

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR GOVERNANCE, 2008

A SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The University of Toronto is one of the world's foremost research-intensive universities. It has educated hundreds of thousands of students and enjoys a global reputation in multiple fields of scholarship.

Each year we measure progress toward our long-term goals in a range of teaching and research areas. An annual Performance Indicators Report has been presented to Governing Council since 1998, and the University of Toronto has led Ontario's post-secondary sector in providing reports of this nature as part of our accountability to governance. The indicators in these reports have changed over the years as we expanded the scope of areas measured, enhanced our data collection, and created partnerships with other institutions and agencies for external benchmarking.

This year's project included new analysis in several key areas:

- Field-level research publication and citation data
- A third year of National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) results
- Refinement of the counting of faculty and development of student-faculty ratios
- Continued work on the humanities indicator project
- Analysis of the impact of tuition on retention and graduation

In 2007-08 the University completed Towards 2030, a long-term planning process to determine how the University can build on its achievements and continue to excel in the varied dimensions of its mission. In 2008 we began to align our measures against the 2030 Framework, and in coming years we will continue to refine our 2030 performance measures.

This summary document highlights several of this year's major findings:

- The University continues to employ award-winning faculty, whose research output and strength is unparalleled in Canada and, for some fields, in North America.
- Research funding from the Tri-Councils is increasingly competitive, and the University needs to do more to attract investment and partnerships with industry to support commercialization and knowledge transfer.
- The University's physical assets in terms both of space available and deferred maintenance need serious and ongoing attention.
- U of T continues to attract a growing number of undergraduate and graduate students, and tuition fee increases have not affected student retention or graduation rates.
- Undergraduate students are reporting a more positive student experience, and graduate students continue to respond positively about all aspects of their student experience.
- While the private support of alumni and friends is at a record level, there continues to be a significant gap in per-student funding between the University of Toronto and its peer institutions.

This summary document provides an overview of the 2008 Performance Indicators. The comprehensive inventory of our performance measures can be found at

http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/public/Reports/performanceindicators.htm.

In addition to the Performance Indicators report, the University of Toronto publishes a number of other detailed accountability reports and makes available a large amount of annual performance-related data. This additional information includes: the Multi-Year Accountability Agreement and annual Report-Backs to Government, the Common University Data Ontario (CUDO), the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) Report, and the Canadian Graduate and Professional Students Survey (CGPSS) Report. See: http://www.utoronto.ca/about-uoft/measuring-our-performance.htm.

THE UNIVERSITY'S DISTINCTIVE ROLE

I. FACULTY HONOURS AND RESEARCH OUTPUT

Prestigious national and international honours are one measure of scholarly research excellence, and publication and citation counts¹ demonstrate research output and intensity, particularly in science disciplines, where research reporting is predominantly journal-based.

Comparisons with both Canadian and US institutions indicate our research productivity in the science fields relative to our peers; research rankings also measure our performance relative to our peers.

FACULTY HONOURS BY AWARD, 1980-2008 UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO COMPARED TO AWARDS HELD AT OTHER CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES



The chart above indicates the percentage of International Faculty Honours and Canadian Faculty Honours held by UofT faculty as a percentage of the total amount of these awards held by faculty in Canada over a 28-year period.

¹Thomson Scientific's University Indicators is a database that contains the number of papers from each university and the number of times these papers/publications have been cited since publication. These indicators include publications (articles, notes, reviews, and proceedings papers) and citations indexed in over 10,000 peer-reviewed journals. Citations refer to the number of times that a given article, note, review or paper is referenced/referred to in another article, note, review or paper since publication.



Over the last twenty-eight years, the University of Toronto has won more awards from prestigious international bodies than any other Canadian university. The more competitive the award – nationally or internationally – the better our researchers do. According to Statistics Canada, U of T's share of Canada's full-time faculty is just under seven percent (excluding clinical faculty) and yet since 1980 our faculty has won 19.2 to 34.5% of national awards and 23.5 to 63% of international awards.

RESEARCH RANKINGS



Shanghai Jiao Tong University Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2008



Times Higher Education World Rankings

Academic Peer Review, 2008

Research Infosource Canada's Innovation Leaders, 2008





for World Universities, 2008



^{*}Higher Education Evaluation & Accreditation Council of Taiwan

The charts above compare the University of Toronto's international ranking and position relative to its Canadian peer institutions on four research-focused rankings:Shanghai Jiao Tong; Times Higher Education Supplement (Academic Peer Review); Research InfoSource (Canada only); and HEEAC of Taiwan.

The University of Toronto's research output and strength is unparalleled in Canada. In a number of fields, particularly in the sciences, U of T ranks first in Canada. In some of these fields, U of T ranks in the top three in North America.

PUBLICATIONS AND CITATIONS: SCIENCE FIELDS Summary of Rankings for the University of Toronto 2003-2007 Among Canadian Peers (G13), Aau Public Institutions, and all aau institutions

	G13 (Canada)		AAU Publics		AAU AII	
	Publications	Citations	Publications	Citations	Publications	Citations
All Science Fields	1	1	1	3	2	6
Health and Life Sciences	1	1	1	2	2	4
Cell Biology	1	1	2	3	5	9
Materials Science, Biomaterials	1	1	1	3	2	6
Biotechnology and Applied Microbiology	1	1	7	6	12	11
Engineering	1	1	6	9	8	12
Nanoscience and Nanotechnology	1	1	17	17	24	28
Optics	1	1	3	2	8	13
Environmental Engineering	1	1	2	1	2	1

Source: Thompson ISI U.S. and Canadian Indicators - Deluxe and Standard Editions 2007

The chart above indicates the University of Toronto's position on publications and citations in a selection of science-based fields relative to its Canadian peers, AAU public peers and all AAU institutions.



II. RESEARCH FUNDING AND YIELDS

Measures of research funding from the tri-councils (SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR) show the share of funding received by an institution's faculty members relative to its peers and over time.

The research yield indicator measures the share of funding an institution receives relative to its share of eligible faculty members. While we can measure research yields for both SSHRC and NSERC, problems of comparability on faculty counts preclude us from presenting this measure for CIHR disciplines.



CANADIAN PEER UNIVERSITIES VS. UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO'S SHARE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL (SSHRC) FUNDING CUMULATIVE 5-YEAR SHARE: 2002-03 TO 2006-07



Source: SSHRC Payments by Program Activity Architecture, Region, Province & Institution 2002-03 to 2006-07 reports. Expenditures for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes, Canada Research Chairs and training programs are excluded. For the national total, only expenditures to Canadian colleges and universities, and their affiliates, are counted. The mean for our Canadian peers excludes UofT.

The chart above compares UofT's five-year cumulative share of SSHRC funding to our Canadian peers. The insert chart shows UofT's trend in share over the most recent twelve-year period.

CANADIAN PEER UNIVERSITIES VS. NATIONAL RESEARCH YIELD Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC): 2002-03 to 2006-07



Faculty funding data source: SSHRC Payments by Program Cluster, Region, Province & Institution 2002-03 to 2006-07 reports. Payments for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes, Canada Research Chairs, training programs, and communication programs are excluded. For the National Total, only payments to Canadian colleges and universities, and their affiliates, are counted. Okanagan University College counted with UBC starting 2005-06.

Faculty count data source: Statistics Canada UCASS 2002 to 2006 files. For the 2006 national count, UCASS 2005 data were used, as they are the most recent available. Note Dalhousie was excluded in 2005-06 due to missing faculty counts. Ranks: Full, Associate and Assistant Professors including those with administrative responsibilities.

Not shown: eight Canadian peer institutions with yields lower than 1.60 in 2006-07: Alberta, Calgary, Dalhousie, Laval, Ottawa, Queen's, Waterloo, and Western. Dalhousie was excluded from the Canadian peer group in 2005-06 due to missing faculty counts and is counted with all other universities. Affiliated/federated institutions are included with each relevant institution.

The SSHRC research yield indicator measures the share of funding received by an institution's faculty members relative to its share of eligible faculty in the Social Sciences and Humanities disciplines. A research yield of 1.0 indicates that a university is receiving funding in proportion to the size of its faculty.

CANADIAN PEER UNIVERSITIES VS. UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO'S SHARE OF NATIONAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING RESEARCH COUNCIL (NSERC) FUNDING CUMULATIVE 5-YEAR SHARE: 2002-03 TO 2006-07



Source: NSERC Facts & Figures 2006-07, expenditures by University, report by program

Expenditures for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes, Canada Research Chairs and training programs are excluded. For the national total, only expenditures to Canadian colleges and universities, and their affiliates, are counted. The mean for our Canadian peers excludes UofT.

The chart above compares UofT's five-year cumulative share of NSERC funding to our Canadian peers. The insert chart shows UofT's trend in share over the most recent twelve-year period.



CANADIAN PEER UNIVERSITIES VS. NATIONAL RESEARCH YIELD NATIONAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING **RESEARCH COUNCIL (NSERC): 2002-03 TO 2006-07**

> Faculty funding data source: NSERC Facts & Figures 2006-07, Expenditures by University, report by program and by year.

Payments for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes, Canada Research Chairs, Undergraduate Student Awards. Postgraduate Fellowships and Research Fellowships are excluded. For the National Total, only payments to Canadian colleges and universities, and their affiliates, are counted. Okanagan University College counted with UBC starting in 2005-06. Faculty count data source: Statistics Canada UCASS 2002 to 2006 files. For the 2006 national count, UCASS 2005 data were used, as they are the most recent available. Dalhousie was excluded from the Canadian peer group in 2005-06 due to missing faculty counts. Ranks: Full, Associate and Assistant Professors including those with administrative responsibilities. Not shown: eleven Canadian peer institutions with yields lower than 1.6 in 2006-07: Alberta, British Columbia, Calgary, Dalhousie, Laval, McGill, McMaster, Montréal, Ottawa, Waterloo, Western. Affiliated/federated institutions are included with each relevant institution.

The NSERC research yield indicator measures the share of funding received by an institution's faculty members relative to its share of eligible faculty in the Sciences and Engineering disciplines. A research yield of 1.0 indicates that a university is receiving funding in proportion to the size of its faculty.



CANADIAN PEER UNIVERSITIES VS. UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO'S SHARE OF CANADIAN INSTITUTES OF HEALTH RESEARCH (CIHR) FUNDING CUMULATIVE 5-YEAR SHARE: 2002-03 TO 2006-07

Source: CIHR Expenditures by University and CIHR Program, 2002-03 to 2006-07 reports. Expenditures for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes, Canada Research Chairs, and training programs are excluded.

The chart above compares UofT's five-year cumulative share of CIHR funding to our Canadian peers. The insert chart shows UofT's trend in share over the most recent twelve-year period.

Competition for tri-council funding from institutions that have not traditionally participated in research activities is, increasingly, affecting our share of funding from the tricouncils, particularly SSHRC and NSERC. The federal government, seeking to grow research capacity throughout the country and position smaller institutions to attract more research funding, has encouraged this trend by providing these institutions with higher indirect research costs rates, access to a special allocation of Canada Research Chairs and an associated preferential rate on Canada Foundation for Innovation infrastructure support.

In addition, the beginnings and endings of large grants can cause sharp fluctuations in funding. Our 2006-07 share of SSHRC funding was affected by the completion of a set of programs (the Initiatives for the New Economy) for which U of T held a disproportionately high share of funding.



RESEARCH REVENUE FROM INDUSTRIAL SOURCES UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AND CANADIAN PEERS, 2006-07



The charts above compare U of T's research revenue in absolute terms and as a percentage of total research funding to Canadian peer institutions.

Measures of funding from industrial sources show the University's effectiveness in attracting industry investment to the University's research enterprise. In absolute terms, our level of research funding from industrial sources remains the highest in Canada. When expressed as a percentage of total research funding, however, our position declines sharply: at 8% of total research funding, our share is one of the lowest of the research-intensive universities in Canada. The University needs to do more to attract investment and partnerships with industry.



III. COMMERCIALIZATION AND KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER

The creation of startups and spin-off companies to launch new inventions is one important indicator of how our research can move beyond the borders of the University and contribute to more widespread social and economic benefits.



NEW SPIN-OFF COMPANIES, CANADIAN AND AAU PEER INSTITUTIONS

The chart above provides the three-year sum of new spin-off companies for Canadian and AAU peer institutions from 2003-04 to 2005-06.

A recent survey of companies started at U of T found 114 active companies employing more than 4,000 people and generating nearly one billion dollars in annual revenues. There is, however, still room for improvement on measures of commercialization and knowledge transfer. The University needs to develop and support stronger and more sustained research partnerships with the private sector. MaRS Innovation – a commercialization partnership of 14 Torontobased academic research institutions – and U of T's Innovations Group (located at MaRS) will continue to foster collaboration among the science, business and capital communities.

SPACE INVENTORY AND DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

The University's capital investments over the last decade have transformed the interior and exterior environments on all three campuses – an important factor in a positive experience for students, staff and faculty.

Space allocation data compiled by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) every three years (most recently in 2007-08) measure the extent to which the supply of available space in the provincial system meets the institutional needs as defined by COU space standards. Here we present ratios of total space allocation for each of our three campuses, compared to other Ontario institutions and over time.

TOTAL SPACE ALLOCATION, ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES; RATIO OF ACTUAL SPACE INVENTORY TO COU FORMULA (%) 2007-08 DATA (PRELIMINARY DEC. 2008)



Source: COU inventory of Physical Facilities of Ontario Universities 2007-08 (preliminary, December 2008)

The bars above reflect a ratio of inventory formula that, for each institution, compares the COU generated 'space entitlement' to the actual inventory of space. If a university's inventory of space matches its formula space, then that university is said to have 100% of the generated amount.

The existing inventory of total space for UTSC is just 60% of the COU space standard. UTM is at 71% and St. George at 80% of the COU standard. For research and teaching space only, the percentages are UTSC: 64.1%; UTM: 77.6%; and St. George: 84.4%. The gap at all three campuses has grown dramatically since 2001-02.

The need for new capital infrastructure at the University, particularly at UTSC, is significant. The Ontario Government's commitment to include universities in the \$60 billion, ten-year infrastructure investment plan is encouraging.

TOTAL SPACE - TIME SERIES BY CAMPUS



Growing Gap Between Space Requirements and Actual Space Inventory in thousands of NASMs



The charts above compare the total actual space versus COU space requirements by campus and over time, measured in Net Assignable Square Metres (NASMs).



UTSC

Compounding the shortage of space on our three campuses is an alarming backlog of deferred maintenance. In April 2003, a report presented to Business Board – *Crumbling Foundations*² – estimated our deferred maintenance liability at \$273 million. Our current deferred maintenance liability is \$276.5 million.



DEFERRED MAINTENENCE BACKLOG BY CAMPUS, DECEMBER 2007

Through the Facilities Renewal Program (FRP), the provincial government has, traditionally, been the primary source of funding for deferred maintenance. In 2007-08, the province invested a further \$335 million in one-time funding for infrastructure renewal in Ontario universities. The University has also committed significant funding from internal sources to address deferred maintenance. These investments in infrastructure renewal are starting to make a difference, particularly on the St. George campus. The recent announcement by the Federal Government of \$2 billion over two years for post-secondary institutions to accelerate repairs, maintenance and construction should help further reduce our deferred maintenance problem. But the backlog of deferred maintenance is an issue that the University will need to address for many years to come.

² http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/bac/details/bb/2002-03/bba20030407-05bii.pdf

STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND EXPERIENCE

The Towards 2030 process reaffirmed our commitment to recruiting the most talented students, locally, nationally, and internationally. We continue to focus on providing experiences, in and out of the classroom, that encourage students to excel and that enrich their lives as members of the U of T community.

I. STUDENT RECRUITMENT

Volume of applications and yield rates (registrations as a percentage of offers) indicate the success of our recruitment efforts and our attractiveness to students.

TOTAL APPLICATIONS, OFFERS, REGISTRATIONS AND YIELD RATES UNDERGRADUATE FIRST-ENTRY PROGRAMS 2002-03 TO 2007-08



Source: Ontario Universities Application Centre (OUAC).

Undergraduate first-entry programs include: Arts & Science St. George campus, UTM, UTSC, APSE, Music, Physical Education and Health. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.

The line in the chart above indicates the change over time in the number of students who registered in first-entry programs as a percentage of the number of offers that were made each year.





Source: School of Graduate Studies (SGS)

Masters programs include: MA, MSc, MASc, MScF, Specialty MSc, MusM, LLM.

Doctoral programs include: MusDoc, PhD, EdD, SJD.

Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.

The line above indicates the change over time in the number of students who registered in doctoral stream programs as a percentage of the number of offers that were made each year.

The University has maintained favourable yield rates since 2002-03 in both undergraduate and graduate programs.

Consistent with the University's academic mission and the government's Reaching Higher plan, the University has begun to expand graduate enrolment significantly. This expansion will strengthen the University's research enterprise and create opportunities for enhancing both the undergraduate and graduate student experience.



II. STUDENT RETENTION AND GRADUATION

The rate at which students continue their studies and graduate in a timely way reflects the University's ability to attract well-qualified students and provide an environment in which they can succeed. We have included measures of retention and graduation at the undergraduate level exchanged with the Consortium on Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE) and time-to-completion and graduation at the graduate level exchanged with the G13 Data Exchange.

For this year's measures, we have also compared retention and graduation results at the undergraduate level with changes in tuition fee levels and the OSAP status of students.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO RETENTION RATE: FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME, FIRST YEAR COHORTS, 1997 COHORT TO 2005 COHORT AND SIX YEAR GRADUATION RATE: FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME, FIRST YEAR COHORTS, 1997 COHORT TO 2001 COHORT CSRDE STUDY



Retention rate = the proportion of entering registrants continuing to following year, 1997-2005 entering cohorts.

Graduation rate = the proportion of entering registrants in a 4-year program graduating at the end of the sixth year, 1997 - 2001 entering cohorts.

Notes: Starting with the 1999 cohort, students registered in three-year programs have been excluded, and students who continue to an undergraduate professional program are included. The retention rate in the most recent year (2006 cohort), is understated as it does not include students who step out for one year and then return. For instance, for the 2005 cohort, 278 students did not return in the fall of 2006, but did return in the fall of 2007. The retention rate for the 2005 cohort was restated to include these students.

The top line in the chart above indicates the change over time in the retention rate, which is the proportion of first-time, full-time first year registrants in direct entry programs continuing to the following year. The bottom line indicates the change over time in the graduation rate, which is the proportion of first-time, full-time registrants of a four-year program graduating by the end of their sixth year.

SECOND YEAR RETENTION RATE OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS BY OSAP STATUS AND BY YEAR OF ADMISSION ALL PROGRAMS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



Source: University of Toronto Admissions and Awards

The chart above compares the year-one to year-two retention of undergraduate students receiving OSAP support with the retention rate of those students not receiving OSAP support from 2002-03 to 2007-08.

SECOND YEAR RETENTION RATES AND TUITION FEE FOR ENTERING COHORT UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO - ENGINEERING



Source: CSRDE Report, University of Toronto Tuition Fee Schedules

The chart above compares the year-one to year-two retention of Engineering students to the changes in tuition fee levels for the 1994 through 2005 cohorts. It is noteworthy that a tuition freeze was in force in Ontario from 2003 to 2005. Also, the 2003 cohort was the first cohort of students from Ontario secondary schools educated under the new curriculum.

SEVEN YEAR GRADUATION RATES AND TUITION FEE FOR ENTERING COHORT UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO - LAW



Source: MTCU Graduation Rate, University of Toronto Tuition Fee Schedules

The chart above compares the 7-year graduation rate of Law students to the changes in tuition fee levels for the 1991 through 2000 cohorts.



SEVEN YEAR GRADUATION RATES AND TUITION FEE FOR ENTERING COHORT UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO - MEDICINE



Source: MTCU Graduation Rate, University of Toronto Tuition Fee Schedules

The chart above compares the 7-year graduation rate of Medicine students to the changes in tuition fee levels for the 1991 through 2000 cohorts.

The proportion of first-year students continuing to their second year remains high at 92.1%. The overall six-year graduation rate for the 2001 cohort was 73.3%, and we continue to compare favourably to other public institutions, including those in the highly selective category and Canadian peer institutions.

There is no empirical evidence to suggest that tuition fee levels or participation in OSAP affects retention and graduation rates.³ In fact, during the tuition freeze, we saw a drop in the retention rate for the 2003 cohort. (The new high school curriculum may have had an influence on the success of students, particularly in math- and science-based programs.)

³ For more information, see Dan Lang's recent article "Does the Level of Tuition Fees Affect Student Retention and Graduation?" Lang notes "There is no evidence from either of the two studies that overall rates of retention are affected by levels of tuition fees, or that students with financial need are affected differently from students without financial need."

SEVEN-YEAR AND NINE-YEAR COMPLETION RATE 1995, 1996, AND 1997 DOCTORAL COHORTS

7 Year Completion rate
9 Year Completion rate



Source: G13DE.

Note: Canadian peer cohorts includes UofT. 1995 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter 2004; 1996 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter, Summer or Fall 2005; 1997 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter, Summer or Fall 2006.

100%

The chart above indicates the percentage of doctoral students who have graduated seven and nine years from when they began their program. Data is presented by discipline and compared to the means of our Canadian peers.

The completion rate of doctoral students who began their studies at U of T in 1997 and graduated within seven and nine years now exceeds the mean at our Canadian peers for all the discipline groups and overall (56.8% versus 55.0% and 66.5% versus 62.9%). The sharp year-over-year improvement in the humanities observed for the 1996 cohort has stabilized for the 1997 cohort.

These rates also compare favourably to PhD completion rates at US institutions.⁴ Results from a recent US study indicate the following ten-year completion rates by discipline category: humanities (49%), social sciences (56%), math and physical sciences (55%), engineering (64%), and life sciences (64%).

⁴ Results are from the PhD Completion Project conducted by the Council of Graduate Schools in 2005. The data reflects ten-year completion data for three cohorts for the period 1992-93 through 1994-95. Twenty-nine US universities participated, including both public and private institutions.

III. STUDENT EXPERIENCE: STUDENT-FACULTY RATIOS

Access to faculty – opportunities for interaction or feedback on academic work, for example – is an important part of the student experience. Student-faculty ratios at the institutional level provide a general indication of the deployment or available level of resources, and when compared to similar institutions and over time, these ratios can signal funding, resource and quality issues. Traditionally, student-faculty ratios at the University of Toronto have been measured against two sets of peers – our ten publicly-funded US peers⁵ and our research-intensive Canadian peer universities – using two different methodologies to calculate these measures.



STUDENT-FACULTY RATIOS, FALL 2006 FTE COMPARISON WITH CANADIAN PEERS

In Fall 2006 there were 27.3 FTE students to every one full-time faculty member at UofT compared to the mean at our Canadian peers of 22.4 FTE students to every one full-time faculty member. It should be noted that the definition used to calculate these ratios is different from the AAU comparison in that it includes teaching-stream and faculty in Medicine, excluding Clinicians.

STUDENT-FACULTY RATIOS, FALL 2004, 2005 AND 2006 FTE COMPARISON WITH MEAN OF CANADIAN PEERS



⁵ Our ten public AAU peers for this comparison are: University of Arizona, University of California - Berkeley, University of Illinois -Urbana Champaign, University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, University of Minnesota - Twin Cities, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Texas - Austin, University of Washington, and University of Wisconsin - Madison.





* The definition used to calculate the first bar is the AAU definition which applies a different definition for FTE enrolment and excludes faculty in the Faculty of Medicine, teaching stream and status-only faculty.



The last chart above indicates the range of variability that results in student-faculty ratios when different categories of faculty are included and full-time equivalent (FTE) adjustments have been made to the faculty counts. Using consistent student counts, the student-faculty ratio varies from 24.5:1 to 10.4:1, depending on whom we count as "faculty."⁶

The ratio of students to full-time faculty in professorial ranks at the University of Toronto remained constant in 2006. However, it continues to be the second highest among Canadian peer universities.

We had hoped that the increased funding announced in the 2005 Ontario budget would help to improve our performance on this measure, but much of the new funding has gone to fund graduate and undergraduate enrolment expansion and to increase student aid support. Funding to improve the quality of the student experience has been a relatively smaller proportion of the total. We will continue to assess our progress closely over the coming years and work with our Canadian peers to have a more comprehensive and consistent counting of faculty.

⁶Student-faculty ratios can vary widely depending on the definitions used for eligible faculty and students. Over the past year, we have developed a more comprehensive count of faculty and appropriate full-time equivalent adjustments as well as a more meaningful categorization of faculty groups. The student-faculty ratio analyses presented here represent an initial set of results currently under discussion with Canadian peer institutions.

IV. STUDENT EXPERIENCE: UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE SURVEY RESULTS

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was developed by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research to assess the undergraduate student experience. The University of Toronto, along with all Ontario universities and several other universities across Canada, participated in the 2008 survey. For many, including the University of Toronto, these results can be compared to the 2004 and 2006 results, and to peer institutions' results. NSSE provides each participating institution with a benchmark report comparing scores on key questions with those of other participating institutions. What follows are our benchmark scores on the 2004, 2006 and 2008 surveys, as well as the corresponding benchmark scores for the aggregate of our Canadian peers, in the following areas:

- Level of academic challenge
- Active and collaborative learning
- Student-faculty interaction
- Enriching educational experiences
- Supportive campus environment

NSSE benchmarks are made up of groups of questions on the survey and are expressed in 100-point scales; the larger the score, the more positive the underlying responses.

NSSE SCORES, FIRST YEAR AND SENIOR YEAR STUDENTS, U OF T VS. CANADIAN PEERS: LEVEL OF ACADEMIC CHALLENGE



Survey Items:

- Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, etc. related to academic program)
- Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings
- Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more; number of written papers or reports of between 5 and 19 pages; and number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages.
- Coursework emphasizing analysis of the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory
- Coursework emphasizing synthesis and organizing of ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships
- Coursework emphasizing the making of judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
- Coursework emphasizing application of theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations
- Working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations
- Campus environment emphasizing time studying and on academic work

NSSE SCORES, FIRST YEAR AND SENIOR YEAR STUDENTS, U OF T VS. CANADIAN PEERS: ACTIVE AND COLLABORATIVE LEARNING



Survey Items:

- · Asked questions in class and contributed to class discussions
- Made a class presentation
- · Worked with other students on projects during class
- · Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
- Tutored or taught other students
- Participated in a community-based project as part of regular course
- Discussed ideas from your reading on classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)

NSSE SCORES, FIRST YEAR AND SENIOR YEAR STUDENTS, U OF T VS. CANADIAN PEERS: STUDENT-FACULTY INTERACTION



Survey Items:

- Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
- Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
- Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, etc.)
- Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)
- Worked with a faculty member on a research project outside of course or program requirements

NSSE SCORES, FIRST YEAR AND SENIOR YEAR STUDENTS, U OF T VS. CANADIAN PEERS: ENRICHING EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES



Survey Items:

- Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, publications, student government, sports etc.)
- Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment
- Community service or volunteer work
- Foreign language coursework, and study abroad
- · Independent study or self-designed major
- Culminating senior experience (comprehensive exam, capstone course, thesis, project, etc.)
- Serious conversations with students of different religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values
- Serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity
- Using electronic technology to discuss or complete an assignment
- Campus environment encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic background
- Participated in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together

NSSE SCORES, FIRST YEAR AND SENIOR YEAR STUDENTS, U OF T VS. CANADIAN PEERS: SUPPORTIVE CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT



Survey Items:

· Campus environment provides the support you need to help you succeed academically

- Campus environment helps you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family etc.)
- Campus environment provides the support you need to thrive socially
- Quality of relationships with other students
- · Quality of relationships with faculty members
- Quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices

This year's survey results show improvement in all benchmark scores. The significant improvement in 'student-faculty interaction' is particularly encouraging.

U of T's investments and initiatives to enhance the student experience appear to be starting to make a difference. Notable examples of such new initiatives include: first-year learning communities, the new first-year engineering design curriculum, the Centre for Community Partnerships, ArtsZone, the Science Engagement Centre at UTSC, the Undergraduate Research Enhancement program at UTM, and the Economics Study Centre at the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Still, we continue to lag behind our Canadian peers in a number of areas. U of T will continue to participate in the NSSE survey to help assess the undergraduate student experience. While we expect improvements on specific items as a result of initiatives underway, significant changes will require a multi-year effort. In addition, participating faculties will be able, in the coming months, to analyze their own data and share best practices. The NSSE research team at Indiana University notes that the experience of students tends to vary more within institutions – that is, from faculty to faculty – than it does among institutions.

For more information regarding the 2008 NSSE results, see *Measuring Up* on the Undergraduate Student Experience: NSSE 2008.



V. STUDENT EXPERIENCE: GRADUATE SURVEY RESULTS

In 2007, along with our Canadian peer institutions⁷ and all Ontario universities, the University of Toronto participated for the second time in the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS).⁸ All in-program graduate students in degree programs with an available e-mail address were surveyed. We received 5,182 responses (a 45.7% response rate).

Graduate surveys like the CGPSS provide information that helps identify aspects of academic and student life that can be improved through changes in policies and practices. These results are intended to complement more objective and observable measures such as time-to-completion and graduation rates.

Graduate students responded positively to questions related to the overall quality of their experience at the University of Toronto. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that overall they would rate their experience as "excellent", "very good" or "good". With respect to their "academic experience", "graduate program" and "overall experience", U of T students responded more positively than students at our Canadian peer institutions in aggregate. Only in the area of "student life" did our graduate students respond less favourably than students at our Canadian peer institutions (77.4% favourable vs. 81.0% favourable). In all of the overall satisfaction question areas, the University of Toronto's graduate students responded more positively in 2007 than in 2005.



⁷ Alberta, British Columbia, Calgary, Dalhousie, Laval, McGill, McMaster, Montréal, Ottawa, Queen's, Waterloo, and Western.

⁸ While the survey was previously administered in 2005, the 2007 survey instrument was significantly shorter.

CGPSS 2005 AND CGPSS 2007 RESULTS OVERALL, HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE QUALITY OF:



Source: CGPSS 2005 and 2007 survey results

Figures reported for our Canadian peers exclude U of T.

Note: In 2005, only six of our 12 Canadian peers participated in CGPSS (Alberta, Laval, McGill, McMaster, Waterloo and Western). In 2007, all Canadian peers participated.

The percentages above indicate the distribution of responses by U of T students to four general satisfaction questions in the CGPSS survey compared to the responses of graduate students from the other participating Canadian peer institutions.

ADVANCEMENT AND LONG-TERM INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

Funding from a variety of sources helps support the University's mission, and the private support of alumni and friends is essential to helping the University fulfill its priority objectives.

Private giving plays a definitive role in the life of the University, providing the critical "margin of excellence" that helps our academic leadership support the most promising students, attract star faculty and ensure that the best ideas flourish.

ANNUAL FUND-RAISING ACHIEVEMENT: GIFT AND PLEDGE TOTAL BY DONATION TYPE AND FISCAL YEAR



Source: Division of University Advancement

These figures reflect the reconciliation between the University of Toronto Audited Financial Statements and Annual Receipted Gifts, and payments on pledges. These figures include those receipted by the University of Toronto and those donations directly receipted by the University of St. Michael's College, University of Trinity College, Victoria University and Massey College. These figures also include donations received by the University but not counted in the audited financial statements.

The bars above show the annual pledges and gifts, realized planned gifts and gifts-in-kind (in millions of dollars) received by U of T in the three-year period from 2004-05 to 2007-08.

During 2007-08, the University received \$183,046,025 in new commitments and gifts. For the first time in the University's history, private giving has surpassed \$150 million in two consecutive years. The \$183 million in charitable gifts represents a 12% increase over the previous fiscal year and a 102% increase over 2004-05 levels.



TOTAL ALL REVENUE PER FTE STUDENT FISCAL YEAR 2006-07 (US FUNDS) UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO VS PUBLIC AAU PEERS

Source: AAUDE

Note: All Revenue excludes Hospital/Medical Centre Revenues. Data on Texas - Austin and Pittsburgh were not available. AAU mean excludes Toronto. Toronto converted to US funds using the purchasing power parity (PPP) of 0.80.

The bars in the above chart compare the total revenue per FTE student in U.S. dollars at UofT to eight of our ten public AAU peers and the AAU mean in the 2006-07 fiscal year.



Total funding on a per-student basis compared to our public AAU peers provides a measure of the University's resource situation. Due to data comparability issues, we are not yet able to make comparisons with our Canadian peers.

Our total funding per student is significantly lower than our AAU peers. While the gap with Canadian peer institutions is smaller, the average per-student funding gap between Ontario universities and the average of the other provinces is still more than 25%.

Over the past three years we have seen only modest gains in funding per student. The 'Reaching Higher' funding announced in the 2005 Ontario budget provided additional resources we had hoped would improve our funding situation, but most of the incremental funding has gone to support the government's access priorities (enrolment growth and student aid improvements) rather than improvements to quality.

Additional per-student funding from the Ontario Government remains the most important component of any serious effort to improve the quality of the University experience. Tuition is another key piece of the per-student funding picture, and a more flexible tuition framework with appropriate student aid support is more important than ever as a policy direction for the future. Finally, during these uncertain economic times, we will continue to manage the operations of the University responsibly and consider all appropriate cost containment measures.

CONCLUSION

Given the serious funding gap that has continued for two decades, it is truly remarkable that the University of Toronto has emerged as one of the world's great public universities. By many measures, the institution's academic fabric has never been stronger. While 2009 will bring ongoing financial turbulence and some difficult decisions, we are confident that, in the longer run, the University of Toronto will continue to excel. That confidence, in turn, reflects an extraordinary record of success attributable to the talent, commitment and creativity of our faculty, staff, students, alumni and friends.

In this year's summary, we have identified specific areas where notable change has occurred on a few key measures. For a complete examination of our performance, we encourage you to visit our performance indicators website, where the entire set of measures is posted:

http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/public/Reports/performanceindicators.htm

