

RYERSON FACULTY ASSOCIATION

Meeting of Council of Department/School Representatives

Wednesday, March 30, 2016

International Room, ILC

MINUTES

Present

Peter Danziger
Kileen Tucker Scott
Ron Babin
Ian Sakinofsky
Rahul Sapra
André Foucault
Chil-Hung Cheng
Seyed M. Hashemi
Vanessa Magness
Umberto Berardi
John Morgan

Andriy Miranskyy
Vadim Geurkov
Joey Power
Bernard McEvoy
Gerda Cammaer
Franklyn Prescod
Aziz Guergachi
Jamin Pelkey
Jane Schmidt
Tammy Landau

Sharon Paton
Corrine Hart
Yvonne Yuan
Vladislav Toronov
Miriam Anderson
Carolyn Meyer
Susan Preston
Christopher Powell
Leila Farah
Sejal Patel

Regrets

Bryan Koivisto
Joe McPhee
Elsayed Elbeshbishy
Khandaker Anwar Hossain
Joanna Holt
Angela Valeo
Thomas Barbiero
Amy Peng
Kaamran Raahemifar
Lev Krischian
Jennifer Burwell
Jonathan Rollins

Henry Navarro Delgado
Richard Shaker
Stephen Swales
Rich Adams
Rupa Banerjee
Katy McCormick
Taymoore Balbaa
Marsh Barber
M.J. Suhonos
Taymoore Balbaa
Marsha Barber
Seth Dworkin

Jim Dianda
Meredith Schwartz
Paul Brunet
Maria Gurevich
Matthew Flisfeder
Alexandra Fiocco
Seung Hwan (Mark) Lee
David Bouchard
Charles Zamaria
Dawn Onishenko
Julie Tomiak
Perry Schneiderman

Staff

Agnes Paje

Minutes

1. Order/Establishment of Quorum

Meeting began at 5:25 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda (Landau/Hart) - Adopted.

3. Approval of minutes from March 2, 2016 (Hart/Landau) - Adopted.

4. Opening remarks and announcements

- The RFA General Meeting will be held on May 5, 2016 in the International Room, ILC from 12 – 2 p.m. Lunch will be served at 12 p.m. Please encourage members to attend.
- The next Reps' Council meeting will be held on April 13, 2016 in the International Room, ILC from 5:15 – 7:15 p.m. Dinner and wine will be served from 4:30 p.m.

5. Business Arising

- Overload payment
 - The issue identified at the last Reps' Council has been forwarded to the Administration.
- Garbage collection
 - Non-Ryerson employees are bonded; the University does NOT have a clean desk policy; students are not employed in capacities that would allow them access to faculty offices without the faculty member present
- RFANET
 - The discussion regarding RFANET has been deferred to the next Reps' Council meeting on April 13, 2016.
- The Political Action Committee (PAC)
 - Packages were sent to members, containing a sticker (to be put on office doors right away) and a button, to be worn on the Day of Action, Thursday, April 7, 2016 and on April 11 the first guided arbitration day.
 - Reps' are asked to encourage faculty to wear their buttons and to join the RFA at the April 7, 2016, 'Celebrate the Day' social event that evening
 - Thanks to the Political Action Committee for their efforts on our collective behalf (Corinne Hart, Marsha Barber, Henry Navarro Delgado and John Morgan)
- Report from Vice President, External – Rahul Sapra
 - Rahul made a presentation on The University Funding Formula. Please see attached fact sheet.

6. Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Next meeting: Wednesday, April 13, 2016

Fact Sheet – March 30, 2016 – RFA Vice President, External, Rahul Sapra

University Funding Formula:

The Existing Funding formula

- The existing funding formula is an “**allocative formula,**” since it is primarily based on student enrolments in an institution. The existing funding formula remains “**student-centered**” in the sense that the mechanism used to distribute operating grants reflects **enrolment numbers**. Enrolment is weighted by level of study and program by assigning basic income units (BIUs) that reflect the estimated relative costs of teaching and research.
- The existing funding formula provides a **certain degree of consistency** and predictability in funding, which allows universities for long term planning. It includes a mechanism to **guard against harmful financial fluctuations**. Each institution’s share of available funding remains consistent unless there is a considerable and sudden drop in enrolment numbers.
- In addition, the existing funding formula is supposed to **treat all institutions as same, which helps to ensure a certain level of equality** – both in terms of funding and educational quality. It is **not based on differentiation** between various institutions.
- However, the **existing funding formula needs to be updated** due to various factors such as: in this formula there is no means of ensuring that an institution gets adequate funding for research and teaching. It does not go up in proportion to inflation. Furthermore, the funding has been dwindling a long period now.

NEW FUNDING FORMULA: PERFORMANCE-BASED FUNDING

- The government is proposing a new funding formula for universities, which would be driven more by Performance-based funding. **Performance based funding has been advocated by HECQUO – (Higher Education Quality Control of Ontario).**

Performance Based Funding is of different types, **but it is not student-centered**. It will be awarded according to an institution’s “**Performance**” (to meet certain targets) that will be evaluated by “**Metrics**”.

Performance Based Funding will take into factors such as:

- a) Student-Retention rates
- b) Co-op learning opportunities / Experiential learning
- c) Quality of student learning.
- d) Outcomes – student job placements etc.

PROBLEMS WITH PERFORMANCE-BASED FUNDING:

- 1) **Competitive Targets** – Performance-Based Funding would lead to ranking of institutions, since funding would be awarded according to **Competitive Targets**. In this system, the government could set a variety institutional level targets, such as graduation rates, retention, jobs and also research-expectations from faculty.
- 2) **Ranking of Institutions:** The institutions would then be ranked according to their success at meeting these targets, and would be awarded funds according to their relative ranking. But universities that fail to meet the targets may not receive any performance funding.
- 3) **METRICS** would be used to measure a university's performance.
- 4) **NO Evidence of Success:** As per the Data collected so far (From some universities in USA that are funded as per their “performance”) there has been **no improvement in quality of Education:**
 - a) There has been an increase in the granting of short-term certificates (**moving students quickly through an institution quickly, thereby protection student retention and graduation rates**).
 - b) Outcomes depends upon “**external**” factors – University may produced excellent graduates, but they can struggle to get jobs if the economy has failed.
 - c) **Raising of admission requirements**, since it is based on the assumption that more qualified students are more likely to persist in degree completion. This has negative implications on equity and access. Students (such as racialized, indigenous students etc.) that come from less privileged educational background suffer.
- 1) **Quality** becomes defined as what can be **measured**, and not what a student actually needs to be successful.
- 2) So, this system is based on **reward and punishment** (smaller universities will suffer even more).
- 3) Institutions cannot do long-term planning, since the formula is not student-centered.
- 4) **FUNDING-CUTS** due to under-performance (It can also lead to less hiring of Tenure-track professors etc)
- 5) **The formula is market-driven, so it will have a major impact on funding for research.**

Differentiation and SMA (Strategic Mandate Agreements):

PERFORMANCE-BASED FUNDING and SMA (Strategic Mandate Agreements):

The Policy framework of Differentiation mentioned in the SMA informs the formula for Performance-based funding. For the SMA (Strategic Mandate Agreements) submitted by Ryerson University to MTCU, please see the following link: <http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/publications/vision/>

Differentiation

The Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) views differentiation as “a primary policy driver for the system.” As such, the framework is used to inform the Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) process and on-campus initiatives like program prioritization.

The document lays out six “components” of differentiation:

1. 1) Jobs, innovation, and economic development
2. 2) Teaching and learning
3. 3) Student population
4. 4) Research and graduate education
5. 5) Program offerings
6. 6) Institutional collaboration to support student mobility.