported in the audited financial statements.
- 4.6 The auditor should obtain, in the prescribed form (see item 5), a certificate from the institution's registrar, attesting that (except as noted) enrolments in all programs of study offered fall within the formula categories under which they have been included. In addition, this certificate will declare that all enrolment reported is eligible for purposes of determining grant assistance except as noted in the certificate.
- 4.7 Four areas requiring special audit procedures are:
- formula units at the graduate level,
  - study abroad courses and programs,
  - eligible international student enrolment reporting and formula fees, and
  - honours student differentiation criteria (when differentiated programs do not exist).
- 4.7.1 Item 7.1, entitled "Counting of Graduate Students--Audit Implications" (of the methods/procedures for establishing formula entitlements at the graduate level) lists some possible audit tests applicable to formula units at the graduate level. Item 7.2 provides a sample certification of graduate student status and eligibility for formula operating grant support (to be used for "verifying" some of the less auditable criteria).
- 4.7.2 Item 8 summarizes the information an auditor would need in order to verify the eligibility for formula funding of a student on a study abroad course or program. Institutions are required to keep on file a completed copy of this form, signed by a dean and the registrar (or their equivalents), for every study abroad course or program offered by the institution.



4.7.3 Item 9 outlines the procedures to be used by institutions and their auditors to identify international students for purposes of applying the international student fee policy and to determine conformity of institutional practice with this policy.

4.7.4 Institutions are required to keep on file a copy (copies) of the ministry's approval of the current (and/or historical) criteria used to differentiate students as honours, for reporting purposes, when differentiated programs of study do not exist. Auditors are required to attest that these criteria have been accurately applied within the overall materiality limits of their enrolment audit.

Institutions should obtain written approval from the ministry for existing criteria, and shall thereafter obtain ministry approval for any changes to such criteria. In enrolment audit reports, the auditors shall notify the ministry of any changes to existing criteria if ministry approval has not been obtained.

4.8 External auditors are required to complete a questionnaire (Item 4.8.1, following page) concerning the procedures that they have examined in conducting their enrolment audit.

**4.8.1 ANNUAL ENROLMENT AUDIT QUESTIONNAIRE**

TO: THE MINISTRY OF TRAINING, COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

RE: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Institution)

AND THE ENROLMENT REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING: \_\_\_\_\_

*(TICK EITHER YES OR NO FOR EACH ITEM BELOW AND PROVIDE OTHER RESPONSES AS REQUIRED.)*

1. During the course of the enrolment audit, were there any matters that you have reported, or intend to report, to the management, the audit committee, the board of governors, or governing council of your client regarding material inaccuracies or the possibility of material inaccuracies in the enrolment report?

YES             NO

If YES, please outline what they are:

\_\_\_\_\_

- 2a. Did you submit a management letter pertaining to the enrolment audit for the year prior to the year under review?

YES             NO

- 2b. Have all the matters in the management letter pertaining to the enrolment audit been resolved to your satisfaction?

YES             NO

If NO, please comment:

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Did you review the responses contained in this questionnaire with the institution?

YES             NO

NAME AND ADDRESS OF AUDIT FIRM:

\_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE OF AUDITOR: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF PARTNER IN CHARGE: \_\_\_\_\_

LICENCE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

## 5. Registrar's Certification in Connection with Audit of Enrolment

*(Public Accounts Council of Ontario Licence Number)*

*(UNIVERSITY LETTERHEAD)*

### **Registrar's Certification in Connection with Audit of Enrolment**

To: *(Name of Auditor)*  
*(Institution)*

*(Session)*

Dear Sir:

In connection with your examination of the enrolment reports for *(session)* submitted to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and the records from which these have been prepared I hereby certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief:

1. That all records have been maintained in a manner consistent with the internal university procedures established for the compilation of enrolment data and that the figures shown on the enrolment reports agree with these records.
2. That there is explicit authority for inclusion of enrolments in all programs of study offered by the university within the formula categories under which they have been reported, except as noted below:
3. That all students ineligible for support under the provisions of the Ontario formula for operating grants have been excluded in determining the operating grant which has been paid.

The numbers of such students and the programs of study in which they are enrolled are as noted below:

4. That all relevant instructions and provisions applicable to the completion of the enrolment reports and the determination of the operating grants have been correctly followed.

Yours truly,

---



---

Title

To be signed by the Registrar (or such other university official as is responsible for completion of MTCU enrolment reports).

## 6. STATISTICAL Sampling

Extracts from a letter dated October 18, 1972 from Clarkson, Gordon & Co. to Mr. F. J. Kidd, on the subject of the application of statistical sampling techniques to enrolment auditing follow.

### 6.1 Background

An auditor does not and cannot "certify to the accuracy" of figures in a financial statement (or enrolment report) first, because the accounting principles governing its preparation always require judgement in application and second, because it is usually completely impractical for the auditor to check 100% of the underlying transactions. Instead, the auditor bases his/her examination on tests guided by analyses of the figures, internal reconciliation of balances, review of internal control, and so on, and then reports, if appropriate, that "in her/his opinion" the financial statement (or enrolment report) "presents fairly" the financial position or other information required (such as the "weighted enrolment").

The words "in his/her opinion" imply that the auditor cannot provide 100% certainty but rather a reasonable degree of *confidence* as a result of the audit work. The words "present fairly" imply that the auditor cannot report that the financial statement (or enrolment report) is accurate to the cent but rather that (subject to the reasonable degree of confidence mentioned above) it is not misstated by a *material* amount. Any audit, therefore, implies a choice of *confidence* level and *materiality* limit. Such choices are made implicitly when an auditor employs judgemental testing procedures. (The auditor intuitively decides how *much* must be tested to be *reasonably sure* of detecting a *material error* if present). When an auditor employs statistical sampling procedures, however, the choice of confidence level and materiality limit (which in turn determine sample size) must be made explicit.

The Ministry has stated that for the purposes of the enrolment audit, the university auditor may employ *either* statistical sampling techniques *or* judgemental testing procedures. Where the nature of the enrolment records, however, permits the application of statistical sampling techniques, most university auditors will wish to consider such application seriously because of the benefits of greater objectivity to be derived therefrom. The following material is intended to indicate a method of applying such techniques.

### 6.2 Prescription of Confidence Level and Materiality Limit

The Ministry has prescribed a sampling confidence level of 95% and a materiality limit of 2% (with respect to the upper limit of net overstatements) where the university auditor employs statistical sampling procedures in arriving at an opinion on the reported "weighted enrolment."

### 6.3 Statistical sampling of BIUs

There are various different components of a complete enrolment audit: studying the system of internal control, reconciling reported academic fees to reported enrolment, sampling records of 'basic income units' (BIUs) to verify 'weighted enrolment' reflected in the year's enrolment reports, etc. The following material, however, addresses itself exclusively to the statistical sampling of BIU records to verify the year's enrolment reports.

What is required is a statistical sample of BIU records that will yield 95% sampling confidence that total BIUs reported on the year's enrolment reports have not been overstated by more than 2%.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>59</sup> With respect to the specific prescribed guidelines of 95% confidence and 2% upper error limit, the Ministry prescription requires only that these be applied to net overstatements. When, however, the auditor expresses an opinion that the "enrolment reports present fairly the weighted enrolment" he/she will normally want to be

Since the objective of the audit test is to assess the frequency of net overstatements in total reported BIUs, the direction of the audit test must clearly be from the reported BIUs *back* to underlying enrolment records.

The first question is whether the auditor should select a random sample of students or a random sample of BIUs (in the former case every student would have an equal chance of selection while in the latter case every BIU would have an equal chance of selection). If the former method is chosen, the auditor will be able to arrive at a statistical conclusion that X% of the student records may contain BIU overstatements. The auditor will not, however, be able to convert this conclusion into a rigorous statistical conclusion with respect to total BIUs themselves.

If the X% of overstated student records were or might be mostly graduate students, then total BIUs might well be overstated by far more than X% (since each graduate student overstatement might be an overstatement of several BIUs). It is possible that additional judgemental testing (particularly among graduate records) may still permit the auditor in such a case to arrive at a reasonable judgemental conclusion. Nonetheless, it is desirable, where feasible, to obtain a statistical conclusion directly relating to reported BIUs and this can be done by drawing a statistical sample of BIUs.

The first point is, therefore, that it is desirable for the auditor to draw a *random sample of BIUs*; that is, every BIU among the total reported BIUs should have an equal chance of selection in the audit sample.

Such a procedure will, for example, give somewhat more chance of selection to graduate students than to undergraduates but this is appropriate since, in terms of BIUs, each of the former has a greater potential for overstatement than each of the latter.

#### 6.4 Mechanics of Drawing a Statistical Sample of BIUs

Pure random sampling involves making a new random draw on each selection. A far less cumbersome procedure, however, is to use 'systematic' or 'interval' sampling whereby the auditor selects every nth BIU throughout the population. This requires two things:

1. that the auditor can identify a set of BIU records (the 'population') that has been added (or will be added) and agreed (or will agree) in total to the total BIUs reported on the year's enrolment reports, and
2. that the auditor can by some method count through this population of BIUs in order to select every nth one.<sup>60</sup>

For example, if the total population amounts to 4,000 BIUs and the auditor has estimated that a sample of 400 BIUs would be needed (sample size determination is discussed below) then every 10th BIU throughout the entire population would be selected. The counting through the population to pick every 10th BIU may be able to be done manually (if the BIU records exist on visible accounting reports) or by computer (if the BIU records exist on computer files).

---

satisfied in any event that there is reasonable confidence that neither a material overstatement error nor a material understatement error exists. The procedures described in this appendix should usually be adequate to give such reasonable assurance with respect to understatements as well as overstatements.

<sup>60</sup> The mechanics of selecting every nth BIU are complicated if the BIU weights are applied manually at a summary level and are not readily available at a detail level. In some cases, this problem can be solved by stratifying the population into groups, students within each group having identical BIU weights. In a computerized system, however, these problems are not as great.

There is a risk that 'interval sampling' may contain a bias (if there is any periodicity or clustering in the pattern of errors throughout the population). For this reason, it is desirable for the auditor to use either 'randomly varying intervals' (the better method) or 'fixed intervals following several random starts'.

With the preferable method of 'randomly varying intervals' the auditor would use a stream of random intervals (obtained either from random number tables or a computer program) averaging to the desired average interval. For example, in the case above, if the auditor wishes 400 selections out of 4,000 BIUs then he or she needs to select at an average interval of 10, but the specific intervals would vary randomly above and below 10 (e.g. the auditor might count along 7 for the 1st selection point, another 15 for the 2nd, and so on). One method of obtaining varying intervals averaging to 10, for example, is to pick random numbers between 1 and 20 (twice the desired average interval), which, if enough are selected, will be bound to average to close to 10.

If, however, the auditor uses fixed intervals, he should take several random starts. One method (still using the above example) is to pick 3 random starts each between 1 and 30 at the very beginning of the population and then fixed intervals of 30 after each of these starts (producing in total a random start between 1 and 10 at the beginning of the population and then fixed intervals of 30 after each of these starts (producing in total about 400 selections). Another method is to pick a random start between 1 and 10 at the beginning of each third (or smaller division) of the population followed by fixed intervals of 10 thereafter throughout that division of the population. These methods are generally considered acceptable but the method of varying intervals described in the previous paragraph is to be preferred.

## 6.5 Evaluation of a Statistical Sample of BIUs

The evaluation of statistical samples will now be discussed and, following that, the planning of required sample size.

Suppose, temporarily, that a university consisted solely of students having 1 BIU each and that the only errors discovered by the auditor were instances where the student should not have been included at all (i.e. each discovered error represented a 1 BIU overstatement).

Statistical attribute sampling tables for 95% confidence (the confidence level prescribed by the Ministry) indicate the following:

For 95% confidence,<sup>61</sup>

Number of Errors Found In Sample	'Upper Error Limit Factor'
0	3.00
1	4.75
2	6.30
3	7.76
4	9.16

<sup>61</sup> This table is based on Poisson tables, and represents a slightly conservative (i.e., safe) approximation to Binomial tables (the rigorous values for attribute sampling from large populations). Additional conservatism arises when these values are used for very small populations (e.g., when 20% of the population has been covered in the sample) but the amount of this additional conservatism (from ignoring the "finite population correction factor") is slight. In any case, since both the above approximations are conservative, the values are safe for the auditor to use (i.e., if anything they will yield conclusions slightly more pessimistic than those the auditor is really entitled to as a result of sampling).

where:

'upper error limit' frequency =  $\frac{\text{'upper error limit' factor}}{\text{sample size}}$

For example,

if 0 errors were found in a sample of 100,

$$\text{U.E.L.} = \frac{3.00}{100} = 3.00\%$$

if 1 error was found in a sample of 100,

$$\text{U.E.L.} = \frac{4.75}{100} = 4.75\%$$

if 3 errors were found in a sample of 400,

$$\text{U.E.L.} = \frac{7.76}{400} = 1.94\%$$

## 6.6 Evaluation for Varying Error Sizes

In practice, of course, a university does not consist solely of students having 1 BIU each but rather some having 1, some 4, some 2.5, etc. Suppose that, in drawing the statistical sample of BIUs, one particular BIU selected happens to fall within a student enrolment record for 4 BIUs. Of course, the auditor cannot verify merely the 1 BIU selected but rather must verify the whole student enrolment record of 4 BIUs. If this whole student record proves to be correct, then obviously the selected BIU therein must be correct too (and accordingly no sample error should be scored for this item).

On the other hand, if the whole student record proves to be fictitious then obviously the selected BIU therein is 100% fictitious too (and accordingly a sample error of *one* 100% fictitious BIU should be scored). If all selected BIUs turned out to be completely right or completely wrong then the table values above could always be used to project the 'upper error limit' of completely fictitious BIUs throughout the population (and this would represent the 'upper error limit' of overstatement in total reported BIUs).

However, in the above example, the auditor may find that the student enrolment record of 4 BIUs should properly have been recorded as 2 BIUs. In this case, the student enrolment record has been overstated by 50% of its reported value. It is logical then to consider each of the 4 reported BIUs (including the one selected BIU therein) as being "tainted" by a 50% overstatement error. In such a case, then, a sample error of *one* 50% overstated BIU should be scored.

## 6.7 Tainting Percentages Under 100%

How is such a 50% overstated BIU discovered as the only error, say, in a sample of 100 to be projected? Referring to the previous table, a sample of 100 containing 0 errors had a UEL of 3.00% while a sample of 100 containing 1 error had a UEL of 4.75%. It follows, in a sample of 100 containing no 100% errors and one 50% error, that 100% errors (0 found in sample) have a UEL of 3.00%, while 100% and 50% errors together (1 found in sample) have a UEL of 4.75%. It can be readily shown that the most conservative way of combining these two rigorous statistical conclusions is to attribute a 3.00% possible frequency to

100% errors and the remaining 1.75% possible frequency to 50% errors.

The net UEL would therefore be computed as follows:

Errors Found	Tainting 100%	UEL Incremental Factor	Product	Sample Size	Net UEL
0	100% x	3.00	= 3.00		
1st	50% x	<u>1.75</u> 4.75	= <u>0.88</u>		
			3.88	÷100	= 3.88%

To permit such computation to be done when several different errors are found, a table of UEL incremental factors is desirable as follows:

For 95% confidence,<sup>62</sup>

Errors found in sample, ranked in declining tainting percentage	'Upper error limit' incremental factor
0	3.00
1st	1.75
2nd	1.55
3rd	1.46
4th	1.40
5th	1.36
6th	1.33
7th	1.30
8th	1.29
9th	1.27
10th	1.26
11th	1.24
12th	1.24
13th	1.22
14th	1.22
15th	1.21

where:

<sup>62</sup> This table represents merely the increments between successive values shown in the previous table. The derivation of the values is subject to the same technical note as Footnote 3.

The above method of evaluation by ranking tainting percentages is supported by Dr. Albert Teitlebaum of McGill University and also corresponds (except for differences in terminology) with that outlined in Chapter V of the Research Study, "Statistical Sampling in a Audit Context", published in March 1972 by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants. It is possible to eliminate some of the conservatism inherent in this method by the use of a computer program, but such a refinement is usually not significant enough to be worthwhile.



'upper error limit' frequency value =  $\frac{1}{\text{sample size}}$

x (3.00 x100%  
 + 1.75 x tainting % for 1<sup>st</sup> error  
 + 1.55 x tainting % for 2<sup>nd</sup> error  
 + etc.)

and where:

tainting % of an error =  $\frac{\text{amount of error (in BIUs)}}{\text{reported BIUs for that student record}}$

For conservatism, it is necessary to rank the errors in order of declining tainting % (as indicated above) since the UEL incremental factors are larger for the early errors. Note that the zero line is always scored at 3.00 x 100% since, even if no 100% errors are found in the sample, overstatement errors as large as 100% each (though no larger) could exist in the population.

## 6.8 Offsetting Overstatements and Understatements

The above procedures should be applied solely to errors of overstatement discovered in the audit sample. The logic is that individual errors of understatement cannot possibly aggravate any total overstatement and therefore in projecting individual errors of overstatement it is perfectly safe for the auditor simply to ignore any individual errors of understatement. If the gross UEL overstatements projected on the foregoing basis amounts to 2% or less then the auditor is in a position to give an unqualified opinion without consideration of the possible offsetting effect of any understatements.

Cases may arise, however, where the gross UEL of overstatements exceeds the 2% limit and yet it is most unlikely that the net overstatement could be this high because of the offsetting effect of understatement errors. It can be shown statistically that it is proper to deduct from the gross UEL of overstatement errors the MLE ('most likely error' rate) of understatement errors.<sup>63</sup>

The 'most likely error' of understatement (to be deducted above) is equal to the sum of the tainting percentages of individual understatement errors discovered in the audit sample divided by the sample size.

## 6.9 Summary of Evaluation Procedure

The above procedures can be summarized as follows:

### 6.9.1

After the BIU selection points have been identified throughout the population of reported BIUs, verify the

<sup>63</sup> For 95% confidence, this statement is rigorous for populations consisting of up to 3.6% overstatements offset by 1.6% understatements. Even for 6% overstatements offset by 4% understatements, the slight inaccuracy of the statement is not large enough to be of material consequence. Auditors should, however, avoid using the offsetting benefit of understatements when gross projected errors in both directions are each several times the 2% materiality limit.

student record in which selected BIU falls.

### 6.9.2

For each selected BIU determine a tainting % as follows:

$$\text{tainting \%} = \frac{\text{amount of error (in BIUs)}}{\text{reported BIUs for that student record}} \times 100\%$$

### 6.9.3

Rank the overstatement errors in order of declining tainting % and compute the gross UEL of overstatements as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gross UEL of overstatements} = & \frac{1}{\text{sample size}} \\ & \times (3.00 \times 100\% \\ & + 1.75 \times \text{tainting \% for 1}^{\text{st}} \text{ error} \\ & + 1.55 \times \text{tainting \% 2}^{\text{nd}} \text{ error} \\ & + \text{etc.}) \end{aligned}$$

using the previous table.

### 6.9.4

Compute the most likely error of understatement as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MLE of understatement} = & \frac{1}{\text{sample size}} \\ & \times (\text{tainting \% for 1}^{\text{st}} \text{ error} \\ & + \text{tainting \% for 2}^{\text{nd}} \text{ error} \\ & + \text{etc.}) \end{aligned}$$

### 6.9.5

Compute upper error limit of net overstatement as follows:

$$\text{Net UEL of overstatements} = \text{gross UEL of overstatements} - \text{MLE of understatements}$$

### 6.9.6

Compare the net upper error limit of overstatements to the 2% materiality limit prescribed by the Ministry.

### 6.9.7

If the net UEL of overstatement is 2% or less, the auditor is in a position to give an unqualified opinion as far as this portion of the audit is concerned (although, of course, the results of other audit work such as the review of internal control, the reconciliation of academic fees, etc., must be assessed judgementally as well).

### 6.9.8

If, on the other hand, the net UEL of overstatement exceeds 2%, the auditor is not in a position to give an unqualified opinion. He should then consider the desirability of extending his sample size (this is discussed below). If, however, it seems clear that no amount of sample extension will lead to an unqualified opinion then he must report his findings to the Ministry.

### 6.10 Suggested Audit Working Paper

The audit working paper form (shown on the following page) can be used to record the statistical evaluation according to the foregoing procedures and contains an example to illustrate its use. In the example illustrated, the auditor discovered four overstatement errors and two understatement errors in the sample of 300 BIUs. The 'most likely' errors are 0.83% overstatements and 0.50% understatements, for a net 'most likely error' of 0.33% overstatements. The university records are *probably* overstated by only this small 0.33% rate. However, they *might*, subject to 95% confidence, be overstated by a net amount of as much as 1.83% (the net UEL of overstatement). Since this net UEL does not exceed the prescribed materiality limit of 2%, the auditor (subject to the completion and assessment of the other audit work: internal control review, academic fee reconciliation, etc.) is in a position to give an unqualified opinion. Had the net UEL, on the other hand, exceeded the 2% limit, the auditor would have had to consider the possibility of sample extension (discussed below).

### 6.11 Sample Extension

Suppose that in the foregoing example the auditor's sample of 300 had instead contained three 100% overstatement errors and no understatement errors. The statistical evaluation in this case would have worked out to the following:

$$\text{MLE of over statement: } \frac{300\%}{300} = 1\%$$

$$\text{ULE of overstatement: } \frac{7.76}{300} = 2.56\%$$

Here the situation is that while the overstatement of reported BIUs is *probably* only 1% (which would be acceptable) it *might*, subject to 95% confidence, be as high as 2.59% (which is unacceptable). Based on the audit work done to date the auditor is *not* in a position to give an unqualified opinion. On the other hand, there is a reasonable indication that the population error is not material (i.e. not as high as 2%) and that a larger sample size will be able to prove this. In such a situation the auditor should extend the sample size by drawing additional items from the population.

**6.10.1 ILLUSTRATION OF ENROLMENT AUDIT WORKING PAPER TO EVALUATE STATISTICAL SAMPLE OF BASIC INCOME UNITS (BIUs)**

Identification No. of Student Found to Contain BIU Errors	BIU As Reported	BIU Should Be	Amount Understated	Amount Overstated	Understatement Tainting % D/B * 100	Overstatement Tainting % E/B * 100	Rank of Overstatement Error (G) (In Declining Tainting %)	UEL Incremental Factor for This Rank of Error (per below)	Tainting % * UEL Incremental Factor (G * I)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	3.00	3.00
A423	4	3	-	1	-	25%	4	1.40	0.35
F218	2	3	1	-	50%	-	-	-	-
L106	1	0	-	1	-	100%	1	1.75	1.75
M247	3	1.5	-	1.5	-	50%	3	1.46	0.73
R351	1	2	1	-	100%	-	-	-	-
S067	4	1	-	3	-	75%	2	1.55	1.16
<b>Totals</b>					<b>150%</b>	<b>250%</b>			<b>6.99</b>

Factors for 95% Confidence							
Errors in Sample (Ranked in Declining Tainting %)	'Upper Error Limit' Incremental Factor	Under	Over	← SAMPLE SIZES →			
0	3.00	300	300				300
1 <sup>st</sup>	1.75	=	=				=
2 <sup>nd</sup>	1.55						
3 <sup>rd</sup>	1.46						
4 <sup>th</sup>	1.40	0.50%	0.83%			Gross UEL of Overstatement:	2.33%
5 <sup>th</sup>	1.36						
6 <sup>th</sup>	1.33						
7 <sup>th</sup>	1.30		0.50%			less MLE of Understatement:	0.50%
8 <sup>th</sup>	1.29						
9 <sup>th</sup>	1.27						
10 <sup>th</sup>	1.26		0.33%			Net UEL of Overstatement:	1.83%
11 <sup>th</sup>	1.24						
12 <sup>th</sup>	1.24					compare to:*	↕
13 <sup>th</sup>	1.22						
14 <sup>th</sup>	1.22					Prescribed materiality limit	2.00%
15 <sup>th</sup>	1.21						

\* If net UEL of overstatement exceeds the materiality limit, the auditor must either:  
 a) extend sample size and re-evaluate, or  
 b) report why unqualified opinion is impossible.

Suppose the auditor draws an additional 300 BIUs and finds a further three 100% overstatement errors therein (the same error frequency as in the initial sample). The auditor now has a total sample of 600 BIUs containing six 100% overstatement errors. It is appropriate to evaluate this expanded sample of 600 in exactly the same way as already described. The statistical evaluation of the 600 sample would work out to the following:

$$\text{MLE of overstatement: } \frac{600\%}{600} = 1\%$$

$$\text{UEL overstatement: } \frac{11.85}{600} = 1\%$$

It might be noted that the MLE of 1% has not changed but the UEL has been reduced from 2.59% to 1.98% and is now acceptable (as being less than the prescribed 2% materiality limit). Based on the expanded audit work now completed, the auditor *is* in a position to give an unqualified opinion (always subject to completion and assessment of other audit work: internal control review, academic fee reconciliation, etc.).

In general, extending the sample size should not be counted on to change the MLE (though in any particular case it may in fact change it either up or down) but it can be counted on to reduce the precision gap between the MLE and the UEL, and thus usually to reduce the UEL. A greater amount of audit work permits a more precise answer and so the precision gap between the MLE and the UEL is narrowed.

The UEL will of course always exceed the MLE (there will always be some precision gap however large the sample size). Therefore, if in the auditor's preliminary sample of 300, he/she had discovered seven 100% overstatement errors--for a MLE of 2.3% and a UEL of 4.4%--there is no point in the auditor extending the sample size. The MLE projected from any extended sample is likely to remain in the neighbourhood of 2.3% and the UEL will be even higher than this. There is, therefore, little prospect of bringing the UEL down to 2% and thereby obtaining an acceptable conclusion. Indeed, if the initial work indicates that a material error (over 2%) *probably does exist* and it is unlikely that extended work will provide 95% confidence that a 2% error does not exist, the auditor should not extend the sample but proceed immediately to report to the Ministry.

## 6.12 Guide as to Sample Extension

The following table can be used as a guide in deciding to what extent an initial sample should be extended (if any extension is appropriate at all).

For 95% confidence:<sup>64</sup>

<sup>64</sup> This table is constructed from the previous tables to show what sample size and error combinations yield a 2% UEL. Technically, the values shown are only rigorous for one-stage samples. Where a one-stage sample of 590 is found to contain 6 errors there is 95% confidence with respect to a 2% UEL. Where a sample of 590 however, is drawn in two stages (say, 240 first plus a further 350 later) with a possibility of stopping at the end of the first stage (in this case if only 1 error has been found in the first 240), it can be shown statistically that there is a slight fall-off in confidence level (in the range of a few percentage points). That is, if 6 errors are found in total in the two-stage sample of 590, there is not quite 95% confidence with respect to a 2% UEL as indicated above. However, it can be shown that in the range of sample extensions likely to be employed by auditors, such fall-off is slight. Considering the judgemental nature of a choice of 95% confidence in the first place, and the complexities of the statistical refinements necessary to obtain a perfectly rigorous answer, this slight statistical inaccuracy should not be considered of significance.

Sample Size	Number of 100% overstatement errors found in sample (assuming no understatement errors found)	MLE(=sample error rate)	UEL
150	0	0.00%	2%
240	1	0.42	2
320	2	0.64	2
390	3	0.78	2
460	4	0.88	2
520	5	0.94	2
590	6	1.02	2
660	7	1.06	2
720	8	1.10	2
790	9	1.14	2
850	10	1.18	2

To use the previous example, if the auditor had found a 1% sample error rate in an initial sample of 300 (say, three 100% errors), it would be reasonable to extend the sample size to 590 (or about 600) since the above table shows that if the 1% sample error rate continues the same when one extends the sample (which is the most likely event) then a sample of 590 is needed before a sample error rate as high as 1% yields a UEL of the desired 2%.

The above table can only, however, be an approximate guide because:

(a) the table is only in terms of 100% errors

- this gives the worst situation
- the situation is not as bad if an equivalent value of smaller errors is found instead for example, in a sample of 100, one 100% error yields an MLE of 1% and a UEL of 4.75%; however, two 50% errors yield an MLE of 1%, but a UEL of only 4.65%.

(b) the table is only in terms of overstatement errors

- the situation is slightly worse if the equivalent net value of sample errors is made up instead of offsetting overstatements and understatements
- for example, in a sample of 100, one 1percent overstatement sample error frequency yields a UEL of 4.75 percent; however, a net 1 percent overstatement sample error frequency made up of 2 percent overstatements offset by 1 percent understatements yields a net UEL of 5.30 percent.

Nonetheless, use of this table will give a general indication of the extent to which the sample size should probably be increased. Of course, if the sample error rate found in the initial sample is, say 1.6%, it may be uneconomical to increase the sample (since a total sample of well over 1,000 items

would be required) and a report under Item 1, paragraph 3 may be preferable.

Note that when a sample is extended, the results of the initial sample must not be discarded but rather incorporated into the total cumulative sample. The cumulative sample (initial stage plus extension) must then be re-evaluated using the same procedures as outlined previously.

If a sample is extended from, say 400 to 600, it is also important that the additional 200 selection points be drawn randomly out of the whole population. The mechanics of drawing the additional 200 items are the same as for the first 400 (except of course, a different average sampling interval is involved). In fact, if there appears to be a reasonable possibility that sample extension may be required, the full 600 points can be identified in the first place (to avoid the need to go back and count through the population of BIUs a second time). In such a case, the initial sample of 400 would be randomly selected out of the 600 identified selection points (perhaps by omitting every third one), the initial sample of 400 verified, and the additional 200 selection points only examined should the initial sample of 400 prove unacceptable.

### **6.13 Planning the Initial Sample Size**

The same table presented above as a guide for sample extension can also be used for planning the initial sample size. Referring to this table, it is clear that the initial sample must be no less than 150 items (since a sample of 150 items barely yields a 2% UEL if *no* sample errors are found). It would, however, generally be imprudent to choose an initial sample size as low as 150 since at this size the discovery of even one error, however small, will render the conclusions unacceptable and necessitate sample extension.

Previous years' audit results will obviously be the best guide. For example, if past sample error rates have varied between 0 and 0.6%, a sample size of about 300 would seem a prudent choice. Of course, there is always the chance that the current year results may turn out worse and the 300 prove inadequate. In such a case, however, the auditor can proceed to extend the sample size (rather than examining an excessive sample size to start with).

It should be stressed that while estimating the required sample size is always an uncertain business (involving, as it does, the anticipation of what sample error rate may be encountered), this uncertainty does not attach to the final statistical evaluation. Once a sample has been chosen, verified, and the sample error rate determined, an objective statistical conclusion can be drawn based on the evaluation procedures described earlier.

## **6.14 Summary of BIU Statistical Sampling Steps**

The above procedures for conducting a statistical sample of BIU records can be summarized as follows:

### **6.14.1**

Based on prior years' observed error frequencies (or any indications of the current year's frequency) choose an adequate sample size (greater than 150) by reference to the sample extension guide.

For example, if prior years' observed error frequencies have been in the range of 0 to 0.6%, an initial sample size of about 300 would usually be a prudent choice.

### **6.14.2**

If there is a reasonable possibility that subsequent sample extension might prove necessary, choose (by reference to the guide) a gross sample size larger than in 6.14.1 above. Determine all the gross sample selection points by counting through the BIU population, either manually or by computer (see above discussion on sampling mechanics). Select the initial sample (6.14.1) out of the gross sample selection points (e.g. by selecting every other one, or every third, etc.).

### **6.14.3**

Verify the initial sample and determine the tainting percentages of any individual errors of overstatement or understatement discovered therein.

### **6.14.4**

Compute the statistical conclusion arising from the initial sample results by completing the audit working paper (referenced in item 6.10). Compare the net 'upper error limit' of overstatement to the prescribed 2% materiality limit.

### **6.14.5**

If the net UEL of overstatement does not exceed 2%, the auditor is in a position to give an unqualified opinion (subject to the completion and assessment of other audit work: internal control review, academic fee reconciliation, etc.).

### **6.14.6**

If the net UEL of overstatement exceeds 2%, but the net MLE of overstatement is significantly less than 2% (say, not much in excess of 1%) then there is every indication that an acceptable conclusion will be able to be reached through sample extension. Based on the sample error rate observed in the initial sample, and by reference to the sample extension guide, choose the extended sample size likely to be required.

### **6.14.7**

Select additional sample items randomly (either from the population directly or from the additional gross sample selection points already held in reserve in 6.14.2) to increase the cumulative sample



size up to the extended size chosen in 6.14.6. Verify these additional sample items. Re-evaluate the whole extended sample by re-completing the audit working paper. Compare the new net 'upper error limit' of overstatement to the prescribed 2% materiality limit. The process of sample extension can be continued in this manner until an acceptable conclusion is reached or until it becomes evident that no acceptable conclusion is possible.

#### **6.14.8**

Where the MLE of overstatement (of either the initial or extended sample) exceeds 2% or where it is only slightly under 2% (e.g., 1.6%, 1.8%, etc.) it is unlikely that any acceptable conclusion will be able to be reached through sample extension (or further sample extension). The auditor should therefore report her/his findings in such a case to the Ministry as called for in item 1, paragraph 3.

### **6.15 Investigation of the Nature of Errors Discovered**

This appendix has been directed exclusively to the drawing of a statistical conclusion based on the frequency of errors observed in a sample of BIUs. None of the statistical work should, however, limit the auditor from evaluating judgemental any other evidence available from his/her audit work. In particular, it is desirable that the auditor investigate the *nature* of any errors discovered in the audit sample. If any errors discovered in the sample appear to be *systematic* in nature, the auditor may well wish to perform additional judgemental audit steps to assess the likely extent of such systematic errors, over and above the statistical sample projections of upper error limits.

### **6.16 Combination with Other Audit Conclusions**

The statistical projections described in this appendix relate to the projection of a possible error frequency among the population of BIU records and the comparison of this upper error limit with the 2% materiality guideline. Of course, if other known errors are discovered outside the BIU records being subjected to sampling, the effect of these known errors should be added to the statistical 'upper error limits' and the total compared to the 2% materiality guideline. For example, if an overstating addition error of 0.5% was discovered in the summarization of the total BIU figure reported on the enrolment reports and, on top of this, the statistical upper error limit for overstatements among the individual BIU records was 1.9%, the total combined 'upper error limit' would be 2.4% (and hence unacceptable without further work).

### **6.17 Other Considerations**

A number of other considerations may well arise in the conduct of any particular enrolment audit. For example, in some universities the net 'weighted enrolment' is reduced by certain cost-sharing percentages related to affiliated colleges. These cost-sharing percentages are themselves subject to audit and such audit may likewise be performed using statistical sampling procedures. In the latter case, it is desirable that the statistical conclusions regarding the gross reported BIU's and the statistical conclusions regarding the cost-sharing percentages be combined before comparison with the prescribed 2% materiality limit.

A discussion of this and other considerations is, however, beyond the scope of this appendix. The auditor who has had some training in statistical sampling techniques will be able to resolve such matters when they are encountered.

## 7.1 COUNTING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS: EXAMPLES SHOWING AUDIT IMPLICATIONS

Section	Evidence Required	Possible Audit Test
4.2.5.2(b)	Program of studies meets requirements of O.C.G.S. appraisals procedure	Where applicable, examine evidence of successful program appraisal
4.2.5.2(d)	No units have been claimed for students who are registered but inactive	Obtain certificate (see form, item 7.2)
4.5.1 (1)	Student has an honours undergraduate degree or equivalent	Examine transcript or other documentary evidence
4.5.1 (2)	Student is making substantial demands on resources of the university	Obtain certificate (see form, item 7.2)
4.5.2 (2)	Student identifies him/herself as a full-time graduate student records (statement of intent, etc.)	This should be verified by reference to student
4.5.2 (4)	Student claimed as full-time geographically available and visits campus regularly	This should be verified by reference to student
4.5.5	Minima and maxima provisions have been	(a) Examine, on a test basis, units claimed adhered to during the academic year under these provisions  (b) Assess the adequacy of records and procedures for the correct determination of these claims
<u>General</u>	Adequate records and procedures have been established for the counting of graduate students for entitlement purposes	Review of internal control

## 7.2 COUNTING OF GRADUATE STUDENTS - CERTIFICATION (SAMPLE)

### CERTIFICATION OF GRADUATE STUDENT STATUS AND ELIGIBILITY FOR FORMULA OPERATING GRANT SUPPORT

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Auditors)

Term of 20\_\_ 20\_\_ Session \_\_\_\_\_


Name of Student: \_\_\_\_\_

Claimed for Support: \_\_\_\_\_ Program of Study: \_\_\_\_\_

Status reported: ~ Full-time ~ Part-time

- |   | <u>Yes</u>               | <u>No</u>                |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (i) This student made substantial demands upon the resources of the university (see Section 4.5.1(2)), i.e., either the student was registered in a regular course of study or was actively engaged in writing a dissertation under continuing supervision. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (ii) For students accorded full-time status (Section 4.5.2):  |                          |                          |
| (a) Apart from approved absence (see item b) was student geographically available and did he or she visit the campus regularly?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) If the student was absent from the university for a period exceeding four weeks, was such absence approved as required?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



 <b>Ontario</b> Ministry of Training, Colleges & Universities		Form 1.2a <b>Minima - Maxima Adjustments                      To Graduate Entitlements</b>						
<b>INSTITUTION:</b> Actual _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
		Spring	Summer	Fall	Winter			
FORPOS CODE (8 - 10)	PROGRAM	MASTER'S AND 1ST STAGE DOCTORAL			2ND STAGE DOCTORAL			TOTAL UNITS CLAIMED
		MINIMA	MAXIMA	NET CLAIM	MINIMA	MAXIMA	NET CLAIM	
241	Agriculture			0.000			0.000	0.000
242	Architecture			0.000			0.000	0.000
243	Child Study			0.000			0.000	0.000
244	Commerce & Business Administration			0.000			0.000	0.000
245	Dentistry			0.000			0.000	0.000
246	Engineering			0.000			0.000	0.000
247	Fine & Applied Arts			0.000			0.000	0.000
248	Forestry			0.000			0.000	0.000
249	Geography			0.000			0.000	0.000
250	Hospital Administration			0.000			0.000	0.000
251	Household & Food Service			0.000			0.000	0.000
252	Humanities			0.000			0.000	0.000
253	Hygiene and Public Health			0.000			0.000	0.000
254	Journalism			0.000			0.000	0.000
255	Law			0.000			0.000	0.000
256	Library Science			0.000			0.000	0.000
257	Mathematics			0.000			0.000	0.000
258	Medicine			0.000			0.000	0.000
259	Music			0.000			0.000	0.000
260	Nursing			0.000			0.000	0.000
261	Pharmacy			0.000			0.000	0.000
262	Physical & Health Education			0.000			0.000	0.000
263	Physical & Biological Sciences			0.000			0.000	0.000
264	Physical & Occupational Therapy			0.000			0.000	0.000
265	Psychology			0.000			0.000	0.000
266	Public Administration			0.000			0.000	0.000
267	Social Work			0.000			0.000	0.000
268	Social Sciences - Other			0.000			0.000	0.000
269	Veterinary Medicine			0.000			0.000	0.000
270	Criminology			0.000			0.000	0.000
271	Environmental Studies			0.000			0.000	0.000
272	Theology			0.000			0.000	0.000
273	Education			0.000			0.000	0.000
274	Clinical Behavioural Studies			0.000			0.000	0.000
275	Physiological Optics			0.000			0.000	0.000
276	Art Conservation			0.000			0.000	0.000
277	Speech Pathology & Audiology			0.000			0.000	0.000
278	Child Development			0.000			0.000	0.000
279	Urban & Regional Planning			0.000			0.000	0.000
280	Industrial Relations			0.000			0.000	0.000
281	Oral Pathology Residence			0.000			0.000	0.000
282	Occupational/Physical Therapy			0.000			0.000	0.000
283	Pastoral Studies			0.000			0.000	0.000
284	Theology MA/PhD			0.000			0.000	0.000
285	Computer Science			0.000			0.000	0.000
286	Compressed MBA			0.000			0.000	0.000
287	Dental Specialty (3 Years)			0.000			0.000	0.000
288	Dental Specialty (4 Years)			0.000			0.000	0.000
289	Comp. Meng. & Public Policy			0.000			0.000	0.000
290	Post-Master's Nurse Practitioner			0.000			0.000	0.000
291	Architecture			0.000			0.000	0.000
				0.000			0.000	0.000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>

Note: Any Institution specific or other valid FORPOS not shown in the list, please use one of blank lines provided.

Reporting Officer	Date	University President	Date

Page



**APPENDIX 8: STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS AND COURSES**

*(To be submitted for audit purposes by responsible Deans to Registrar)*

1. University offering program/course \_\_\_\_\_  
Fiscal Year \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Name of program/course  
\_\_\_\_\_
  3. Category:  Study abroad program  
 Study abroad course  
 Exchange program (under formal agreement)
  4. When recognized by Senate for credit? \_\_\_\_\_ Ref: \_\_\_\_\_
  5. Designed as an integral part of what degree program?
  6. Program level (year of study):
  7. Length of program/course (in weeks): \_\_\_\_\_ From \_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_
  8. What is the duration of the program/course in student contact hours?
- Is this at least equal to the contact hours for comparable programs/courses (specified below) offered on campus in Ontario during the same sessions? ~ Yes ~ No
9. Courses offered abroad: \_\_\_\_\_  

(Course Name)	(Number)
---------------	----------
  10. Location offered (country/city):
  11. In what year was this program/course started?
  12. If started before 1981, was MTCU approval for formula funding obtained?
  13. Briefly explain why a foreign locale is essential for this program/course.
  14. If this is an exchange program under the terms of a formal exchange agreement give:
    - (a) Name and date of agreement:
    - (b) A brief description of its terms:
    - (c) Name of (each) other participating university:
    - (d) Number of foreign students in Canada on this exchange (append list of their names)
    - (e) Number of students from your university abroad on this exchange (append list of their names)
    - (f) Number of FTE's claimed for formula grants
    - (g) Number of BIU's claimed for formula grants
  15. If this is not an exchange program give:

(a) Number of Ontario students enrolled in this study abroad program or course who have registered in Ontario at university (*append list of their names*).

(b) Have all of the above:

- (i) enrolled for credit in degree programs described in their Ontario university's official calendar?  
 Yes  No
- (ii) been assessed the regular academic fee for their study abroad program/course?  
 Yes  No
- (iii) received instruction abroad paid for by their Ontario university?  
 Yes  No
- (iv) together generated no more formula income for their Ontario university than twice its direct costs?  
 Yes  No

(Exclude from grant claim any students with "no" answers, noting which they are on appended list).

(c) Number of FTE's claimed for formula grants

(d) Number of BIU's claimed for formula grants

(e) 50% of (BIU's x current BIU value of \$ \_\_\_\_\_) =

(f) Man-years of teaching given (based on an Ontario faculty member's normal annual load) by:

- (i) Ontario university's regular faculty  
(ii) Other faculty specifically retained by Ontario university for program/course

(g) Direct costs of program/course (formula-eligible expenditures only):

Teaching (attributable salaries & benefits)	_____
Other instructional costs	_____
Physical facilities	_____
Supplies and equipment	_____
Other (specify)	_____
Total (equal to 15(e) or greater)	_____

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature (*Responsible Date Reporting Officer*  
*Dean, or equivalent*)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



## **APPENDIX 9: PROCEDURES TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENT TUITION FEES**

Section 5.1.4. provides a description of the policy regarding the application of international student tuition fees. Effective 1996-97, government funding for the majority of international students was discontinued and tuition fees were deregulated. Grandparenting provisions apply to international students enrolled in 1995-96. These provisions are outlined in Section 5.1. In addition, certain categories of international students, outlined in Section 4.1., may qualify as eligible for government funding purposes and these students should be charged a maximum of the domestic fee rate.

With regard to grandparented international students and international students who are claimed as eligible for government funding under Section 4.1.3, institutions are expected to have documented procedures in place and implemented that will substantiate the student's grandparented or eligible funding status. These procedures are to be made available to the institution's external auditors. The auditor's reporting in respect of these international students must:

- verify that tuition fees have been charged and students reported appropriately; and
- reference and attach a copy of the procedures, provide concurrence (or otherwise) as to the acceptability of the procedures, state whether examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and accordingly, include such tests and other procedures as considered necessary in the circumstances and express an opinion as to whether or not the institution has complied with the referenced procedures.

**APPENDIX 10: ONTARIO UNIVERSITY STANDARD FEE SCHEDULE, REGULAR 2008-09**

<b>Arts &amp; Science and Other Programs</b>	
Group 1: Technology (Lakehead)(a)	Standard Fee: \$1,575
Groups 2 & 3:(b)	Discontinued
Group 4: Dental Hygiene (Technology) Nursing Technology	Standard Fee: \$2,034
Group 5: Agriculture Arts & Science (Toronto) Arts & Science (1st Year, Trent) Arts, General & 1st Year Honours Arts, Upper Years Honours Conversion Engineering (Lakehead) Diploma Public Health Nursing Education Environmental Studies Fine & Applied Arts Forestry Household & Food Science Journalism Library Science Music Nursing Ontario College of Art and Design Programs (formerly Group 3) Physical & Health Education Preliminary Year Pre-medicine Secretarial Science Science General & 1st year Honours Science, Upper years Honours Social Work, 1st year Social Work, Upper years Theology	Standard Fee: \$2,386
<b>Professional and Graduate Programs</b>	
Group 5: Commerce & Business Administration Computer Science Law Pharmacy Physical & Occupational Therapy Veterinary Medicine	Standard Fee: \$2,386
Group 6:(c) Architecture Engineering Landscape Architecture Industrial Design Optometry	Standard Fee: \$2,591
Group 7: (c) (d) Dentistry (e)	Standard Fee: \$3,035

Medicine	
Graduate (One Term Fee) All Programs	Standard Fee: \$1,198

(a) Not all standard fees for institution-specific programs are listed. Please refer to the *"Essential Notes and Reporting Instructions"*, produced by the ministry, for a detailed breakdown of institution-specific standard fees.

b) Group 2 ( Ryerson-specific fee category) and Group 3 (OCAD-specific fee category) have been discontinued.

(c) Group 6 fees apply to all programs in the group, with the exception of the Optometry program at Waterloo, for which an additional \$1,000 may be charged on top of the standard fee including the discretionary component.

(d) Standard fees are applied to Group 7 programs, except for the residency years of Oral Surgery and Oral Pathology and Medical Interns and Residents, to which a zero standard fee applies.

(e) For their Doctor of Dental Surgery program, Toronto and Western were permitted to increase the standard fee including the discretionary component, by an additional amount of up to \$4,000, beginning with students entering in September, 1996.

**APPENDIX 11: ONTARIO UNIVERSITY REGULAR TUITION FEE RATES (2002-03 AND 2003-04)**

Fee Category <sup>1,2</sup>	2002-03			2003-04		
	Standard Fee	With Average Discretion Fee Portion of 72.10%	With Maximum Discretion Fee Portion of 181.09%	Standard Fee	With Average Discretion Fee Portion of 75.35%* (Base Fee Level)	With Maximum Discretion Fee Portion of 186.4%*
<b>Undergraduate (Two Term Fee)</b>						
Group 1: Technology (Lakehead)	\$1,575	\$2,711	\$4,427	\$1,575	\$2,762	\$4,511
Group 4: Dental/ Nursing Technology	\$2,034	\$3,501	\$5,717	\$2,034	\$3,567	\$5,825
Group 5: <sup>3</sup> Arts Science, etc.	\$2,386	\$4,106	\$6,707	\$2,386	\$4,184	\$6,833
Group 6: <sup>4</sup> Architecture Engineering <sup>3</sup> , etc.	\$2,591	\$4,459	\$7,283	\$2,591	\$4,543	\$7,421
Group 7 <sup>3,5</sup> Dentistry <sup>6</sup> Medicine	\$3,035	\$5,223	\$8,531	\$3,035	\$5,322	--
<b>Graduate (One Term Fee) All Programs<sup>3</sup></b>	\$1,198	\$2,062	\$3,367	\$1,198	\$2,101	--
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group 2 (Ryerson-specific fee category) and Group 3 (OCAD-specific fee category) have been discontinued. Also, see Appendix 5.1.1 in <i>Operating Funds Distribution Manual</i> for a more detailed breakdown of programs within each fee category.</li> <li>Since 1998-99 the following programs were eligible for additional cost recovery: Business/Commerce (2<sup>nd</sup> Entry), Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Optometry, Pharmacy and Veterinary Medicine.</li> <li>Since 1997, engineering and computer science programs participating in ATOP; and dentistry, medicine, law, optometry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, 2<sup>nd</sup> entry business and graduate programs were designated as additional cost recovery-eligible.</li> <li>Group 6 fees apply to all programs in the group, with the exception of the Optometry program at Waterloo, for which an additional \$1,000 may be charged on top of the Standard Fee including the discretionary component.</li> <li>Medical Residents and Oral Surgery/Pathology students pay no fees.</li> <li>For their Doctor of Dental Surgery program, Toronto and Western were permitted to increase the standard fee including the discretionary component by an additional amount of up to \$4,000, beginning with students entering September, 1996.</li> </ol>						

## **APPENDIX 12: REQUIREMENTS FOR PROTOCOLS – COMPULSORY NON-TUITION – RELATED ANCILLARY FEES**

### **PART A - SECTION I REQUIREMENTS FOR PROTOCOLS - COMPULSORY NON-TUITION-RELATED ANCILLARY FEES**

#### GENERAL

- In order to accommodate the introduction of the protocol process, an optional two-stage approach was developed to give both institutions and students greater flexibility.
- Compulsory non-tuition related ancillary fees are to remain at 1993-94 levels unless a protocol is in place.
- An institution's governing body may not unilaterally change the text of a protocol agreed to by its administration and student government representatives, but shall refer any concerns back to those who developed the text.
- In the event that an eligible student government chooses not to nominate a representative for the purpose of developing a protocol, the written support of that student government is not required for the approval of the long-term protocol. However, the terms of the protocol will still affect the students represented by the non-participating student government.
- Institutions with a multi-campus facility may wish to have multiple protocols documents to address the different compulsory non-tuition related ancillary fee configurations at their institution.
- A review process may be provided for within a protocol(s).

#### INTERIM (or FIRST STAGE) PROTOCOL

The option of an interim protocol was developed to permit fee increases or new compulsory fees for 1994-95 only.

There was no requirement to have an interim protocol.

This alternative approach allowed increases or new compulsory fees for 1994-95 provided that:

- the institution's administration and student government representatives reached agreement on the text of an interim protocol recognizing that the methods used for student input for these purposes would not prejudice the development of a long-term (or second stage) protocol;
- the students eligible to participate in the development of an approval of an interim protocol included all student government representatives. Other student representatives may also have participated in the development of an interim protocol with the concurrence of the administration and student government representatives.
- student agreement to the interim protocol was obtained through, at minimum, the support of the majority of student governments involved in the development of the protocol, who in turn,

served on behalf of the majority of students paying compulsory non-tuition-related ancillary fees;

- written support from student government representatives for an interim protocol should have been obtained in compliance with the ministry's compulsory ancillary fee policy;

An interim protocol had the approval of the institution's governing body.

While an interim protocol should not prejudice the development of a long-term (second stage) protocol, it can be used to facilitate the development of a long-term protocol. This approach requires the agreement of both the institution's administration and student government representatives.

### LONG-TERM (or SECOND STAGE) PROTOCOL

A long-term (or second stage) protocol will come into affect provided that:

- the institution's administration and student government representatives reach an agreement on the text of a long-term protocol;
- the students eligible to participate in the development and approval of a long-term protocol include all student government representatives;
- the administration and the student government representatives jointly identify representative(s) to be involved in the development and approval of a long-term protocol when there are students who pay compulsory non-tuition related ancillary fees who are not represented through any of the institution's student's governments;
- student agreement to the long-term protocol is obtained through, at minimum, the support of the majority of students involved in the development of the protocol who, in turn, serve on behalf of the majority of students paying compulsory non-tuition-related ancillary fees;
- the long term protocol has the approval of the institution's governing body.

## **PART A - SECTION II**

### **EXAMPLES OF COMPULSORY NON-TUITION-RELATED ANCILLARY FEES THAT MIGHT BE REQUIRED FOR INCLUSION IN PROTOCOL**

1. HEALTH/INSURANCE FEES
2. STUDENT ACTIVITY FEES

Student activity fees are those fees, the revenue from which is not applied to the costs of instruction in any course or program normally offered for credit toward an eligible degree, diploma or certificate, but is applied to the costs of enhancing the cultural or social or recreational life of the students, or to provide other non-academic services to students. This definition excludes academic services such as library, computing and learning centre services.

### 3. ATHLETIC FEES

Athletic fees are those fees, the revenue from which is not applied to the costs of instruction in any course or program normally offered for credit toward an eligible degree, diploma or certificate, but is applied to the costs of providing athletic or recreational services to student or the costs of athletic associations or the costs of institutional athletic teams.

### 4. TRANSPORTATION/PARKING FEES

### 5. HOUSING PLACEMENT FEES

Institutions may charge compulsory ancillary fees for the total costs of placing students in housing.

Note: In some cases, these or other compulsory non-tuition-related fees may be combined into a single student service fee. Such combination fees are also examples of a fee which might be incorporated in a protocol.

## PART B

### FEES FOR FIELD TRIPS, MATERIALS AND SERVICES WHICH ARE EXEMPTED FROM SECTION 5.2

#### 1. FIELD TRIP FEES

Institutions may charge a compulsory ancillary fee for the reasonable, direct costs of travel and accommodation of students on compulsory field trips. Compulsory ancillary fees cannot be charged for such things as salaries and benefits or travel and accommodation of faculty, or for any specific tuition-related activities for any compulsory field trips.

Compulsory ancillary fees cannot be charged for any component of out-of-province compulsory field trips in compulsory courses (as defined in Section 5.2.2). [Exemptions may be granted by the ministry for reasonable costs of compulsory out-of-province field trips in compulsory courses for institutions located near inter-provincial or international borders.]

#### 2. FEES FOR LEARNING MATERIAL AND CLOTHING RETAINED BY THE STUDENT (E.G., DENTAL KITS)

#### 3. FEES FOR MATERIAL USED IN THE PRODUCTION OF ITEMS WHICH BECOME THE PROPERTY OF THE STUDENT

#### 4. FEES FOR MATERIAL OR SERVICES WHERE THE INSTITUTION ACTS AS A BROKER WITH A VENDOR FOR THE STUDENT

These are fees paid by students to the university which do not produce net revenue for the institution but instead are set and levied through an agreement with a vendor. In these cases, the institution is neither the manufacturer nor supplier of the material or service being purchased. Similarly structured fees, where student governments serve in the "broker" role, are considered student government fees.

## **PART C**

### **ELIGIBLE COMPULSORY NON-TUITION-RELATED ANCILLARY FEES ASSOCIATED WITH WORK TERM PLACEMENTS**

Institutions may charge compulsory ancillary fees for the total costs of placing students in jobs for work terms. The following types of costs will be considered eligible for coverage:

- i) placement-service costs including:
  - salaries and benefits of that portion of each position directly related to the provision of placement services and work-term activity, including such positions as placement directors, officers, assistants and administrative and support staff; and
  - non-salary expenditures attributable to the provision of placement services and work-term activities including travel, telephone, mailing/postage, printing, photocopying, publicity, computing, equipment and furnishing, supplies and expenses, and external meetings, etc.; and
- ii) maintenance costs of space used for placement service, including costs of utilities, custodial service and security of this space. Eligible space should include:
  - the space used for administrative and professional placement staff; and
  - interviewing or meeting rooms used in the placement function.

The costs of space used for part of the time for other purposes should be adjusted according to the proportion of usage for placement service.



**APPENDIX 13: OGSST PROGRAM GUIDELINES, 2008-09****Ontario Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology (OGSST)  
Program Guidelines 2009-10  
Updated May 2009****Overview:**

Since 1998, Ontario, in partnership with the private sector, has rewarded excellence in graduate studies in science and technology. Under the original design of the program, the Ontario Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology (OGSST) has awarded seventy-five million dollars to graduate students over a ten year period beginning in 1998-99 and ending in 2007-08. This program is in addition to and distinct from the Ontario Graduate Scholarship (OGS) program.

On August 4, 2006, the Ministry informed eligible institutions that the OGSST program was extended by one year, to 2008-09. The Government has decided to extend the OGSST program for an additional year, to 2009-10. Decisions on the OGSST past 2009-10 will be communicated by the Ministry in Fall 2009, after an internal review of this program.

**Government Funding:**

The Ontario government has committed \$50 million over ten years to this program, starting in 1998-99, plus an additional \$5,010,000 invested in 2008-09. A further investment of \$5,010,000 has been allocated for 2009-10. Universities are expected to raise \$2,505,000 from the private sector in 2009-10 towards the cost of scholarships provided to graduate students.

**Scholarship Value:**

The scholarship value will be to a maximum of \$15,000 annually, or \$5,000 per term. Consistent with the 2:1 ratio of government funding to institutional funding for this program, the Ontario government portion of the award to an individual student will be to a maximum of \$10,000 annually, or \$3,333 per term. The remaining funds are to be provided by the institution, through fund-raising from the private sector. Individual universities can determine the actual value of the scholarships awarded, up to the maximum per term, based on the number of students they wish to support.

**Eligible Students:**

The scholarships must be awarded to Canadian citizens or permanent residents enrolled full-time<sup>65</sup> in approved research masters and or doctoral programs in science and technology at an Ontario university.

Recipients must exhibit overall academic excellence. Applicants entering the 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> year of graduate studies must have an average of at least A minus, or the equivalent, on the last 20 one-term/semester courses or the equivalent completed. Applicants entering 3<sup>rd</sup> year or beyond of graduate studies must have an average of at least A minus, or the equivalent, on all graduate courses completed. Recipients will also exhibit research ability or potential; excellent communication skills; and interpersonal and leadership abilities. The university is responsible for assessing the

---

<sup>65</sup> If a qualified applicant is unable to study full-time due to a disability, the student can still be considered for this program.

overall academic performance of the applicant and determining that – taking into account both course work and research work – the applicant meets the minimum “A minus” requirement.

Recipients may hold other awards up to a total of \$10,000 per year, but cannot hold an Ontario Graduate Scholarship (OGS) for the same year of study in which they hold an OGSST.

Students enrolled in a postgraduate MD training program and simultaneously registered in full-time doctoral graduate program may hold other awards that, together with the OGSST, do not exceed the current level of funding for clinical training provided by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Recipients may also accept research assistantships, part-time teaching positions, or other employment that does not affect their status as a full-time graduate student.

Recipients cannot be enrolled in a qualifying or make-up year or be on a paid educational leave or sabbatical.

### **Eligibility Conditions:**

Master’s students can receive the scholarship for a maximum of two years and doctoral students for a maximum of four years, subject to a lifetime maximum of four years per student. Master’s students are not eligible for an OGSST after two years of study at the master’s level, and doctoral students are not eligible for an OGSST after five years of study at the doctoral level.

Note that the OGSSTs, unlike the OGSs, do not have attached to them a lifetime limit of four years of government-funded scholarship support, including OGS, NSERC, MRC (now CIHR), and SSHRC. It is possible for a doctoral student to have received four years of support from OGS or NSERC and still be eligible for one year of support through the OGSST program.

Each scholarship is tenable for a maximum of two years, i.e., recipients must reapply for a second two-year award. Since there currently is no decision on whether this program extends beyond 2009-10, universities are advised to award one-year awards in 2009-10.

Recipients must remain enrolled as a full-time student in an eligible program. Recipients who withdraw, transfer to part-time status, or fail to complete the term, will be required to repay the award.

**Eligible Disciplines:**

The OGSST program supports graduate students enrolled in research masters and doctoral programs in science and technology disciplines. Collaboration, inter-disciplinary study, and innovation are encouraged. The following are the eligible disciplines:

**Applied Sciences:**

- Aerospace (may include Aeronautical Engineering)
- Biomedical Engineering
- Chemical Engineering
- Civil Engineering and Architecture (may include Landscape Architecture)
- Computer Engineering
- Electrical Engineering
- Engineering Science (may include Engineering, Engineering Physics, and Nuclear Engineering)
- Mechanical Engineering
- Mining, Metallurgy, and Material Science (may include Metallurgical Engineering)
- Systems and Industrial Engineering (may include Systems/Design Engineering and Operational Research)

**Biological and Life Sciences:**

- Biochemistry and Biophysics (may include Medical Biophysics)
- Environmental Sciences (may include Agriculture, Ecology, Forestry, and Toxicology)
- General Biological Sciences (may include Biology, Botany, Entomology, Microbiology, Mycology, Plant and Animal Biology, and Zoology)
- Genetics, Cell, and Molecular Biology
- General Health Science (may include research-oriented programs in Epidemiology, Human Kinetics, Hygiene, Nutrition, and Rehabilitation disciplines such as Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Audiology, and Speech Pathology)
- Human Biology (may include Anatomy, Biomedical Sciences, Food Science, Immunology, Neuroscience, Pathology, Pharmacology, and Physiology)
- Medical and Veterinary Sciences (may include research-oriented programs in Dentistry, Medical Sciences, Nursing, Optometry, and Pharmacy)

**Physical Sciences:**

- Chemistry
- Computer Science (may include Information/Systems Science)
- Earth Sciences (may include Geology and Geophysics)
- Mathematics and Statistics
- Physics (may include Astronomy, Meteorology, and Space Science)

Universities wishing to make an award in an area that is not listed here should contact the Postsecondary Finance and Information Management Branch (see contact name at the end of the guidelines). As a general rule, the following approach is taken: for programs such as Physical Anthropology and Physical Geography, an OGSST can be awarded to top students, provided the university views the program as a science program within the spirit and intent of the OGSST program. One “test” of the program as “science” would be that NSERC provides research grants and scholarships/ fellowships in this area, and SSHRC does not.

Note, however, that this affects only the eligibility of students, not the basis on which the awards are allocated across the system. The annual allocation is based on enrolment in science disciplines as coded in the Ministry’s University Statistical and Enrolment Reporting System (USER) (see Appendix 2 in the guidelines). While the university may choose to award a scholarship in, for example, Physical Anthropology, enrolment in this program does not generate scholarships.

As noted above, recipients should be enrolled in “research” programs. There is no established definition for this. It is incumbent upon the university to identify the graduate programs that can be viewed as “research” programs.

### **Allocation of Funds:**

OGSST funds from the Government are allocated to the universities on a formulaic basis. The allocation mechanism relates directly to the purpose of the program, which is to reward excellence in graduate studies in science and technology. The provincial funds are distributed according to each university’s share of eligible<sup>66</sup> full-time domestic graduate enrolments in applied sciences, biological sciences, and physical sciences. To account for changes in enrolment levels among institutions and for the introduction of new graduate programs over the ten year period, the allocation is re-calculated each year, based on a three-year moving average of enrolment, slipped two years.

The following table provides the final distribution of OGSST Awards; using the average of 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 graduate enrolments (full-time, eligible, domestic students in applied, biological, and physical sciences) as the basis for allocating \$5,010,000 for 2009-10.

---

<sup>66</sup> Enrolments eligible for provincial funding (“BIU eligible”).

## 2009-10 OGSST Allocation

Institution	Enrolment Average for 2005-06, 2006-07 & 2007-08 <sup>1</sup>	Percentage Share of Total Enrolment	2009-10 Allocation based on Enrolment	2009-10 Number of Full Awards
Algoma	0	0.00%	\$0	0
Brock	120	0.93%	\$50,000	5
Carleton	642	4.98%	\$250,000	25
Guelph	854	6.63%	\$330,000	33
Lakehead	194	1.51%	\$80,000	8
Laurentian	105	0.81%	\$40,000	4
Hearst	0	0.00%	\$0	0
McMaster	1,140	8.85%	\$440,000	44
Nipissing	0	0.00%	\$0	0
NOSM	0	0.00%	\$0	0
OCAD	0	0.00%	\$0	0
Ottawa	1,084	8.41%	\$420,000	42
Queen's	1,027	7.97%	\$400,000	40
Ryerson	421	3.27%	\$160,000	16
Toronto	3,951	30.68%	\$1,530,000	153
Trent	65	0.50%	\$30,000	3
UOIT <sup>2</sup>	23	0.18%	\$10,000	1
Waterloo	1,157	8.99%	\$450,000	45
Western	1,427	11.08%	\$550,000	55
Wilfrid Laurier <sup>3</sup>	8	0.06%	\$10,000	1
Windsor	332	2.58%	\$130,000	13
York	329	2.56%	\$130,000	13
<b>Total</b>	<b>12,879</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$5,010,000</b>	<b>501</b>

For a full breakdown of enrolment, awards and allocations, please see Appendix 1 in the guidelines.

For full details on the SPEMAJ codes, please see Appendix 2 in the guidelines.

<sup>1</sup> Enrolments are defined as full-time graduate (Fall term data), domestic students, eligible for funding in science and technology disciplines (see SPEMAJ Codes).

<sup>2</sup> Beginning in 2007-08, one award is reserved for UOIT. However, effective 2009-10 UOIT's enrolments generate their allocation.

<sup>3</sup> One award reserved for WLU (Physical Geography, joint program with Waterloo).

**Number of awards:**

With \$5,010,000 in provincial funding providing \$10,000 toward the maximum value of individual awards, at least 501 full (three-term) scholarships will be available annually. The number of recipients in any year will vary, however, because of the variable award value, the multi-year award provisions, and related variables. Depending upon where they are in their program at the time of the award, and the length of their program, students can receive the award for less years than the allowable maximums, and for less than three terms in one academic year.

**Academic Terms for the Award:**

Program funds are provided on the Ministry's fiscal year basis, i.e. April to March, and are to be expended on a fiscal year basis. It is recognized that this does not completely coincide with most universities' academic years. The academic terms covered by the fiscal year include May, September and January. Universities wishing to provide a three-term award starting in September can do so by drawing on program funds from previous fiscal year.

**Administrative Arrangements:**

- The following conditions apply to the receipt and disbursement of funds at the university:
- The scholarships should be administered centrally within the university, e.g., through the Graduate Studies Office.
- Universities must raise new funds from the private sector (businesses, organizations, or individuals) to provide the matching funds for the scholarships awarded. The amount raised from the private sector in a fiscal year should be equivalent to at least one-half of the provincial allocation. This minimum amount can either be raised within the fiscal year or carried forward from the previous year.
- Funds received through research contracts or research grants cannot be used to match OGSST awards. New funds are to be raised that can be designated specifically for this program.
- Awards are to be made according to the conditions of eligibility of students and programs outlined above. Universities are expected to establish written guidelines for application and selection and to establish selection committees to make award decisions. Conditions of eligibility stated in these guidelines are a minimum. Universities may apply more stringent criteria as long as they fall within these eligibility requirements.
- Universities are expected to expend their scholarship funds within the fiscal year.
- Universities must make suitable arrangements for:
  - tracking the academic standing of recipients of two-year awards;
  - tracking recipients who transfer between universities, so that the four year maximum per student is not exceeded;
  - checking the OSAP restricted list status of all recipients through the institutional Financial

Aid Office, and ensuring that restricted applicants receive clearance from the Student Support Finance Unit of the Postsecondary Finance and Information Management Branch and/or the Canada Student Loans Plan before releasing scholarship funds. If clearance is not received, the applicant cannot receive the OGSST.

- The universities will issue a T4A to each recipient.
- The universities will bear the costs to administer the program within their institutions.

**Accountability Requirements:**

- At the end of each fiscal year, the university will provide a report to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, which includes the following:
  - the name, program, and level of study of each recipient;
  - for each recipient, the value of the award, and the number of terms of the award;
  - sources of the institutional matching funds;
  - a balance sheet for the funds.

The year end reports, due the third week in October, should be signed by the chief financial officer of the university and will also include:

- copies of the application form and guidelines developed by the university for administering and awarding the OGSSTs;
  - if applicable, information on how A minus equivalency was determined for applicants whose last two years of full-time study did not include course work for which specific grades were assigned;
  - confirmation that the eligibility criteria of the program were adhered to in granting all awards.
- A template is provided for the year-end report. This is a template only. The university can prepare the year-end report and attachments in its own preferred format, but must include, at a minimum, the information requested in the template, including the required signatures.
  - The year end reports should be sent by October 23, 2009 to:

Manager  
 Universities Finance Unit  
 Postsecondary Finance & Information Management Branch  
 Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities  
 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Mowat Block, 900 Bay Street  
 Toronto, Ontario  
 M7A 1L2

- The year end reports will be used by MTCU to confirm appropriate use of the funds within these guidelines and to compile system-wide program information.
- The Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) may work from time-to-time with the Postsecondary Finance and Information Management Branch to conduct periodic reviews of the effectiveness and efficiency of the OGSST Program and to make recommendations for adjustments as required, including recommendations for ensuring the program's compatibility

with the OGS Program (in consultation with the OGS Selection Board).

**Award Identification:**

Awards will be clearly identified to applicants and recipients as partially funded by Province of Ontario, through the following means:

- Application forms and informational material published by the university must identify the awards as Ontario Graduate Scholarships in Science and Technology, funded in part by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities;
- Universities are free to use “hyphenated names” for the awards, identifying a private sector contributor if appropriate, provided the provincial nature of the award remains clear, e.g., the Government of Ontario - Smith Company Graduate Scholarship in Science and Technology.
- Upon request by the Ministry, the university will provide the name and current address of the current OGSST recipients, so that the Minister can send congratulatory letters if desired. The university would be expected to comply within four weeks of the request from MTCU.

The Ministry will be pleased to discuss any aspect of these guidelines with university staff, and provide further clarification or interpretation of the guidelines. However, the Branch cannot review individual applications and rule on the eligibility of individual candidates. These are institutional awards and must be fully adjudicated by the university.

**For further information, please contact:**

Itan Farrokhyar  
Senior Policy Advisor  
Universities Finance Unit  
Postsecondary Finance & Information Management Branch  
Ministry of Training, College and Universities  
7th Floor, Mowat Block  
900 Bay Street  
Toronto, Ontario  
M7A 1L2  
416.314-3868  
Itan.Farrokhyar@ontario.ca