



FOR INFORMATION

PUBLIC

OPEN SESSION

TO: Governing Council

SPONSOR: Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-President and Provost
CONTACT INFO: 978-2122, provost@utoronto.ca

PRESENTER: See above.
CONTACT INFO:

DATE: April 27, 2017 for May 18, 2017

AGENDA ITEM: 5

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

2016 Performance Indicators for Governance.

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

The Terms of Reference for the Executive Committee state that the Committee reviews and reports to the Governing Council on the discharge of the Council's accountability requirements, including but not limited to the annual Performance Indicators report.

The Governing Council receives the annual Performance Indicators Report for information.

In 1994, the Governing Council approved in principle a recommendation of the Broadhurst Task Force on Ontario University Accountability that standard institutional performance measures should be approved by governing boards and reported on in a consistent manner.

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. Executive Committee [for information] (May 4, 2017)
2. **Governing Council [for information] (May 18, 2017)**

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

In 1997, the Governing Council formally approved a list of institutional performance indicators relating to central dimensions of the University's mission and which, to the extent possible, allow for a comparison of performance against that of other universities. Annual reports are required, and this is the eighteenth annual report.

HIGHLIGHTS:

The University of Toronto educates more students and makes more discoveries than any other university in Canada. It is recognized as one of the foremost research-intensive universities in the world. The size and complexity of the institution leads to fantastic opportunities for our students and faculty, but also to greater challenges than faced by many of our Canadian peers. The University can proudly claim international eminence in an impressive number of academic disciplines. At the same time, our size requires that we find creative ways to provide quality facilities and to ensure that every member of our community feels connected to campus life.

The Performance Indicators for Governance report measures our progress towards long-term goals in a range of teaching, research, and other areas. It is our central accountability report to governance and is designed to serve members of the wider community who wish to know more about the University's operations, achievements and challenges. The indicators included have changed over the years in relation to the areas that we have sought to measure, and as we have enhanced our data collection and partnerships with other institutions that allow for external benchmarking. The 2016 report includes 116 measures and more than 300 performance indicators that span our teaching and research missions.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATION:

For information.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

2016 Performance Indicators for Governance
Executive Summary
Project Changes



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Performance Indicators for Governance

2016



Prepared by:

Government, Institutional and Community Relations

Indicator	
A. Research and Innovation Excellence	
1. Rankings	
A-1-a	Summary Table of International Rankings (U15)
A-1-b	Summary Table of International Rankings (Top 25)
A-1-c	THE Rankings by Discipline (U15 in Top 50)
2. Awards and Honours	
A-2-a	Faculty Honours by Award
A-2-b	Canada Research Chairs
A-2-c	Faculty Teaching Awards: 3M
A-2-d	Faculty Teaching Awards: OCUFA
3. Research Publications and Citations	
A-3-a	Number of Publications: Science Fields (Top 40)
A-3-b	Number of Publications: Science Fields (U15)
A-3-c	Number of Citations: Science Fields (Top 40)
A-3-d	Number of Citations: Science Fields (U15)
A-3-e	Summary of Ranking Citations, Selected Fields
4. Research Funding	
A-4-a	SSHRC Funding Share
A-4-b	NSERC Funding Share
A-4-c	CIHR Funding Share
A-4-d	Tri-Agency Funding Share
A-4-e	Canada Foundation for Innovation Funding Share
A-4-f	Research Funding from Industrial Sources
A-4-g	Total Research Funding Awarded by Sector
A-4-h	Total Research Funds Awarded Over Time
5. Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship	
A-5-a	New Invention Disclosures (U15 & AAU Peers)
A-5-b	New Licenses (U15 & AAU Peers)
A-5-c	New Research-based Spin-off Companies (U15 & AAU Peers)
A-5-d	Entrepreneurship-related Courses
B. Education Excellence	
0. Rankings	
B-0-a	Times Higher Education Global Employability University Ranking
B-0-b	QS Graduate Employability Rankings
1. Recruitment and Admissions	
B-1-a	Entering Averages: Distribution of Entering Grade Averages U of T compared to Ontario
B-1-b	Entering Averages: Arts & Science and Engineering by Campus

B-1-c	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Undergraduate First-entry Programs - aggregate, time series
B-1-d	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Undergraduate First-entry Programs - by program, current year
B-1-e	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Undergraduate Professional Programs - aggregate, time series
B-1-f	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Undergraduate Professional Programs - by program, current year
B-1-g	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Professional Masters Programs - International Students
B-1-h	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Doctoral-stream Masters Programs - International Students
B-1-i	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Doctoral Programs - International Students
B-1-j	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Professional Masters Programs - Domestic Students
B-1-k	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Doctoral-stream Masters Programs - Domestic Students
B-1-l	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Doctoral Programs - Domestic Students
2. Student Awards	
B-2-a	Undergraduate Student Awards
B-2-b	Prestigious Canadian Doctoral Scholarships
3. The Student Experience: Student Faculty Ratios	
B-3-a	Student-Faculty Ratios: Comparison with AAU Peers
B-3-b	Student-Faculty Ratios: Comparison with Canadian Peers
B-3-c	Student-Faculty Ratios: Comparison with Mean of Canadian Peers Over Time
B-3-d	Student-Faculty Ratios Using Different Faculty Inclusions - FTEs
B-3-e	Student-Faculty Ratios Using Different Faculty Inclusions - Headcounts
4. The Undergraduate Student Experience: Retention and Graduation	
B-4-a	Undergraduate First Year Retention Rate and Six Year Graduation Rate Over Time (CSRDE)
B-4-b	Undergraduate First Year Retention Rate Compared to Selectivity Groupings (CSRDE)
B-4-c	Undergraduate Six Year Graduation Rate Compared to Selectivity Groupings (CSRDE)
5. The UG Student Experience: Foundational Year Programs, Instructional Engagement and Class Size Exp.	
B-5-a	Foundational year programs: Registrations, Offers, Enrolment on St. George Campus
B-5-b	Foundational year programs: Enrolment by Campus
B-5-c	Undergraduate Instructional Engagement
B-5-d	Undergraduate Class Size Experience: First Year
B-5-e	Undergraduate Class Size Experience: Senior Year
B-5-f	Course Section Teaching by Instructor Type

6. The Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results	
B-6-a	NSSE Benchmarks: 2004, 2006, 2008, 2011
B-6-b	NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Academic Challenge
B-6-c	NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Learning with Peers
B-6-d	NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Experiences with Faculty
B-6-e	NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Campus Environment
B-6-f	NSSE 2014 Results: High-Impact Practices
B-6-g	Recommendations Resulting from NSSE Focus Group Sessions
7. The Undergraduate Experience: Experiential Learning	
B-7-a	Undergraduate Service-Learning Course Enrolment Supported by the CCP
B-7-b	Results of the Service-Learning Assessment Survey
B-7-c	Engagement Indicators (EI) Scores of Senior Year Students - NSSE
B-7-d	Co-curricular Record (CCR)
8. The Graduate Student Experience: Survey Results	
B-8-a	CGPSS General Satisfaction Questions
B-8-b	CGPSS Ratings of Research-Oriented and Professional Graduate Programs
9. The Graduate Student Experience: Interdisciplinary Learning and Research	
B-9-a	CGPSS Responses on Interdisciplinary Opportunities Over Time
B-9-b	CGPSS Responses on Interdisciplinary Opportunities by Research-Oriented and Professional
B-9-c	CGPSS Responses on Graduate Publications and Presentations
10. The Graduate Student Experience: Time to Completion and Graduation	
B-10-a	Doctoral Completion Rates by SGS Grouping - 7 & 9 years
B-10-b	Doctoral Median Number of Terms Registered to Degree
11. The International Student Experience	
B-11-a	International Student Enrolment over Time
B-11-b	International Students by Geographic Origin
12. Diversity of Our Students	
B-12-a	Student reported responses to visible minority/ethno-cultural info questions (NSSE)
B-12-b	Percentage of respondents who are first generation students (NSSE)
B-12-c	Estimated number of students who are first generation based on NSSE results
13. Accessibility Services	
B-13-a	Number of Students Registered with accessibility services
B-13-b	Number of Students with Exam/Test Accommodations
14. Academic Pathways	
B-14-a	Transitional Year Program Enrolment and Transition
B-14-b	Academic Bridging Program Enrolment and Transition
B-14-c	Facilitated Transfer Programs

B-14-d	International Pathway Programs
15. Online Courses	
B-15-a	Online Courses and Enrolment
B-15-b	Online Learning Project Pilot Student Survey Results
16. Student Financial Support	
B-16-a	Undergraduate Net Tuition for OSAP Recipients by Program
B-16-b	Student Access Guarantee (SAG) Related Expenditures
B-16-c	SAG Expenditures per Recipient - comparison with Ontario universities.
B-16-d	Parental Income of First Year Students Receiving OSAP in Direct-Entry Programs
B-16-e	Scholarships and Bursaries per FTE
B-16-f	Doctoral Student Support: Average Financial Support
17. Branching Out	
B-17-a	Number of Participants in Study Abroad & Exchange Programs
C. Outstanding People: Faculty, Staff, Alumni Friends and Benefactors	
1. Faculty and Staff Satisfaction	
C-1-a	Faculty & Staff Satisfaction (UTFSES)
C-1-b	Faculty & Staff Work/Life Balance (UTFSES)
2. Alumni, Friends Benefactors	
C-2-a	Annual Fundraising Achievement Over Time
C-2-b	Annual Fundraising Achievement by Sector
C-2-c	BOUNDLESS Campaign Goals by Priority
D. The Shape of Our University	
1. Graduate Student Enrolment Expansion	
D-1-a	Graduate Student Enrolment
D-1-b	Graduate Enrolment compared to Canadian Peers
D-1-c	Graduate Enrolment compared to AAU Peers
D-1-d	University of Toronto's Share of Enrolment in Masters Programs and Doctoral Programs
2. Space	
D-2-a	Total Space – Ontario comparison
D-2-b	Teaching and Research Space – Ontario comparison
D-2-c	Total Space – Time Series by Campus
D-2-d	Room Utilization
3. Deferred Maintenance	
D-3-a	Deferred Maintenance Backlog by Campus
D-3-b	Deferred Maintenance Backlog Over Time
E. Resources and Funding	
1. Library	
E-1-a	ARL Ranking

2. IT	
E-2-a	Information Technology Investments
3. Funding and Finances	
E-3-a	Central Administrative Costs
E-3-b	Endowment Per FTE
E-3-c	Debt Burden Ratio
E-3-d	Viability Ratio
E-3-e	Credit Ratings
E-3-f	Total Revenue per student

Introduction

The University of Toronto educates more students and makes more discoveries than any other university in Canada. It is recognized as one of the foremost research-intensive universities in the world. The size and complexity of the institution leads to fantastic opportunities for our students and faculty, but also to greater challenges than faced by many of our Canadian peers. The University can proudly claim international eminence in an impressive number of academic disciplines. At the same time, our size requires that we find creative ways to provide quality facilities and to ensure that every member of our community feels connected to campus life.

The Performance Indicators for Governance report, produced annually since 1998, measures our progress towards long-term goals in a range of teaching and research areas. It is our central accountability report to governance and is designed to serve members of the wider community who wish to know more about the University's operations, achievements and challenges. The indicators included have changed over the years as we have expanded the scope of areas that we have sought to measure and have enhanced our data collection and partnerships with other institutions that allow for external benchmarking. The 2016 report includes 115 measures that span our teaching and research missions.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
1. Rankings

Rankings

Performance Relevance:

Rankings provide one measure of the institution's performance, particularly internationally. This section presents the results of various research-focused rankings, results of international rankings, and the Time Higher Education World University Rankings by Discipline.

Figure A-1-a
Comparison of International Rankings,
University of Toronto and Canadian Peer Institutions
Overall Rankings, Selected Sources, 2016

The University of Toronto is the highest ranked Canadian university in the majority of the global university rankings.

University	Times Higher Education ¹ 2016	Shanghai Jiao Tong 2016	NTU (formerly HEEACT) 2016	US News Best Global Universities 2017	QS World Univ. Rankings 2016
Toronto	22	27	4	21	32
British Columbia	36	34	24	31	45
McGill	42	63	33	50	30
McMaster	113	83	111	129	149
Montréal	103	151-200	94	149	126
Alberta	107	101-150	83	144	94
Waterloo	173	201-300	263	240	152
Calgary	195	201-300	140	204	196
Ottawa	251-300	201-300	151	221	291
Western	201-250	201-300	195	289	198
Laval	251-300	201-300	219	324	372
Dalhousie	251-300	301-400	286	356	283
Queen's	201-250	201-300	315	379	223
Manitoba	401-500	401-500	296	402	501-550
Saskatchewan	401-500	401-500	390	553	471-480

Notes:

1. In the 2016 Times Higher Education rankings, U of T ranked **20th** in Research – Volume, Income & Reputation and **28th** in Teaching – Learning Environment.
2. Ordered by aggregate scores for each institution.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
1. Rankings

Figure A-1-b
Comparison of International Rankings,
Top 25 International Institutions
Overall Rankings, Selected Sources, 2016

The University of Toronto's ranking position compares favourably with our international peers across all major global university rankings.

Institution	Country	Times Higher Education 2016-17	Shanghai Jiaotong 2016	NTU (Formerly HEEACT) 2016	US News Best Global Universities 2017	QS World University Ranking 2016
Harvard University	USA	6	1	1	1	3
Stanford University	USA	3	2	2	3	2
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	USA	5	5	9	2	1
University of Cambridge *	GBR	4	4	14	7	4
University of Oxford *	GBR	1	7	5	6	6
University of California, Berkeley *	USA	10	3	7	4	28
California Institute of Technology	USA	2	8	43	5	5
Columbia University	USA	16	9	13	9	20
Johns Hopkins University	USA	17	16	3	11	17
University of Chicago	USA	10	10	20	13	10
Yale University	USA	12	11	18	14	15
University College London*	GBR	15	17	11	23	7
Princeton University	USA	7	6	72	8	11
University of California, Los Angeles *	USA	14	12	10	10	31
University of Pennsylvania	USA	13	18	12	17	18
Imperial College London *	GBR	8	22	16	19	9
Cornell University	USA	19	13	21	22	16
University of Michigan *	USA	21	23	8	17	23
University of Toronto *	CAN	22	27	4	21	32
University of Washington *	USA	25	15	6	11	59
Duke University	USA	18	25	19	19	24
ETH Zurich *	CHE	9	19	42	35	8
University of California, San Diego *	USA	41	14	17	15	40
Northwestern University	USA	20	26	27	25	26
University of Tokyo *	JAN	39	20	23	44	34


Notes:

- * Public institution.
- Ordered by aggregate scores for each institution.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
1. Rankings

Figure A-1-c
Times Higher Education World University Rankings by Discipline, 2016

The University of Toronto is the highest ranked Canadian university in seven of the eight discipline rankings by Times Higher Education. It is also the only Canadian institution to be ranked in the top 50 of all eight disciplines.



Notes:

1. Only includes Canadian Peers in the Top 50 for each discipline.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
2. Awards and Honours

Faculty Honours


Performance Relevance:

Receipt of the most prestigious honours by faculty members from both national and international bodies is a key measure of faculty excellence.


Figure A-2-a
University of Toronto Market Share of National and International Honours
Awarded to Researchers at Canadian Universities (2006-2015)

Although the University of Toronto accounts for only 7% of Canada's professorial faculty, the university amasses a dominant share of prestigious Canadian and international honours.

International Honours



Canadian Honours



Notes:

1. Based on UCASS for Fall 2010, U of T accounts for 7% of Canada's professorial faculty.
2. Data source: Division of the Vice-President, Research & Innovation.
3. Changes to names of prestigious honours (*):
 The National Academy of Medicine is the new name for the membership-granting branch of the US Institute of Medicine, effective April 2015.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
2. Awards and Honours

The annual CIHR Health Researcher of the Year prize was discontinued in 2014. It will be replaced with the biennial CIHR Gold Leaf Prizes, which will be first awarded in 2017.

Related Websites:

University of Toronto Prestigious Awards & Honours Program:

<http://www.research.utoronto.ca/media-and-public/awards-honours/>

University of Toronto Royal Society of Canada Recognitions:

<http://www.research.utoronto.ca/media-and-public/awards-honours/rsc/>

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
2. Awards and Honours


Canada Research Chairs

Performance Relevance:

The Canada Research Chairs (CRC) program was established in the year 2000 by the federal government to create 2,000 research professorships in universities across Canada. Chair holders work at improving our depth of knowledge and quality of life, strengthening Canada's international competitiveness, and training the next generation of highly skilled people through student supervision, teaching, and the coordination of other researchers' work.

Figure A-2-b
Number of Canada Research Chairs,
University of Toronto Compared to Canadian Peer Universities, 2015 Allocation

The University of Toronto leads Canada in terms of securing Canada Research Chairs.



Notes:

1. Data source: CRC website updated March 2015 (n=1,800 regular chairs).
2. Excludes Special Chairs.
3. Montréal includes École Polytechnique and École des Hautes Études Commerciales (regular chairs only).
4. Ontario peers are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
2. Awards and Honours

Related Websites:

Program details and nomination guidelines:

<http://www.research.utoronto.ca/research-funding-opportunities/canada-research-chairs-crc-2/>

Canada Research Chairs homepage:

<http://www.chairs-chaire.gc.ca/home-accueil-eng.aspx>

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
2. Awards and Honours

Faculty Teaching Awards


Performance Relevance:

External teaching awards indicate the excellence of our faculty in their role as teachers. The prestigious 3M Teaching Fellowship Awards recognize teaching excellence as well as educational leadership at Canadian universities. The Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) Teaching Awards, while restricted to Ontario institutions, provide a further measure of our faculty's teaching performance.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
2. Awards and Honours

Figure A-2-c
3M Teaching Fellowship Awards Percent Share,
Top 25 Institutions, 1986-2016

The University of Toronto has garnered a significant proportion of Teaching Fellowship Awards.




Notes:

1. Data source: 3M Teaching Fellowships (n=308).
2. Ontario peer institutions are shown in capital letters.
3. École des Hautes Études Commerciales is included under U de Montréal.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
2. Awards and Honours

Figure A-2-d
Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) Teaching Awards, 1973-2015

The University of Toronto has garnered more OCUFA Teaching Awards than any other university.



Notes:

1. Data source: OCUFA Teaching Awards (n=376) as of September 2016.
2. U15 peer Institutions are shown in capital letters.

Related Website:

<http://teaching.utoronto.ca/awards/external-awards/>

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
3. Research Publications and Citations

Research Publications and Citations


Performance Relevance:

Publications and citations are important indicators of scholarly impact as measured by research output and intensity. This is particularly true in scientific disciplines where research reporting is predominantly based in peer-reviewed journals.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
3. Research Publications and Citations

Figure A-3-a
Number of Publications (All Science Fields),
Top 40 Universities in the World, 2011-2015

The University of Toronto is a world leader in the volume of published research, 2nd only to Harvard.



Notes:


1. Data source: InCites™ dataset updated 2016-07-14 including Web of Science content indexed through 2016-05-27.
2. Ontario peer institutions are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
3. Research Publications and Citations

Figure A-3-b

**Number of Publications (All Science Fields),
University of Toronto compared to Canadian Peers, 2011-2015**

University of Toronto's volume of published research is significantly higher than Canadian peers.



Notes:


1. Data source: InCites™ dataset updated 2016-07-14 including Web of Science content indexed through 2016-05-27.
2. Ontario peer institutions are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
3. Research Publications and Citations

Figure A-3-c

**Number of Citations (All Science Fields),
Top 40 Universities in the World, 2011-2015**

The University of Toronto is one of the most highly cited universities in the world, 2nd only to Harvard.




Notes:

1. Data source: InCitesTM dataset updated 2016-07-14 including Web of Science content indexed through 2016-05-27.
2. Ontario peer institutions are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
3. Research Publications and Citations

Figure A-3-d
Number of Citations (All Science Fields),
University of Toronto compared to Canadian Peers, 2011-2015

The University of Toronto has been cited, a key indicator of research influence, significantly more than any Canadian peer.



Notes:

1. Data source: InCites™ dataset updated 2016-07-14 including Web of Science content indexed through 2016-05-27.
2. Ontario peer institutions are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
3. Research Publications and Citations

Performance Relevance:

Comparisons with institutions both within Canada and the United States show the breadth of a university's research engagement.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
3. Research Publications and Citations

Figure A-3-e
Summary of Publication and Citation Ranks for the University of Toronto
Relative to Canadian Peers, AAU Public Institutions, and All AAU Institutions, 2011-2015

The University of Toronto is a leading institution in North America in many fields, reflecting the University's exceptional multidisciplinary excellence.

	Canadian Peers U15		North American Public Peers U15 & Public AAU (N=50)		North American Peers U15 and All AAU (N=75)	
	Publications	Citations	Publications	Citations	Publications	Citations
ALL FIELDS	1	1	1	1	2	2
HEALTH & LIFE SCIENCES*	1	1	1	1	2	3
Cardiac & Cardiovascular Systems	1	1	1	1	4	6
Dentistry, Oral Surgery & Medicine	1	1	5	7	7	10
Medical Informatics	1	1	1	1	2	2
Molecular Biology & Genetics*	1	1	1	2	2	7
Nursing	1	1	4	1	7	2
Pediatrics	1	1	1	1	3	3
Pharmacology & Pharmacy	1	1	1	1	2	2
Psychiatry	1	1	1	1	3	4
Public, Environmental & Occupational Health	1	1	2	2	4	5
Rehabilitation	1	1	1	1	1	1
Sport Sciences	1	3	1	4	2	5
ENGINEERING & MATERIALS SCIENCES*	2	1	10	10	12	15
Biomaterials	1	1	4	5	6	8
Biomedical Engineering	1	1	1	2	2	5
Cell & Tissue Engineering	1	1	2	1	4	4
Environmental Engineering	1	1	2	4	3	8
PHYSICAL SCIENCES†	1	1	8	5	14	11
Biophysics	1	1	1	4	2	9
Chemistry, Organic	1	1	2	2	3	2
Mathematical & Computational Biology	1	1	7	6	12	10
Mathematics	1	1	3	3	4	6
Space Science*	1	1	9	3	16	7
Transportation	1	2	7	5	7	5
SOCIAL SCIENCES*	1	1	1	1	2	2
Anthropology	1	1	1	1	2	2
Behavioral Sciences	1	1	1	1	2	2
Business, Finance	1	1	1	7	6	17
Criminology & Penology	1	1	3	6	3	6
Economics	1	1	3	4	14	16
Education & Educational Research	1	1	3	5	4	8
Political Science	1	1	3	9	9	19
Psychology	1	1	1	3	2	5
Social Work	1	1	1	1	1	1
Sociology	1	1	3	12	5	18
ARTS & HUMANITIES†	1	1	1	1	1	2
Ethics	1	1	1	1	2	3
History	1	1	1	4	3	13
Linguistics	1	1	1	1	1	2
Literature	1	1	1	3	1	4
Philosophy	1	1	1	2	1	3
Religion	1	1	1	2	2	4

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
3. Research Publications and Citations

Notes:

1. Data source: University of Toronto analysis of publication and citation counts from InCites™, by Clarivate Analytics. Report created 2016-09-06 from Web of Science® data processed July 2016. Limited to articles and review articles.
2. Unless otherwise indicated, fields are Web of Science fields.
* Essential Science Indicators field.
† GIPP (InCites dataset updated 2016-10-27).
Includes Web of Science® content indexed through 2016-07-29.
3. North American peers are the Canadian U15 universities and the members of the Association of American Universities (AAU).

**A. Research and Innovation Excellence
4. Research Funding**

Tri-Agency Funding – SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR


Performance Relevance:

The three federal granting agencies, SSHRC, NSERC and CIHR, provide close to a third of the University of Toronto’s total sponsored research funding and are critical to the ability of faculty to extend the boundaries of knowledge in all areas of enquiry. Comparisons with top performing Canadian peer institutions demonstrate the University’s success in attracting research funding from these key sources.

Tri-agency funding takes on additional importance as the primary driver to allocate other federal research investments including the Canada Research Chairs, the Research Support Fund, and a portion of the Canada Foundation for Innovation funding.

**Figure A-4-a
University of Toronto's Share of
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Funding
Compared to Canadian Peers, 2015-16**

The University of Toronto continues to lead in successfully securing SSHRC grants.




Notes:

1. Data source: SSHRC Awards Search Engine.
2. Funding for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes and Canada Research Chairs are excluded.
3. For the national total, only funding to Canadian colleges and universities, and their affiliates, is counted.
4. Ontario peers are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
4. Research Funding

Figure A-4-b
University of Toronto's Share of
Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) Funding
Compared to Canadian Peers, 2015-16

The University of Toronto continues to lead in successfully securing NSERC grants.




Notes:

1. Data source: NSERC Awards Database.
2. Funding for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes, Canada Research Chairs, the Canadian Microelectronics Corporation (Queen's) and the Canadian Light Source (Saskatchewan) are excluded.
3. For the national total, only funding to Canadian colleges and universities, and their affiliates, is counted.
4. Ontario peers are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
4. Research Funding

Figure A-4-c
University of Toronto's Share of
Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) Funding
Compared to Canadian Peers, 2015-16

The University of Toronto continues to lead in successfully securing CIHR grants.




Notes:

1. Data source: CIHR Expenditures by University and Program Category.
2. Funding for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes and Canada Research Chairs are excluded.
3. For the national total, only funding to Canadian colleges and universities, and their affiliates, is counted.
4. Ontario peers are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
4. Research Funding

Figure A-4-d
University of Toronto's Share of Funding from the Three Federal Granting Agencies (Tri-Agencies) Compared to Canadian Peers, 2015-16

The University of Toronto continues to lead in successfully securing tri-agency funding, with a 15.5% share.



Notes:

1. Data source: CIHR Expenditures by University and Program Category 2015-16 report, NSERC Awards Database, and SSHRC Awards Search Engine.
2. Funding for Networks of Centres of Excellence nodes, Canada Research Chairs, Research Support Fund, Canadian Microelectronics Corporation (NSERC funding held at Queen's) and the Canadian Light Source (NSERC funding held at U. Saskatchewan) are excluded.
3. For the national total, only funding to Canadian colleges and universities, and their affiliates, is counted.
4. Ontario peers are shown in capital letters.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
4. Research Funding


Canada Foundation for Innovation

Performance Relevance:

Research funding from the federal government’s Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), in partnership with the Ontario Ministry of Research and Innovation, plays a crucial role in enabling the University of Toronto and partner hospitals to host world-leading facilities. These in turn help us attract and retain some of the world’s most talented researchers and trainees. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis through peer review.

Figure A-4-e
Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI)
Funding by University, April 2010 to March 2016

The University of Toronto continues to lead in successfully securing CFI awards.



Notes:

1. Data source: CFI website, January 16, 2017.
2. National projects excluded. Funding to partners and affiliates included with each university.
3. Includes six years rather than five (done in previous years) in order to bring consistency in covering two cycles of the Innovation Fund.


Research Revenue from the Private Sector

Performance Relevance:

The level of research investment from the private sector provides an indication of the extent of the collaborative relationships between the university research community and the private sector. These partnerships turn ideas and innovations into products, services, companies and jobs. They also make tangible contributions to our mission of training the next generation of researchers by giving students practical opportunities to create new knowledge while helping them establish, along with faculty, strong links with industrial contacts.

Figure A-4-f
Research Revenue from the Private Sector
University of Toronto and Canadian Peers, 2014-15

The University of Toronto leads Canadian universities in overall research support from private sector partners.



Notes:

1. Data Source: CAUBO Financial Information of Universities and Colleges 2014-15.
2. Toronto data corrected for 1-year lag in reporting for affiliates. McMaster: only consolidated entities were included.
3. Partners and affiliates included with each university.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
4. Research Funding


Total Research Funding

Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto’s engagement in research is supported by a wide spectrum of funding sources and partners. Total Research Funding includes the annual dollar value of grants flowing to the University and its nine fully affiliated partner hospitals. Over the past decade the University’s growth in research funding has followed an upward trend that has leveled off in more recent years.

Figure A-4-g
University of Toronto Research Funds Awarded by Sector, 2014-15

More than half of the University of Toronto’s research funding comes from government sources. The largest federal sources fall under the umbrella of the three granting agencies, CIHR, NSERC and SSHRC. The largest Ontario source is the Ministry of Research and Innovation.




Notes:

1. Data source: Division of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation.
2. Includes University of Toronto and partner hospitals.
3. The Federal Granting Agencies (CIHR, NSERC and SSHRC) include the Canada Research Chairs and the Canada Excellence Research Chairs programs.
4. Other Federal includes the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI).
5. Other Government includes municipal governments and provincial governments other than Ontario.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
4. Research Funding

Figure A-4-h
Research Funds Awarded,
Time Series of Three-Year Rolling Averages,
for the periods 2005-08 to 2012-15

Research infrastructure funding from CFI (Other Federal), with Government of Ontario and not-for-profit matches, supports world-leading facilities at the University of Toronto and partner hospitals.



Notes:

1. Data source: Division of the Vice-President, Research and Innovation.
2. Includes University of Toronto and partner hospitals.
3. The Federal Granting Agencies (CIHR, NSERC and SSHRC) include the Canada Research Chairs and the Canada Excellence Research Chairs programs.
4. Other Federal includes the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI).
5. Other government includes municipal government and provincial governments other than Ontario.

Related Reports:

Vice-President, Research and Innovation - Annual Reports

<http://www.research.utoronto.ca/publications/>

Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship

Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto is a leader in generating and protecting “made-in-Canada” ideas and innovations. Our community of faculty members and students is creating new technologies, products and services that are improving lives around the world, enabling our students to invent their own careers, and creating jobs and prosperity.

An innovation ecosystem is often measured using various indicators: invention disclosures, license agreements, start-up companies and engagement of the community in entrepreneurship programs and initiatives.

In addition to these measures, the University of Toronto continues to expand the campus-based initiatives that support our increasing number of entrepreneurial students. *University of Toronto Entrepreneurship*, facilitates a growing number of programs for entrepreneurs delivered through incubators and accelerators located across our three campuses. University of Toronto Entrepreneurship also oversees the Banting & Best buildings which have been repurposed to provide physical space for innovation and entrepreneurship. These buildings currently host over 20 start-up companies, five commercialization support agencies, the Impact Centre, UTEST, and the Innovation & Partnerships Office (IPO), and will be the site of the university’s ambitious ONRamp initiative, which will provide over 15,000 square feet of space to entrepreneurs and startups.

Recent years have also seen an increase in entrepreneurial courses and student-led clubs and initiatives. There are currently nearly 200 courses and programs focused on entrepreneurship and innovation available to students across various faculties. In the 2015 academic year, more than 11,000 registrants were able to learn about and experience entrepreneurship by taking part in these University of Toronto offerings.

Related Websites:

Vice-President, Research and Innovation: <http://research.utoronto.ca/>


University of Toronto Entrepreneurship: <http://entrepreneurs.utoronto.ca/>

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
5. Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship

Invention disclosures are submitted by members of the University of Toronto community to describe original ideas and inventions that have the potential to become products, services or technologies useful to society. While not all invention disclosures ultimately lead to a marketable technology or a company, they can nevertheless be used as a broad measure of innovation activity.

Figure A-5-a
New Invention Disclosures
Canadian and U.S. Peers, 2011-12 to 2013-14

The University of Toronto outperforms Canadian peers and compares favorably with U.S. peers for the number of New Invention Disclosures.



Notes:


1. Data Source: Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM).
2. Fiscal year varies by university. The University of Toronto's is May to April.
3. Where available, the University of Toronto includes partner hospitals.
4. Ontario peer institutions are shown in capital letters.
5. UC Berkeley is excluded as its data is available only as part of the University of California System.
6. University of Texas at Austin is excluded as its data is available only as part of the University of Texas System.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
5. Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship

Licensing a technology, idea or process can be an important mechanism to share and transfer knowledge from the University to users who can further develop and bring the innovation to the marketplace and society.

Figure A-5-b
New Licenses
Canadian and US Peers, 2011-12 to 2013-14

The University of Toronto is a leading institution among North American peers for the number of New Licenses.



Notes:


1. Data Source: Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM).
2. Fiscal year varies by university. U of T's is May to April.
3. Where available, U of T includes partner hospitals.
4. Ontario peer institutions are shown in capital letters.
5. UC Berkeley is excluded as its data is available only as part of the University of California System.
6. University of Texas at Austin is excluded as its data is available only as part of the University of Texas System.
7. The above figures include license and option agreements.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
5. Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship

Creating a **start-up company** is another route for bringing novel ideas and technologies into society and into the economy. The decision to create a company depends on many factors, including the nature of the technology, the path to market, the anticipated demand and the level of involvement desired by the inventors.

Figure A-5-c
New Research-based Start-up Companies
Canadian and US Peers, 2011-12 to 2013-14

The University of Toronto leads North American peers for the number of new research-based start-up companies.



Notes:


1. Data Source: Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM).
2. As per the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM), "New Research-based Start-up Companies" are defined as new companies that are dependent on licensing institutional intellectual property for their formation.
3. Fiscal year varies by university. U of T's is May to April.
4. Where available, U of T includes partner hospitals.
5. Ontario peer institutions are shown in capital letters.
6. UC Berkeley is excluded as its data is available only as part of the University of California System.
7. University of Texas at Austin is excluded as its data is available only as part of the University of Texas System.

A. Research and Innovation Excellence
5. Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship


Figure A-5-d
Entrepreneurship-related Courses, Academic Years 2014 and 2015

The University of Toronto has developed a wide range of academic courses related to entrepreneurship for both undergraduates and graduates.

Number of Entrepreneurship-related Academic Courses



Entrepreneurship-related Academic Course Registration



Notes:

1. Data source: Division of the Vice-President Research and Innovation (VPRI) and Government, Institutional and Community Relations (GICR).
2. Courses related to entrepreneurship were identified in the course catalog by searching for a set of keywords relating to entrepreneurship and manually validating the results for relevance. The above figures include only academic courses and exclude extracurricular courses and programs.
3. Registrations represent the number of students registered in individual courses, not the number of individual students.
4. The 2014 data were updated in PI 2016.

B. Education Excellence
0. Rankings

Rankings


Performance Relevance:

Rankings provide one measure of the institution's performance and are particularly useful for international comparison.

This section speaks specifically to the employability of graduates of the University.

Figure B-0-a
Times Higher Education Global Employability University Ranking,
Top 25 International Institutions, 2016

The University of Toronto is the highest ranked Canadian university and 14th in the world for Employability (THE).




Notes:

1. * public institution.
2. Data source: THE (<https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/global-university-employability-ranking-2016>)

B. Education Excellence
0. Rankings

Figure B-0-b
QS Graduate Employability Rankings,
Top 25 International Institutions, 2017

The University of Toronto is the highest ranked Canadian university and 19th in the world for Employability (QS).



Notes:

- * public institution.
- Data source: <http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/employability-rankings/2017>

B. Education Excellence
1. Recruitment and Admissions

Entering Averages

Performance Relevance:


Student entering grade averages reflect an institution’s ability to attract a well-qualified student body.

A comparison of the University of Toronto with the rest of the Ontario University system has been included. This comparison illustrates the differences in distribution of entering grade average.

Comparisons over time provide an indication of an institution’s ability to consistently attract high quality students. Entering averages specific to the Arts and Science programs across the three campuses indicate our ability to attract high quality students by campus.

Figure B-1-a
Distribution of Entering Grade Averages of Ontario Secondary School Students Registered at the University of Toronto Compared to Students Registered at other Ontario Universities First-Entry Programs, Fall 2014

The University of Toronto is more selective of student’s Entering Grade Averages than the average of other Ontario institutions.



Notes:


1. Data source: COU. Based on OUAC final average marks.
2. System excludes University of Toronto
3. Data for Ontario institutions was unavailable for 2015 and this chart has not been updated.

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-b
Entering Grade Averages (Average Mark),
Arts & Science and Engineering by Campus, Fall 2012 to Fall 2016

Across all campuses, and within Engineering, the University of Toronto is becoming more selective of student's Entering Grade Averages.



Notes:

1. Data source: Admissions & Awards. Based on final program admission average.

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Applications, Offers, and Registrations

Performance Relevance:


The success of our recruitment efforts for new students can be measured by the annual volume of applications, offer rates and yield rates.

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-c
Total Applications, Offers, and Registrations (St. George)
Undergraduate First-Entry Programs, 2007-08 to 2015-16

For undergraduate First-Entry programs at the University of Toronto (St. George): the number of applications grew steadily until 2014-15 but has dropped slightly for 2015-16. The offer rate has been stable. The yield rate saw a 4 percentage point increase in 2015-16.



Notes:

1. Data source: Ontario Universities' Application Centre (OUAC).
2. Undergraduate first-entry programs include: Arts & Science St. George campus, UTM, UTSC, Applied Science & Engineering, Architectural Studies, Kinesiology & Physical Education, and Music.
3. Includes applicants directly from high school (OUAC 101) and all other undergraduate applicants (OUAC 105) who applied through OUAC for first year full time fall entry into first-entry programs. Excludes students who applied directly to U of T, and who applied with advanced standing.
4. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.
5. Offer rate is the number of offers divided by number of applications.
6. UTM and UTSC are not included.

Figure B-1-d
Applications, Offers, and Registrations (St. George)
Undergraduate First-Entry Programs by Faculty, 2015-16


	Arts, Science and Commerce (St. George)	Applied Science and Engineering	Architectural Studies	Kinesiology and Physical Education	Music
Applications	31,050	10,134	1,689	1,546	370
Offers	18,630	2,962	722	815	154
FT Registrations	5,943	1,149	245	243	84
Offer Rate	60.0%	29.2%	42.7%	52.7%	41.6%
Yield Rate	31.9%	38.8%	33.9%	29.8%	54.5%

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-e
Total Applications, Offers, and Registrations
Second-Entry Professional Programs, 2009-10 to 2015-16

For Second-Entry Professional Programs at the University of Toronto: applications and offers are steady, but registrations have shown moderate growth.



Notes:

1. Data source: Faculty admission offices.
2. Second-entry professional programs include: Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy.
3. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.
4. Offer rate is the number of offers divided by number of applications.

Figure B-1-f
Applications, Offers, and Registrations
Second-Entry Professional Programs by Faculty, 2015-16


	Dentistry	Law	Medicine	Nursing	Pharmacy
Applications	540	2,040	3,488	733	732
Offers	139	323	327	254	291
FT Registrations	96	206	260	180	237

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-g
Total Applications, Offers, Registrations – International Students
Professional Masters Programs, 2007-08 to 2015-16

For International students in Professional Masters Programs at the University of Toronto: applications, offers and registrations have shown strong growth. The offer and yield rate remain steady.



Notes:


1. Data source: School of Graduate Studies (SGS).
2. Professional Masters programs include: Master of Museum Studies; Master of Music, Performance; Master of Visual Studies; Global Professional Master of Laws; Master of Arts-Child Study and Education; Master of Architecture; Master of Business Administration; Executive Master of Business Administration; Executive Master of Business Administration (Global Option); Master of Education; Master of Education, Counseling Psychology; Master of Finance; Master of Financial Economics; Master of Global Affairs; Master of Information; Master of Industrial Relations and Human Resources; Master of Landscape Architecture; Master of Management and Professional Accounting; Master of Public Policy; Master of Studies in Law; Master of Science, Planning; Master of Science, Sustainability Management; Master of Social Work; Master of Teaching ; Master of Urban Design; Master of Urban Design Studies; Master of Engineering; Master of Engineering in Cities Engineering and Management; Master of Engineering Design and Manufacturing; Master of Environmental Science; Master of Health Science, Clinical Engineering; Master of Mathematical Finance; Master of Science in Applied Computing; Master of Biotechnology; Master of Forest Conservation; Master of Health Informatics; Master of Health Science; Master of Health Science, Public Health Sciences ; Master of Health Science, Medical Radiation Sciences; Master of Health Sciences, Speech Language Pathology; Master of Management of Innovation; Master of Nursing; Master of Public Health; Master of Science in Dentistry; Master of Science, Biomedical Communications; Master of Science, Community Health; Master of Science, Occupational Therapy; Master of Science, Physical Therapy.
3. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.
4. Offer rate is the number of offers divided by number of applications.

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-h
Total Applications, Offers, Registrations – International Students
SGS Doctoral-Stream Masters Programs, 2007-08 to 2015-16

For International Students in Doctoral Stream Masters Programs at the University of Toronto: there is little change in recent years.



Notes:


1. Data source: School of Graduate Studies (SGS).
2. Masters programs include: MA, MSc, MASc, MScF, Specialty MSc, MMus, LLM.
3. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.
4. Offer rate is the number of offers divided by number of applications.

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-i
Total Applications, Offers, Registrations – International Students
SGS Doctoral Programs, 2007-08 to 2015-16

For International Students in Doctoral Programs at the University of Toronto: applications, offers and registrations remain steady. The decline in the yield rate warrants continued monitoring.



Notes:


1. Data source: School of Graduate Studies (SGS).
2. Doctoral Programs include: DMA, PhD, EdD, SJD.
3. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.
4. Offer rate is the number of offers divided by number of applications.

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-j
Total Applications, Offers, Registrations – Domestic Students
Professional Masters Programs, 2007-08 to 2015-16

For Domestic Students in Professional Masters Programs at the University of Toronto: applications, offers and registrations have shown growth. The offer rate remains steady, the yield rate warrants further monitoring.



Notes:


1. Data source: School of Graduate Studies (SGS).
2. Professional Masters programs include: Master of Museum Studies; Master of Music, Performance; Master of Visual Studies; Global Professional Master of Laws; Master of Arts-Child Study and Education; Master of Architecture; Master of Business Administration; Executive Master of Business Administration; Executive Master of Business Administration (Global Option); Master of Education; Master of Education, Counseling Psychology; Master of Finance; Master of Financial Economics; Master of Global Affairs; Master of Information; Master of Industrial Relations and Human Resources; Master of Landscape Architecture; Master of Management and Professional Accounting; Master of Public Policy; Master of Studies in Law; Master of Science, Planning; Master of Science, Sustainability Management; Master of Social Work; Master of Teaching ; Master of Urban Design; Master of Urban Design Studies; Master of Engineering; Master of Engineering in Cities Engineering and Management; Master of Engineering Design and Manufacturing; Master of Environmental Science; Master of Health Science, Clinical Engineering; Master of Mathematical Finance; Master of Science in Applied Computing; Master of Biotechnology; Master of Forest Conservation; Master of Health Informatics; Master of Health Science; Master of Health Science, Public Health Sciences ; Master of Health Science, Medical Radiation Sciences; Master of Health Sciences, Speech Language Pathology; Master of Management of Innovation; Master of Nursing; Master of Public Health; Master of Science in Dentistry; Master of Science, Biomedical Communications; Master of Science, Community Health; Master of Science, Occupational Therapy; Master of Science, Physical Therapy.
3. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.
4. Offer rate is the number of offers divided by number of applications.

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-k
Total Applications, Offers, Registrations – Domestic Students
SGS Doctoral-Stream Masters Programs, 2007-08 to 2015-16

For Domestic Students in Doctoral-Stream Masters Programs at the University of Toronto: applications and registrations show slight decline. The yield rate warrants further monitoring.



Notes:


1. Data source: School of Graduate Studies (SGS).
2. Masters programs include: MA, MSc, MASc, MScF, Specialty MSc, MMus, LLM.
3. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.
4. Offer rate is the number of offers divided by number of applications.

B. Education Excellence

1. Recruitment and Admissions

Figure B-1-I
Total Applications, Offers, Registrations – Domestic Students
SGS Doctoral Programs 2007-08 to 2015-16

For Domestic Students in Doctoral Programs at the University of Toronto: applications, offers and registrations remain steady. The yield rate warrants further monitoring.



Notes:

1. Data source: School of Graduate Studies (SGS).
2. Doctoral Programs include: DMA, PhD, EdD, SJD.
3. Yield rate is the number of registrations divided by number of offers.
4. Offer rate is the number of offers divided by number of applications.

B. Education Excellence
2. Student Awards

Undergraduate Student Awards

Performance Relevance:

In an effort to further assess the achievements of our students a number of prestigious undergraduate awards and scholarships as metrics have been included.

Entrance scholarships and awards (awarded at the beginning of students' studies) provide a measure of success of the University in attracting excellent students. The TD Scholarship¹ is an example of an undergraduate level entrance award.

Exit scholarships (awarded at the end of students' studies) demonstrate the quality of the University's performance in educating and providing students with the necessary environment to achieve excellence. Undergraduate level exit scholarships include the Rhodes Scholarship², the Knox Fellowship³, and the Commonwealth Scholarship⁴. We have expressed the number of University of Toronto recipients as a percentage of the number of recipients in Canada, with one exception. Since the Rhodes program provides a fixed number of awards per province, the share is expressed at the provincial rather than national level.

Notes:

1. TD Scholarships are awarded to individuals who have demonstrated outstanding community leadership. Twenty scholarships are awarded each year and are renewable for four years.
2. At the undergraduate level, two Rhodes Scholarships are granted to Ontario students each year, and a total of eleven are awarded to Canadian students. It should be noted that applicants can apply using their home province or that of their undergraduate university.
3. The Frank Knox Memorial Fellowship program provides funding for students from Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the UK to conduct graduate study at Harvard University. Through in-country competitions, Knox Fellowships are typically awarded to 15 newly admitted students each year, including six from the UK and the rest from Canada, Australia and NZ. Funding is guaranteed for up to two years of study at Harvard. Fellows are selected on the basis of "future promise of leadership, strength of character, keen mind, a balanced judgment and a devotion to the democratic ideal".
4. Commonwealth Scholarships were established by Commonwealth governments "to enable students of high intellectual promise to pursue studies in Commonwealth countries other than their own, so that on their return they could make a distinctive contribution in their own countries while fostering mutual understanding with the Commonwealth".

B. Education Excellence
2. Student Awards


Figure B-2-a
Undergraduate Student Scholarship Recipients by Award
University of Toronto's Share of Total Awarded to Canadian Universities

The University of Toronto's undergraduate students are awarded a large share of entrance and exit awards. The share of awards is significantly larger than the University's share of undergraduate students, which is approximately 7% of the national total and 15% of the provincial total.

Exit Awards



Entrance Award



Notes:

1. Data source: AUCC for Knox and TD Awards; Enrolment Services for Rhodes Scholarship; the Bureau of International Education (CBIE) for Commonwealth Scholarship.
2. Rhodes Scholarship counts include those University of Toronto students who received the scholarship from outside of Ontario.

B. Education Excellence
2. Student Awards

Graduate Student Awards

Performance Relevance:


The number of prestigious student awards received by our graduate students provides an assessment of the University's ability to recruit excellent students and provide an environment in which they can thrive.

Doctoral scholarships are awarded (based on merit) upon entry or continuation into the doctoral program. We have included the number of University of Toronto graduate students receiving top tier doctoral scholarships (Canada Graduate Scholarships and Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarships) from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), as well as Pierre Elliott Trudeau Scholarships.

B. Education Excellence
2. Student Awards

Figure B-2-b
Prestigious Canadian Doctoral Scholarships,
Percentage Share, 2007-2016

The University of Toronto's doctoral students are awarded a large share of prestigious Canadian Doctoral Scholarships.
The share of scholarships is significantly larger than the University's share of doctoral students, which is approximately 11% of the national total.



Notes:

1. Data source: Agency websites
2. Percent share based on total cumulative counts.
3. Awards counted in the chart include: Canada Graduate Scholarships - Doctoral and Vanier Scholarships from CIHR, NSERC and SSHRC; and, the Pierre Elliot Trudeau Scholarship.
4. Only our Canadian peer institutions are shown above.

B. Education Excellence
3. Student-Faculty Ratios

Student-Faculty Ratios – U.S. and Canadian Peers

Performance Relevance:

Student-faculty ratios at the institutional level provide an indication of the deployment or available level of resources. A significant part of the student experience is predicated on access to faculty, e.g., opportunities for interaction or feedback on academic work. When compared to similar institutions and over time, these ratios can signal funding, and resource issues.

Student-faculty ratios at the University of Toronto have been measured against two sets of peers: our ten publicly-funded U.S. peers¹, and our research-intensive Canadian peer universities², using two different methodologies for calculation of these measures. The resulting ratios are not comparable with each other.

This table lists the main differences of the two methodologies:

	U.S. Peer methodology	Canadian Peer methodology
Student Enrolment	Excludes residents	
Student Full-time Equivalent (FTE) conversion	Undergraduate and Graduate FTE: FT = 1, PT=0.3	Undergraduate FTE is based on course load; Graduate FTE: FT=1, PT=0.3
Similarities between the two methodologies regarding Faculty Count	Includes Tenured/ Tenure Stream and Non-Tenured Stream Professorial Ranks, and teaching stream (lecturers/instructors) ³ .	
Differences between the two methodologies regarding Faculty Count	Full-time Headcounts	Faculty Full-time Equivalent (FTE) ⁴
	Excludes Medicine	Includes Medicine, but excludes Clinicians
Source of Faculty data	AAUP Faculty Salary Survey	U15 faculty counts project
Fall 2014 Student FTEs used to calculate S-F ratio	76,620	70,853
Fall 2014 Faculty count used to calculate S-F ratio	2,178	2,679
Fall 2014 Student Faculty Ratio	35.2	26.4

¹ U.S. peers include 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

² Canadian peers include University of Alberta, University of British Columbia, University of Calgary, Dalhousie University, Laval University, University of Manitoba, McGill University, McMaster University, University of Montréal, University of Ottawa, Queen's University, University of Saskatchewan, University of Waterloo, Western Ontario University


³ The U.S. Peer methodology has changed to include teaching stream (lecturers/instructors) in the 2014 Performance Indicators. The historical data in Figure B-3-a and b have all been updated using the new method.

⁴ The Canadian Peer methodology has changed to use faculty FTE instead of Full-time headcounts in the 2015 Performance Indicator, where the historical data in Figure B-3-b and c have been updated using the new method.

B. Education Excellence
3. Student-Faculty Ratios

Figure B-3-a
Student-Faculty Ratios,
Comparison with U.S. Peers, Fall 2014

The University of Toronto's Student-Faculty Ratio is higher than US peers (using US peer methodology).




Notes:

1. For comparability with U.S. Peers, Student-Faculty Ratio is calculated using U.S. Peer Methodology (AAUDE), see "Performance Relevance" section at the start of section B-3 for details.
2. Data source: IPEDS Fall Enrolment (Preliminary data from NCES Website) and Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) Annual AAUP Faculty Salary Survey.
3. Data missing for the University of Washington.
4. U.S. Peers Average is a simple average and is not weighted by university size.
5. Faculty data exclude Medicine while the student enrolment data include Medicine.
6. Faculty counts include the following ranks: Professor, Associate Prof, Assistant Prof, Instructor, Lecturer, and FT faculty with no assigned rank. Please note that this more comprehensive definition is new for the 2014 cycle of Performance Indicators.
7. Part-time students converted to Full-time-equivalent (FTE) by multiplying by 0.3.

B. Education Excellence
3. Student-Faculty Ratios

Figure B-3-b
Student-Faculty Ratios,
Comparison with Canadian Peers, Fall 2015

The University of Toronto's Student-Faculty Ratio is higher than most Canadian peers (using Canadian peer methodology).




Notes:

1. Data source: U15 Data Exchange (U15DE).
2. Faculty counts are Full-time Equivalent (FTE) of full-time and part-time Professoriate including tenure stream, non-tenure stream, and teaching stream faculty with contracts of 12-months or more.
3. Faculty counts exclude Clinicians.
4. The students include special students, certificate and diploma students.
5. Beginning with PI 2014, student enrolment excludes medical residents as clinicians are excluded from the faculty counts.
6. Canadian peer mean excludes the University of Toronto, University of Montreal and University of Western Ontario.

B. Education Excellence
3. Student-Faculty Ratios

Figure B-3-c
Student Faculty Ratios
Comparison with Mean of Canadian Peers
Fall 2011 to 2015



Notes:

1. Data source: U15 Data Exchange (U15DE).
2. Faculty counts are Full-time Equivalent (FTE) of full-time and part-time Professoriate including tenure stream, non-tenure stream, and teaching stream faculty with contracts of 12-months or more.
3. Faculty counts exclude Clinicians.
4. The students include special students, certificate and diploma students.
5. Canadian peer mean excludes the University of Toronto
6. Canadian peer mean 2015 excludes University of Western Ontario and University of Montreal.
Canadian peer mean 2014 excludes University of Western Ontario.
Canadian peer mean 2013 excludes University of Western Ontario, University of Montreal, and University of Dalhousie.
Canadian peer mean 2012 excludes University of Western Ontario and University of Montreal.

Student-Faculty Ratios – Various Faculty Inclusions

Performance Relevance:


Student-faculty ratios at the institutional level provide a general indication of the deployment or available level of resources. A significant part of the student experience is predicated on access to faculty, e.g., opportunities for interaction or feedback on academic work.

There are many different categories of academic appointees and many ways to count them. The range of categories is greatest for institutions with professional schools or affiliated research institutes. Faculty can be categorized by appointment status (e.g. tenure-stream, teaching-stream, short-term contract, adjunct), by rank (e.g. assistant, associate and full professors), by time commitment (full-time, part-time), by job description (e.g. research scientists, clinical faculty), or by salary source (university or affiliated institution). What these categories mean in terms of contribution to the teaching and research mission of the University also varies from one institution to the next. As we see in the charts below, our faculty counts vary dramatically depending on which definition is used.

B. Education Excellence
3. Student-Faculty Ratios

Figure B-3-d
Student-Faculty Ratios based on Faculty FTE
by Various Faculty Inclusions, Fall 2015

The University of Toronto utilizes many types of faculty for teaching. Student-faculty ratios vary depending on the categories of faculty that are included.




Notes:

1. Source: Government, Institutional & Community Relations (GICR).
2. The students include special students, certificate and diploma students, but exclude residents.
3. In Fall 2015, there were 73,241 FTE students at the University of Toronto.

B. Education Excellence
3. Student-Faculty Ratios

Figure B-3-e
Student-Faculty Ratios based on Faculty Headcount
by Various Faculty Inclusions, Fall 2015

The University of Toronto utilizes many types of faculty for teaching. Student faculty ratios vary depending on the categories of faculty that are included.



Notes:

1. Source: Government, Institutional & Community Relations (GICR).
2. The students include special students, certificate and diploma students, but exclude residents.
3. In Fall 2015, there were 73,241 FTE students at the University of Toronto.

B. Education Excellence
4. Undergraduate Student Experience: Retention and Graduation

Undergraduate Student Retention and Graduation

Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto is committed to providing students with an environment in which they can thrive. The rate at which students continue their studies and graduate in a timely fashion reflects the University's success in creating these conditions, and also reflects the University's ability to attract those students best qualified for our programs.


To assess the University's performance at the undergraduate level, we have included measures of retention and graduation exchanged with the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE); both across time and in comparison to peer institutions.

2003 was the first year of the Ontario double cohort with graduates of both the old five-year secondary school curriculum and the new four-year curriculum entering first-year university. Although retention and graduation statistics for the 2003 cohort are no longer reported, there are still some observable lag effects in the 2005 cohort.

B. Education Excellence
4. Undergraduate Student Experience: Retention and Graduation

Figure B-4-a
University of Toronto First Year Retention Rate, 2005 Cohort to 2014 Cohort;
Six-Year Graduation Rate, 2005 Cohort to 2009 Cohort

The University of Toronto's First Year Retention rate has steadily improved until the 2013 cohort, however the drop for the 2014 cohort warrants further monitoring. The University's six-year graduation rate has shown significant improvement for the 2009 cohort.




Notes:

1. Source: Government, Institutional and Community Relations (GICR) using Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE) methodology.
2. Retention rate: The proportion of entering registrants in a 4-year program continuing to the following year.
 Graduation rate: The proportion of entering registrants in a 4-year program graduating at the end of the sixth year.
3. Students registered in three-year programs are excluded.
4. Students who continue to an undergraduate professional program are counted as continuing instead of graduating.

B. Education Excellence
4. Undergraduate Student Experience: Retention and Graduation

Figure B-4-b
First Year Retention Rate
University of Toronto Compared to Other AAU Public Institutions by Selectivity
2014 Cohort Continuing their Studies in 2015

The University of Toronto's First Year Retention Rate compares favourably to Canadian and US peers.



Notes:


1. Data source: CSRDE Report 2016.
2. The CSRDE survey is based on the premise that an institution's retention and completion rates depend largely on how selective the institution is. Therefore, CSRDE reports the retention and graduation results by four levels of selectivity defined by entering students' average SAT or ACT test scores.

Highly Selective:	SAT above 1100 (maximum 1600) or ACT above 24 (maximum 36)
Selective:	SAT 1045 to 1100 or ACT 22.5 to 24
Moderately Selective:	SAT 990 to 1044 or ACT 21 to 22.4
Less Selective:	SAT below 990 or ACT below 21.
3. The CSRDE survey includes both public and private institutions in North America. We have chosen Public Institutions – Highly Selective as our comparator.
4. Canadian peers exclude the University of Toronto. Missing data for Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Laval.
5. The n in the brackets is the number of institutions in the group.
6. In Fall 2014, there are 11,710 first-year students who entered into a first-entry four-year undergraduate program in U of T.

B. Education Excellence
4. Undergraduate Student Experience: Retention and Graduation

Figure B-4-c
Six-Year Graduation Rate
University of Toronto vs. Other Public Institutions by Selectivity
2009 Cohort Graduating by 2015

The University of Toronto's Six-year Graduation Rate is slightly lower than Canadian peers and US *Highly Selective* public universities. However, the Graduation Rate is significantly higher than other US public universities.



Notes:

1. Data source: CSRDE Report 2016.
2. The CSRDE survey is based on the premise that an institution's retention and completion rates depend largely on how selective the institution is. Therefore, CSRDE reports the retention and graduation results by four levels of selectivity defined by entering students' average SAT or ACT test scores.
 - Highly Selective: SAT above 1100 (maximum 1600) or ACT above 24 (maximum 36)
 - Selective: SAT 1045 to 1100 or ACT 22.5 to 24
 - Moderately Selective: SAT 990 to 1044 or ACT 21 to 22.4
 - Less Selective: SAT below 990 or ACT below 21.
3. The CSRDE survey includes both public and private institutions in North America. We have chosen Public Institutions – Highly Selective as our comparator.
4. Canadian peers are limited to the four institutions (McGill, UBC, Calgary and Waterloo) that exclude 3-year degree programs in their calculations.
5. The n in the brackets is the number of institutions in the group.
6. In U of T, there are 7,919 students of cohort 2009 who graduated by 2015.

B. Education Excellence

5. Undergraduate Student Experience

First Year Foundational Programs

Performance Relevance:

The University is committed to improving undergraduate student engagement by offering small learning community opportunities. One initiative to achieve this commitment was to expand the First Year Foundational Year Programs for arts, science and business students.

In 2003 Victoria College introduced Vic One, which gave first year students an opportunity to experience an intense small-class learning environment. In 2005, Trinity College introduced a similar program, Trin One. In 2012, the concept of Foundational Year Programs was expanded to all seven colleges in the Faculty of Arts and Science St. George campus¹, as well as to U of T Scarborough and U of T Mississauga. Munk School of Global Affairs started the Munk One program in 2013.

First Year Foundational Programs: College One programs typically combine one or more theme-based courses with co-curricular events (e.g. guest lectures) and experiential learning opportunities. All first-year, full-time students in the Faculty of Arts and Science, regardless of college affiliation, are eligible for admission to these programs.


These programs provide a structured transition from high school to university with a focus on developing critical thinking, speaking and writing skills and an atmosphere that allows students to develop close relationships with fellow classmates and instructors.

¹ The seven colleges on St. George campus are: Innis College, New College, St. Michael's College, Trinity College, University College, Victoria College, Woodsworth College.

B. Education Excellence
5. Undergraduate Student Experience

Figure B-5-a
First Year Foundations – The *One* Programs,
Registrations, Offers, Enrolment on St. George Campus, Fall 2016

The University of Toronto's *One* Programs at the St. George campus are a popular option for students.



Notes:


1. Data source: Faculty of Arts and Science

B. Education Excellence

5. Undergraduate Student Experience

**Figure B-5-b
Foundational Year Programs,
Enrolment by Campus, Fall 2016**

The popularity of The *One* Programs extends to all three of the University of Toronto campuses.



Notes:

1. Data source: Faculty of Arts and Science, UTM One office, UTSC Registrar office

Related website:

Foundational Year Programs

<http://discover.utoronto.ca/one>

B. Education Excellence

5. Undergraduate Student Experience

Undergraduate Instructional Engagement


Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto has many assets which it can tap to enrich the scope of learning opportunities for students. These include its impressive complement of some of Canada’s most accomplished scholars, and its physical location in Greater Toronto, one of the country’s most diverse urban environments.

Canada Research Chairs (CRCs), University Professors, and Endowed Chairs can be taken as a proxy population of faculty who have received special distinction for their research.

Figure B-5-c
Undergraduate Instructional Engagement
Applied Science & Engineering, Arts & Science, Law, UTM, UTSC, 2015-16

The University of Toronto’s complement of accomplished scholars (CRCs, University Professors and Endowed Chairs) take an active role in undergraduate instruction and engagement. Almost all of them teach undergraduate courses.



Notes:

1. Of the 196 CRCs, endowed chairs, and university professors identified, 17 were excluded given their roles held as senior administrators (Chair or Dean), 19 were excluded as they were on leave (sabbatical/ maternity/ parental/ other), 2 were excluded as no teaching is the requirement of their award(s), 5 were excluded as they taught only graduate courses.
2. Courses include full credit, as well as half credit courses (un-weighted).
3. As a second entry program, all Law students were considered upper year for the purpose of this analysis, and so grouped with Year 4.

B. Education Excellence

5. Undergraduate Student Experience

Undergraduate Class Size Experience

Performance Relevance:


The University of Toronto is committed to providing undergraduate students with the opportunity to participate in a variety of learning formats, including smaller class experiences. An assessment of the distribution of enrolment by class size and by year provides an indication of the class size experience our undergraduate students are receiving.

We assessed the class size experience of our students in four direct-entry program areas (Arts and Science - St. George, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM), University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC), and Applied Science and Engineering (APSE)), at two points in their undergraduate programs, first and fourth year.

B. Education Excellence
5. Undergraduate Student Experience

Figure B-5-d
Class Size Experience in Undergraduate First Year Courses
Fall & Winter Enrolments from 2007 to 2015

The University of Toronto is committed to providing undergraduate students with the opportunity to participate in a variety of learning formats, including smaller class experiences.




Notes:

1. Source: Government, Institutional and Community Relations reported on data compiled from ROSI.
2. Values of 4% or less are not labeled.
3. * Weighted enrolment expressed in Full Course Equivalents (FCEs). Enrolment in half-credit courses is counted as 0.5 per student. Enrolment in full-credit courses is counted as 1.0 per student.

B. Education Excellence
5. Undergraduate Student Experience

Figure B-5-e
Class Size Experience in Undergraduate Fourth Year Courses
Fall & Winter Enrolments from 2007 to 2015

In the fourth-year the concentration of small class learning formats is greater.




Notes:

1. Source: Government, Institutional and Community Relations reported on data compiled from ROSI.
2. Values of 4% or less are not labeled.
3. * Weighted enrolment expressed in FCEs. Enrolment in half-credit courses is counted as 0.5 per student. Enrolment in full-credit courses is counted as 1.0 per student.

B. Education Excellence
5. Undergraduate Student Experience

Figure B-5-f
Course Section Teaching by Instructor Type,
2011-12 to 2015-16

At the University of Toronto the majority of course sections continue to be taught by the professoriate.



Notes:

1. Data Source: Planning & Budget
2. Includes both Undergraduate and Graduate courses.

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Results

Performance Relevance:

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 first participated in NSSE in 2004 to support a process of institutional change.

NSSE proved to be an invaluable tool and the University has continued to participate on a regular basis; running the survey in 2006, 2008, 2011 and 2014. Participation in NSSE has also expanded to include all Ontario universities and many other Canadian universities.

For the 2004, 2006, 2008 and 2011 surveys, NSSE provided each participating institution with a Benchmark Report comparing scores on key questions with those of other participating institutions. Figure B-6-a shows our five benchmark scores as well as the benchmark scores for the aggregate of our Canadian peers.

Beginning with the 2014 cycle, NSSE made a number of changes to the survey instrument and replaced the Benchmark scores with ten Engagement Indicators and several “High-Impact Practice” indicators:

Each **Engagement Indicator (EI)** provides a summary of student responses to a set of three to eight related NSSE questions. The ten EIs are organized in four broad themes with each EI scored on a 60-point scale. The mean of each EI is calculated for each student after responses to each survey question are converted to a 60-point scale (e.g., Never=0; Sometimes=20; Often=40; Very often=60). High EI scores indicate positive underlying responses.

NSSE has designated six undergraduate opportunities as “**High-Impact Practices**” (**HIPs**) because these opportunities are positively associated with student learning and retention (NSSE, 2014). The results of the first three HIPs presented here are for both first-year and senior students while the results of the last three HIPs are for seniors only.

The University uses the survey results to inform policies and programs that impact our undergraduate students. Our analyses look both at our results over time and comparisons with our peer institutions.

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Figure B-6-a
NSSE Benchmarks: 2004, 2006, 2008, 2011

The University of Toronto has shown steady improvement in the *five Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice* as measured by NSSE*.

Figure 1. Level of Academic Challenge




Figure 2. Active and Collaborative Learning




Figure 3. Student-Faculty Interaction




Figure 4. Enriching Educational Experiences





Figure 5. Supportive Campus Environment




Notes:

* Since 2014, NSSE has adopted a different approach to grouping indicators. The older grouping of indicators is used here for trend comparison. See <http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/Benchmarks%20to%20Indicators.pdf> for more information on the change.

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Figure B-6-b
NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Academic Challenge

The University of Toronto scores in NSSE for the different aspects of the theme *Academic Challenge* compare favourably with Canadian peers.



"Academic Challenge" consists of 4 engagement indicators and each indicator is based on several survey items:

Higher-Order Learning

Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized...

- 4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations
- 4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts
- 4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source
- 4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information

Reflective & Integrative Learning

Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...

- 2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments
- 2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues
- 2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments
- 2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue
- 2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective
- 2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept
- 2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge

Learning Strategies

Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...

- 9a. Identified key information from reading assignments
- 9b. Reviewed your notes after class
- 9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials

Quantitative Reasoning

Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...

- 6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information
- 6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue
- 6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information


Notes:

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

1. The results were weighted by institution-reported sex and full-time/part-time status (and institutional size for comparison groups). High scores indicate positive underlying responses.
2. The dots represent the aggregate of the Canadian peer institutions' scores (excluding U of T).

Figure B-6-c
NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Learning with Peers

The University of Toronto scores in NSSE for the individual questions in the theme of *Learning with Peers: Collaborative Learning* merits further monitoring, *Discussion with Diverse Others* exceeds Canadian peers.



"Learning with Peers" consists of 2 engagement indicators and each indicator is based on several survey items:

Collaborative Learning
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...

- 1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material
- 1f. Explained course material to one or more students
- 1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students
- 1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments

Discussions with Diverse Others
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...

- 8a. People from a race or ethnicity other than your own
- 8b. People from an economic background other than your own
- 8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own
- 8d. People with political views other than your own


Notes:

1. The results were weighted by institution-reported sex and full-time/part-time status (and institutional size for comparison groups). High scores indicate positive underlying responses.
2. The dots represent the aggregate of the Canadian peer institutions' scores (excluding U of T).

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Figure B-6-d
NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators – Experiences with Faculty

The University of Toronto scores in NSSE for the different aspects of the theme *Experience with Faculty* compare favourably with Canadian peers.



"Experiences with Faculty" consists of 2 engagement indicators and each indicator is based on several survey items:

Student-Faculty Interaction

Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...

- 3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member
- 3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)
- 3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class
- 3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member

Effective Teaching Practices

Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much instructors have...

- 5a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements
- 5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way
- 5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points
- 5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress
- 5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments


Notes:

1. The results were weighted by institution-reported sex and full-time/part-time status (and institutional size for comparison groups). High scores indicate positive underlying responses.
2. The dots represent the aggregate of the Canadian peer institutions' scores (excluding U of T).

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Figure B-6-e
NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators – Campus Environment

The University of Toronto scores in NSSE for the different aspects of the theme of *Campus Environment* merit further monitoring.



"Campus environment" consists of 2 engagement indicators and each indicator is based on several survey items:

Quality of Interactions

Percentage rating a 6 or 7 on a scale from 1="Poor" to 7="Excellent" their interactions with...

- 13a. Students
- 13b. Academic advisors
- 13c. Faculty
- 13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)
- 13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)

Supportive Environment

Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much the institution emphasized...

- 14b. Providing support to help students succeed academically
- 14c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)
- 14d. Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)
- 14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially
- 14f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)
- 14g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
- 14h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)
- 14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues


Notes:

1. The results were weighted by institution-reported sex and full-time/part-time status (and institutional size for comparison groups). High scores indicate positive underlying responses.
2. The dots represent the aggregate of the Canadian peer institutions' scores (excluding U of T).

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Figure B-6-f
NSSE 2014 Results: High-Impact Practices

The NSSE results of student participation in High-Impact Practices at the University of Toronto are higher than Canadian Peers.



Notes:

- The results were weighted by institution-reported sex and full-time/part-time status (and institutional size for comparison groups). High scores indicate positive underlying responses.

Related Reports:

University of Toronto Reports on National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Results:
<http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/public/reports/NSSE.htm>

Related Websites:

National Survey of Student Engagement main website: <http://nsse.iub.edu/>

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

**National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Focus Groups:
Results and Actions**

Performance Relevance:

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) serves as University of Toronto's primary means of assessing progress in its efforts to enhance the student experience. As of 2011, NSSE will be administered every three years. During the intervening years, the University undertakes different strategies to understand some of the key issues identified through NSSE results. These strategies provide information to form the basis for new initiatives that enrich our students' experience.

In 2011, after extensive consultations with our students, the Council on Student Experience released its report, *U of T's Response to: In Their Own Words: Best practices & strategies for enhancing the student experience at the University of Toronto*, containing recommendations on key issues including orientation and transition, student-faculty interactions, navigating the campuses, peer mentorship programs, communication, and quality of services. As a result, several new initiatives have been implemented and our 2011 NSSE results show that we are making steady progress in many areas in the benchmarks of student-faculty interaction, supportive campus environment and enriching educational experiences.

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Figure B-6-g
Recommendations Resulting From National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Focus Group Sessions

The table below summarizes strategies implemented or under development to address NSSE responses in three benchmark areas.

Student-Faculty Interaction	Supportive Campus Environment	Enriching Educational Experiences
Established a Faculty Advisory Group with 22 instructors active in undergraduate teaching, from a range of Divisions and disciplines on all three campuses. Members provided input on their experiences and pedagogical approaches related to Student-Faculty Interaction, and identified several areas of potential focus for the University of Toronto community.	Provided “just-in-time” messaging to students through a variety of media including digital signage, web and social media, in classrooms before and between classes and through an enhanced student welcome campaign. Messages contain information on important dates, co-curricular involvement, school spirit, campus services and events.	Established a Co-Curricular Record (CCR) to document learning experiences outside of the classroom and link these experiences to concrete learning competencies. Emphasized career-related skills and experiences developed through co-curricular participation.
Created a central online repository for faculty resources on Student-Faculty Interaction, including an Inventory of Effective Teaching Practices, strategy documents, and a series of faculty profiles, to showcase ongoing initiatives and demonstrate the positive value of interaction on the teaching and learning experience.	Increased student to student communications through Community Crew student bloggers, and student social media ambassadors.	Established a Mentorship Resource Centre to support mentors and inventory all mentorship opportunities available to students across the campus.
Engaged students in teaching and learning programming to inform faculty development by creating resources. Included a student advisory team of four undergraduates Liaisons to report on their experiences and write creative projects, and a blogger with Student Life to provide student voice for faculty on learning experiences.	Improved UHIP processes by making the student card available electronically for ease of access for students. Developed partnership between Housing and Food Services providing a “one-stop” for students.	Developed a Leadership Opportunities Inventory to encourage student leadership involvement.
Created an integrated communications plan with CTSI and Student Life to increase student confidence about interacting with their professors in office hours, or “How to Talk to Profs”.	Convened a “communication summit” to improve all types of communications with students including email, social media, print and online communications.	Established the Centre for Community Partnership Ambassador Program in which students from colleges, faculties, residences, recognized student groups and athletic teams were identified to promote service-learning on campus.

B. Education Excellence
6. Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Student-Faculty Interaction	Supportive Campus Environment	Enriching Educational Experiences
Introduced innovative teaching and assessment practices in large classrooms, student and faculty interaction using technology and a focus on developing more small class opportunities including the further development of learning communities to enhance student-faculty interaction.	Developed Campus Room Finder – an application which provides ease of access for room bookings for recognized clubs and organizations.	

Notes:

1. Source: Office of Student Life

Related reports:

U of T's Response to: In Their Own Words: Best practices & strategies for enhancing the student experience at the University of Toronto (2011).

<http://www.vicereprovtstudents.utoronto.ca/uoftresponse.htm>

Service Learning Opportunities

Performance Relevance:

Service-learning provides students with practical, “experiential” learning opportunities with community partners. Students apply what they are studying in real-world settings to support identified community needs and later reflect on those experiences in the classroom. Through service-learning, students gain a deeper understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of their chosen discipline and develop a higher level of critical thinking and problem solving. Each year the Centre for Community Partnerships conducts a Service-Learning Assessment Survey that assesses the learning outcomes of students. A selection of results is presented in this year’s report.

The Centre for Community Partnerships supports a wide variety of service learning opportunities for students. Four examples are provided below:

- In IRE 446 “*Working as an Internal HR Consultant*” students experienced what it is like to be an internal HR consultant by completing an HR-related project within a community organization. Students worked with ACORN Canada to both evaluate and modify the organization’s HR manual. Students also worked with two divisions at the City of Toronto to develop a training program to advance an important and complex social policy initiative adopted by City Council.
- In HLTD02 “*Health Research Seminar*” students explored the cultural interpretations of what it means to age successfully at different stages of the life course. Students explored methods for empirically and critically understanding contemporary notions of productive, happy, and healthy aging. Placements included working with Malvern Family Resource Centre to enhance the Centre’s health and wellness program, develop evaluation systems, and contributing to research. Additionally, at the Scarborough Centre for Healthy Communities students worked with professional staff to provide holistic healthcare to community residents.
- In CRI390H “*Roots of Criminal Justice Policy*” students worked with community agencies to experience a service environment in which one of more of several basic orientations inform the work of the agency. Those orientations include: community service, public service through religious organizations, public participation in sports, and environmental advocacy and action.


Continued.

B. Education Excellence
7. Undergraduate Student Experience: Service Learning Opportunities

- In NEW 342 “*Theory and Praxis in Food Security*” students worked with a food-related social service agency, social food enterprise or community food initiative. Students worked with Sistering: A Women’s Place to serve hot, nutritious and culturally diverse meals to women attending drop-in programs, and with St. Stephen-in-the-Fields by volunteering at breakfasts, working in the garden and attending meetings relevant to the organization.

Figure B-7-a
Undergraduate Service-Learning Credit Course Enrolment
Supported by the Centre for Community Partnerships (CCP), 2005-06 to 2016-17

At the University of Toronto enrollment in service-learning, supported by the Centre for Community Partnerships, has shown steady growth in recent years.




Notes:

1. Data source: Centre for Community Partnerships
2. The enrolment for 2016-17 is estimated. The 2015-16 enrolment was updated with actual enrolment.
3. The Co-Curricular Record (CCR) tracks additional service learning opportunities outside of credit courses.

B. Education Excellence
7. Undergraduate Student Experience: Service Learning Opportunities

Figure B-7-b
Results of Service-Learning Assessment Survey - Selected Items, 2015-16

The results of the University of Toronto's *Service-Learning Assessment Survey* indicate that students reflect very positively on their experiences.



Notes:

1. Data source: Centre for Community Partnerships


Related Website:

Centre for Community Partnerships: <http://www.ccp.utoronto.ca/>

B. Education Excellence
7. Undergraduate Student Experience: Service Learning Opportunities

Figure B-7-c
Engagement Indicators (EI) Scores of Senior Year Students
Who Have/Not Done a Community-based Project (Service-Learning), NSSE 2014

Students that participate in Service-Learning at the University of Toronto show enhanced levels of engagement as measured in NSSE 2014.



Notes:

1. Data source: The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2014 results

Related Reports:

University of Toronto Reports on National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
Results: <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/public/reports/NSSE.htm>

Related Websites:

National Survey of Student Engagement main website: <http://nsse.iub.edu/>

B. Education Excellence
7. Undergraduate Student Experience: Service Learning Opportunities

Co-Curricular Record

Performance Relevance:


Launched in September 2013, the Co-Curricular Record (CCR) is an institutional initiative, coordinated through Student Life that provides a single centralized database that help students find opportunities beyond the classroom, allowing students to track, reflect on, and market transferable skills and competencies. Students can highlight these experiences and competencies on an officially validated University of Toronto record, which they can then use to illustrate their experiences, skills, and competencies to employers, graduate and professional programs, and for awards and scholarships.

The CCR captures activities that are attached to the university, provides an opportunity for meaningful competency and skill development, and encourages active engagement. Some of these opportunities include: work study, mentorship and leadership opportunities, governance, international experiences, research opportunities, personal and professional development, course unions, clubs and organizations, university-affiliated volunteer experiences, and student life programs.

B. Education Excellence
7. Undergraduate Student Experience: Service Learning Opportunities

Figure B-7-d
Co-Curricular Record (CCR)

The University of Toronto has seen a large growth in the usage of the *Co-Curricular Record*.



Related Website:

Co-Curricular Record (CCR): <https://ccr.utoronto.ca/home.htm>

B. Education Excellence
8. The Graduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS) Results

Performance Relevance:

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.

The University of Toronto first participated in CGPSS in 2005. The University's peer institutions and all Ontario based universities have been consistently participating in CGPSS since 2007. The survey was repeated in 2010, 2013 and 2016 and this provides a valuable resource for benchmarking our performance against peer institutions and tracking trends over time.


In 2016, the University of Toronto participated in CGPSS along with 49 other universities across Canada. The survey instrument was essentially unchanged for 2016. The University invited 15,877 students to participate and received 5,513 responses by the time when the survey closed. The response rate (34.7%) achieved this year was lower than what we achieved in 2013 but higher than the national average (32.3%).

B. Education Excellence
8. The Graduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Figure B-8-a
CGPSS Results – Ratings of All Graduate Programs 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2016

The results of the *Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey* show that the satisfaction rates of graduate students at the University of Toronto compare favourably with Canadian peers for most indicators.

Overall, how would you rate the quality of ...



Notes:


1. Data source: CGPSS 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016 survey results.
2. Canadian peers exclude U of T.

B. Education Excellence
8. The Graduate Student Experience: Survey Results

Figure B-8-b

CGPSS Results - Ratings of Research-Oriented and Professional Graduate Programs, 2016

The *Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey* results differentiate Research Orientated graduate programs and Professional graduate programs. The University of Toronto's results compare favourably with Canadian peers in most indicators.



Notes:

1. Data source: CGPSS 2016 survey results.
2. Canadian peers exclude U of T.

Related Report:

Report on Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS) results:

<http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/about/Pages/Measuring-Our-Performance.aspx>

Graduate Interdisciplinary Opportunities - CGPSS Responses


Performance Relevance:

Student responses from the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS) survey conducted in 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016 provide a measure of how our interdisciplinary opportunities are perceived by students.

We have presented the results overall and by type of program (Research-Oriented and Professional Graduate programs).

Figure B-9-a
CGPSS 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016 Results:
Respondents who rated 'opportunities to engage in interdisciplinary work' as 'Excellent', 'Very good' or 'Good'

The responses to the *Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey* indicate that the University of Toronto's interdisciplinary engagement is higher than that of Canadian peers.




Notes:

1. Data source: CGPSS 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016 survey responses.
2. Canadian peers exclude U of T.
3. In 2005, only six of our Canadian peers participated in CGPSS (Alberta, Laval, McGill, McMaster, Waterloo and Western). In 2007, 2010 and 2013 all Canadian peers participated.

B. Education Excellence
9. Graduate Student Experience: Interdisciplinary Learning and Research

Figure B-9-b
CGPSS 2016 Results: Research-oriented Programs and Professional Programs
Respondents who rated 'opportunities to engage in interdisciplinary work'
as 'Excellent', 'Very good' or 'Good'

The responses to the *Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey* indicate that the University of Toronto's interdisciplinary engagement is higher than that of Canadian peers for both Research Orientated programs and Professional programs.



Notes:

1. Data source: CGPSS 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016 survey responses.
2. Canadian peers exclude U of T.
3. In 2005, only six of our Canadian peers participated in CGPSS (Alberta, Laval, McGill, McMaster, Waterloo and Western). In 2007, 2010 and 2013 all Canadian peers participated.

Related web site:

University of Toronto Report on results of Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS):

<http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/about/Pages/Measuring-Our-Performance.aspx>


Graduate Research, Publications and Presentations - CGPSS Responses

Performance Relevance:

Survey results regarding graduate student research, publications and presentations provide an indication of the program and department support that students receive to undertake these activities. We are able to assess our improvement over time by comparing our results from the 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016 Canadian Graduate and Professional Survey (CGPSS) and benchmark with peer institutions by comparing our 2016 results with those of Canadian peer institutions.

Figure B-9-c
GPSS 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2016 Results:
Graduate Publications and Presentations
Respondents who answered 'Yes'

The responses to the *Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey* indicate that the University of Toronto's student's involvement with scholarly publications and presentations is increasing and is higher than Canadian peers.



Notes:

1. Data source: CGPSS 2007, 2010, 2013 and 2016 survey results.
2. The responses are from graduate students who answered positively to a prior question asking if they were preparing a thesis.
3. The 2013 results reported here are slightly different from what were reported in the previous PI because the coding for these questions has been changed by the survey data provider.

Related web site:

University of Toronto Report on results of Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS):

<http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/about/Pages/Measuring-Our-Performance.aspx>

B. Education Excellence

10. Graduate Student Experience: Time to Completion and Graduation

Graduate Time-to-Completion and Graduation


Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto is committed to providing students with an environment in which they can thrive. The rate at which students continue their studies and graduate in a timely fashion reflects our success in creating these conditions, and also reflects the University's ability to attract those students best qualified for our programs. At the graduate level, we have provided a measure of doctoral completion by discipline grouping over time.

B. Education Excellence
10. Graduate Student Experience: Time to Completion and Graduation

Figure B-10-a
Seven-Year and Nine-Year Completion Rates
2003, 2004 and 2005 Doctoral Cohorts

The proportion of doctoral students at the University of Toronto who complete their studies in a timely manner compares favourably with Canadian peers in most fields.



Toronto		7 Year Completion Rate	9 Year Completion Rate	Canadian Peers		7 Year Completion Rate	9 Year Completion Rate
Humanities				Humanities			
2005 cohort	(n=163)	42.3%	57.7%	2005 cohort	(n=628)	48.6%	60.4%
2004 cohort	(n=170)	44.1%	58.2%	2004 cohort	(n=372)	54.0%	62.1%
2003 cohort	(n=139)	42.4%	57.6%	2003 cohort	(n=520)	44.4%	55.0%
Social Sciences				Social Sciences			
2005 cohort	(n=279)	62.6%	72.1%	2005 cohort	(n=1,280)	53.0%	63.1%
2004 cohort	(n=187)	62.0%	73.3%	2004 cohort	(n=794)	58.9%	68.6%
2003 cohort	(n=180)	58.9%	68.9%	2003 cohort	(n=1,171)	50.8%	62.7%
Physical and Applied Sciences				Physical and Applied Sciences			
2005 cohort	(n=312)	71.8%	76.3%	2005 cohort	(n=2,217)	69.0%	74.4%
2004 cohort	(n=312)	74.7%	80.8%	2004 cohort	(n=1,604)	69.9%	74.9%
2003 cohort	(n=308)	68.2%	72.4%	2003 cohort	(n=2,115)	69.0%	74.4%
Life Sciences				Life Sciences			
2005 cohort	(n=284)	74.3%	85.2%	2005 cohort	(n=979)	71.9%	79.2%
2004 cohort	(n=268)	71.3%	80.2%	2004 cohort	(n=657)	75.3%	80.4%
2003 cohort	(n=226)	69.9%	79.6%	2003 cohort	(n=760)	71.7%	79.9%


Notes:

1. Data source: U15 DE.
2. n in the brackets is the number of students who entered the cohort.
3. Canadian peers include U of T.
4. 2005 Cohort excludes Saskatchewan.
2004 Cohort excludes Saskatchewan, Dalhousie, Alberta and Montreal
2003 Cohort excludes Saskatchewan and Dalhousie.
5. For the calculation of 9-year completion: 2005 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter, Summer or Fall 2014.
2004 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter, Summer or Fall 2013.
2003 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter, Summer or Fall 2012.

B. Education Excellence
10. Graduate Student Experience: Time to Completion and Graduation

Figure B-10-b
Median Number of Terms Registered to Degree for Graduates
2003, 2004 and 2005 Doctoral Cohorts

Doctoral students at the University of Toronto take a comparable number of terms to complete when compared to Canadian peers.



Toronto		Median Number of Terms	Canadian Peers		Median Number of Terms
Humanities					
2005 cohort	(n=94)	19	2005 cohort	(n=379)	17
2004 cohort	(n=99)	19	2004 cohort	(n=231)	17
2003 cohort	(n=80)	19	2003 cohort	(n=286)	18
Social Sciences					
2005 cohort	(n=158)	16.5	2005 cohort	(n=808)	16
2004 cohort	(n=137)	18	2004 cohort	(n=545)	16
2003 cohort	(n=124)	17	2003 cohort	(n=734)	17
Physical and Applied Sciences					
2005 cohort	(n=238)	15	2005 cohort	(n=1,649)	14
2004 cohort	(n=252)	15	2004 cohort	(n=1,201)	14
2003 cohort	(n=223)	15	2003 cohort	(n=1,574)	15
Life Sciences					
2005 cohort	(n=242)	15.5	2005 cohort	(n=775)	15
2004 cohort	(n=215)	15	2004 cohort	(n=528)	15
2003 cohort	(n=180)	16	2003 cohort	(n=607)	15

Notes:

1. Data source: U15DE.
2. Canadian peers include U of T.
3. 2005 cohort exclude Saskatchewan;
 2004 cohort exclude Saskatchewan, Dalhousie, Alberta and Montreal;
 2003 cohort exclude Saskatchewan and Dalhousie.
4. For the calculation of 9-year completion: 2002 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter, Summer or Fall 2011.
 2003 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter, Summer or Fall 2012.
 2004 Doctoral Cohort as of Winter, Summer or Fall 2013.
5. n in the brackets is the number of students who graduated within 9 years. For Canadian Peers, the numbers of students who graduated within 9 years have been updated in PI 2016.

B. Education Excellence
11. The International Student Experience


International Students

Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto aims to attract the best students from around the world. Increasing international student enrolment over time is an indicator of the effectiveness of our efforts to broaden the University’s international reputation. The map provides a snapshot of these students’ countries of origin.

Figure B-11-a
Enrolment of International Students (Headcount), 2007-08 to 2015-16

International enrolment, at both undergraduate and graduate level, is increasing at the University of Toronto.




Notes:

- Both degree and non-degree seeking students are included. Non-degree students are certificate/diploma students, special students, and residents/post-graduate medical students.
- Includes full-time and part-time headcounts.
- Excludes Toronto School of Theology (TST)

B. Education Excellence
11. The International Student Experience

Figure B-11-b
International Student Enrolment by Geographic Origin (15,931), Fall 2015

This map provides an overview of the University's international students' countries of origin, in total 165 countries are represented.



B. Education Excellence
12. Diversity of Our Students

Diversity of Students

Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto recognizes that access to a university education can be influenced by several factors including socio-economic or family circumstances. As such, efforts are made by the University not only to attract individuals from varied backgrounds but also to provide the support they need to successfully complete their studies.

To measure the diversity of our students, we have included a measure estimating the proportion of our first-entry undergraduate program students who identify themselves as “visible minorities” (2004 and 2006) or “non-white” (2008, 2011, 2014) as part of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).


First Generation students are students whose parents or guardians did not complete post-secondary education. We have included the NSSE results to the question “Neither father nor mother attended college”.

Based on the NSSE results, we can estimate the percentage of undergraduate students in direct-entry programs who are visible minority (non-white) and who are first-generation students.

B. Education Excellence
12. Diversity of Our Students

Figure B-12-a
NSSE Results: Students who reported they are...
Part of a visible minority group in Canada (2004, 2006),
Non-white (2008, 2011, 2014)

The proportion of students, first and senior year, who reported that they are part of a visible minority is increasing at the University of Toronto and is higher than Canadian peer institutions.




Notes:

1. The wording of the question on ethno-cultural information in the survey changed in 2008. In the previous surveys, students were asked if they were "a member of a visible minority group in Canada." In the 2008, 2011 and 2014 surveys, students were asked to identify their ethno-cultural background from a list provided with the option of selecting all that apply. The percentage represents students who reported belonging to at least one of the 14 non-white ethno-cultural groups listed in the survey. Therefore comparisons over time need to be cautious.

**B. Education Excellence
12. Diversity of Our Students**

**Figure B-12-b
NSSE Results:
Percentage of Respondents who are First-Generation Students
2004, 2006, 2008, 2011, 2014**

The proportion of students, first and senior year, who reported that they are First-Generation students, is steady over time and higher than Canadian peer institutions.




Notes:

1. The Canadian peer institution's data are not available for NSSE 2004, 2006 and 2008.
2. The chart above indicates the percentage of first-year and senior-year undergraduate students in direct-entry programs who responded 'yes' to the question "Neither my father nor my mother attended college" in NSSE.

B. Education Excellence
12. Diversity of Our Students

Figure B-12-c
Estimated Number of Students in Direct-Entry Undergraduate Programs
who are First-Generation Students,
Based on NSSE responses (NSSE 2004, 2006, 2008, 2011, and 2014)

The total number of First-Generation students at the University of Toronto is increasing.



Notes:

1. The numbers of First-Generation Students have been estimated using a rate generated from NSSE responses (NSSE 2006 results for Fall 2005 enrolment; NSSE 2008 results for Fall 2007 enrolment; NSSE 2011 results for Fall 2010 enrolment; NSSE 2014 results for Fall 2013 enrolment).

Related Report:

<http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/public/reports/NSSE.htm>

B. Education Excellence
13. Accessibility Services

Accessibility Services


Performance Relevance:

Access to a university education can be influenced by several factors, including disability. As such, efforts are made by the University of Toronto to not only attract individuals from varied backgrounds, but to also provide the support they need to successfully complete their studies.

The University's accessibility offices facilitate the inclusion of students with mental health conditions and physical, sensory and learning disabilities into all aspects of university life. The change over time in the number of students registered with these offices reflects the success of the University in attracting and supporting this population.

Figure B-13-a
Total Number of Students Registered with Accessibility Services,
2006-07 to 2015-16

The number of students at the University of Toronto that register for Accessibility Services is increasing.




Note:

1. Data source: Accessibility Services (St. George Campus), AccessAbility Resource Centre (UTM), and AccessAbility Services (UTSC).

B. Education Excellence
13. Accessibility Services

Figure B-13-b
Total Number of Tests/Examinations Coordinated and Supervised by Accessibility Services, 2006-07 to 2015-16

The number of Tests/Examinations, at the University of Toronto, coordinated and supervised by Accessibility Services is increasing.



Note:

1. Data source: Accessibility Services (St. George Campus), AccessAbility Resource Centre (UTM), and AccessAbility Services (UTSC).
2. The number for 2014-15 has been updated in PI 2016.

Academic Pathways

Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto recognizes that access to a university education can be influenced by many factors such as financial, socio-economic, family circumstances and disabilities, and that not everyone pursues university directly from secondary school. The University also recognizes that many international students face challenges related to moving far from home and beginning their university studies in English.

Given the wide range of potential barriers, the University has developed different types of access, pathway and support programs in place. We have highlighted four examples of programs that provide academic pathways into our undergraduate programs. Information on some of our other types of access and support programs can be found elsewhere in our Performance Indicators report.

TYP: The Transitional Year Program (TYP) is an access program for adults without the formal educational background needed to qualify for university admission. TYP offers students the opportunity to undertake an intensive, eight-month full-time course and the opportunity to earn credits towards a University of Toronto Bachelor of Arts degree.

Academic Bridging Program: The University of Toronto's Academic Bridging Program offers mature students the opportunity to pursue a university degree. Students enrolled take one Academic Bridging course and are provided additional support as required. Students who successfully complete the course may continue their degree in the Faculty of Arts and Science.


Facilitated Transfer Programs: The University of Toronto strongly believes in the need to support college students who transfer into undergraduate programs. The model is structured so that students receive intensive, personalized support before, during and after transfer from a partner college. Transfer students in these programs are markedly more successful than those transferring from without a facilitated pathway.

International Pathway Programs: The University offers several programs to help prepare international students for entry into our undergraduate programs. The focus is on improving English language skills prior to entry.

B. Education Excellence
14. Academic Pathways

Figure B-14-a
Transitional Year Program (TYP) Enrolment and Transition, 2006 to 2014 cohorts

The number of Transitional Year Program students who transferred to the University of Toronto and the transition rate warrant further monitoring.



Notes:

1. Source: Office of Government, Institutional and Community Relations (GICR).


Related web site:

<http://www.utoronto.ca/typ/>

B. Education Excellence
14. Academic Pathways

Figure B-14-b
Academic Bridging Program Enrolment and Transition

The percentage of students completing the University of Toronto's Bridging Program is increasing steadily. However, the percentage of those students that register in the Faculty of Arts & Science warrants further monitoring.



Notes:

1. Data source: Office of the Academic Bridging Program
2. Students who successfully complete the Bridging Program are eligible to register in Arts & Science.

Related website:

http://www.wdw.utoronto.ca/index.php/programs/academic_bridging/overview/

B. Education Excellence
14. Academic Pathways

Figure B-14-c
Facilitated Transfer Programs

The table below provides a sample of the University of Toronto's Transfer Programs with Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts & Technology. These programs are structured so that students receive support before, during and after transfer to the University.

U of T	College	Description
Woodsworth	George Brown	Facilitated pathway for liberal arts and science studies at George Brown College to the Faculty of Arts and Science at U of T – St. George.
Woodsworth	Humber	Facilitated pathway for general arts and science studies at Humber College to an HBA program at U of T – St. George.
Woodsworth	Seneca	Facilitated pathway for liberal arts studies at Seneca College to an HBA in Humanities or social sciences at U of T – St. George.
UTSC	Seneca	Facilitated pathway for students in the liberal arts programs at Seneca College to an HBA program at UTSC.
UTSC	Seneca	Facilitated pathway for students in the liberal science programs at Seneca College to an HBSc program at UTSC.
UTM	George Brown	Facilitated pathway for liberal arts and science studies at George Brown College to an HBA program at UTM.
UTM	Humber	Facilitated pathway for general arts and science studies at Humber College to an HBA program at UTM.
UTM	Mohawk	Facilitated pathway for general arts and science studies at Mohawk College to an HBA program at UTM.
UTM	Niagara	Facilitated pathway for general arts and science studies at Niagara College to an HBA program at UTM.
UTM	Sheridan	Facilitated pathway for general arts and science studies at Sheridan College to an HBA program at UTM.

**B. Education Excellence
14. Academic Pathways**

**Figure B-14-d
International Pathway Programs**

The table below provides a sample of International Pathway Programs offered by the University of Toronto.

Program	Description
International Foundation Program (IFP)	<p>The International Foundation Program (IFP) offers admission to academically qualified international students whose English fluency scores fall below the direct entry requirements. IFP is a unique offering that combines conditional acceptance to the University of Toronto with intensive English language instruction and for-credit courses. In accordance with the University academic calendar, the Fall/Winter IFP runs from September to April and the Summer IFP runs for 8 weeks in July and August. Successful completion of the IFP guarantees admission to the Faculty of Arts & Science, Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering or the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape & Design with academic credit towards an undergraduate degree.</p> <p>http://www.ifp.utoronto.ca/</p>
Green Path Program (UTSC)	<p>The Green Path Program (UTSC) helps academically qualified students from mainland China hone their English skills and begin adjusting to Toronto's culture before starting classes at University of Toronto Scarborough in the Fall. It consists of a 12-week, full-time program run over the summer months.</p> <p>http://webapps-new.utsc.utoronto.ca/greenpath/index.php</p>
Facilitated Admissions International Recruitment (FAIR) – Taiwan (UTSC)	<p>The University of Toronto Scarborough FAIR – Taiwan program is a special process to admit academically qualified students from Taiwan into undergraduate programs at UTSC. Students attend an eight-week summer Academic & Acculturation program (SAAP) and, upon successful completion, enter a four-year degree program at UTSC.</p> <p>http://www.utsc.utoronto.ca/~fair/taiwan/english/index.html</p>
Academic Culture and English (ACE@UTM)	<p>The Academic Culture and English (ACE) program is designed for academically qualified students who have been admitted to UTM but who require additional English language skills training. The Summer ACE@UTM Program consists of 240 hours of Academic English Level 60 language instruction over 8 weeks in July and August. The Fall-Winter ACE@UTM Program consists of 96 hours of English Level 60 language instruction on Saturdays for 24 weeks from September to April. Completion of ACE@UTM may be a condition of an offer of admission. ACE@UTM is specifically designed to target the development of communication, research and study skills.</p> <p>http://www.utm.utoronto.ca/registrar/new-students-parents/academic-culture-and-english-program-ace</p>

B. Education Excellence
15. Online Courses

Online Courses

Performance Relevance:

Given the increasing availability of online learning options, many of our students would like to take advantage of the flexibility and rich learning environments that new technologies offer. The development of a number of online options can enhance student experience by facilitating access to courses on other campuses and other universities, allowing students to take courses when away from campus on work terms or over the summer, and allowing students from across the province, country and world to benefit from University of Toronto courses.



The Online Learning Strategies Portfolio facilitates the University of Toronto's participation in the provincial online learning arena and supports online opportunities within the university. In response to the growing interest in fully online and mixed mode learning initiatives, the University of Toronto is continuing to increase our focus on capacity development in this area. Provision of appropriate support to faculty in designing, developing and teaching in online environments, as well as enhancement of infrastructure across related functions such as library liaison, student success and registrarial services are key components to ensure success.

In the fall of 2015 an integrated Course Evaluation component was implemented for courses flagged as 'Fully Online' in the ROSI system. A customized set of three items was presented to all students in these courses. In the fall semester there were 15 undergraduate courses in divisions where the Course Evaluation framework is implemented that served as a pilot for integrated data collection regarding effectiveness of support for online learners. Feedback was collected from 3501 respondents across all 15 courses, with an average response ratio of 37%. The aggregated results are reported in Figure B-15-b.

B. Education Excellence
15. Online Courses

Figure B-15-a
Number of Online Courses Available, and Online Course Enrolment

At the University of Toronto, the number of online courses available is increasing and the number of registrations to those courses has grown rapidly.



Note:


1. Data source: Office of Online Learning Strategies
2. Registrations represent the number of students registered in individual courses, not the number of individual students.

B. Education Excellence
15. Online Courses

Figure B-15-b
University of Toronto Online Learning Course Evaluation Survey, 2015

The below indicates the most popular responses to the question 'what was the most important motivator to register in an online course'.

The Median Score out of full score 5



Notes:

1. Data source: Office of Online Learning Strategies

Net Tuition and Student Access Guarantee (SAG)

Performance Relevance:

Net Tuition is the amount that students actually pay after taking into account the contribution of both the Province, through OSAP grants, and the University, through its various grants and scholarships. With the significant Government and University investments in student financial support, net tuition is substantially lower than the full tuition cost for many students and is the appropriate measure on which affordability should be assessed.


Under the Student Access Guarantee (SAG) program, universities are required to provide financial support to cover any unmet need due to tuition and book shortfalls for students in Direct Entry undergraduate programs. Unmet need is defined by the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development as the remaining financial support required after government support is provided. Universities often provide additional financial support beyond this minimum requirement (e.g. support for living expenses, students in second entry programs, etc.).

For more information please see the *2015-16 Annual Report on Student Financial Support* produced by the Office of the Vice-Provost, Students:
<http://www.governingcouncil.lamp4.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/a0227-1ci-2016-2017bb.pdf>

**B. Education Excellence
16. Student Financial Support**

**Figure B-16-a
Undergraduate Net Tuition for OSAP Recipients by Program, 2014-15**

Along with the Province of Ontario, the University of Toronto provides exceptional levels of financial support to its students. The combined result is that undergraduate students, on average, only pay 51% of their tuition.



Notes:


1. Source: University of Toronto, Planning and Budget
2. Includes all full-time, domestic undergraduate students receiving OSAP support.
3. Does not include the impact of loans, tax credits or the Ontario Student Opportunity Grant (OSOG) that caps government debt.
4. Does not include students who only received Ontario Tuition Grant (OTG) support.
5. 'Average Direct Entry' includes students registered in Arts & Science; Architecture, Landscape & Design; Applied Science & Engineering; Music; Kinesiology & Physical Education; and the Transitional Year Program.
6. 'Average Undergraduate' includes students registered in 'Direct Entry Undergrad' programs + Medicine, Law, Nursing, OISE, Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Woodsworth Certificate Programs.

B. Education Excellence
16. Student Financial Support

Figure B-16-b
Actual Student Access Guarantee (SAG) Related Expenditures
Compared to Required SAG, 2015-16

University of Toronto's provides its students with additional support far in excess of the provincial Student Access Guarantee (SAG) requirements. Total expenditure on Student support has grown from \$7.7 million in 1992-93 to almost \$200 million in 2015-16.

Total University of Toronto SAG Expenditures (2015-16) = \$65.7M




Notes:

1. Data source: Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development – OSAP Summary as of October 2016.
2. Includes Toronto School of Theology (TST).

B. Education Excellence
16. Student Financial Support

Figure B-16-c
Average SAG Expenditure per Recipient
University of Toronto compared to Ontario Universities, 2015-16

The average Student Access Guarantee (SAG) expenditure per recipient at the University of Toronto is significantly higher than other Ontario universities.



Notes:

1. Data source: Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development – OSAP Summary as of October 2016.
2. Includes Toronto School of Theology (TST).

**B. Education Excellence
16. Student Financial Support**

Parental Income and Student Support


Performance Relevance:

Access to a university education can be influenced by several factors, including financial and socio-economic circumstances. As such, efforts are made by the University of Toronto to not only attract individuals from varied backgrounds, but to also provide the support they need to successfully complete their studies.

A measure showing parental income of first-year students receiving OSAP reflects the accessibility of a U of T education across the spectrum of income levels. Our efforts to broaden accessibility are also reflected by the significant expenditure per student that we devote to scholarships and bursaries and comparative statistics on the level of graduate financial support.

**Figure B-16-d
Parental Income of First-year Students Receiving OSAP in Direct Entry Programs
at the University of Toronto Compared to All Ontario Universities, 2015-16**

The University of Toronto supports a high proportion of students from lower income families.




Notes:

1. Data source: Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD).
2. System numbers exclude the University of Toronto.

**B. Education Excellence
16. Student Financial Support**

**Figure B-16-e
Average Scholarships and Bursaries Expenditures per Student FTE,
2005-06 to 2014-15**

The average Scholarship and Bursary expenditure per student at the University of Toronto is significantly higher than the Ontario average.




Notes:

1. Data source for financial data: Annual Compendia of Statistical and Financial Information - Ontario Universities. Table 4 -Summary of Expense by Fund and Object of Expense - consolidated report; excludes partner hospitals.
2. Data source for enrolment data: COU undergraduate all term FTEs, graduate fall and summer FTEs; includes Toronto School of Theology.
3. Scholarships and Bursaries include all payments to undergraduate and graduate students from both internal and external sources. These payments include scholarships (OGS, OSOTF, OGSST, etc.), bursaries (UTAPS), granting council awards, prizes and awards. Scholarships and Bursaries for UofT and the Ontario System include student aid funded by restricted funds.

**B. Education Excellence
16. Student Financial Support**

**Figure B-16-f
Doctoral Student Support, Average Financial Support per Student,
All Divisions (excl. Health Sciences), 2014-15**

The average financial support per doctoral student, at the University of Toronto, compares favourably with Canadian peer institutions.



Notes:

1. Data source: U15DE.
2. Canadian peer mean excludes U of T.
3. Quebec data do not include direct-to-student Provincial bursary support.
4. Excludes Montreal.

B. Education Excellence

17. Branching Out


International Experience

Performance Relevance:

As the world has become more globally interconnected, many universities are placing a growing emphasis on meaningful international experiences for their undergraduate students; whether through student exchange programs, study abroad programs, international work co-op placements, brief but intensive courses conducted abroad, or modules taught in courses on our campuses by international visitors.

Figure B-17-a
Number of Participants of
Study Abroad & Exchange Programs and
Woodsworth College Summer Abroad Programs
(Outgoing Exchange Students, 2004-05 to 2015-16)

The number of students participating in Study Abroad & Exchange Programs and Woodsworth College Summer Abroad Programs follows an increasing trend in recent years.



Notes:

1. Data source: International Student Exchange Programs office and Woodsworth College.
2. Study Abroad & Exchange Programs managed by International Student Exchange Programs office and Woodsworth College Summer Abroad programs only.
3. Study Abroad & Exchange Programs managed by International Student Exchange Programs includes first entry undergraduate, Law students and graduate students.

C. Outstanding People: Faculty, Staff, Alumni Friends and Benefactors
1. Faculty and Staff Satisfaction

Employee Satisfaction: Faculty, Librarian and Staff Responses

Performance Relevance:

Surveying our faculty and staff is an important means of measuring the experience of our employees and our ability to be an employer of choice. The first University of Toronto Faculty and Staff Experience Survey (Speaking UP) was conducted in 2006, the second Speaking UP survey was conducted 2010 with an overall response rate was 52%, and the third survey was conducted in 2014 with a response rate of 50%.


We are able to compare responses to 2 benchmarks – Canadian Public Sector Norm, and International Education Norm (Americas).

For more information see: <http://initiatives.hrandequity.utoronto.ca/speakingup/>

C. Outstanding People: Faculty, Staff, Alumni Friends and Benefactors
1. Faculty and Staff Satisfaction

Figure C-1-a
University of Toronto Speaking UP Faculty and Staff Experience Survey, 2014
Overall, how satisfied are you with being an employee of U of T?

The majority of staff and faculty at the University of Toronto are satisfied. Their level of satisfaction is better than in the past and higher than similar organizations.




Notes:

1. Data source: UofT Faculty and Staff Experience Survey: Speaking UP, 2014.
2. Ipsos Reid provided benchmarks for selected questions.

C. Outstanding People: Faculty, Staff, Alumni Friends and Benefactors
1. Faculty and Staff Satisfaction

Figure C-1-b
U of T Speaking UP Faculty and Staff Experience Survey, 2014
I am satisfied with the balance between my private and professional life

Staff and faculty at the University of Toronto responded that they are satisfied with the balance between private and professional life. Their level of satisfaction is better than in the past and comparable to similar organizations.



Notes:

1. Data source: UofT Faculty and Staff Experience Survey: Speaking UP, 2014.
2. Ipsos Reid provided benchmarks for selected questions.

C. Outstanding People: Faculty, Staff, Alumni Friends and Benefactors
2. Annual Fundraising Achievement and Alumni Donors

Annual Fundraising Achievement and Alumni Donors


Performance Relevance:

In November 2011, the University of Toronto unveiled *Boundless*, the largest fundraising campaign in Canadian university history, with a historic \$2-billion goal.

By April 30, 2016 the University had surpassed the \$1.99 billion mark establishing a new benchmark in Canadian philanthropy. The University owes tremendous thanks to the many donors who have made this possible with their generous support of our faculty, programs and students. The financial contributions of our donors have, for decades, supported the University’s institutional independence and academic freedom. Through their philanthropy and engagement in the life of the University, our alumni and friends are empowering students and faculty, inspiring leadership and excellence, and creating a fertile landscape for innovative ideas and solutions to take root. With their support, we are able to recruit and retain top faculty, perform cutting-edge research and maintain our leadership across a broad spectrum of fields. We are also able to strengthen the undergraduate experience, promote campus diversity and inclusion and provide scholarships to exceptional students who might not otherwise be able to afford a university education.

Figure C-2-a
Annual Fund-Raising Achievement:
Gifts and Grants by Fiscal Year, 2006-07 to 2015-16

The bars below show fundraising achievement including new gifts and new philanthropic research grants (in millions of dollars) received by the University of Toronto within a ten-year period.




Notes:

1. Data source: Division of University Advancement
2. Gift totals include pledges and gifts (donations), realized planned gifts and gifts-in-kind (in millions of dollars) to the University of Toronto. Include those received by federated universities and other affiliated institutions (the University of St. Michael's College, the University of Trinity College and Victoria University), but exclude donations to partner hospitals.
3. Research Grants are contributions made through the University's Research Office that are philanthropic in nature.

C. Outstanding People: Faculty, Staff, Alumni Friends and Benefactors
2. Annual Fundraising Achievement and Alumni Donors


Figure C-2-b
Annual Fundraising Achievement:
Percentage of Funds Raised by Donor Sector, 2015-16

The chart below shows the distribution of total funds raised by source category. For the period May 1, 2015 to April 30, 2016, a total of \$233.1 million was raised for the University, including \$196.7 million in pledges and gifts (donations) and \$36.4 million in philanthropic research grants (recorded as other grants revenue for restricted purposes).



Data source: Division of University Advancement.

Figure C-2-c
BOUNDLESS Campaign Fund-Raising Achievement by Priority



Data source: Division of University Advancement.

Related Website:

Boundless: The Campaign <http://boundless.utoronto.ca/>

D. The Shape of our University
1. Graduate Student Enrolment Expansion

Graduate Student Enrolment Expansion

Performance Relevance:

Graduate education is a distinctive feature of the University of Toronto and is a defining part of our vision.

Graduate students are the life-blood of university research. Sustaining and expanding the current research effort is dependent on the availability of excellent graduate students. The percentage of graduate students in the student population is a rough indicator of the intensity of the research effort at the institution.


Furthermore, graduate students are an essential component in linking research and teaching. As teaching assistants, graduate students make a valuable contribution to teaching. A larger number of graduate students increases our ability to match their skills and background to the needs of individual courses and student groups.

In its 2005 Budget, the Ontario Government introduced a new funding program to expand the number of domestic graduate spaces in the province.

D. The Shape of our University
1. Graduate Student Enrolment Expansion

Figure D-1-a
Graduate Degree-Seeking Student Enrolment Fall 2007 - Fall 2016

Graduate enrolment at the University of Toronto has shown steady increase in recent years.




Notes:

1. Degree-seeking students exclude special students, and students in graduate diploma programs.

D. The Shape of our University
1. Graduate Student Enrolment Expansion

Figure D-1-b
Graduate Enrolment as a Percentage of Total Enrolment
University of Toronto Compared to Canadian Peers, Fall 2006 and Fall 2015

At the University of Toronto, the percentage of Total Enrolment that is Graduate Enrolment has increased between 2006 and 2015 at a pace that is higher than peer institutions.




Notes:

1. Data source: U15 Data Exchange.
2. Graduate enrolment to total enrolment ratio is calculated as $[\text{Graduate Enrolment FTE}]/[\text{Total Enrolment FTE}]$.
3. FTE graduate enrolment and total enrolment are based on IPEDS methodology. Residents are excluded from enrolment. FTE is calculated as $(\text{Full-time Headcount} * 1) + (\text{Part-time Headcount} * 0.3)$.
4. Cdn Peer mean excludes Toronto.
5. Ontario peers are shown in capital letters.

D. The Shape of our University
1. Graduate Student Enrolment Expansion

Figure D-1-c
Graduate Enrolment and First Professional Enrolment as a Percentage of Total Enrolment
University of Toronto Compared to AAU Peers
2006 Compared to 2014

At the University of Toronto, the percentage of Total Enrolment that is Graduate Enrolment or First Professional Enrolment has increased between 2006 and 2014 at a pace that is higher than AAU peer institutions.




Notes:

1. Data source: IPEDS website.
2. Graduate enrolment to total enrolment ratio is calculated as $[\text{Graduate Enrolment FTE}]/[\text{Total Enrolment FTE}]$.
3. FTE graduate enrolment, First Professional enrolment and total enrolment are based on IPEDS methodology. Residents are excluded from enrolment. FTE is calculated as $(\text{Full-time Headcount} * 1) + (\text{Part-time Headcount} * 0.3)$.
4. AAU Peer mean excludes Toronto.
5. First-professional degrees include the following 10 fields: Chiropractic (D.C. or D.C.M.), Dentistry (D.D.S. or D.M.D.), Law (L.L.B., J.D.), Medicine (M.D.), Optometry (O.D.), Osteopathic Medicine (D.O.), Pharmacy (Pharm. D.), Podiatry (D.P.M., D.P., or Pod. D.), Theology (M.Div., M.H.L., B.D., or Ordination), Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.). The use of this term was discontinued in IPEDS as of the 2010-11 data collection (Fall 2008 data). Students enrolled in these programs are now included in graduate enrolment.

D. The Shape of our University
1. Graduate Student Enrolment Expansion

Figure D-1-d
Total Enrolment in Masters and Doctoral Programs at Ontario Universities
University of Toronto's Share of Enrolment in Masters Programs and Doctoral Programs
Fall 2006 to Fall 2015

Although the University of Toronto's enrolment has increased during the period, the share of Ontario's enrolment in both Masters and Doctoral Programs has declined since 2006, but is steady in recent years.



Notes:

1. Data source: MTCU Enrolment data.
2. Includes both full-time and part-time enrolment.
3. Excludes graduate diploma programs.
4. Masters, Qualifying Year Doctoral and Special students are included in "Masters, 1st Stage Doctoral" Programs.
5. U of T data excludes Toronto School of Theology.

D. The Shape of our University
2. Space

COU Space Inventory

Performance Relevance:

Capital infrastructure is an important element of the university experience for faculty, staff and students. New investments can improve the amount and quality of space. Aging facilities are revitalized when deferred maintenance needs are addressed.


The overall inventory of space, compiled by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) every three years, measures the extent to which the supply of available space in Ontario universities meets the institutional needs as defined by COU space standards. In 2015, COU released the most recent report presenting 2013-14 results.

In recent years, the University has completed construction of several additional major capital projects; adding substantial new space to its inventory. We anticipate that this new space will be reflected in the next update of the COU Space Inventory Report.

D. The Shape of our University
2. Space

Figure D-2-a
Total Space Allocation, Ontario Universities
Ratio of Actual Space Inventory to COU Formula (%), 2013-14

The bars below reflect a ratio between the actual total space available at each institution and the generated space (space required according to the COU standards). If a university's inventory of space matches its formula space, then that university is said to have 100% of the generated amount. The two elements that influence this ratio are physical space and population. A higher ratio may indicate declining enrolment rather than increased space.




Notes:

1. Data Source: COU Inventory of Physical Facilities of Ontario Universities 2013-14.
2. The space factor for a number of space categories have been changed in the 2013-14 survey and therefore caution should be taken when making comparisons with the 2010-11 data, especially the generated space and %I/G figures.
3. COU mean excludes Hearst and NOSM.

D. The Shape of our University
2. Space

Figure D-2-b
Research/Teaching Space Allocation, Ontario Universities
Ratio of Actual Space Inventory to COU Formula (%), 2013-14

The bars below reflect a ratio between the actual research/teaching space available at each institution and the generated space (space required according to the COU standards). If a university's inventory of space matches its formula space, then that university is said to have 100% of the generated amount. The two elements that influence this ratio are physical space and population. A higher ratio may indicate declining enrolment rather than increased space.




Notes:

1. Data Source: COU Inventory of Physical Facilities of Ontario Universities 2013-14.
2. The space factor for a number of space categories have been changed in the 2013-14 survey and therefore caution should be taken when making comparisons with the 2010-11 data, especially the generated space and %I/G figures.
3. COU mean excludes Hearst and NOSM.

D. The Shape of our University
2. Space

Figure D-2-c
Total Space by Campus, 1995-96 to 2013-14

The charts below compare the total actual space inventory versus COU space requirements by campus and over time. They show the significant gap between space requirements and actual space inventory at all of University of Toronto's three campuses.



Notes:

1. Data Source: COU Inventory of Physical Facilities of Ontario Universities.
2. NASM = Net Assignable Square Metre
3. The space factor for a number of space categories have been changed in the 2013-14 survey and therefore caution should be taken when making comparisons with the 2010-11 data, especially the generated space and %/G figures.

Related Report:

Inventory of Physical Facilities of Ontario Universities, 2013-14

<http://cou.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/COU-Inventory-of-Physical-Facilities-of-Ontario-Universities-2013-14.pdf>

D. The Shape of our University
2. Space


Room Utilization

Performance Relevance:

As an indication of how efficiently we use our existing space, we have reported on our utilization of centrally allocated classrooms on the St. George campus for a typical week compared to COU's standard room utilization rate of 60% (34 hours out of a 57 hour week).

Figure D-2-d
Room Utilization by Time of Day for Week of Oct 17, 2016 to Oct 21, 2016
St. George Campus, Based on a 57 hour week,
Monday - Thursday 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. and Friday 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.

The line in the chart below represents COU's standard room utilization rate of 60%. The bars indicate room utilization of centrally allocated classrooms on the St. George campus according to five types of classrooms, three time slots and the overall usage, for the week of Oct 17, 2016 to Oct 21, 2016



Notes:

1. Data source: Office of Space Management.
2. This data only represents the St George centrally allocated classrooms. It excludes classrooms in Law, Music, Management, Social Work, Architecture and other departmental space.

D. The Shape of our University
3. Deferred Maintenance

Deferred Maintenance

Performance Relevance:

Capital infrastructure is an important element in the university experience for faculty, staff and students. Investments made in both existing and new facilities can improve the amount and quality of space. However, addressing the on-going maintenance of existing facilities is also needed to ensure that space remains available for use. As maintenance projects are delayed because of limited funding, they add to our deferred maintenance liability.


The Provincial Government's Facilities Renewal Program (FRP) provides an important source of annual funding to address maintenance projects. However, it is insufficient to meet the needs of the University. As a result, the University commits significant funding from internal sources to address its deferred maintenance backlog. In 2014, the Provincial Government announced that it will increase the funding available through the FRP program from the current \$26M (across all universities and colleges) to \$100M annually by 2019-20. This is welcome news and will ease some of the financial burden on universities.

In 1999, the COU and the Ontario Association of Physical Plant Administrators (OAPPA) developed the Facilities Condition Assessment Program (FCAP), to assess university facilities using consistent software, cost models and common audit methodology. The common software and assessment methodology provide a consistent way to determine, quantify and prioritize deferred maintenance liabilities.

D. The Shape of our University
3. Deferred Maintenance

Figure D-3-a
Deferred Maintenance Backlog by Campus, December 2015

The chart below indicates the deferred maintenance backlog which needs to be addressed within the next 5 years as of December 2015, by campus.




Notes:

1. Data source: Deferred Maintenance Report, Facilities and Services Department.

D. The Shape of our University
3. Deferred Maintenance

Figure D-3-b
Deferred Maintenance Backlog by Campus, 2005 to 2015

The chart below indicates the deferred maintenance backlog which needs to be addressed within the next 5 years by campus from December 2005 to December 2015.



Notes:

1. Data source: Deferred Maintenance Report, Facilities and Services Department.

Related Reports:

Deferred Maintenance Report December 2015, Facilities and Services Department

<http://www.fs.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/DM-Report-2015.pdf>

Ontario Universities' Facilities Condition Assessment Program as of June 2015

<http://cou.on.ca/papers/ontario-universities-facilities-condition-assessment-program-june-2015/>

E. Resources and Funding

1. Library

Library Resources

Performance Relevance:

Library resources are central to the University's mission as a public research university. For comparative purposes the appropriate peer group for the University of Toronto is the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) whose membership comprises over 100 research university libraries in North America. ARL annually reports a ranking of its membership based on an index measured using five variables.

E. Resources and Funding
1. Library

Figure E-1-a
Major North American Research Libraries

The University of Toronto's libraries are ranked 4th in North America and 1st in Canada by the Association of Research Libraries.

ARL	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
RANK	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY
1	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard	Harvard
2	Yale	Yale	Yale	Yale	Yale	Yale	Yale
3	Columbia	Toronto (3rd)	Toronto (3rd)	Toronto (3rd)	Toronto (3rd)	Toronto (3rd)	Columbia
4	Toronto (4th)	Columbia	Michigan	Columbia	Columbia	Columbia	Toronto (4th)
5	Michigan	Michigan	Columbia	Michigan	Michigan	Michigan	Michigan
6	California, Berkeley	New York	California, LA	California, Berkeley	New York	California, Berkeley	California, Berkeley
7	Pennsylvania State	California, Berkeley	New York	New York	California, Berkeley	New York	New York
8	California, L.A.	Princeton	California, Berkeley	Pennsylvania State	Princeton	Pennsylvania State	Princeton
9	Princeton	Pennsylvania State	Princeton	Princeton	Pennsylvania State	Texas	Cornell
10	Texas	Texas	Pennsylvania State	Cornell	Cornell	Princeton	Pennsylvania State

Top 5 Canadian Universities

2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15
RANK/	RANK/	RANK/	RANK/	RANK/	RANK/	RANK/
UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY	UNIVERSITY
4/Toronto	3/Toronto	3/Toronto	3/Toronto	3/Toronto	3/Toronto	4/Toronto
16/Alberta	11/Alberta	11/Alberta	14/British Columbia	18/Alberta	22/British Columbia	27/Alberta
26/British Columbia	24/British Columbia	16/British Columbia	16/Alberta	24/British Columbia	26/Alberta	31/British Columbia
34/Montreal	31/Montreal	32/McGill	28/Montreal	30/McGill	35/McGill	43/McGill
40/McGill	37/McGill	38/Montreal	31/McGill	35/Montreal	36/Montreal	49/Calgary

Notes:

1. Data source: Association of Research Libraries Statistics.
2. Variables used: total library expenditures, total library materials expenditures, salaries and wages of professional staff, and total number of professional and support staff.

E. Resources and Funding
2. IT


IT Investment

Performance Relevance:

Our investment in IT is a reflection of our commitment to support students, faculty, and staff in both teaching and research.

Figure E-2-a
Information Technology Costs

The University of Toronto continues to invest in Information Technology to support students, faculty, and staff.



Notes:

1. Data source: Information and Technology Services

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances

University Central Administrative Costs

Performance Relevance:


Central administrative costs are those associated with operating the University as a whole. Some of these costs are associated with activities that are undertaken to meet legislated requirements (for example, preparation of financial statements, reports to government, compliance with legislation such as the Ontario Disabilities Act and the Occupational Health & Safety Act, etc.); others are associated with governance. A requirement since 2006 is administering and ensuring compliance with the Freedom of Information and Personal Privacy Act (FIPPA). Other costs relate to value-added services provided by the central administrative group for the benefit of the University. These include the President's office, Governing Council, Vice-President and Provost, Vice President University Operations, Vice President Human Resources and Equity, Vice-President Research & Innovation, Vice-President Advancement, Vice-President Communications, Vice-President International, Chief Financial Officer among other university-wide services and support costs.

The University of Toronto actively works to contain central administrative costs incurred for these essential services.

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances

Figure E-3-a
Central Administrative Costs as a Percentage of Total Operating Expenditures,
2005-06 to 2014-15

Central Administrative Costs as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure at the University of Toronto are lower than the average of other universities in Ontario.



Notes:

1. Data source: COU Financial Report of Ontario Universities, Volume I, Table 6 - Expense Operating (excluding internal and external cost recoveries) 1998-99 to 2014-15.
2. Administration and General Expenses include: administration; planning and information costs and activities associated with the offices of the president and vice-presidents (excludes administration which is included in Academic Support and External Relations); internal audit; investment management; space planning; Governing Council Secretariat; finance and accounting (including research accounting); human resources; central purchasing, receiving and stores; institutional research; general university memberships; the administration of the occupational health and safety program, including the disposal of hazardous wastes; professional fees (legal and audit); convocations and ceremonies; insurance (except fire, boiler and pressure vessel, property and liability insurance which are reported under the physical plant function); activities in the registrar's office not included in Academic Support.

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances

Endowment per Student


Performance Relevance:

The University of Toronto's endowment provides support for scholarships, teaching, research and other educational programs now and in the future. Endowments came under pressure at many universities during the global economic crisis in 2008-09.

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances

Figure E-3-b
Top Endowments at AAU Public Institutions per FTE Student
as at April 30, 2014 (\$US)

The University of Toronto's Endowment per student is lower than many AAU Peer institutions.



Notes:

1. Data source: IPEDS website
2. U of T figure converted to US dollars at an exchange rate of 0.9127 as at April 30, 2014.
<http://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/exchange/10-year-converter/>

Related Reports:

University of Toronto Endowment Reports:

<http://www.finance.utoronto.ca/alerts/endowrpts.htm>

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances

Financial Health

Performance Relevance:

Information on the debt burden ratio, viability ratio and credit ratings of the University of Toronto is useful to governors to assess the University's capacity to service and repay debt. Credit ratings are good indicators of the University overall financial health, as assessed by independent credit agencies. Key credit rating criteria also include diversity of revenues and strength of student demand.

The debt burden ratio (principal + interest divided by total expenditures) is the key financial indicator in determining debt limit. It indicates how much debt the University can afford. It is expressed as the percentage of debt service cost to total expenditures. A low percentage indicates less strain on the University's budget to service debt. The maximum debt burden ratio (for total internal and external debt) has been set at 5%, so the actual debt burden ratio should be below 5%. For 2016, the actual ratio was 3.5%.

A secondary ratio that is taken into consideration in setting the maximum debt limit is the viability ratio (expendable resources that includes deferred contributions, divided by debt). It indicates the amount of funds on hand that could be used to repay the outstanding debt. The ratio is expressed as times coverage, and a higher ratio indicates higher capacity to repay debt. The lowest threshold for total external and internal debt is set at 0.8, so it is desirable to have an actual rate above 0.8. For 2016, the actual viability ratio was 1.6, which is above 0.8.


The University has three credit ratings – from Moody's Investors Service, from Standard and Poor's and from Dominion Bond Rating Service. The following table shows the credit rating definitions and the ratings assigned to those of our U.S. and Canadian peers. The University of Toronto is ranked at the same level as or higher than the Province and is ranked higher than several of our peers. Many factors are brought to bear in determining credit ratings at any given point in time. The University of Toronto uses credit ratings as a guide, but not a constraint, in determining borrowing levels. The goal is to maintain a credit rating at a level that will permit it to borrow to meet the needs of the University on a cost effective basis.

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances

Figure E-3-c
Debt Burden Ratio

The Debt Burden Ratio (principal and interest divided by total expenditures) is an indicator of how much debt the University can afford. A low percentage indicates less strain on the University's budget to service debt.

The University of Toronto's Debt Burden Ratio is stable and comfortably below the University's policy. It is also considerably lower than the industry threshold.



Note:


1. Data source: Financial Services Department.

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances

Figure E-3-d
Viability Ratio

The Viability Ratio (expendable resources divided by debt) indicates the amount of funds on hand that could be used to repay outstanding debt. A higher ratio indicates higher capacity to repay debt.

The University of Toronto's Viability Ratio is rising and well above the University's own additional monitoring rate.



Note:

1. Data source: Financial Services Department.

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances

Figure E-3-e
Credit Rating, University of Toronto
Compared to US and Canadian Peers at June 2016

The table below indicates the credit rating definitions and the ratings assigned to those of our US and Canadian peers that have been rated by the University of Toronto's rating agencies.

Rating Definitions	Moody's Investors Service	Standard & Poor's	Dominion Bond Rating Service
Best quality	Aaa	AAA	AAA
Next highest quality	Aa1	AA+	AA(high)
and so on, declining	Aa2	AA	AA
	Aa3	AA-	AA(low)
↓	A1	A+	A(high)
	A2	A	A
	and so on	and so on	and so on

University	Moody's Investors Service	Standard & Poor's	Dominion Bond Rating Service
PROVINCE OF ONTARIO	Aa2	A+	AA(low)
University of Michigan	Aaa	AAA	
University of Texas system	Aaa	AAA	
University of Washington	Aaa	AA+	
University of British Columbia	Aa1	AA+	
University of Pittsburgh	Aa1	AA+	
University of Minnesota	Aa1	AA	
Ohio State University	Aa1	AA	
University of Toronto	Aa2	AA+	AA
Queen's University		AA+	AA
University of Western Ontario		AA	
McMaster University		AA	AA(low)
University of California	Aa2	AA-	
University of Ottawa	Aa2		AA(low)
McGill University	Aa2	AA-	
University of Arizona	Aa2	AA-	
University of Illinois	Aa3	A+	

Note:

1. Data Source: Credit rating agencies' websites and reports.

Related Reports:

University of Toronto Financial Reports:

<http://www.finance.utoronto.ca/alerts/finreports.htm>

E. Resources and Funding
3. Funding and Finances


Total Revenue per FTE Student

Performance Relevance:

Total funding on a per student basis compared to U.S. peers provides a measure of the University's resource situation. We have provided comparisons with nine of our U.S. public peers.

Figure E-3-f
Total Revenue per FTE Student
University of Toronto Compared to U.S. Public Peers (US Funds),
Fiscal Year 2014-15


The University of Toronto's Total Revenue per student is lower than U.S. public peer institutions.



Notes:

1. Data source: AAUDE
2. All Revenues exclude Hospital/Medical Centre Revenues.
3. U.S. Peer Mean excludes U of T.
4. Data for University of Washington is unavailable.
5. U of T figure converted to U.S. funds using an exchange rate of 0.8252 as at April 30th 2015.

The End



Top 3 Countries

U of T International Students are from

1. China
2. India
3. United States

18.4%

of U of T Students are International Students

11,000+
Registrations for
Entrepreneurship-
Related Courses



1,600+
Undergrad
Students
Participated in Study
Abroad and Exchange
Programs



Average SAG
Expenditure per
Recipient

U of T Student Access
Guarantee Expenditures far
Exceed other Ontario
Institutions

Graduate Students

19.8%
of U of T Students
are Enrolled in
Graduate Programs



#14
in Global Employability
University Ranking
(Times Higher
Education)



U of T

\$5,205

Other Ontario Institutions

\$1,863

Over 70%
of U of T Graduate
Students Rated
their Academic
Experience as
Excellent or
Very Good



52%
of Ontario's
Rhodes Scholars
are from U of T



\$200 Million

expenditure in
Student Support
in 2015-16, Grown
from \$7.7 Million
in 1992-93





How does U of T Compare?



Times Higher Education World Universities Rankings

#22 Overall Worldwide

#8 Worldwide among Public Universities



Worldwide for Volume of Published Research

#2




in North America for Research-Based Start-up Companies

#1



in North America for Research Libraries

#4



15% of Canada's Tri-Agency Research Funding



40% of Canada's Prestigious International Research Awards



\$233 Million

Raised in Gifts, Donations, and Philanthropic Research Grants, from May 2015 to April 2016



U of T's Credit Rating

Aa2

Moody's Investor Service

AA+

Standard & Poor's

AA

Dominion Bond Rating Service

pi.utoronto.ca

visit the website for all performance indicators and more information



2016 Performance Indicators

1. New in 2017
2. Transition from 2016 to 2017
3. pi.utoronto.ca

New in 2017

In response to feedback from 2016, we initiated this project with the following objectives:

- Make U of T's Performance Indicators more interactive and intuitive
- Improve accessibility
- Increase visibility



Original Report



New Report

Number of Sections	5 Sections	4 Sections
Number of Charts	105 charts	77 charts
Format	PDF	PDF Website Interactive Charts
Accessible Format	PDF	Website
Visual Identity	U of T Logo	U of T Logo Colour Palette Icons
Location	https://www.utoronto.ca/about-u-of-t	http://pi.utoronto.ca/

New in 2017: Content Structure

Original Structure

Sections

1. **Research & Innovation Excellence**
5 subsections / 25 charts
2. **Education Excellence**
18 subsections / 67 charts
3. **Outstanding People: Faculty, Staff, Alumni Friends and Benefactors**
2 subsections / 5 charts
4. **The Shape of Our University**
3 subsections / 10 charts
5. **Resources & Funding**
3 subsections / 8 charts

Indicator	
A. Research and Innovation Excellence	
1. Rankings	
A-1-a	Summary Table of International Rankings (U15)
A-1-b	Summary Table of International Rankings (Top 25)
A-1-c	THE Rankings by Discipline (U15 in Top 50)
2. Awards and Honours	
A-2-a	Faculty Honours by Award
A-2-b	Canada Research Chairs
A-2-c	Faculty Teaching Awards: 3M
A-2-d	Faculty Teaching Awards: OCUFA
3. Research Publications and Citations	
A-3-a	Number of Publications: Science Fields (Top 40)
A-3-b	Number of Publications: Science Fields (U15)
A-3-c	Number of Citations: Science Fields (Top 40)
A-3-d	Number of Citations: Science Fields (U15)
A-3-e	Summary of Ranking Citations, Selected Fields
4. Research Funding	
A-4-a	SSHRC Funding Share
A-4-b	NSERC Funding Share
A-4-c	CIHR Funding Share
A-4-d	Tri-Agency Funding Share
A-4-e	Canada Foundation for Innovation Funding Share
A-4-f	Research Funding from Industrial Sources
A-4-g	Total Research Funding Awarded by Sector
A-4-h	Total Research Funds Awarded Over Time
5. Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship	
A-5-a	New Invention Disclosures (U15 & AAU Peers)
A-5-b	New Licenses (U15 & AAU Peers)
A-5-c	New Research-based Spin-off Companies (U15 & AAU Peers)
A-5-d	Entrepreneurship Ecosystem
A-5-e	Entrepreneurship-related Courses
B. Education Excellence	
0. Rankings	
B-0-a	Times Higher Education Global Employability University Ranking
1. Recruitment and Admissions	
B-1-a	Entering Averages: Distribution of Entering Grade Averages U of T compared to Ontario
B-1-b	Entering Averages: Arts & Science and Engineering by Campus

B-1-c	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Undergraduate First-entry Programs - aggregate, time series
B-1-d	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Undergraduate First-entry Programs - by program, current year
B-1-e	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Undergraduate Professional Programs - aggregate, time series
B-1-f	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Undergraduate Professional Programs - by program, current year
B-1-g	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Professional Masters Programs - International Students
B-1-h	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Doctoral-stream Masters Programs - International Students
B-1-i	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Doctoral Programs - International Students
B-1-j	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Professional Masters Programs - Domestic Students
B-1-k	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Doctoral-stream Masters Programs - Domestic Students
B-1-l	Applications, Offers, and Registrations: Doctoral Programs - Domestic Students
2. Student Awards	
B-2-a	Undergraduate Student Awards
B-2-b	Prestigious Canadian Doctoral Scholarships
3. The Student Experience: Student Faculty Ratios	
B-3-a	Student-Faculty Ratios: Comparison with AAU Peers
B-3-b	Student-Faculty Ratios: Comparison with Canadian Peers
B-3-c	Student-Faculty Ratios: Comparison with Mean of Canadian Peers Over Time
B-3-d	Student-Faculty Ratios Using Different Faculty Inclusions - FTEs
B-3-e	Student-Faculty Ratios Using Different Faculty Inclusions - Headcounts
4. The Undergraduate Student Experience: Retention and Graduation	
B-4-a	Undergraduate First Year Retention Rate and Six Year Graduation Rate Over Time (CSRDE)
B-4-b	Undergraduate First Year Retention Rate Compared to Selectivity Groupings (CSRDE)
B-4-c	Undergraduate Six Year Graduation Rate Compared to Selectivity Groupings (CSRDE)
5. The UG Student Experience: Foundational Year Programs, Instructional Engagement and Class Size Exp.	
B-5-a	Foundational year programs: Registrations, Offers, Enrolment on St. George Campus
B-5-b	Foundational year programs: Enrolment by Campus
B-5-c	Undergraduate Instructional Engagement
B-5-d	Undergraduate Class Size Experience: First Year
B-5-e	Undergraduate Class Size Experience: Senior Year
B-5-f	Course Section Teaching by Instructor Type

New in 2017: Content Structure

Original Structure (Cont.)


6. The Undergraduate Student Experience: Survey Results	
B-6-a	NSSE Benchmarks: 2004, 2006, 2008, 2011
B-6-b	NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Academic Challenge
B-6-c	NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Learning with Peers
B-6-d	NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Experiences with Faculty
B-6-e	NSSE 2014 Engagement Indicators - Campus Environment
B-6-f	NSSE 2014 Results: High-Impact Practices
B-6-g	Recommendations Resulting from NSSE Focus Group Sessions
7. The Undergraduate Experience: Experiential Learning	
B-7-a	Undergraduate Service-Learning Course Enrolment Supported by the CCP
B-7-b	Results of the Service-Learning Assessment Survey
B-7-c	Engagement Indicators (EI) Scores of Senior Year Students - NSSE
B-7-d	Co-curricular Record (CCR)
8. The Graduate Student Experience: Survey Results	
B-8-a	CGPSS General Satisfaction Questions
B-8-b	CGPSS Ratings of Research-Oriented and Professional Graduate Programs
9. The Graduate Student Experience: Interdisciplinary Learning and Research	
B-9-a	CGPSS Responses on Interdisciplinary Opportunities Over Time
B-9-b	CGPSS Responses on Interdisciplinary Opportunities by Research-Oriented and Professional
B-9-c	CGPSS Responses on Graduate Publications and Presentations
10. The Graduate Student Experience: Time to Completion and Graduation	
B-10-a	Doctoral Completion Rates by SGS Grouping - 7 & 9 years
B-10-b	Doctoral Median Number of Terms Registered to Degree
11. The International Student Experience	
B-11-a	International Student Enrolment over Time
B-11-b	International Students by Geographic Origin
12. Diversity of Our Students	
B-12-a	Student reported responses to visible minority/ethno-cultural info questions (NSSE)
B-12-b	Percentage of respondents who are first generation students (NSSE)
B-12-c	Estimated number of students who are first generation based on NSSE results
13. Accessibility Services	
B-13-a	Number of Students Registered
B-13-b	Number of Students with Exam/Test Accommodations
14. Academic Pathways	
B-14-a	Transitional Year Program Enrolment and Transition
B-14-b	Academic Bridging Program Enrolment and Transition
B-14-c	Facilitated Transfer Programs

B-14-d	International Pathway Programs
15. Online Courses	
B-15-a	Online Courses and Enrolment
B-15-b	Online Learning Project Pilot Student Survey Results
16. Student Financial Support	
B-16-a	Undergraduate Net Tuition for OSAP Recipients by Program
B-16-b	Student Access Guarantee (SAG) Related Expenditures
B-16-c	SAG Expenditures per Recipient - comparison with Ontario universities.
B-16-d	Parental Income of First Year Students Receiving OSAP in Direct-Entry Programs
B-16-e	Scholarships and Bursaries per FTE
B-16-f	Doctoral Student Support: Average Financial Support
17. Branching Out	
B-17-a	Number of Participants in Study Abroad & Exchange Programs
C. Outstanding People: Faculty, Staff, Alumni Friends and Benefactors	
1. Faculty and Staff Satisfaction	
C-1-a	Faculty & Staff Satisfaction (UTFSES)
C-1-b	Faculty & Staff Work/Life Balance (UTFSES)
2. Alumni, Friends Benefactors	
C-2-a	Annual Fundraising Achievement Over Time
C-2-b	Annual Fundraising Achievement by Sector
C-2-c	BOUNDLESS Campaign Goals by Priority
D. The Shape of Our University	
1. Graduate Student Enrolment Expansion	
D-1-a	Graduate Student Enrolment
D-1-b	Graduate Enrolment compared to Canadian Peers
D-1-c	Graduate Enrolment compared to AAU Peers
D-1-d	University of Toronto's Share of Enrolment in Masters Programs and Doctoral Programs
2. Space	
D-2-a	Total Space – Ontario comparison
D-2-b	Teaching and Research Space – Ontario comparison
D-2-c	Total Space – Time Series by Campus
D-2-d	Room Utilization
3. Deferred Maintenance	
D-3-a	Deferred Maintenance Backlog by Campus
D-3-b	Deferred Maintenance Backlog Over Time
E. Resources and Funding	
1. Library	
E-1-a	ARL Ranking









2. IT	
E-2-a	Information Technology Investments
3. Funding and Finances	
E-3-a	Central Administrative Costs
E-3-b	Endowment Per FTE
E-3-c	Debt Burden Ratio
E-3-d	Viability Ratio
E-3-e	Credit Ratings
E-3-f	Total Revenue per student

New in 2017: Content Structure

New Structure




The original 5 sections were converted to 4 sections with shorter names and assigned icons to make them easier to remember





-  Performance Indicators
-  Executive Summary
-  Contents
-  Research & Innovation
-  Student Experience
-  Education & Pathways
-  Staff & Resources
-  Accessibility


New in 2017: Content Structure









New Structure

 Contents


PAGE CONTENTS

 Research & Innovation	 Student Experience	 Education & Pathways	 Staff & Resources
Rankings Awards & Honours Research Publications and Citations Research Funding Innovation, Commercialization and Entrepreneurship	Student-Faculty Ratios <hr/> Undergraduate Experience Retention & Graduation Foundational Year Programs, Instructional Engagement and Class Size Experiential Learning NSSE Survey Results <hr/> Graduate Experience Time to Completion and Graduation Interdisciplinary Learning and Research CGPSS Survey Results <hr/> International Experience International Students	Recruitment & Admissions Graduate Students Awards & Scholarships Financial Support Employability Ranking Library Ranking Diversity Accessibility Academic Pathways Study Abroad Online Courses	Employee Engagement Fundraising Space Deferred Maintenance Technology Funding & Finances



-  Performance Indicators
-  Summary
-  Contents
-  Research & Innovation ▾
-  Student Experience ▾
-  Education & Pathways ▾
-  Staff & Resources ▾
-  Accessibility



New Sections

- 
Research & Innovation
 5 subsections / 15 charts
- 
Student Experience
 9 subsections / 24 charts
- 
Education & Pathways
 11 subsections / 25 charts
- 
Staff & Resource
 6 subsections / 13 charts

New in 2017: Content Structure

Executive Summary

- **New in 2017**
- **Two formats**
PDF and accessible web version
- **Web version (accessible)**
each item will link to relevant performance indicator



New in 2017: Executive Summary



2016 Online Report Sections

- Student Experience
- Education & Pathways
- Research & Innovation
- Staff & Resources

PDF Charts

PDF Charts

- B-11-b
- B-11-a
- B-16-c
- B-17-a
- A-5-d
(from Research & Innovation section)
- D-1-b
- B-0-a
- B-16-a to B-16-f
- B-8-a
- B-2-a




- A-1-b
- A-3-a
- A-5-c
- A-4-d
- A-2-a
- E-1-a
(from Education & Pathways section)
- C-2-b
- E-3-e
- (website)

New in 2017: Executive Summary


Transition from 2016 to 2017

2016

2015 Report PDF &
Text-only Version



Charts



Text-only




2017

2016 Report PDFs, Executive Summary,
Website, Tableau Visualizations



Charts



Executive
Summary




Interactive
Visualizations
& Accessible
Tables

Transition from 2016 to 2017


2016

2015 Report
Single Year PDF
(+ Text-only PDF)



2017

2016 Report
Single Year PDF
+ Executive Summary
+ Time-Series
visualizations
+ accessible versions



Transition from 2016 to 2017

pi.utoronto.ca

2016 Components



People

Many people across divisions contribute to performance indicators



Charts

Static charts for print and interactive charts for online version



Accessibility

An accessible text-only PDF and HTML tables for the accessible online format



Servers

A web server for the website and Tableau server for the interactive visualizations



Pages

Print or web pages where charts, notes, descriptions and accessible data tables are presented

+ Icons



 **Accessibility**

Contact Information

Explanation of
accessible content
on site

Link to U of T's
Accessibility
Statement

Online Accessibility & Interactive Charts



Interactive Charts



2015 Accessible Version



2016 Accessible Version



2017 Accessible Version

Time-Series: Each
chart contains data
for multiple years

Similar to PDF version, a
separate data table with
description and notes is
required for each year

Site Map

