

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
University Operating Funding	In Budget 2010, the government of Ontario announced an investment of \$310 million to add 20,000 spaces to colleges and universities.	<p>Total undergraduate enrolment in universities (at the November count date) is slightly under the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities' (MTCU) projected enrolment. MTCU staff indicates that it is likely that undergraduate growth in all universities in 2010-11 will be fully funded, since the additional funding required is within the amount announced in the 2010 Budget.</p> <p>In December, MTCU announced that \$20.7M for special purpose grants has been allocated (of the \$40M announced in the Province's 2010 Budget), and that no further allocations were anticipated for 2010-11.</p> <p>Background: Of the \$310 million announced in Budget 2010, \$248 million is allocated to universities. The \$248 million covers full enrolment funding in 2009-10 and funding required in 2010-11 to cover projected 1st year enrolment increases as well as increases in retention in upper years.</p> <p>Details of the announced \$248 million:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$101 million to fund 2009-10 enrolment growth • \$102 million to fund 2010-11 enrolment growth • \$5 million for growth in undergraduate nursing programs • \$40 million for special purpose grants <p>The Ministry provided planning allocations to institutions based on their 2010-11 enrolment projection submissions. These allocations have been used to flow undergraduate growth funding (through the 2010-11 Undergraduate Accessibility Grant) to institutions starting in July/August 2010. The following is a planned schedule for flowing undergraduate enrolment growth funding in 2010-11 (based on November enrolment counts):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If growth is consistent with planning allocation (i.e., 85% or more) then adjustments will be made to bi-weekly payments to flow 85% of institution's planning allocation. • If growth is between 75% and 85% of planning allocation then the institution's bi-weekly payments would remain at 75%. • If growth is less than 75% of planning allocation then bi-weekly payments to the institution will be reduced and the difference recovered. <p>Final reconciliation of the 2010-11 Undergraduate Accessibility Grant will take place in spring 2011 against actual enrolments and payment of the remaining balance of the approved planning allocation.</p>
Planning and Funding of Enrolment	Enrolment in 2011-12	<p>Update: MTCU staff has indicated that the Ministry is considering its approach to allocations for enrolment growth in 2011-12. MTCU is considering a request to institutions concerning anticipated growth in 2011-12, but not until after the provincial budget on March 29, 2011.</p> <p>COU has urged the Ministry to initiate a planning and allocation approach for undergraduate growth in 2011-12 that is explicit and clear. It is necessary for institutions to know whether information provided to MTCU will be used to determine funding allocations, and, if so, what the process will be to adjust funding allocations to respond to actual growth.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
<p>Planning and Funding of Enrolment</p>	<p>COU has developed a proposal concerning planning and funding changes in enrolment</p>	<p>COU has developed a position paper focused on mechanisms to support planning for enrolment changes and to provide operating funding in response to institutions' changes in enrolment – both increases and decreases in enrolment, but focusing on aligning funding with the policy objectives of growth. The position paper was approved by Executive Heads in May 2010.</p> <p>The position paper has been submitted to the MTCU and is a key focus of COU advocacy. COU recommends an approach where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MTCU would establish new base funding for each institution based on actual enrolment whenever the new base is established. • Each institution would negotiate, as part of its MYAA, a four-year plan of enrolment growth. The institution and MTCU would agree to an enrolment target for each of the four years. • Institutions would receive a guaranteed level of funding for growth each year, specific to each institution (through access grants outside of their base funding). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If an institution grew to its target, it would receive full funding for that growth. ○ If its growth met only part of the target, it would receive full funding for actual enrolment growth. ○ If it grew above its target, it would receive funding only up to the target (and the institution and MTCU would negotiate a revised plan for subsequent years). • If an institution's enrolment declined below the enrolment level in its base funding, there would be a mechanism to smooth the reduction in revenue. This mechanism to address decline would be like the former corridor system, using a moving average to adjust funding downwards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is important to note that this "corridor"-like approach would work only for enrolment declines. • Every four years, MTCU and institutions would negotiate a new enrolment plan as part of MYAAs. At that time, institutions would also negotiate a new base level of funding (reflecting actual enrolment and institutions' plans at that time). This would add funding that had been provided through access grants to the new base funding of each institution. <p>The full text of COU's proposal can be found at http://www.cou.on.ca/Issues-Resources/Key-Issues/PDFs/Framework-for-Planning-and-Funding-of-Enrolment---.aspx</p>
<p>Undergraduate Accessibility Fund</p>	<p>MTCU will roll funding for growth into base funding and the new base year for the undergraduate accessibility grant is reset to 2009-10</p>	<p>COU welcomes the decision to reset the base year for the undergraduate accessibility grant as it helps institutions plan for enrolment growth in the 2010-11. The Ministry has received COU advice, through CUPA, regarding the rolling of undergraduate accessibility grants into base and is considering how to move forward.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Capital Funding and Planning	<p>The Ontario government re-committed to development of a 10-year infrastructure plan, beginning in 2011. MTCU, with support from the Ministry of Infrastructure, is developing a long-term capital planning process to meet the province's infrastructure needs, including those in the postsecondary sector</p>	<p>In support of the Ontario ten-year infrastructure plan, MTCU sent a survey to all institutions inviting them to submit information on capital projects or initiatives, including projects related to satellite campuses that would be normally eligible for funding through MTCU's Major Capital Support Program. Institutions were asked by the Ministry to put forward projects which have already received the appropriate internal consideration, support institutional mission and academic priorities, and could proceed on a timely basis in the event that funding from the Ministry was to become available.</p> <p>Responses to the survey template were collected by the Ministry by the end of June. A memo was sent to Executive Heads on August 31, 2010 from Marie-Lison Fougère, ADM, Strategic Policies and Programs, MTCU noting that the proposals are currently being reviewed and compared to provincial strategic priorities for PSE. Universities are meeting with MTCU to discuss proposals in more detail; almost all institutions have met with MTCU.</p> <p>In August 2010, COU prepared a submission to the Ministry of Infrastructure Consultations on the 10-year Infrastructure Plan. The submission addressed the key infrastructure priorities for the sector, trends that expected to impact the use of infrastructure in the sector, and investment priorities. The submission can be found at http://www.cou.on.ca/Issues-Resources/Key-Issues/Infrastructure.aspx</p>
Condition of University Facilities	<p>Adjustment to Facilities Renewal Program (FRP) announced in Budget 2010</p>	<p>MTCU announced a reduction of the funds available for the FRP program in 2010-11. The FRP funds are being reduced to \$26 million from the current \$40 million and the universities' share of the fund will be \$17.3 million (2/3 of the total) in 2010-11.</p> <p>In contrast to this allocation, COU's report on facilities condition (see below) finds that, to maintain our campuses in their current condition, universities would require annual expenditures of \$380.8 million.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
<p>Facilities Condition Assessment Program (FCAP)</p>	<p>The Task Force of the Council of Senior Administrative Officers (CSAO) and the Ontario Association of Physical Plant Administrators (OAPPA) released its 2010 report in January, which highlights that the sector's deferred maintenance backlog has reached \$1.97 billion.</p>	<p>Update: On March 4, 2011, members of the CSAO/OAPPA task force and COU representatives met with staff from the Ministries of Infrastructure (MOI) and MTCU. Both MOI and MTCU noted the need for more information about the issue to be communicated at the higher levels of government to ensure sound understanding of the urgency and risks of the problem.</p> <p>As a next step, COU is planning to draft a potential strategy for moving forward on the deferred maintenance file during the 2011-12 fiscal year. Darryl Boyce, Assistant Vice-President (Facilities Management and Planning), Carleton and member of OAPPA, will present findings of the 2010 Facilities Condition Assessment Program to Executive Heads at their round table meeting in April.</p> <p>Background: Since 2000-01, a task force comprised of members from CSAO and OAPPA has produced FCAP reports tracking deferred maintenance in Ontario universities. The data reported has become increasingly reliable and robust, yet government funding for deferred maintenance has not kept up with the sector's needs.</p> <p>The 2010 Facilities Condition Assessment Program report was published January 2011 and can be accessed at: http://www.cou.on.ca/Issues-Resources/Publications/Reports.aspx.</p> <p>As of February 17, 2010, the overall Facilities Condition Index system average was 0.10 which means that overall, buildings in the university sector are in poor condition. The Current Replacement Value of universities' physical infrastructure is \$19.3 billion, and the cost of deferred maintenance is \$1.97 billion.</p> <p>To maintain our campuses in their current condition would require annual expenditures of \$380.8 million.</p>
<p>Tuition Framework for 2010-11 and 2011-12</p>	<p>In March 2010, the government announced a two-year tuition framework as well as changes to OSAP and the Tuition Set-Aside Requirements</p>	<p>Tuition: The tuition framework has been extended for 2010-11 and 2011-12. Tuition increases are limited to an annual average of 5%. For Arts & Science programs, increases cannot exceed 4.5% for 1st year programs and 4% for other years; for professional/graduate programs, increases cannot exceed 8% for 1st year and 4% for other years.</p> <p>Tuition Set-Aside: Universities and colleges are required to contribute 10% of additional revenue from tuition fee increases to bursaries and other student assistance programs (see Student Access Guarantee below)</p> <p>OSAP: Key changes to OSAP include increases to several allowable costs and resources as well as introduction of a six-month interest-free period on student loans after graduation; increases in the tuition fee cap in the OSAP assessment, tied to the increase in tuition (4.5%); and an increase to the Ontario Student Opportunity Grant threshold, which caps student debt, from \$7000 to \$7300 for two terms.</p> <p>COU has not issued a position concerning the tuition framework.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Student Access Guarantee (SAG)	Significant changes to the SAG in 2010-11; upcoming consultations for 2011-12	<p>Update: The Ministry will initiate its annual consultations with COU and Colleges Ontario in mid-April on the 2011-12 SAG guidelines. It is not anticipated that the guidelines will change significantly from 2010-11.</p> <p>Background: With the tuition and OSAP changes announced in March 2010, the government also announced changes to the SAG, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indexing the threshold for calculating the tuition shortfall by the maximum allowable tuition increase rate for undergraduate Arts and Sciences. The 2010-11 ceiling increased from \$4700 to \$4912 (for co-op programs, from \$5560 to \$5810). The book shortfall threshold is indexed to the CPI – in 2010-11, the threshold is \$1046, an increase from \$1020. • Institutions are required to automatically provide non-repayable assistance to undergraduate (first entry) OSAP recipients with unmet need attributed to the tuition/book shortfall, i.e. the student does not have to make a separate application (The ministry is of the view that institutions will generate sufficient funds through the Tuition Set-Aside to cover their SAG obligations). • For second-entry, professional and graduate students, the SAG assistance can be provided in the form of repayable assistance (e.g. access to a student line of credit) and the student can be required to make an application. <p>The SAG Guidelines require universities to make formal arrangements with a lender for 2011-12 if they intend to meet their SAG obligations for second entry students through loans. In 2009 COU issued, on behalf of several universities, an RFP for a Student Line of Credit to be made available to second entry students, and TD Canada Trust was selected as the provider. Participating universities are now finalizing the provider agreement with TD. Other universities wishing to participate in the TD agreement can still do so.</p>
Teacher Education Funding	Adjustment to Teacher Education Funding announced as part of Budget 2010.	<p>Update: On March 2, 2011, MTCU announced a decision regarding specific allocation of education spaces to individual institutions. COU (through CUPA’s ORBC committee) has provided an estimate of funding impacts. MTCU has not yet announced funding impacts, and is developing directions concerning implementation of the reductions in enrolment reporting and adjustments to base funding.</p> <p>Institutions release offers of admission to education faculties on April 1, 2011.</p> <p>Background: Motivated by the current oversupply of teachers, MTCU has announced its intent to reduce funding for teacher education spaces by approximately \$7.5 million.</p> <p>MTCU has announced that funding adjustments will take place over two years with an initial \$5 million reduction in 2011-12 and the remaining \$2.5 million in 2012-13. The choice of reducing enrolments in specific teacher education programs within the university will be left to individual institutions provided a reduction in total teacher education (concurrent and/or consecutive) is achieved.</p> <p>MTCU has collected information on institutional enrolment and types of programs offered at each institution with a faculty of education in Ontario. The Ministry has worked with a representative from each institution to verify the data.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status												
Applications for Fall 2011-12	The Ontario Universities' Application Centre (OUAC) releases monthly statistics between January 2011 and September 2011 on applications to first year undergraduate programs.	<p>Update: OUAC released the following application statistics to the public as of March 9, 2011:</p> <p>Secondary School Applicants:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>Number of first choice applicants</td> <td style="text-align: right;">89,650</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% change since March 2010</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Number of applications</td> <td style="text-align: right;">389,776</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% change since March 2010</td> <td style="text-align: right;">1.8%</td> </tr> </table> <p>Non-Secondary School Applicants:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>Number of first choice applicants</td> <td style="text-align: right;">37,253</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% change since March 2010</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4.7%</td> </tr> </table> <p>The next report is expected no later than April 13, 2011.</p> <p>Background: The deadline for students currently enrolled in an Ontario secondary school (referred to as Secondary School applicants) was January 12, 2011. Historically, 98% of total secondary school applicants submit their applications by this date.</p> <p>The second group of applicants, which are referred to as Non-Secondary School applicants, includes all other applicants (mature students, those taking a gap year(s), and those transferring from another institution or country). The January 12 deadline does not apply to these students; most choose to apply later in the cycle (in particular, those transferring from college or another university). For this reason, a full reporting on these applicants will not be available until April 2011.</p> <p>Since 2000, the number of applications has increased by 49% and continues a rising trend that has not faltered, even after the double cohort, when there were Ontario high school graduates from both Grade 12 and 13.</p> <p>More details and regular updates can be found under the “Statistics” tab at www.ouac.on.ca</p>	Number of first choice applicants	89,650	% change since March 2010	2.1%	Number of applications	389,776	% change since March 2010	1.8%	Number of first choice applicants	37,253	% change since March 2010	4.7%
Number of first choice applicants	89,650													
% change since March 2010	2.1%													
Number of applications	389,776													
% change since March 2010	1.8%													
Number of first choice applicants	37,253													
% change since March 2010	4.7%													
Applications for Fall 2012-13		Applications for Fall 2012-13 are now open.												

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Credit Transfer: Student Mobility Pathways	The provincial government would like student mobility and pathways enhanced at the postsecondary level.	<p>Update: On February 24, MTCU released a credit transfer policy statement and further information about funding to support credit transfer initiatives. The government also announced that it will establish a new coordinating body, the Ontario Council on Articulation and Transfer (ONCAT).</p> <p>MTCU also indicated the allocation of the \$73.7M over five years (announced on January 17) over various aspects of the credit transfer initiative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$23.5M for an Innovation Fund (for projects to develop new pathways, much like the recent calls for proposals by the CUCC), • \$10.6M for a new website and the ongoing operations of the new coordinating body (ONCAT), and • \$39.6M for annual allocations to institutions to support credit transfer. <p>COU is meeting with representatives of the colleges and MTCU in the Web Design Advisory Group to discuss the proposed new web portal.</p> <p>As part of the development of COU recommendations for implementation of the Ontario Online Institute, a survey was distributed to registrars at Ontario universities to explore options for supporting more streamlined credit transfer for fully online courses, including a centralized database of online course equivalencies.</p> <p>Background: On January 17, 2011, Minister Milloy announced initiatives concerning improved credit transfer among Ontario’s postsecondary institutions, including \$73.7 million funding over five years to support a credit transfer system in Ontario. Part of this funding will be available directly to institutions, subject to accountability agreements. He also announced introduction of a Credit Transfer Innovation Fund and a new web portal for students to improve access to credit transfer information.</p> <p>In 2009, The Ministry established a Steering Committee with representatives from COU, Colleges Ontario, College University Consortium Council (CUCC) and student associations to develop options for a credit transfer system for Ontario. COU representatives are Alastair Summerlee, Guelph; Bob Silverman, Queen’s; Dan Lang, Toronto; and Peter Gooch, COU. The Ministry also set up a Working Group to support their work, with representatives from the same four groups noted above: COU, CO, CUCC and student associations.</p> <p>In addition, COU’s Credit Transfer Resource Group continues to advise the COU members of the Steering Committee and Working Group on strategies and challenges. The resource group includes representatives of OCAV, Registrars, CUPA, Academic Colleagues and other staff responsible for credit transfer functions in universities.</p> <p>The Ministry also established a Technical working Group on Credit Transfer to provide advice concerning data and indicators for accountability and funding. COU members are drawn from COU’s Credit Transfer Resource Group.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Teaching and Learning	Ontario universities are collaborating to share ideas and information on teaching and learning innovations to improve student engagement and learning outcomes.	<p>Update: The Teaching & Learning Task Force has distributed surveys to key stakeholders to gather information on teaching and learning activities and opportunities. Discussions with the Council of Ontario Educational Developers are also underway. Surveys were also distributed to institutions in order to gather information on exemplary and/or innovative teaching and learning practices that are being used, or considered for use, by Ontario universities. The surveys have been returned, and collated, and analysis of the results will commence shortly.</p> <p>The Task Force is requesting advice from the Surveys Committee of the Council of University Planning and Analysis (CUPA) concerning effective use of existing survey instruments related to student engagement and teaching and learning. CUPA’s Surveys Committee has initiated discussion and intends to respond by March, as requested.</p> <p>A survey has just been distributed to institutions to gather information on the range of three- year bachelor degrees now offered, and/or other degree program structures that reduce time to degree completion.</p> <p>Background: COU is developing strategies to help universities take initiative to meet their teaching and learning objectives. A Teaching & Learning Task Force has been established under the aegis of OCAV. The Task Force will address a range of teaching and learning issues, including recommending effective practices to improve instruction, student engagement, and learning outcomes. A communications strategy is being developed to showcase innovative teaching and learning practices at Ontario universities. COU has established an Online Learning Working Group to shape MTCU’s implementation decisions concerning the proposed “online institute” (see below).</p> <p>The Task Force has distributed several surveys to registrars and other key stakeholders to gather information on teaching and learning activities and opportunities. Discussions with the Council of Ontario Educational Developers are also underway.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Online Institute	The provincial government has announced that an online institute for the postsecondary sector will be established	<p>Update: On February 23, 2011, Minister Milloy announced the appointment of Mr. Maxim Jean-Louis, Chief Executive Officer of Contact North, as a special advisor to make recommendations on how best to facilitate the establishment and roll-out of an online institute. Simultaneous, to the announcement, MTCU also released a document entitled “Objectives and Guiding Principles” which enunciated a framework for developing the Online Institute.</p> <p>COU has established an Online Working Group to develop recommendations to submit to Mr. Jean-Louis for consideration in the development of his recommendations. Mr. Jean-Louis is expected to submit his report in early May 2011.</p> <p>Background: Consultation with senior provincial officials following the March 2010 Budget announcement indicated that the government had not yet crystallized its thinking on the form that the Institute should take. Accordingly, in April 2010, COU established an Online Learning Working Group to develop a proposal for the government, which was submitted in July 2010. The brief recommends that the Institute not be a separate degree-granting body but rather a COU-led collaborative of participating institutions. COU asked for funding to conduct an initial consultation and prepare a five-year plan. COU staff continue meet with Ministry officials to learn more about the government’s intent.</p> <p>COU staff is meeting with the Ontario University Registrars’ Association (OURA) and with the Credit Transfer Resource Group to discuss the potential for developing a centralized database of online courses, and the collaborative development of online courses.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
International	<p>The Throne Speech announced and the Ontario Budget in March 2010 confirmed the government’s goal to increase international student recruitment by 50% over the next five years.</p>	<p>Update: The Ontario government has been reluctant to pursue any further activity on this file since November 2010. However, COU continues to move forward with the proposals outlined in the submission to government and has struck a Signature Program Sub-Committee with the main goal of determining whether there is an opportunity to acquire private sector support for this concept. Discussions have begun to obtain a supplier who would map out the parameters of other international competitions, develop a pilot program and a business case to support a program.</p> <p>Background: COU officially submitted its international proposal to government in July 2010 in a document called <i>the Open Ontario Strategy for Internationalizing Postsecondary Education</i>. Many of the concepts in this document had been shared with officials and political staff in MTCU and the Premier’s Office, to favourable review. At the request of the Premier’s office, COU and Colleges Ontario (CO) attempted a joint submission. During the process, CO indicated that they would not be able to support our collaborative draft of the proposal, and it was agreed that separate papers would be submitted to the Premier’s office. COU’s revised submission recognizes the diversity of the Ontario’s postsecondary education sector and the need for different approaches for universities and colleges.</p> <p>In November 2010, COU welcomed the Ontario Trillium Scholarships for PhD students, a key recommendation of its proposed international strategy. The program will provide 75 of the world's best students with \$40,000 each year for up to four years. During the initial four years, Ontario will invest \$20 million to support the program, with participating universities contributing a further \$10 million. The announcement required significant efforts by COU and the government to quell complaints from the Conservative opposition. In January 2011, three members of the International Working Group attended the International conference organized by the Higher Education Strategy Associates to promote the university position on international recruitment. COU is also working on a slide deck for MTCU with institutional profiles that the Ministry could provide to incoming foreign delegations, as well as Canadian offices abroad as background on the scope and excellence of Ontario universities. In addition, COU is monitoring proposed study permit regulations, which will require more reporting on the status of students on those permits from our institutions.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Quality Assurance	Transition to new Quality Assurance Framework	<p>Update: The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) has now met seven times since it was established and has reviewed the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) documents from all of the universities. The Quality Council has provided feedback to all of the institutions. Several universities have submitted revised IQAPs. The Quality Council worked closely with OCAV Executive in February to develop a clarifying statement to be added to the definition of “new Program” in the Quality Assurance Framework. The Quality Council also communicated with all universities early in March with illustrations of the definitions of “significant change” for major modifications. It is anticipated that these latter two activities will be of assistance in finalizing IQAPs for ratification. The Quality Council will continue to focus on IQAP reviews over the next several meetings until all university IQAPs have been ratified.</p> <p>The Quality Council is in process of establishing its first Appraisal Committee with the appointment of seven members from amongst those senior faculty members nominated by the universities. The Appraisal Committee will be reviewing new graduate and undergraduate program proposals from universities once their IQAP has been ratified.</p> <p>The Ontario Council of Graduate Studies is completing its review of new graduate programs proposals submitted in its last round and is finalizing its recommendations for periodic appraisals that were initiated last year.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) has now wrapped up its mandate with the completion of the final two university audits. Audit Reports for Algoma University and for the University of Ontario Institute of Technology were received by OCAV at its February meeting. Under the mandate of the Quality Council, each university will be audited on an eight year cycle.</p> <p>Background: The Quality Assurance Framework was approved by Executive Heads of Ontario Universities in April 2010. The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance was established shortly thereafter with its first meeting in July 2010. The quality assurance processes that fall under the mandate of the Ontario Council for Graduate Studies and the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee are now being wound down in this transition year. By 2011-12, the Quality Council will oversee implementation of the protocols for new program approvals and the audit process as defined in the Quality Assurance Framework.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
<p>University Pension Plans</p>	<p>Unmanageable solvency and going concern special payments:</p> <p>-based on June 30/July 1, 2009 estimates going concern special payments were estimated to be \$298 million per year and \$257 million per year for solvency payments, for total special payments of \$555 million per year.</p>	<p>Update: On March 3, a technical briefing on the pension relief regulation paper was provided to “Union Coalition” representatives by Allan Shapira of Aon Hewitt, on behalf of the Ministry of Finance. Allan’s presentation provided similar information to what was shared at the February 18 technical briefing to CSAO representatives. OCUFA, CUPE, OPSEU, USWA, CAW, OSSTF and SEIU were all represented at the March 3 meeting.</p> <p>Background: In August 2010, the Ontario government announced a 2-stage temporary pension solvency relief plan for universities. The relief plan states that universities with defined benefit (DB) and hybrid pension plans whose funded ratio (on a going concern OR solvency basis) are less than 90% will be eligible to apply for the 2-stage solvency funding relief plan.</p> <p>On August 24, 2010, the Ontario government announced proposed reforms to modernize Ontario’s pension system. Among other changes, the proposed reforms include the continued exclusion of promised indexation benefits in solvency valuations and a permanent exemption from solvency funding requirements for Jointly Sponsored Pension Plans.</p> <p>Given the government position on jointly sponsored plans, the mandate of the Working Group on Pension Plans was revised to investigate the feasibility of the joint sponsorship model for university pension plans, both on a single employer and a multiple employer basis. The Terms of Reference for the Working Group was updated and submitted to MTCU as well as a funding request to support the work of the Working Group in phase 2. No response to date has been received.</p> <p>In January 2011, COU was contacted by OCUFA and informed that OCUFA has formed a Union Coalition with a number of university unions – USW, CAW, SEIU, OSSTF, CUPE and OPSEU. The Union Coalition has developed a research proposal which it has submitted to MTCU for funding. The proposal builds on the work of the Working Group’s Final Report and will focus on pension governance, decision-making and plan design concerns as well as funding and finance. The Union Coalition has proposed a tripartite meeting with the Working Group and government to discuss moving forward.</p> <p>On February 10, 2011, the Ministry of Finance (MOF) released amendments to Regulation 909 under the Pension Benefits Act. One amendment extended the filing date for valuations with effective dates from December 31, 2009 up to and including August 1, 2010, to May 31, 2011. This extension allows all universities to apply for the 2-stage relief package announced in August 2010 should they want to. The second amendment relates to the 2-stage relief itself. Further details on this amendment are provided in a paper titled <i>Details of Temporary Solvency Funding Relief for Certain Pension Plans in the Broader Public Sector</i> and can be found the provincial government’s regulatory register (http://www.ontariocanada.com/registry/view.do?postingId=5662&language=en). The paper provides details on the proposed relief measures and requirement for application. The deadline for submitting an application for Stage 1 relief for eligible pension plans with a valuation date as at December 31, 2009 or with a valuation date in 2010 is March 23, 2011. A detailed briefing session was held on February 18 with MOF.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
<p>COU Going Greener Forum and Annual Report</p>	<p>In November 2009, Executive Heads signed a pledge to publish an annual report on how Ontario universities are going greener, and to provide forums for the discussion and development of solutions regarding sustainability issues.</p>	<p>On November 4, 2010 COU hosted the Going Greener Forum at the Metro Toronto Convention Centre and released the second annual Going Greener Report, based on the 2010 Survey of Green Initiatives at Ontario universities. The primary purpose of the Forum was to advocate for the role of Ontario universities in helping to build the province’s green economy by showcasing how the sector is working with others in the Broader Public Sector (BPS). A total of 125 people attended the Going Greener Forum, as well as two provincial cabinet ministers: the Honourable John Wilkinson, Minister of Environment, and the Honourable Glen Murray, Minister of Research and Innovation, both of whom emphasized the importance of such forums in terms of building partnerships and building a sustainable future.</p> <p>A short survey was sent to Forum participants following the event to gain insight on its perceived value, whether there is desire for similar events in the future, and suggestions for how the content/format could be amended in the future. When asked whether the speakers and themes of the forum were relevant and insightful and whether the Forum met their expectations, respondents provided an average score of 7/10. In terms of whether COU should continue to hold similar events in the future, the average score was 9/10. The average was 8/10 when asked about the usefulness of the Going Greener Report. COU is currently exploring options for a 2011 green report and/or event.</p> <p>On January 21, 2011 the Executive Committee received a brief report on the Going Greener Forum and Report, and confirmed its support for an annual Forum and preparation of an annual Report, which is developed from a comprehensive survey regarding universities’ sustainability initiatives. The Committee felt that as an advocacy tool to demonstrate tangible results to government, and in fulfillment of the “Green Pledge,” which is of importance on campus, especially to students, the annual Forum and Report are worth valuable initiatives.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
<p>Recommendation of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts related to space management and space utilization.</p>	<p>The 2007 Annual Report of the Auditor General of Ontario, <i>Universities-Management of Facilities</i>, includes a recommendation from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts that MTCU must supply space utilization rates for each university.</p>	<p>The Space Management Committee is continuing to work on collecting accurate and comparable space utilization data across institutions and will work with the COU Government Relations Committee and technical experts from CUPA as needed when preparing its submission to MTCU. It will also work closely with university registrars to ensure that unique characteristics for the university context for space management are accurately captured.</p> <p>On November 29, 2010 the Committee met with university Registrars to discuss the pedagogical drivers for space management in the sector, as well as challenges facing timetabling practices and reasonable expectations for space utilization.</p> <p>The Committee met again on January 12, 2011 to discuss next steps. It was determined that a final request for institutions to confirm data will be sent, along with a request for the number of scheduling hours available at each institution. The final data set will include scheduled activities directly related to a course code only; however, the draft report will reference the importance of extracurricular/non course-affiliated activities for the academic missions of universities. A draft report will be developed for review by the Committee at its next meeting.</p> <p>On February 2, 2011, COU sent a request on behalf of the Space Management Committee to CSAO, OCAV, the Committee on Space Standards and Reporting, and other university space managers, asking for institutions to revisit their original space utilization data submissions and confirm their accuracy by March 18. Institutions were also asked to report the number of hours in their typical Monday to Friday scheduling weeks. Once the revised data is received, the Space Management Committee will reconvene to determine next steps in its report development.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Inter-University Transit Services (IUTS)	Effective September 1, 2010, the IUTS service provider has switched from Purolator Ltd. to Canpar to minimize costs. As of October 1, 2010 the frequency of pickup of mail items will be reduced.	<p>Update: Effective February 28, 2011, Queen’s University moved to a single injection point for IUTS services through its library.</p> <p>Background: The Ministry of Government Services (MGS) awarded its contract for courier services to Canpar Transport LP, effective September 1, 2010. Due to the fact that COU/IUTS benefits from the pricing negotiated by MGS, it was no longer economically feasible to continue contracting services from Purolator Ltd., so IUTS services were switched to Canpar on Sept. 1, 2010 (or as close to that date as possible).</p> <p>As of October 1, 2010 IUTS pickup of general mail non-library materials be reduced from 5 days per week to 2 days for those sites that have multiple pickup locations, in order to reduce IUTS costs related to the movement of regular mail.</p> <p>COU is encouraging institutions to move to a single injection point for IUTS services to further incur cost savings. To date, Brock, Ottawa, Trent, Queen’s, Ryerson, Waterloo, Nipissing, Lakehead, Laurentian, UOIT, Carleton and Windsor have all moved to a single point/consolidated address for both mail and Inter Library Loans. Wilfrid Laurier also has plans to make the transition shortly.</p> <p>A group of IUTS users met on January 19, 2011 to discuss the conversion process from Purolator to Canpar and identify further savings opportunities. Overall, the transition has been smooth and users are satisfied with the change. Further work is underway to explore the feasibility of moving to a single consolidated IUTS location at McMaster, Guelph and the University of Toronto.</p>
Council of Finance Officers – Universities of Ontario (COFO-UO)	Launch of a new micro website for online financial reporting.	<p>Based on recent work with TGT Solutions Inc. to move to a new online financial reporting system for Ontario universities, COU launched a new micro website on November 26, 2010 designed to provide access to the COFO-UO financial reports. This online reporting system provides a more convenient and user-friendly interface for those inputting and seeking financial information pertaining to the sector, and offers the option to produce customized reports. These improvements will lead to increased transparency of university financial information and allow for access to data in a timely manner.</p> <p>The site can be accessed directly at: http://www.cou.on.ca/Statistics/COFO-UO.aspx, or via the COU home page (www.cou.on.ca) by clicking on the Statistics tab, then COFO-UO. It is grouped into three main sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • About - provides information about COFO-UO members and its objectives. • Financial Reports –provides links to static financial reports grouped by fiscal year and allows for the compilation of customized financial reports based on the user’s information needs. This section also contains the instruction manual and reporting guidelines for financial reporting, as well as a link to the Financial Report of Ontario Universities Highlights that offers high-level information at the system level. • Members Only Portal – provides instructions for and allows COFO-UO members to submit financial information online.

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
<p>Council of Finance Officers – Universities of Ontario (COFO-UO)</p>	<p>Bill 122: The Broader Public Sector (BPS) Accountability Act</p>	<p>Update: A meeting to discuss the definitions of consultants and consulting services was held on March 9, 2011 with representatives from the COFO Working Group on Bill 122, TCU and MOF. The Working Group prepared a list of common services procured by universities, and government representatives agreed that many would not be deemed consulting services for the purposes of the Procurement Directive since they did not include the provision of strategic advice. Examples specific to the PSE sector will be developed and shared at upcoming training sessions on the Directives. The meeting went a long way to address issues related to the definitions and to reassure finance staff that the Directives will not be too onerous in terms of increasing the number of competitive bid processes required.</p> <p>Background: The Broader Public Sector Accountability Act (Bill 122) passed in the Legislature on December 2, 2010, and will bring new rules and higher accountability standards for BPS organizations including universities around the use of external lobbyists, consultants and expenses effective April 1, 2011.</p> <p>COFO-UO has set up a Working Group to examine the potential impacts of the Bill for the sector. The Procurement Directive will be very similar to the Supply Chain procurement directive issued in April 2009 and substantially aligns with Provincial Trade Agreements, Management Board and Cabinet Procurement Directives. Rules governing competitive acquisition of consulting services will be implemented, regardless of dollar value. The Expenses Directive will require that all BPS organizations have expense policies in place, that the policies are posted on their website, and that institutions comply with their policies.</p> <p>The Directives were released by the Ministry of Finance on February 1, 2011 at: www.fin.gov.on.ca/bpssupplychain. A detailed briefing on the Directives was held on February 16 with members of MOF, MTCU, COU and COFO. Of particular concern is section 4.4 of the Expenses Directive, which recommends that hospitality costs for functions involving only university employees be reimbursed with public funds. The Working Group would also like to pursue further clarification of the definitions of consultants and consulting services in the Procurement Directive, and learn more about the compliance requirements for the Directives.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
<p>Innovative Ideas: Improving Efficiency at Ontario Universities</p>	<p>COU is initiating an advocacy project to highlight administrative innovation and efficiencies in Ontario universities in light of the emerging focus on affordability by the current government and as a theme in the 2011 provincial election.</p>	<p>Update: COU has received early examples of innovative projects from institutions and is preparing a briefing note for reference in early discussions between COU and politicians. COU is also continuing to work with universities on the preparation of their abstract submissions for the end of March.</p> <p>Background: The aim of the Innovative Ideas project will be to showcase examples from a number of subject categories of how institutions are saving money through innovative administrative processes and actions. These examples will be published in a report to be shared with government, and highlighted at an advocacy event. Eight subject categories (procurement, space management, facilities and operations, human resources, financial management, student affairs, IT and communications, and other) have been selected for identifying areas of financial innovation. Each university has been asked to submit a maximum of two examples to showcase where they are exhibiting financial innovation. Sector-wide examples of efficiencies such as OUAC and IUTS will also be included.</p> <p>A call for abstracts was distributed by COU in January, 2011 with a March 31, 2011 deadline for all submissions. Universities were also asked to indicate if they would be willing to submit any early examples by March 4, 2011 to be used as references to describe the efficacy of the sector in early discussions between COU and politicians during the election campaign development phase.</p> <p>An informal email was sent to the Government Relations External group on January 28 to get input on the project and feedback received to date has indicated interest in including other BPS groups. As a result, COU is working with others such as Colleges Ontario, the Ontario Hospital Association and the Association of Municipalities of Ontario to determine projects that could be highlighted at the advocacy event.</p> <p>The event will be held on Wednesday, May 25 at the University of Victoria (Alumni Hall) at the University of Toronto.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Proposed Electricity Regulation Amendment	<p>The Ministry of Energy (MOE) proposed amending an existing regulation (Reg. 429/04) to alter how the “global adjustment” (IESO connected university), or the “Provincial Benefit” (utility connected universities) electricity charges are allocated. This change would result in increased electricity costs for at least ten of Ontario’s universities.</p>	<p>Currently, the Provincial Benefit charges are allocated on a volumetric basis each billing period, but the amendment would see larger consumers billed based on their specific demand contribution during the total system peak(s), which would result in increased electricity costs for at least ten of Ontario’s universities.</p> <p>The Ontario Association of Physical Plant Administrators (OAPPA) Energy Committee worked on raising awareness of this issue and a number of universities recently submitted letters to MOE expressing concerns about the increased electrical costs they would incur as a result of the reallocation of Global Adjustment (approx. \$2.5M as a collective). As a result of these efforts, the Ministry has included an option to defer the election to be a Class A consumer for a period of 18 months, which would delay the costs until July 1, 2012.</p> <p>The entire regulation was posted October 26, 2010 and can be found at: http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/source/regs/english/2010/elaws_src_regs_r10398_e.htm.</p> <p>While the option to delay the move to a Class A consumer is positive for the sector, there is still concern that the issue has not gone away. The OAPPA Energy Committee met with Tom Chapman, Manager, Energy Economics at the Ministry of Energy on February 10 to discuss the government’s Long-Term Energy Plan and changes to the Global Adjustment. Tom indicated that the Ministry would be doing a review of the Global Adjustment reallocation regulations this spring. He welcomed OAPPA’s involvement in the process and suggested that concerns/comments be submitted to him in writing. It remains possible that the 18-month opt out clause in the legislation could be permanently removed, which would be a positive development for the sector with potential collective cost savings of about \$2.5M. OAPPA will continue to monitor this file and provide updates to COU.</p>
University Health Insurance Plan (UHIP)	<p>The cost of UHIP health coverage for international students and staff studying and working in Ontario imposes financial burdens that can put universities at a competitive disadvantage when trying to attract foreign talent.</p>	<p>Based on the fact that UHIP premiums are costly to international students and staff in Ontario, the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance (OUSA) is proposing that current UHIP members be covered under OHIP, and that premiums collected by institutions be passed on to government rather than to a private insurer. OUSA approached COU for support for its proposal and COU brought the request to the UHIP Steering Committee. The Committee was in favour of supporting the proposal, provided that premiums are not increased above current UHIP rates.</p> <p>In January, COU sent a letter to Minister Deb Matthews, Health and Long-Term Care, noting its support for the OUSA proposal, assuming premiums are not increased.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Ontario Council on University Research	Harmonization of Research Ethics	<p>Update: MRI has struck a stakeholder working group that is chaired by Courtney Pratt, Chairman, Toronto Region Research Alliance, to identify ways to streamline the Ethics Review Process for multi-site clinical trials. OCUR is represented on the Clinical Trials Working Group by a member of the OCUR Working Group on Research Ethics and will be providing comments on a draft report that has been prepared by this group.</p> <p>Background: The Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-term Care and university researchers have signaled to OCUR an interest in better harmonization of ethics processes among universities in an effort to reduce barriers to research.</p> <p>An OCUR Working Group was established in 2009 to work on this issue. Their mandate is to identify opportunities to: streamline processes; reduce workload and duplication associated with reviews; and, enhance inter-university cooperation. As a first step in the Working Group’s work plan, a draft report on how the shared review of multi-centre research projects can be undertaken in order to make multi-review practices more efficient and transparent in Ontario has been completed. OCUR is also working with MRI on its Clinical Trials Working Group.</p>
	Ontario Research Fund – Research Infrastructure (ORF-RI) / Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI)	<p>The 2009 Ontario Budget announced \$300 million in capital funds (ORF - RI) over six years for research infrastructure, which will be available to leverage funding from CFI.</p> <p>In keeping with the process and criteria developed for the last ORF Large Infrastructure Funding applications, a new Ontario First process and criteria will be developed to guide distribution of the funds announced in Budget 2009.</p> <p>OCUR will work closely with Ministry of Research and Innovation (MRI) over the coming months to provide input into the development of this process.</p> <p>CFI has announced \$182M for the Leaders Opportunity Fund, \$200.5M for the Leading Edge and New Initiatives Fund, and \$185 for the Major Science Initiatives Fund.</p>
	Federal ADM Integration Board	<p>Update: The IB confirmed that the IB/OCUR Symposium will be held on June 17 in Ottawa.</p> <p>Background: The ADMs (Policy) of all federal science-based departments and agencies meet regularly at the Federal ADM Integration Board, which provides a forum for discussion and to work on areas of collective interest. They have invited OCUR to participate in a pilot initiative with them that will seek to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Strengthen relationships between science-based departments and Ontario universities; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Build a strong platform for dialogue on national challenges and science-policy integration; and, 2) Support the recruitment and skill development of future public servants. <p>A working group, headed by Mona Nemer, Ottawa, and Marc Fortin, ADM, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, has been established to organize an IB-OCUR symposium. Marc Fortin met with OCUR on October 28, 2010 to discuss the symposium, which is scheduled to take place in the Spring of 2011.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Ontario Council on University Research (cont.)	Research Matters	<p>Update: OCUR discussed next steps for the project at its February meeting. Research Communicators will be invited to a one-day meeting at McMaster University to develop recommendations and a plan to provide to the Provincial Relations Committee on moving forward with a Why Research Matters campaign.</p> <p>Background: OCUR has identified the need for a new approach to ensure effective delivery of its research message to multiple audiences.</p> <p>A consultancy firm was hired to prepare a report that assessed perceptions of university research and impact. Based on its finding, the report also provided recommendations on potential messaging and strategies that could be used to build awareness and to promote the contribution of Ontario university research.</p> <p>The results of the Why Research Matters report were presented to OCUR on January 20, 2011. The President’s office, AUCC and other key stakeholders met in early February to discuss key elements of the report.</p>
	Review of the Ontario Innovation Agenda Refresh (OIA)	<p>Status Update: In February, OCUR met with ADM Bill Mantel to discuss the status of MRI’s review of the OIA. The outcomes of the review were slated to be presented before Cabinet in early February. The 2011 provincial budget announced the creation of a specialized organization with a clear mandate to focus research activities on productivity growth in key sectors. It is expected that this will result in cost savings of \$3 million over 3 years by better leveraging private-sector investments.</p> <p>Background: The Ministry of Research and Innovation (MRI) is currently undertaking a review of the Ontario Innovation Agenda. Adalsteinn Brown, Acting ADM, Science and Research, who was seconded from the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC) to lead the Review; left in January 2011.</p> <p>At the end of January, Bill Mantel was named acting ADM and has assumed leadership of the 2011 review.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Ontario Council on University Research (cont.)	Ontario Health Research and Innovation Council	<p>Update: OCUR met with COFM: Research on February 24, 2011 and discussed the Ontario Health Research and Innovation Council. COFM: Research asked OCUR for two representatives to sit on a Working Group on the Ontario Research Council. It is unclear at this time, if the council will be included as an outcome of the Ontario Innovation Agenda review. In its March budget, the government confirmed its commitment to create a research council.</p> <p>Background: The Ontario Government has signaled an interest in ensuring that its health research investments are well aligned with the areas of greatest need and in finding new ways to reduce health care system costs. In order to best support this activity and to leverage existing research funding, MRI and MOHLTC have been asked to consider the creation of an Ontario Health Research and Innovation Council.</p> <p>At the March 19, 2010 meeting of the COU Executive Committee, the issue of a new Ontario Health Research and Innovation Council was discussed. The Executive Committee asked that the issue be referred to OCUR for comment.</p> <p>OCUR provided their feedback which was presented at the April 22, 2010 Executive Heads Round Table. Cautions flagged in their feedback were: lack of flexibility, narrowness of focus and the need to ensure that the full costs of research are understood and fully funded.</p> <p>At COFM: Research’s November 21, 2010 meeting, ADM Brown suggested that an Ontario Health Research and Innovation Council may be recommended as part of the Review of the Ontario Innovation Agenda.</p>
	High Performance Computing (HPC)	<p>Update: MRI confirmed that it will be providing \$4 million in bridge funding for 2011/12. It also confirmed its intention to work with OCUR to develop a long-term sustainable plan for HPC in Ontario. As part of its contribution to this exercise OCUR has agreed to an RFP that will provide necessary information on the expected needs and demands of HPC over the next 10 years.</p> <p>Background: HPC is a “supercomputing” system that provides researchers with the processing, storage, networking and visualization power that they require undertaking complex projects and analysis. It is a critical component of Ontario’s research infrastructure that is currently facing significant operational and capital funding pressures.</p> <p>This item was discussed at the Executive Heads Round Table on April 22, 2010 and it was decided that it should be raised as a priority item with the Ontario Government.</p> <p>OCUR representatives are working closely with MRI to acquire short-term transitional funding, as well as a long-term sustainability plan. As part of its work, OCUR has met with staff to the Minister of Research and Innovation. There is an acknowledgement of the need to ensure adequate and sustainable funding for HPC, but no commitment to new funds at this time. OCUR is also working with CFI to identify federal sources of funding.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Accessibility	EnAbling Change Partnership – Foundational Toolkit	<p>Update: Working Groups that support the development of tools for the COU foundational Toolkit meet regularly and tool development is underway. In addition, in March 2011, a second meeting of AODA Coordinators and Administrators was held. A timeline extension for the project has been granted and resource development, gathering and posting will continue until October 2011.</p> <p>Background: The AODA became law on June 13, 2005 with a mandate to make Ontario the most accessible province in Canada by the year 2025. As part of this legislation, the government of Ontario has developed accessibility Standards in five areas: customer service, information and communications, built environment, employment and transportation, which will have significant implications for Ontario universities. In particular, each university will be required to develop a series of policies, practices and guidelines in support of these Standards. Recognizing the potentially significant resources that would be required at each of our institutions to develop the products and processes needed to ensure compliance, COU and the University of Toronto have partnered with the Ministry of Community and Social Services (MCSS) to develop a common toolkit that could be used across the university sector. This common toolkit will offer the opportunity to leverage sector-wide resources and expertise to reduce duplication of effort at each of our institutions.</p> <p>In January 2010 a one and a half-year contract was signed between COU and the MCSS to develop the toolkit of resources. A project coordinator was hired in June 2010 and the work plan was developed in Fall 2010. In September 2010, all AODA Coordinators and Administrators came together for a project working session where participants shared resources, best practices and agreed to work collaboratively with other members on the various products that will be developed for the accessible toolkit through Working Groups</p>
	EnAbling Change Partnership – Online Training Tool	<p>Update: The tool was developed in both English and French and, on December 2, 2009, was distributed to all of our campuses across Ontario to assist universities in training all faculty, staff, volunteers and contract workers on accessible customer service. Reviews of the tool have been very positive and a number of other sectors have requested permission to use it as their own training.</p> <p>Background: The Customer Service Standard was the first Standard to become law and officially came into effect on January 1, 2010 and universities were required to be in compliance by March 31, 2010. COU and Queen’s University partnered with MCSS through the EnAbling Change Partnership to create an online training tool to assist Ontario universities in complying with the training component of this Standard.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Accessibility (cont.)	Integrated Accessibility Regulation	<p>Update: On February 1, 2011, MCSS released its final draft of the Integrated Accessibility Regulation for a 45-day public review period. Similar to the previous draft of the Integrated Accessibility Regulation, COU requested comments from our member institutions and developed a document that consolidated our sectors feedback for government. Additionally, COU will continue to work with MCSS’s Accessibility Directorate of Ontario (ADO) to ensure that university concerns related to the proposed Regulation are addressed.</p> <p>Background: On September 2, 2010, MCSS released the draft Integrated Accessibility Regulation for public review and comment. This new proposed Regulation combined the Accessible Information and Communications Standard, Accessible Employment Standard and the Accessible Transportation Standard into a single Regulation. As has been the practice with other Standards, COU requested comment from our sector and developed a document that consolidated this feedback for government.</p>
	Proposed Final Accessible Built Environment Standard	<p>On May 26, 2010, the Accessible Built Environment – Standard Development Committee (ABE-SDC) submitted the Final Proposed Accessible Built Environment Standard to the Honourable Madeleine Meilleur, Minister of MCSS, for consideration. Currently, the Minister is in the process of reviewing the proposed Standard.</p> <p>We are pleased to say that many of the changes suggested by COU during the public review period were integrated into the Proposed Final Accessible Built Environment Standard. However, there are a number of areas of ongoing concern and COU is working with MCSS to ensure that these issues are addressed in the final Standard.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Mental Health	Mental Health and Addictions	<p>Update: A sub-committee comprising representatives from COU, PACDI, OCSA, OCHA, and IDIA, reporting to the Reference Group on Accessibility, has been established. The sub-committee met on February 17, 2011, to look at next steps that the PSE sector can take to address mental health and addictions issues on campuses. The sub-committee will begin work on legal protocols, an awareness campaign, and policy development in target areas.</p> <p>Background: MTCU, in collaboration with COU and Colleges Ontario, hosted a Mental Health and Addictions Summit in Toronto at Queen’s Park on October 29, 2010.</p> <p>The goals of the PSE Mental Health Summit were to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. identify policy issues for further action and collaboration with government; 2. develop opportunities for partnership and collaboration among our institutions as well with external partners; and to 3. share innovative new models and tools. <p>The Summit provided an important opportunity for discussion and information-sharing among university and college administrators. Specifically, the following themes guided discussion throughout the day:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legal and Institutional Issues 2. Health Promotion and Education and Training of Postsecondary Education Staff 3. Support Services 4. External Collaboration 5. Funding <p>The summit included 4 participants from each Ontario university and college, along with representatives from the MTCU, the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care, and the Ministry of Education.</p>
COU Position Paper on Collaborative Nursing Programs in Ontario	Colleges Ontario has proposed that government authorize colleges to offer stand-alone Nursing BScNs	<p>COU staff members have been meeting with nursing stakeholders to discuss the COU position paper on Collaborative Nursing Programs in Ontario in response to Colleges Ontario’s proposal, “Opening Doors to Nursing Degrees,” which states that colleges should be authorized to grant stand-alone nursing degrees.</p> <p>Background: The COU paper was sent to MTCU in August. The COU position paper states that authorizing colleges to offer stand-alone nursing degrees would destabilize the current collaborative system of nursing baccalaureate education, create inefficiencies, increase costs to the Province, and create a tension with current MTCU policy on collaboration. The COU paper recommends that MTCU support a continuation of the collaborative policy direction set out ten years ago, in which there has been much investment and much success.</p>

COU UPDATE – as of MARCH 31, 2011

Subject	Issue	Status
Council of Ontario University Programs in Nursing (COUPN)	Annual Retreat	<p>COUPN held its annual retreat in January and identified the following priorities for future work:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gather employment data for new grads towards developing a Nursing Health Human Resources Strategy 2. Implement recommendations from position paper on collaborative nursing programs/work with college partners to develop a common vision of baccalaureate nursing education 3. Differentiation and collaboration for graduate programs 4. Leadership mentoring/training/planning for nurse educators
COUPN Primary Health Care Nurse Practitioner Consortium	Establishing a PHCNP Provincial Office	<p>The PHCNP office is moving forward on the following initiatives: securing MOHLTC funding; growing enrollment targets to 200 students; standardization of site functions and roles across the 9-university sites; ensuring program quality; mapping of the NP-PHC competencies to the curriculum; and building on strategic partnerships.</p>
Expansion of Undergraduate and Postgraduate medicine spaces	<p>The Faculties of Medicine have substantially increased the number of undergraduate and postgraduate positions to address the physician shortage in Ontario.</p> <p>Funding from the Ministries of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) and the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC).</p>	<p><i>Undergraduate Medicine:</i> The Faculties of Medicine appreciate MTCU’s investment of \$20 million to blend the funding of pre-expansion and expansion undergraduate medical positions at a rate of \$38,788/position. This blended funding rate is a significant and welcome step towards the ultimate goal of addressing the actual costs of delivering undergraduate medical education.</p> <p><i>Family Medicine:</i> The Family Medicine Departments are implementing a second phase of expansion that is occurring predominantly in the community hospitals and sites and outside Academic Health Science Centres. As such, a number of specialists who train family physician residents were going unpaid until the recent MOHLTC announcement that previously unfunded preceptors would now be remunerated. This announcement has ensured the continued success of the second phase of expansion.</p> <p><i>Postgraduate Royal College Specialty Expansion Funding</i> The enhanced annual operating funding of \$20,000 per new position and one-time start-up funding of \$25,000 per PGY1 position recently announced by the MOHLTC will support building capacity to train specialist physicians in Ontario. These funds are required to provide necessary infrastructure, learning resources, curriculum development, faculty development, and will address the additional costs of training. In addition, the \$10,890,000 infrastructure fund will further allow university and hospital departments to expand clinical areas, call rooms, resident offices for the additional residents. This funding will support the specialty programs in meeting accreditation standards while building new specialty training capacity.</p>