MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of York University is the pursuit, preservation and dissemination of knowledge. We promise excellence in research and teaching in pure, applied and professional fields. We test the boundaries and structures of knowledge. We cultivate the critical intellect.

York University is part of Toronto: we are dynamic, metropolitan and multicultural. York University is part of Canada: we encourage bilingual study, we value diversity. York University is open to the world: we explore global concerns.

A community of faculty, students and staff committed to academic freedom, social justice, accessible education, and collegial self-governance, York University makes innovation its tradition.

Tentanda Via: the way must be tried.

ÉNONCÉ DE MANDAT

L’Université York a pour mandat d’accroître, de préserver et de diffuser le savoir. Nous nous engageons à ce que la recherche et l’enseignement, qu’ils soient purs, appliqués ou professionnels, se placent à un degré d’excellence élevé. Nous repoussons les limites et les structures du savoir. Nous cultivons le sens critique.

L’Université York partage avec la métropole de Toronto son caractère dynamique et multiculturel. L’Université York partage avec le Canada son encouragement aux études bilingues, son attachement à la diversité. L’Université York s’ouvre sur le monde et s’interroge sur les grandes préoccupations internationales.

Composée d’enseignants, d’étudiants et de membres du personnel dévoués à la cause de la liberté, de la justice sociale, du libre accès à l’enseignement et de la direction démocratique, l’Université York a fait de l’innovation sa tradition.

Tentanda Via : Ouvrir des voies nouvelles.
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The Year in Brief

The 2009-2010 academic year was a time of renewal and change. As a young University, we are in the process of experiencing a major transformation, both academically and structurally. Already we have made significant inroads towards meeting our strategic objectives, and have achieved many milestones and successes. But as a dynamic University, with great strengths and even greater potential, now is our opportunity to focus on the future possibilities.

Academic Planning and Infrastructure Growth

Throughout 2009-2010, we continued to articulate the need to become a more comprehensive university, expanding in the areas of science and applied science, while also protecting our current strengths in the arts, social sciences, business and law. This vision aligns closely with the increased value placed on a university education deemed necessary to compete in today's global economic environment.

To support York's academic aspirations to become a leading research-based university, as outlined in the University Academic Plan (2005-2010), we are transforming the University's infrastructure through renovations, expansions and the construction of new buildings, with these renovation projects progressing according to plan and within budget.

THE PROVOSTIAL WHITE PAPER

In 2009, I initiated a long-range strategic planning exercise as it had been a decade since the University had engaged in such a process. The goal of the Provostial White Paper was to articulate long-term strategic directions, identify how York could differentiate itself from other universities, and provide a basis for conveying the academic priorities.

Patrick Monahan, vice-president academic & provost, assumed the task of leading this university-wide effort. In April, following a broad-based consultative process involving faculty, staff and students, the White Paper received unanimous Senate endorsement.

Senior Academic Appointments

After an extensive search, two new deans were appointed, effective July 1, 2010:

- Lorne Sossin was named as the new dean of Osgoode Hall Law School
- Janusz Kozinski was named as the new dean of the Faculty of Science & Engineering

Growing Applied Sciences and Health

This year, our University continued our planning and advocacy efforts to expand our engineering school and create a medical school; both consistent with the priorities of the University Academic Plan, as well as the White Paper.

Sherman Health Sciences Research Centre

Work is well underway on our new state-of-the-art health research facility, which will bring researchers in the health, science and engineering fields together.

The building is also a model of sustainability. The materials from the internal demolition of this former hockey rink are being reused throughout the structure, including the concrete ice pad which was broken up and used around the perimeter of the building to create a man-made alvar, which assists with drainage and storm water management. The alvar is used to test robots designed in the Canadian Centre for Field Robotics on the first floor, and for part of the recreational patio.

Among some of the other features, the hardwood from the arena’s ceiling is being refinished and will be used in the internal staircases that connect the first and second floors; large windows and skylights are being installed to increase the building’s natural light, and to reduce the need for artificial lighting; and energy-efficient light fixtures are also being included for evening use.

When this exciting $11.5-million project opens in the fall of 2010, it will provide our researchers and graduate students with the ability to collaborate and enhance our University's research capacity.

Life Sciences Building

The Life Sciences Building is currently under construction and scheduled to open in 2011. The building will have 160,000 square feet of classroom, laboratory and research space, and will strengthen our capacity in life sciences and health, so that we may better serve our communities and our province.

The governments of Canada and Ontario invested $70 million through the Knowledge Infrastructure Program and Ontario’s 2009 budget to assist with this construction project.
FACULTY OF LIBERAL ARTS & PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

The newly created Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies (LA&PS) is successfully completing its first year, and is evolving very well as a major centre of learning and research, under the leadership of Dean Martin Singer. In June 2010, the Faculty achieved another historic milestone with their Strategic Plan 2010-2020 being approved by Faculty Council.

GLENDON’S CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE

In September, York University’s Glendon College will officially break ground for the new Centre of Excellence for French-Language and Bilingual Postsecondary Education.

The Government of Ontario is investing $20 million towards this facility, which will enable Glendon to provide better access to French-language higher education for francophone learners in southern Ontario and anglophone students wishing to study in French, and strengthen the delivery of collaborative French-language university and college programs.

OSGOODE HALL LAW SCHOOL

Since September 2009, the renovation and expansion of our 42-year-old building has been underway. While construction is not slated to be finished until the spring of 2011, the law school’s new academic wing will be open for this academic year. The Osgoode Hall Law School building is being designed and built to meet Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) Silver Certification standards.

YORK RESEARCH TOWER

This 10-storey building, which received LEED Silver Certification for its sustainability features, opened in September 2009, and represents York’s commitment to building a research culture for success.

This building currently houses 12 research centres and two research project teams, and also provides office space for the Knowledge Mobilization Unit and Advanced Broadband Enabled Learning group, who provide support services for researchers.

SUBWAY

In May 2010, preliminary work on the construction of the Toronto-York Spadina Subway Extension began, which included a new road being formed through the Harry W. Arthurs Common for all the bus diversions.

Construction is expected to continue over the next four to five years to accommodate the two new subway stations, as well as the subway line which will run through the campus. The arrival of the subway will connect us to downtown Toronto and York Region, eliminate more than 1600 buses a day on our campus, and reduce noise and pollution.

Research at York

The efforts to enhance the research culture at York University have been showing signs of success. In 2009 and 2010, our researchers secured several major peer-reviewed Social Sciences & Humanities Research Council of Canada research grants. Additionally, one of York’s researchers received the Canada Council for the Arts’ $100,000 Killam Prize, annually awarded to only five eminent Canadian scholars, for her distinction in social sciences.

Our outreach in research and innovation continued to be successful with the establishment of Innovation York in Markham, and our participation in the newly created Convergence Centre. The Convergence Centre will allow researchers, the private sector and venture capitalist the ability to work together in order to advance regional innovation.

While there are many achievements in research, our ongoing challenge continues to be integrating research into mainstream academic activities, particularly linking research intensification with the goal to create a better learning environment at the graduate level.

Organizational Effectiveness

One of the University’s major successes this year was the dramatic improvement in organizational effectiveness:

• Patrick Monahan was appointed the new vice-president academic & provost and assumed his role in July 2009. He is responsible for institutional leadership in planning, policy development and implementation of new and existing academic programs. In conjunction with the Senate and the president, the vice-president academic & provost sets the academic goals of the University and establishes priorities in terms of University objectives.

• Jennifer Sloan, who joined the University in January 2010, was appointed to the newly created position of vice-president university relations. She is responsible for the University’s activities in the areas of communications, marketing, government relations and community relations.

• The consolidations of the Office of Student Affairs under the provost, and IT Services under the vice-president finance & administration have resulted in better accountability and improved efficiency, and have eliminated redundancies.

Valuing Our People

We recognize that in order to succeed as a University, we must maintain and develop relationships with the entire York community. A number of initiatives are currently underway that will enhance relationships and increase engagement among various student groups, faculty, staff and the broader York community.
BETTER WORKPLACE INITIATIVE

Last year, following the labour disruption, the University established the Better Workplace Initiative. As part of the University’s efforts to better understand the issues that contributed to the strike, York engaged Jim Thomas, former deputy minister of labour, to undertake a consultation process with unions across campus.

Based on his assessments, we have now struck an implementation committee, to be co-chaired by Sharon Hooper, assistant vice-president human resources, and Rhonda Lenton, associate vice-president academic.

THE TASK FORCE ON STUDENT LIFE, LEARNING & COMMUNITY

In the summer of 2009, the Task Force on Student Life, Learning & Community, chaired by Patrick Monahan, submitted its final report. The task force was established to improve the quality of our academics and the student experience.

The recommendations, which I accepted, were wide-ranging and included creating a Standing Committee on Campus Dialogue, changes in the Code of Conduct for students, as well as security procedures, and enhancing the students’ space. With the implementation of these recommendations, the students’ environment on campus is continuing to improve.

THE TASK FORCE ON COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The Task Force on Community Engagement, chaired by Rhonda Lenton, submitted its final report. The task force was established to explore University engagement. Numerous suggestions were provided within the report, all with the goal of embedding community engagement into the institutional fabric of the University.

Included in the report were recommendations to increase alignment of community engagement with academic planning and priorities, and to improve communication and coordination of engagement activities. The task force also highlighted the potential and socially transformative role that an engaged university could have on building community capacity, enhancing students’ learning experiences and promoting civic engagement.

YORK TO THE POWER OF 50 FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN

On June 3, 2010, York University’s largest fundraising campaign came to a successful conclusion. York to the Power of 50, which launched publicly in 2006, raised $207 million, exceeding its initial $200-million goal.

The campaign’s success can be attributed to the many volunteers who devoted so much of their time and effort, and the more than 30,000 donors who contributed to it. Over the course of the campaign, 44 gifts of $1 million or greater were received, with members of the York community leading the charge.

Now that the campaign has concluded, we will conduct a review of all the units engaged in fundraising, alumni and advancement to ensure that the University is well positioned for the future.

Budget

The University, much like everyone else, was not immune to the global economic crisis. However, as a result of our prudent fiscal management, we managed to steer our way through the volatility, although risks and issues remain, particularly with respect to our pension funds.

Despite managing our budget conservatively in order to protect the academic complement and the core academic quality of our programs, this year we still had to make some very difficult decisions. We cut our budget by 3.5 per cent and unfortunately, there are tough choices still to be made.

Safety

The safety and well-being of the members of our University community is critically important. We are a university that strives to provide an environment where students, faculty and staff of diverse social, cultural and academic values are allowed to develop and prosper.

This past June, following a comprehensive evaluation, the Metropolitan Action Committee on Violence Against Women & Children (METRAC) issued the York University Safety Audit Report. The report captured many of the strengths related to safety programs on campus, as well as the approach and rationale for the existence of these programs. However, one of the most prominent themes from the METRAC Safety Audit was the need to develop a more pronounced culture of safety and security for all community members.

The senior administration recognizes the importance of safety on our campuses and is dedicated to a thorough review and implementation of the recommendations. I appointed Gary Brewer, vice-president finance & administration, to lead the Management Safety Audit Implementation Committee, comprised of members from the senior administration. The committee is developing an effective action plan to address the recommendations from the safety audit.

A safety awareness strategic plan was developed. As part of this broader plan, several initiatives were implemented over the summer of 2010:

• I have been providing regular updates to the community on York’s safety initiatives and measures.
• A Safety Awareness website was created, linking all safety services at York on a common page.
• The Office of the Vice-President of Students created a brochure to be distributed to our neighbouring communities regarding off-campus guidelines on how to promote a safe and engaged community.

• A Community Safety Council (CSC), which will advise the president on all matters concerning safety at York University, was created. The CSC will be considered the York University community-based forum for the discussion of safety issues and concerns with a broad representation from across the University, and will work proactively to improve safety in all aspects of campus life.

• Security Services initiated a review of its staffing levels for recommendations to the senior administration.

• goSAFE is currently undergoing a review, and the goSAFE map is being updated to more accurately reflect pick-up and drop-off locations.

• York’s emergency messaging system, including the mass notification system, is being reviewed.

• A campus sign plan is in place to upgrade all interior signs in buildings across our campuses. To date, more than half of our campus buildings have been upgraded in accordance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

• Looking forward, we are already focusing on expanding the Positive Space Program.

### Sustainability

York has a range of sustainability initiatives in place, and much work has been done to improve the University’s standards of sustainability.

In April 2010, I received the final report from the President’s Sustainability Council, chaired by Faculty of Environmental Studies Professor Jennifer Foster, and accepted the recommendations. The report provided several proposals on ways to better address issues of sustainability on a pan-University level.

In October 2009, we were recognized for our efforts to develop and implement a greener University community. The College Sustainability Report Card awarded York a B+ for sustainability, the highest ranking achieved by Canadian universities in the United States-Canada survey.
Environmental Sustainability Report

In 2002, York University made a public commitment to sustainability and became an official signatory of the Talloires Declaration, a ten-point action plan for incorporating sustainability and environmental literacy in teaching, research, operations and outreach at colleges and universities. This section of the Planning, Budget and Accountability Report provides an overview of the University’s operational activities, initiatives and strategies relating to sustainability including a number of associated performance indicators.

Sustainable Approaches to Campus Development and Management

Creating a more sustainable future for facilities, services and operations supports the creation of a more sustainable campus for all students, faculty and staff, both current and future. The Department of Campus Services and Business Operations (CSBO) has adopted a number of standardized procedures and practices aimed at effectively reducing York’s ecological footprint. Staff in each Unit strives for continuous efficiency, while improving service and minimizing harm to the environment. The role of the Senior Manager of Environmental Design and Sustainability in CSBO is to bring focus to sustainable approaches within the department, as well as to coordinate with campus wide sustainability initiatives, including the Institute for Research and Innovation in Sustainability (IRIS), the Faculty of Environmental Studies, the President’s Council on Sustainability and Yorkwise, an awareness campaign promoting stewardship of the campus and quality of life.

Energy Management Program (EMP)

Work has continued on this energy conservation program, in which York University is investing $40 million in converting and renewing building and plant fixtures and systems. MCW Custom Energy Solutions, a Toronto based solutions firm, has worked with CSBO on implementing the initiative which targets a 25 per cent reduction in energy consumption by the conclusion of the five-year project, currently in year 4. During the past year, work proceeded on lighting retrofits, upgrades to HVAC systems and improvements to the central utility plant. Implementation of electrical metering is now complete at the Keele campus – this provides reliable control devices that allow energy usage per building to be tracked and monitored more effectively. The pilot test program, “Res Race to Zero”, aimed at undergraduate student residences at the Keele campus in March of 2009, successfully yielded uniform reductions in energy usage across all eight buildings involved in the competition. The pilot was expanded to include the Glendon campus in 2010, and plans are underway to make this initiative a permanent part of the York University Undergraduate Residence Life program. In addition during the past year, staff and faculty were challenged to reduce their work station energy consumption by getting “unplugged”. This initiative successfully engaged employees on campus to be mindful of turning off computers, lights and small electronics, and demonstrated the collective reductions in energy consumption from relatively minor adjustment to individual practices.

Facilities Renovations

All projects undertaken by CSBO’s Planning and Renovations unit give consideration to the reuse/recycling of existing spaces and materials, and in the case of new, the use of environmentally appropriate sourced materials and supplies. Design and development guidelines now incorporate a statement of commitment to sustainable solutions, and require due consideration to more energy efficient lighting retrofits and upgrades to HVAC, efficient water usage, use of materials free of volatile organic compounds (VOC), minimized inflexible interiors (use of partitions and open concept for office designs, where possible), use of light sensors, exterior sun shades and canopies. Particular attention is paid to the standardization of construction materials so as to improve operational efficiency over the life of the renovated area. CSBO is also testing low VOC roofing materials and their viability from an operational, economical and environmental standpoint.

Work has now been completed on the Sherman Health Science Research Centre, the old campus ice arena which was remodeled as a centre for science, research and support services. This adaptive/reuse project takes advantage of unique opportunities to reuse the building, including recycling the actual concrete rink pad, which was diverted from landfill, broken up and reused for landscaping and storm water management features around the outside of the renovated structure. New services supplied to the building wrap around the exterior walls; waste heat generated by these services will be redirected and used within the building.

In addition to outlining York’s commitment to sustainable solutions, the multiple phase Scott Library renovations presently underway, from design through implementation, has incorporated numerous LEED for Commercial Interiors strategies. This includes the preservation/ restoration of the site and building, maximization of natural light, access to views and daylight, high efficiency heating and cooling solutions, high performance and efficient lighting with particular attention to public corridors, lobbies and washrooms, where savings are possible with little impact to comfort. The renovations include a palette of materials with low VOC and high recycle content.

Infrastructure and Facilities Development

CSBO has adopted a sustainable building strategy that considers design efficiency, target performance, water efficiency, energy conservation, reduction in emissions, materials and resources, green construction practices, indoor environmental quality and site re-naturalization. York’s early dedication to sustainable building is evidenced through past achievements and several building design awards and distinctions.
The design and construction of a number of existing campus buildings were guided by sustainability principles, including Computer Science & Engineering, the Seymour Schulich Building, The Pond Road Residence and the Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL) Building. The recently completed York Research Tower, built as part of a larger capital development on the Keele campus that included the new Archives of Ontario public access facility, received LEED silver certification earlier in 2010.

Current Projects include:
- the Life Sciences Building (presently under construction with completion anticipated in Spring 2010), approximately 150,000 sq ft. of research, laboratory and teaching facilities, expansion of existing science infrastructure, partial green roof to address on-site storm water management capability, targeted LEED certification;
- expansion and renovation of the Osgoode Hall Law School building (in construction; 1st phase renovation of classroom wing completed, remainder of project to be completed in Summer 2010); re-development of the existing building, new entrance and façade, upgrade to existing services; reworking of the existing library; significant recycling and reuse of existing building components, targeted for LEED Commercial Interiors (CI) certification;
- Glendon Centre of Excellence (to commence in Fall 2010), approximately 26,000 sq ft; the plan makes use an existing single loaded corridor in York Hall “A” Wing in order to allow greater use of existing infrastructure; also included are new classrooms, seminar rooms, art studio, labs, a 300 seat auditorium, and the creation of a proper front entrance to the Glendon campus; upgrade and renewal of plant fixtures and distribution systems to reduce energy consumption are included in the project scope;
- Petrie Science and Engineering Building (completed in Summer 2010), full completion of a 4th floor on an existing three-storey building to create 14,000 sq ft. of additional research space, making use of existing building amenities and support services; new green roof which addresses on site storm water management.

Infrastructure improvements, including parking garages, road construction and extensive storm water management improvements historically have occurred in service of creating greater sustainability on the campus. New roads have been constructed incorporating carefully selected lights that eliminate up lighting.. Extensive storm water management initiatives have included the creation of retention ponds, bio swales instead of storm sewers, the use of porous paving, and “stormceptors” in parking lots, the use of green roofs and removal of excessive paved areas with soft ground treatment to allow for water infiltration.

Transportation
Transportation Services continues to encourage commuting to the University through alternatives to the single occupant motor vehicle. Viable alternatives continue to be promoted and expanded. These have included the expansion of available mass transit options, the development of a carpool program, a car sharing program, the creation of a regular shuttle service between campuses and the development of bike paths. The goal has been to reduce the demand for parking and increase awareness of alternative sustainable methods of transportation. Commuter modal split has been dramatically altered in the past 8 years from predominantly single occupant vehicles to predominantly alternative modes of travel. Currently, there are approximately 1,700 daily bus trips at the Keele campus, servicing the needs of students, faculty, staff and visitors, making it one of the largest transit hubs in the country.

Since 2008, significant planning of the TTC subway extension through the Keele campus (into York Region) has proceeded. To accommodate the two stations planned for the campus, subway construction is anticipated from late 2010 to 2015. The subway will improve mass transit to and from the campus, will redistribute the bus hub to several nodes along the subway route, and will thereby reduce significantly the amount of bus traffic on the University’s campus.

Grounds Improvement and Management
The principle of sustainability in grounds operations has been a driving force in the creation of all new landscape designs. Sustainable practices include the use of low maintenance shrubs, drought resistant and native plants, the increase of naturalized open space areas, the elimination of irrigation where used previously, the use of mulch in planted areas for water retention and weed control, and the use of porous hard surface materials i.e. interlock pavers (reusable, better durability than asphalt/concrete and improves water infiltration). Grounds management has adopted the goal of reducing chemical and pesticide usage wherever possible. Organic fertilizer is quickly becoming the fertilizer of choice for many applications. CSBO continues to provide ongoing support to faculty and student inspired improvements to the site, including the Maloca Community Gardens and the annual Arbor Day Tree Planting.

Waste Reduction and Recycling
In 1990, York University adopted a goal of achieving a 50 per cent waste reduction by the year 2000. To meet this goal, a comprehensive, multi-faceted waste management and diversion program was formalized in the mid-1990s. The program experienced early success and, in response, a more ambitious goal was set to reach a 65 per cent solid waste recycling ratio by the year 2013. By the end of 2008 a 58 per cent recycling ratio was achieved. In June, 2010, the University launched its ZeroWaste program, to build on existing waste diversion, promote more awareness of needless waste, and to introduce the expanded program of organic waste collection.

“Co-mingling” initiatives have brought greater efficiencies to the collection and distribution of waste, paper and glass/metal/plastic materials. A tri bin system has been introduced and has proven to be successful in both indoor and outdoor locations. Improvements inside buildings have focused on standardizing the bins and locations within central areas in order to increase awareness and ease of use. This has lowered the requirement for daily, individual office pick up and resulted in a reduction in the amount of office related garbage. The exterior tri bin “in ground” system has proven to capture a greater quantity of paper and plastic recyclables. The “in ground” system installations will be expanded in forthcoming years. The need for regular maintenance
has been greatly reduced by virtue of the compaction and storage capabilities in this system. Food digesters have been placed throughout the campus in close proximity to all buildings in order to promote individual organic recycling, and individual collection bins have been placed in all office kitchen areas.

**Custodial Services**

ZeroWaste also introduced a site wide “Green Cleaning” program, which was piloted during 2009 and has now become the benchmark for institutional cleaning. The first phase of the program took place within the York Research Tower (as a LEED component). The program was expanded to all buildings at both campuses in the summer of 2010. The major elements of the program include: certified green cleaning product usage and dispensing; communal waste receptacles; hand dryers in high use areas; entrance matting; HEPA-filter equipment; and microfibre cloths and mops. HEPA (high efficiency particulate air) are high-efficiency filters that can filter air particulates up to 99.97 per cent.

**Storm Water Management**

The University continues to practice effective storm water management in conjunction with campus improvements. Storm water is detained in ponds, parking lots, in “super pipes” and underground tanks. Impermeable surface drainage is directed to grassy swales and bio-swales wherever possible. The reconstruction of The Pond Road has incorporated bio-swales to direct storm water and allow for infiltration prior to the water entering the Black Creek system. The expanded Stong Pond now serves as proper storm water retention, control and quality improvement, prior to discharge into the Black Creek system. A study of the sediment in Stong Pond revealed that the only contaminant of significance was salt from the roads, paths and parking lots where it is used to aid snow and ice clearing. To address this, in order to help reduce the amount of salt used, two sander units have since been outfitted with a “pre-wetting” application system. The system applies a soluble ice melting solution to dry sand/salt being applied to roadways. The solution activates the melting process and keeps the sand/salt particles in place on a road area. In this way, less sand/salt product is required, contamination of runoff is reduced, safety for drivers and pedestrians is enhanced and fewer resources are spent keeping roads, paths and parking lots clear of ice and snow.

The City of Toronto Secondary Plan for York University’s Keele campus, adopted in December 2009, places key importance on storm water management and incorporates provisions requiring predetermined site wide and site specific storm water management plans prior to any new development.

**Bookstores and Printing Services**

York University’s Printing Services operation first received printer certification in 2008 from the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) Canada, which is an international certification and labeling system that guarantees that forest products purchased come from responsibly managed forests and verified recycled forests. FSC forests are certified against a strict set of environmental and social standards. Fibre from certified forests is tracked to the consumer through a chain of custody certification system. In 2010, certification was renewed after an external audit was completed.

York has been a North American leader in the publication of course kits as a more efficient alternative to high volume book orders. Since 2008, the production of course kits has been carbon neutral as York contributes approximately 2 cents per kit to buy local renewable energy and support for other projects, such as tree planting, through Zerofootprint. Printing Services offers the carbon neutral program to other printing on demand.

FSC certification, carbon offsetting for course kits and new, more energy efficient machinery, has made York’s Printing Services a leader in sustainability on campus. This is particularly significant because, as an industry, printing is historically high in resource use and emissions. The customer service staff at both Printing and also Mailing Services offer advice to the community to minimize waste and make appropriate choices when developing projects requiring paper for programs or mailings.

The Bookstore offers a line of ‘green’ products which are well received by customers and has introduced the 5 cent charge for plastic bags. In addition, the Bookstore at both campuses produces and sells its own 99 cent reusable, woven fabric shopping bags.

**Mailing Services**

Mailing Services continues to work towards the conservation of energy output and to help reduce the ecological footprint of the University.

While the volume of mail coming into and going out of the University continues its downward trend, the number of buildings and delivery dynamics of the ever changing campus continues to be a challenge in providing accurate, efficient and economical service.

As the University physically has expanded and the campus has in-filled, Mailing Services has attempted to do more deliveries by foot routes, lessening the use of vehicles. Deliveries are often via bicycle with a small trailer.

Other initiatives to reduce the volume of unnecessary mail and streamlining delivery output include:

- the use of an automated address cleaning service, so that departments doing large mail-outs can have their addresses verified prior to mailing to minimize returns and number of pieces mailed;
- fostering of closer working relationships with departments such as Human Resources & Employee Relations to support processes of keeping accurate address records so that returns and multiple deliveries are minimized;
- advocating the development of guidelines on how to responsibly communicate at the University, that encourage the use of electronic mail and other messaging tools, information distribution via websites and publications such Y-file, whenever possible.

**Campus Safety and Security**

York is committed to providing a safe and high quality of environment for all students, faculty, staff and visitors. This goal is incorporated into the University’s planning, design and operations strategies. Security Services is comprised of dedicated personnel working within a community based model of service, that is, one
which operates in partnership with all stakeholders in order to provide inclusive solutions to a broad range of security matters. Campus improvements have resulted in an increase to both built and public outdoor areas, yet safety measures have demonstrated a net reduction in the proportional number of reported incidents. This is particularly significant given the adoption of more stringent standard operating procedures with respect to reporting. Security patrols, clearly recognizable red and black uniforms, are a strong and visible presence on site. With respect to sustainability, the Pro Active Cycling Team (PACT) program now includes several trained security officers at both Keele and Glendon campuses. This program has reduced vehicle fuel cost and emissions.

Security Services utilizes multiple levels of resources and technology, including closed circuit Television (CCTV), electronic access alarm monitoring and automated report and dispatch logging systems. Designated CCTV cameras work with the Blue Light Emergency phones which are located throughout both campuses. For emergency assistance, indoor Safety Phones have now been installed in all lecture halls and large classrooms and in foyers and corridors of academic buildings on both campuses. High traffic, indoor corridors of the Keele campus have now been equipped with large, overhead LCD monitors which display community messaging and have the capability of an immediate override for emergency messaging. Work is also proceeded on exploring a hard wired, public address system for campus buildings. York’s Access Control Program ensures appropriate control of keys in order to secure the property and assets of the University, and in order to maximize the safety of members of its community. Security Services promotes Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) to make it difficult, riskier, and less rewarding for offenders to commit crime. CPTED is a multi-disciplinary approach to deterring criminal behavior through prudent environmental design. CPTED strategies rely upon the ability to influence offender decisions that precede criminal acts by giving consideration to how the physical environment is designed, created, improved and/or maintained. For example, in landscaped areas consideration is given to appropriate levels of lighting and sightlines that are clearly within view of adjacent public areas. CPTED reviews are undertaken for all new and renovated developments, as well as major installations.

York is dedicated to an inclusive process of community consultation on all issues related to security. In this regard, there is a Community Safety Council which has broad representation from the community, and is mandated to advise the president of the University.

**Stewardship**

**Land Use Policy**

York has collaborated with the City of Toronto Planning Department and a new secondary plan for the Keele campus has now been approved. An overarching objective of the plan is to create a multi-faceted approach to sustainability. Detailed land use policy pertaining to Natural Environment, Environmental Stewardship and Sustainable Design, will guide the redevelopment of both academic and non-academic uses on the basis of the following principles:

- Growth to be compact and incorporated as in-fill, where possible;
- Maintenance and strengthening of the campus’ heritage features, including lands adjacent to the Black Creek, all natural woodlots and open spaces;
- Growth to give consideration to the expansion of regional rapid transit networks as the key means of further improving modal split of commuters to campus;
- Campus-wide storm water management systems to detain and improve run-off before discharging into the adjacent watercourse.

**Maintaining Campus Lands and Services**

CSBO strives to effectively provide consistent, predictable, integrated services to support the core academic and research mission of the University, all while enhancing the quality of life for University members and visitors to the site. Two of the guiding principles in this work have been:

- The integration of sustainable principles in decision making, and
- The provision of accountability frameworks and reporting practices, in service of creating an environment which promotes stewardship.

Attention has been focused on the creation of standards and on reporting mechanisms that accurately reflect the improved state of campus conditions. These have encompassed strategies to improve energy usage, on-site storm water management, expansion of waste streams to include organics, extensive recycling programs, green building, and various green initiatives within all ancillary operations, including housing, food services, parking, printing and the bookstore.

Rationalizing desirable and sustainable levels of service and related standards is critical to the long-term stewardship of the site. This continues to be challenging as resources have been tested by the economic downturn; yet, demand for service is up because of new development.

**Public Engagement**

An important companion element to all sustainability related initiatives of an operational nature is communication to the community and, in particular, the identification of the role each staff, faculty and student community member must play in contributing to and sustaining positive change. Yorkwise, a University-wide initiative to support sustainability and quality of life on campus continues to communicate and call community members to action.

Over the past year, Yorkwise has focused primarily on energy conservation, in support of York’s broader Energy Management Program, through the Res Race to Zero (resident students) and “Unplugged” (faculty and staff) initiatives; and on waste management, through the promotion of ZeroWaste and support for initiatives such as the 20-minute campus clean up.
Environmental Performance Indicators

ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Energy efficiency at the Keele campus is assessed by measuring energy consumed per square meter of built space. This metric also incorporates energy utilization by York’s Central Utilities Building (CUB). The CUB utilizes electricity, natural gas and water to produce thermal utilities, including heating (steam); cooling (chilled water); and power (electricity). The power is produced by natural gas turbine engines in York’s 10 Megawatt cogeneration plant.

Cogeneration represents a cleaner, more efficient and less costly means of producing electricity than the use of simple cycle power generation and conventional heating boilers. It recovers waste heat to produce steam that is used for heating and cooling. York can produce up to 10 MW from cogeneration, or approximately 60 per cent of typical annual consumption.

In 2009-2010, there was a year-over-year decrease in electricity and natural gas consumption of 4.4 per cent. Three main factors that drove this result were the less adverse weather, in-house user conservation projects, and implementation of several measures of the $40 million Energy Management Project.

Figure 1: Energy Utilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of total amount of energy used:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity (purchased from Toronto Hydro) megajoules</td>
<td>178,821,443</td>
<td>201,301,718</td>
<td>207,508,454</td>
<td>203,570,885</td>
<td>144,408,002</td>
<td>264,919,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas (heating, cooling and cogeneration) megajoules</td>
<td>1,397,951,042</td>
<td>1,393,150,131</td>
<td>1,374,984,644</td>
<td>1,351,663,467</td>
<td>1,195,030,583</td>
<td>977,575,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil (used when gas is not available) megajoules</td>
<td>14,662,364</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,414,264</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,984,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,591,434,849</td>
<td>1,594,451,849</td>
<td>1,584,907,362</td>
<td>1,555,234,352</td>
<td>1,339,438,585</td>
<td>1,248,479,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student population at York</td>
<td>49,946</td>
<td>50,691</td>
<td>51,420</td>
<td>51,819</td>
<td>51,989</td>
<td>53,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption per student (megajoules per capita)</td>
<td>31,863</td>
<td>31,454</td>
<td>30,823</td>
<td>30,013</td>
<td>25,764</td>
<td>23,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of energy used per square metre:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity MJ/Sq.M</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas MJ/Sq.M</td>
<td>2,251</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil MJ/Sq.M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,562.2</td>
<td>2,207.2</td>
<td>2,191.8</td>
<td>2,150.7</td>
<td>1,852.3</td>
<td>1,726.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total gross Square Meteres (GSM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keele Campus Plant</td>
<td>621,121</td>
<td>722,388</td>
<td>723,123</td>
<td>723,123</td>
<td>723,123</td>
<td>723,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Campus Services and Business Operations

Figure 2: Annual Atmosphere Emissions – Carbon Dioxide Emissions Per Capita (student population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of carbon dioxide emitted Kg/year</td>
<td>62,807,190</td>
<td>65,268,487</td>
<td>62,942,568</td>
<td>63,690,514</td>
<td>58,070,689</td>
<td>52,008,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student population at York</td>
<td>49,496</td>
<td>50,691</td>
<td>51,420</td>
<td>51,819</td>
<td>51,989</td>
<td>53,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Dioxide emissions per capita Kg/Capita</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct combustion only from oil and gas, not including purchased electricity or other greenhouse gases

Source: Department of Campus Services and Business Operations

Figure 3: Annual Water Use – Water Used per Capita (student population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of water used Litres/yr</td>
<td>1,296,042,740</td>
<td>1,301,583,045</td>
<td>1,288,629,091</td>
<td>1,300,543,640</td>
<td>1,122,123,992</td>
<td>830,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student population at York</td>
<td>49,496</td>
<td>50,691</td>
<td>51,420</td>
<td>51,819</td>
<td>51,989</td>
<td>53,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water used per capita (student population) Litres/Capita</td>
<td>26,185</td>
<td>25,677</td>
<td>25,061</td>
<td>25,098</td>
<td>21,584</td>
<td>15,612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Campus Services and Business Operations
ATMOSPHERIC EMISSIONS

In 2009-2010, the carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions were lower to that of the previous year by 9.2 per cent. This is related to the implementation of energy performance measures, less adverse weather conditions and lower utilization of the cogeneration units. Annual atmospheric emissions represent the direct emission of CO₂ from York University based on oil and gas burned, including the operation of the cogeneration plant. Adopting cogeneration as a means of producing in-house electricity has increased York’s direct emissions since the two units were installed (in 1997 and 2003). However, the emissions are less than the emissions that would result through the production of an equal volume of electricity by other electricity producers in the province (using a mix of coal, oil, natural gas, hydraulic, nuclear).

WASTE PRODUCTION AND RECYCLING

The Solid Waste Production category includes all non-recyclable waste. Recyclables at York include: glass, newspaper, fine paper, plastic, metal, concrete, plant material, furniture, oil, batteries, aluminum cans, tires, computers, fluorescent light bulbs, corrugated cardboard and packaging and organic waste. The recycling program at York continues to be successful in diverting major amounts of waste produced on site from landfills.

While achieving a nearly 70 per cent waste diversion between 1987 and 2009, waste production has decreased and recyclables have increased appreciably since co-mingling and other new recycling initiatives were introduced in 2005.

WATER CONSUMPTION

Data on water consumption for 2009-2010 indicates a decrease of about 25 per cent relative to the previous year. Water consumption has an environmental impact in terms of the overall availability of natural resources for societal use as well as the costs associated with municipal infrastructure delivery and maintenance. Water consumption figures are based on actual meter readings of all main water meters. Fluctuation in water consumption per capita can be influenced from year-to-year by weather, and precipitation by the associated amount of water used for cooling tower makeup and irrigation of sport fields, gardens and lawns. The significant decrease in 2009-2010 may be due in part to climate - generally cooler temperatures and high rainfall experienced during the summer months of 2009; but may also be a function of the ongoing recalibration by Toronto Water of its metering processes.
BIODIVERSITY

Tree and shrub plantings were undertaken as components of projects and landscape improvements in various exterior locations of the campus. On Arbor Day, York Is U volunteers continued their tradition of adding to the areas of native plants on the Keele campus, adjacent to existing woodlot areas. Native plants are used whenever appropriate to the site.

Fertilizer is applied in order to maintain healthy turf and some plant areas. Factors which influence the annual applications include condition of turf, weather patterns, and traffic. Additional applications may be required in any given year in order to maintain an acceptable standard of growth, and as a result, there are fluctuations within the amounts of fertilizer used in any one year. Since 2008, conditions required a return to a higher level of fertilizer application in order to sustain healthy turf and gardens.

Pesticides and herbicides are limited in use to control such pests as insects and mice. Continuing efforts to minimize their use lessen environmental impacts and potential harm to research work conducted on campus.

TRANSPORTATION

The modal split in 2009-2010 was approximately 35/65 per cent single occupant vehicle to other commuting modes, including public transit. There has been a 50 per cent increase in the number of transit buses serving the Keele campus daily, from 1,100 in 2004 to 1700 in 2009 (counts performed in September each year). There has been an increase in the number of students living closer to campus and walking or cycling from the Tribute Homes development (The Village). In 2007, CSBO introduced Zipcar, a car sharing company on campus to complement the other transportation initiatives; there are over 800 members of the York community who have joined this new program. In Fall 2009, the York University Busway opened, making it much quicker for TTC buses to travel between the University’s Keele campus and Downsview Station.
A continued rise in the use of transportation modes other than a single occupant vehicle (transit, carpooling, cycling) will further reduce harmful vehicle emissions that contribute to poor air quality and increased greenhouse gases.

Reducing single occupant vehicle use also lessens traffic congestion and the land-intensive demand for parking on both campuses. The University will continue to advocate for and encourage commuting to the University in sustainable ways.

**SAFETY**

Safety is an important aspect of a sustainable environment. Benchmark information that illustrates the safe and peaceful environment of the University campus, relative to the surrounding city community is presented in Figure 8 below.

---

**Figure 7: Transportation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking permits issued</td>
<td>17,282</td>
<td>16,086</td>
<td>16,710</td>
<td>14,289</td>
<td>15,757</td>
<td>14,833</td>
<td>12,634</td>
<td>12,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Carpool permits issued annually</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student population at York</td>
<td>43,635</td>
<td>46,794</td>
<td>49,496</td>
<td>50,691</td>
<td>51,420</td>
<td>51,819</td>
<td>51,989</td>
<td>53,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parking permits per 1,000 students</td>
<td>396.06</td>
<td>343.76</td>
<td>337.6</td>
<td>281.88</td>
<td>306.44</td>
<td>286.25</td>
<td>243.01</td>
<td>229.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of carpool permits per 1,000 students</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of buses serving campus daily</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Campus Services and Business Operations

**Figure 8: Safety and Security – Per Capita Comparison of York University Incidents, Compared to City of Toronto**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Toronto*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Police 31 Division*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Department of Campus Services and Business Operations
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Section A: Planning
I. Overview and Context

As York evolves into a comprehensive, research-intensive university by implementing the priorities of the University Academic Plan (UAP), it must plan strategically and also remain open to new opportunities. All new initiatives must adhere to one or more of the eight academic priorities set out in the UAP, meet several overarching principles, reflect the needs of society and address York’s aspirations as a progressive university in the 21st century.

An external and internal environmental scan conducted recently identified relevant challenges and opportunities. This discussion paper presents the approach for developing a set of strategic initiatives which (i) represent York’s competitive response to these challenges/opportunities, and (ii) adhere to the criteria listed above. The paper ends with a list of strategic initiatives which can be pursued.

II. The University Academic Plan: Eight Academic Priorities

1. Intensify and Promote Research Culture
2. Enrolment Planning
3. Graduate Education Focus: Higher Proportion of Graduate Enrolments
4. Enhance the Student Experience
5. Focus on Health Research and Education
6. Maintain and Extend York’s Distinctiveness in Community Education, Accessibility and Internationalization
7. Raise York’s Profile
8. Enhance Organizational Effectiveness
III. Some Overarching Principles for Moving Forward

1. Quality: York must continue to strive for excellence in all of our activities. This means competing for the best researchers, best students and best staff. It also means providing the necessary supports to ensure York can achieve its full potential.

2. Full Funding: Full funding of all activities is a fundamental requirement to the successful long-term implementation of any plan. This means York will continue to demand that government recognize the full cost of teaching and research activity through increased operating, capital and start-up funding and indirect costs of research.

3. Build on York's Heritage as a Socially Responsible, International and Interdisciplinary University: This principle is fundamental to the UAP. York must continue to balance new and innovative directions with traditional areas of strength.

4. Strategic Alignment: Major initiatives must be clearly linked to strategic goals, with administrative processes and resource allocations that reinforce these links.

5. Flexibility, Agility and Responsiveness: Strategic initiatives must respond to the needs of our internal and external constituencies and be flexible enough to respond to specific opportunities and threats in the competitive landscape.

IV. Internal and External Environmental Scan

In the fall of 2007, York entered into a formal Environmental Scan process that involved a series of interviews with the University’s senior leadership. This process produced about 1,000 discrete observations regarding the strategic environment within which York University must compete and strive to achieve its strategic goals.

(I) EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

• GTA Demographics
  Significant immigration-based population growth in the GTA (mainly York and Peel Regions), and modest population declines elsewhere in the province will drive dramatic geographical shifts in the demand for university education in the GTA generally, and in York Region in particular. Over the next two decades, there will be pressure for York to expand enrolment, which presents both opportunities and challenges. York must capitalize on one of its greatest resources, York Region, and define a winning strategy for competing in York Region.

• Globalization/Internationalization
  Competition in teaching and research is occurring on a global scale and is intensifying. York University must use major partnerships and act now to establish itself as globally recognized, high-quality university in both teaching and research and must protect its privileged position in York Region.

• Government Decisions & Political Will
  York, like all other universities, requires greater financial resources, yet government funding regimes likely will continue to be inadequate, unstable and increasingly targeted. Building relationships with key individuals inside and outside of government who can shape political will and/or mobilize major partnerships and donations is critical to our success.

• Information & Communication Technology
  New modes and norms of communication are creating a widening communications divide. York must compete by learning to market effectively across the divide, continuously improving its communication with students and becoming a leader in transforming scholarly communications.

(II) INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT

(ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE)

York takes great pride in its commitment to social justice and its sensitivity to global issues. The University exists in the community at large and not in an “ivory tower.” However, there are also many cultural trait dichotomies that exist at York. These traits are held in tension and striking the appropriate balance will be required to successfully achieve our strategic goals. Examples include the balance between deliberation vs. action; academy vs. administration; and labour relations vs. collegial governance.

V. Key Strategic Initiatives

1. Efforts to Intensify and Strategically Expand Research Activity – While York has grown into one of Canada’s largest universities, it is not yet one of Canada’s top research-intensive universities. Recognizing this dichotomy, the UAP sets the intensification and expansion of research as the paramount objective. This will require strategic initiatives that ensure major short-term leaps forward while creating a sustainable, innovative and enhanced research culture in the long-term. Planned initiatives must ensure research intensification across the entire spectrum in the humanities, social sciences, fine arts and professional schools; that we maintain our prominence in areas of historical research strength; that we invest strategically and aggressively into niche areas; and that we diversify our research base and build our reputation through external partnerships with a focus on building clusters in York Region. Investments in research infrastructure and services are needed to create highly competitive recruitment packages to attract world-class scholars in strategic areas to drive forward York’s research performance.
2. Expansion of Programming with a Focus on the Life Sciences and Applied Sciences – By any standard, York University is a very large institution. Future growth must be carefully controlled and contribute to York’s evolution towards becoming a more comprehensive institution. It must be growth on our terms. The University is currently investigating directions of future growth in the life sciences and applied sciences that could lead to the development of a Medical School and/or a new Faculty of Engineering.

3. Restructuring Leading to a New Faculty – Ongoing efforts to create a more comprehensive university. In its current form, the transition from the Faculty of Arts and the Atkinson Faculty of Liberal and Professional Studies to the Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies is an opportunity to create a foundation that will underpin most of the activities for the largest segment of York's students. The transition efforts will relate to almost all of the priority areas in the UAP.

4. Student Experience – Research on the retention and graduation of students shows that students who find support for their learning, receive feedback about their learning and are actively involved in learning are more likely to learn and to remain engaged as students and as alumni. The initiatives at York are designed to provide academic, social and personal support to connect students with their university experience – both inside and outside of the classroom. Examples of initiatives being developed include the revitalization of the college system, which will create smaller communities within the larger York experience and integrate students into campus life through co-curricular programming, and the Research At York (RAY) program that provides students and faculty the opportunity to work together on research projects. A Retention Council jointly chaired by the associate vice-president academic learning initiatives and the manager of student success and retention in Student Community and Leadership Development has been established with associate deans, college masters and academic advisers to identify new programming and support to assist in the retention of students.

5. Community Relations – York University is involved in the community through many programs and initiatives. Current examples include the Human Services Plan Coalition knowledge mobilization initiatives in York Region, the Westview Partnership, which engages students from local schools in both academic and non-academic pursuits and the new York University-TD Community Engagement Centre in the neighbouring Jane-Finch community, which offers a variety of community-university initiatives that enhance student learning and build stronger neighbourhoods. We are working to bring greater focus and visibility to existing programs and to continue building the valuable relationship with our surrounding community.

6. Improving Administrative Procedures and Integrated Resource Planning – Major initiatives to ensure achievement of academic objectives and the successful implementation of the UAP through streamlining current procedures, aligning resources to strategic initiatives, building administrative infrastructure to support planning and creating a culture of accountability and active performance management.
Environmental Scan

York University has conducted a formal Environmental Scan to synthesize and document perceptions of York’s strategy environment – of the context within which strategy decisions are made – as currently held by a cross-section of York’s senior administrators. The goal was to provide a space and opportunity for strategic conversation amongst senior leadership, initiating a set of information gathering and synthesizing activities that over time would generate and support a shared understanding of York’s strategy environment. The Environmental Scan does not constitute University policy.

The Scan: York University’s External Strategy Environment

The synthesis of the views of Scan participants regarding York’s external environment is structured around four broad themes, each representing a set of closely intertwined phenomena that create a sort of “mega-trend” in York’s strategy environment. Although it is uncertain how individual phenomenon will unfold over time, it seems highly probable that each mega-trend will retain its importance as a major force in York’s strategy environment for at least the next decade or more. The four themes are interrelated, yet each is reasonably self-contained and understandable on its own, thereby assisting in the communication of a manageable, useful narrative regarding what is actually a complex external strategy environment. The four themes are:

• Globalization/Internationalization
• GTA Demographics
• Government Decisions and Political Will
• Information & Communication Technology Revolution

GLOBALIZATION/INTERNATIONALIZATION

Globalization is the process and product of increased interaction amongst people, organizations, and governments of different nations. It is a phenomenon characterized by the flow of goods, services, money, people, ideas, and data across national boundaries, and the concomitant erosion of these boundaries. This phenomenon has cultural, environmental, political, economic and human health ramifications for people the world over. The nature and ideological elements of globalization, as well as the distribution of its positive and negative effects, make it a very controversial topic and globalization is a topic of vigorous debate both inside and outside of the academy.

Internationalization is a term that is often used interchangeably with globalization, but also is used, particularly amongst universities, to denote a particular set of actual international relationships. Thus, while globalization is a phenomenon that is occurring across the world in many human endeavors, internationalization involves the specific set of relationships that an individual organization such as a university proposes or is actually engaging in. In this sense, internationalization may be viewed as being both a response and contributor to globalization. York University strives for “ethical internationalization,” which includes building relationships that are informed by a commitment to social justice and equity.

Globalization as defined above is an old, even ancient, phenomenon. What makes today’s form of globalization different from that which occurred in previous decades and centuries is the sheer magnitude of international flows, and the remarkable rate of increase in international interactions. For instance, the last 25 years, in particular, have seen staggering increases in the amount of international investment. Two of the more significant forces driving this surge in foreign investment are the increased hegemony of neo-liberal free market economic ideology, and the ongoing revolution in information and communication technologies (ICT). With the end of the Cold War, developing countries that previously eschewed free market economic models now were pursuing integration with international markets. These newly opened markets provided major investment opportunities. Mature free market economies, meanwhile, were also becoming more open to international investment via the removal of nationally imposed restrictions on foreign investment (direct and portfolio based) and currency trading. These two factors – financial liberalization and the burgeoning of free market economies amongst developing nations – indicate the current dominance of neo-liberal free market ideology and constitute a major driving force of present-day globalization. The sweeping changes to the transactional underpinnings of economic systems brought about by the ICT revolution constitute the other major driving force. ICT advances are dealt with further in a subsequent section.

Present-day globalization, then, is driven by the expansion of neo-liberal free market thinking and by remarkable ICT advances, and is characterized by the erosion of national barriers to the movement of capital, goods, services, technology and data. Other flows, however, are also caught up in the globalization phenomenon, including the movement of cultural, political, and scientific knowledge and ideas, and also the movement of people. In this regard it is the speed and seemingly unstoppable nature of present-day globalization that is causing the greatest upheaval.

Globalization is “inextricably founded on the market system and its logic, and it comes across as irresistibly pervasive, spilling over into all other areas of human life,” bringing with it “rapid changes in social systems and cultures.”

Yet, examples of resistance to globalization are available: Highly divisive debates have arisen regarding the effects of migration on the cultural and economic norms of society in receiving nations, and migration is a common flashpoint in the public debate regarding globalization. In response, numerous governments have acted to maintain, and even strengthen, barriers to international
immigration. Nonetheless, world-wide international migration increased during the 1990’s and 2000’s and migration appears to be an integral component of globalization, with people choosing to migrate based on social, political, health and security, and economic conditions in both their current place of residence and in the intended destination.

Reactions to the fact of globalization are as varied as the effects of the phenomenon. Participants of the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development wrote:

... We recognize that globalization and interdependence are offering new opportunities to trade, investment and capital flows and advances in technology, including information technology, for the growth of the world economy, development and the improvement of living standards around the world. At the same time, there remain serious challenges, including serious financial crises, insecurity, poverty, exclusion and inequality within and among societies... Globalization should be fully inclusive and equitable, and there is a strong need for policies and measures at the national and international levels... to respond effectively to those challenges and opportunities.5

These remarks convey the hope, optimism, trepidation and uncertainty evoked by present-day globalization, and they are a good point of reference at which to turn towards a consideration of what globalization means for York University. As mentioned previously, York University’s set of international activities and interests has been organized under the banner of “internationalization” and as a whole aspires to the achievable ideal of “ethical internationalization.” The critical questions as to just what this ethical internationalization ought to look like and include in the face of globalization continues to receive the active attention of York’s faculty and students. Thus, York University’s strategic response to globalization is encumbered with a dual responsibility: it should serve York’s interests as an organization competing globally for resources, and it ought to embody the ideal of “ethical internationalization.”

Focusing for now on the fact that York University competes globally for limited resources, one may enumerate some of globalization’s implications:

• International immigration is placing significant pressure on many universities. In the case of York University and other GTA universities, immigration-driven population growth is expected to trigger a significant expansion in university enrolments over the next several decades. (See section on GTA demographics.)

• The widespread entrenchment of neo-liberal free market thinking in government and the public consciousness has been an enabler for governments in their attempts to control spending, limit the size of government and encourage competition within the broader public sector (BPS).6 One result of this, in Ontario and Canada as a whole, has been less government funding on a per-student basis and concomitantly inadequate levels of funding to cover university operating costs. (See section on government decisions and political will.)

• Cooperative academic exchanges continue to be an essential mechanism of internationalization, but at the same time competition is intensifying amongst institutions wanting to recruit the best students and faculty from around the world. The market for academics is increasingly global. The corollary of this is that prospective academics are evaluating offers against those from competitor institutions world-wide. Increasingly, being an excellent university means offering a value proposition that is superior to global competitors’ and the consequences of not doing so will include not being able to attract top-tier human resources. This is one element of a globalization-driven process leading to the bipartite tiering of universities. The top tier will include a small number of universities that are recognized as being of superior quality and that are able to attract a disproportionately large share of the best human resources, on a per-student basis, based on this reputation of excellence. Marquee researchers will gravitate towards the top tier institutions. The larger lower tier will include regionally and locally significant institutions that increasingly will need to shift towards business models that emphasize access to education as the core of their value proposition.

• Governments continue to look towards university-industry partnerships as a way to reduce their own funding obligations, to introduce competitive market forces into the university system and to achieve broader provincial and national economic goals. Government research funding increasingly is being targeted towards areas that offer the potential for generating economic advantage, most notably in the natural and applied sciences, and often is contingent on matching funds from the private sector. At the same time, globalized economic systems allow the private sector to invest wherever returns are likely to be highest. Universities compete with each other to access this investment and resources flowing to universities from the private sector are likely to move in ever-greater proportions to those institutions that are deemed – again, relative to global competitors – to offer a winning value proposition as evaluated by private sector funders/partners. This is the other element of the global process of university tiering in which essential resources flow disproportionately to universities that are deemed to be excellent on a global scale. The process is self-reinforcing, and universities that do not achieve a globally recognized level of excellence in research – particularly in the natural and applied sciences, but more generally in fields that offer potential for economic advantage – will find it increasingly difficult to attract resources for their research activities. These universities may be forced to retreat from the idea of being research intensive and focus on non-research based elements of their teaching mandate at a time when the proportion of government funding tagged for research is expanding and funding for operating costs remains inadequate. (See section on government decisions and political will.)

• Foreign institutions are establishing their own teaching centers abroad and are competing directly with local institutions. This is particularly true in disciplines related to sectors of local economies experiencing labour market growth beyond the capacity of local universities to supply skilled workers, but this is not always the case. For example in 2005 Charles Sturt University, located in New South Wales, Australia, opened a campus in Burlington, Ontario, where it is offering a Bachelor of Primary Education Studies. Whether the Ontario labour market...
for teachers was generating demand that could not be met by Ontario universities is doubtful. The existence of Sturt’s operations in Ontario is of concern in its own right and is an indication of the kind of competitive environment that Ontario universities are moving into (with the opportunities and threats that this environment presents, both locally and abroad). Information and communication technology advances are a major enabler of this trend, providing universities with a wide range of program delivery options.

- Heightened competition for students and for targeted government funding, combined with an increasing reliance on tuition revenue to cover operating costs, is leading universities to develop academic programming that is highly attuned to labour market conditions and private sector needs. Part of this trend is a response to the learning needs of prospective students who are faced with labour markets that are more open, international and competitive than in the past. The international movement of skilled workers is greater now than at any other time, the international movement of work (e.g. off-shoring) is a real option for many firms, and the standards, regulations and practices governing work itself - whether in finance, engineering, media, manufacturing, etc. - are also becoming internationalized. Prospective students are still looking to universities for a high quality liberal arts education, but given the competitive globalized labour markets, it seems that many students also want this education to be explicitly linked to their career goals and to provide highly marketable skills that will allow them immediate entry into the career path of their choice.

- Competition for students and faculty, government funding and private sector investment is driving universities as organizations towards full engagement in the logic of free-market competition. As competition from other institutions increases, the necessity of viewing "opportunity" as meaning "opportunity to compete in the marketplace" also increases; universities are not immune to the seemingly irresistible pull of globalization.

While universities have always been international in outlook and practice, often they also are instruments of the state, being funded and regulated by the state as a means of achieving various government objectives. Regarding this relationship, Roger King notes that there are several open, looming questions:

Will globalization make universities even more the instruments of the nation state, as part of the aim by governments to generate comparative economic advantage in an integrated, knowledge-based world economy – or will globalization and the attendant commercialization and corporatization of universities lead them . . . to float away from the social and economic purposes, and grip, of the nation state, to pursue their own corporate, increasingly multinational interests? And what will happen to those universities that remain behind? Will some universities be state-driven and others globally-driven and how will governmental policymakers react to the prospect of such a fracturing? And, relationally, are states becoming hands-off enablers . . . in the face of globalization . . . or, conversely, are they likely to become even more directive through the use of increasingly interventionist forms of regulation?

These open questions will remain germane to York University’s ongoing strategizing in the face of globalization. They also hint at the kind of bipartite tiering of universities that was discussed previously. Early indications suggest that the Ontario university system may become more fractured (perhaps even at the hand of government), with a level of intrusion into the Ontario market by foreign institutions. At the same time government intervention via regulation and targeted funding arrangements is expected to continue and even increase. (See section on government decisions and political will.) Whatever the future may hold, globalization is occurring now, as are the contests that will determine which universities will operate in the top tier, attracting sufficient resources to maintain their status amongst those that are seen to offer a value proposition based on world-class excellence in teaching in research.

**GTA DEMOGRAPHICS**

Globalization and international migration patterns are having profound effects on the demographic, social and economic fabric of Ontario and the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). By 2031, Ontario’s total population is projected to grow by about 3.6 million people, with the age 18 to 21 segment of the population growing by about 46,000 over 2007 levels. In fact, Ontario is the only province in which the age 18 to 21 year old population segment is expected to be larger for most of the next two decades compared to current levels. Within Ontario the largest population increases will occur in the GTA. Indeed, by the year 2031, the age 18 to 21 population in the GTA is expected to grow by about 69,000 individuals over 2007 levels, suggesting a decline of about 23,000 across the rest of the Province. Furthermore, inside the GTA about 70 per cent of the growth in the age 18 to 21 population is projected to occur in York and Peel Regions. Overall population growth in York and Peel Regions is projected to be 1.3 million people over the same period. This growth will be driven by international immigration, particularly a continuing influx of economic immigrants.

The pressure this population growth places on the Ontario university system is exacerbated by rising university participation rates. Undergraduate university participation rates in Ontario climbed 7 per cent over the last decade, from about 22 per cent in 1997-1998 to 29 per cent in 2006-2007 (for the 18 to 21 years of age cohort). If participation rates continue to climb at an average of 0.7 per cent per year, Ontario will need to contend with an additional 125,000 undergraduate students by the year 2020, which is a 35 per cent increase over 2004-2005 levels. Even if participation rates climb half as quickly, at an average of 0.35 per cent per year, by 2020 there will be an additional 78,000 undergraduate enrolments in the Ontario university system, which represents a 22 per cent increase over 2004-2005. The GTA will be the primary source of these additional students. In fact, province-wide enrolment growth estimates include the enrolment reductions due to population declines in the rest of the province. Thus, GTA-specific enrolment pressures will be even more acute than the above projections suggest, perhaps reaching 82,000 additional students attending GTA institutions by 2021.
So far this discussion has assumed constant participation rates across Ontario, but there are likely to be regional differences in the forces that drive university participation. Many of these forces are tied to the social and economic dimensions of regional demographic shifts. Of particular importance in the context of population growth in Ontario vis-à-vis the GTA are the following:

- Urban youth are more than twice as likely to attend university compared to their rural counterparts. Projected population growth in Ontario is essentially an urban phenomenon; its rural counterpart being population decline. Thus, overall province-wide participation rates ought to increase as a result of these projected regional demographic changes.

- Youth who have at least one parent holding some form of university education experience are almost twice as likely to attend university compared to those whose parents completed only high school. Fifty per cent of adults who recently immigrated to Canada hold a university degree. This compares to the national average of 21 per cent of adults between the ages of 45 and 54 and 26 per cent of adults between the ages of 35 and 44. This differential, combined with the parental influences noted above, suggests that the projected immigration-based population growth over the next several decades will lead to further increases in GTA participation rates.

- Most recent immigrant families, even those in which one or more adults have a university degree, remain in a low-income bracket for at least the first decade of their new lives in Canada. Youth from these families may be encouraged by their parents to attend university, but they must do so within the context of their families’ limited economic resources. University students from lower income families live at home and commute to university more often than students from higher income families. Recent data showed 70 per cent of recent immigrant undergraduate applicants residing in the GTA selected a GTA university as their first choice compared to 55 per cent of their non-recent immigrant counterparts. Furthermore, 7 per cent of recent immigrant applicants residing in the GTA applied only to non-GTA universities, compared to 22 per cent of their non-recent immigrant counterparts. As the recent immigrant proportion of 18 to 21 year olds increases, average family income levels are likely to decrease and it is reasonable to suggest that over the next several decades a larger proportion of university students from the GTA will elect to attend a GTA university. There are other reasons why students from recent immigrant families might elect to remain in the GTA for their university education, including the fact the social networks and community ties that they heavily rely upon might be restricted to the GTA and their familiarity with regions other than the GTA might be relatively limited.

- Currently, 55 per cent of university students from the GTA attend a GTA university, whereas over 90 per cent of non-GTA students attend non-GTA universities. Even if the ratio of GTA students attending GTA universities does not increase in the coming decades, there will be little opportunity for GTA universities to offset increased demand via reductions in their enrolments generated outside the GTA, since very few non-GTA students attend GTA universities to begin with. A successful response to the demographic shifts projected for Ontario must involve creating more university enrolment capacity within the GTA.

- Research indicates that there is a strong correlation between family income and university participation, and this may serve to reduce university demand generated in the GTA, given the lower income status of most recent immigrant families. On the other hand, a recent study concluded that finances are only one factor that explains the participation gap between students from lower-income versus higher-income backgrounds. Other factors such as standardized test scores in reading at age 15, school grades achieved at age 15, high school quality, and parental influence were also strongly correlated with participation. Academic achievement and parental influences amongst recent economic immigrants may differ substantially from those historically noted amongst low-income families (e.g. due to higher levels of parental university experience) and this may serve to mitigate, perhaps even override, the effect of lower incomes as a barrier to university education.

Other important forces driving university participation rates include: affordability (tuition and other costs, financial assistance), labour market conditions (short-term employment alternatives to entering university, post-degree employment opportunities), long-term returns-on-investment in university education, capacity and recruiting activities at undergraduate and graduate degree levels. Of these, labour market conditions and long-term returns-on-investment are likely to support enrolment levels over the next several decades that are at least as high as current levels. Affordability, capacity and recruitment activity are all largely controlled by government and university decisions. All of these other driving forces will be experienced more or less similarly by 18 to 21 year olds across Ontario; none hold major GTA-specific implications that are discernable at this point in time.

Of course, demographics will drive more than university participation rates and enrolment. It will also fuel groundswells of social, economic and political change across the GTA. Major challenges such as providing newcomers with adequate social services and meaningful entrance to the economic and political spheres of society must be addressed in order for the GTA to thrive and prosper in the coming decades. The business opportunities that will attend the influx of new residents to the GTA will also be considerable. In short, the GTA, and York Region in particular, will undergo a transformation. York University, as the university of York Region, has an opportunity to lead the way towards an enlightened transformation of the society it is a part of and serves.

York University has many options available to it as it formulates its response to changing GTA demographics. Yet regardless of the approach taken, it is important to note that York University draws heavily from the pool of students living in York Region and north Peel Region, which are the very areas in which the majority of GTA population growth amongst 18 to 21 year olds is projected to occur over the next several decades. These regions are York University’s primary geographical market areas and indeed they are one of York’s greatest assets. Gone are the days during which York University was an isolated campus somewhere north of the city. Over the last number of years, York University has found itself near the center of growth in the GTA, and and in the future will reside at the epicenter of the tremendous economic, social, political and even environmental groundswells that are certain to come in the wake of major demographic change.
Although the Internet and social media have emerged as global forces in the second half of the 20th century – often called the ICT revolution. One recent analysis concludes that it is is often reported that during this period the processing power of the latest microprocessors has doubled every 6 months. This period has also seen huge increases in the capacity of storage media and data transmission infrastructure such as fiber optics. Dovetailed with these hardware developments are the many software innovations that have occurred during the last 20 years. These ICT advances have led to precipitous declines in the total cost of managing and transmitting data in digital form and, when coupled with the sweeping social and economic changes associated with these developments, have engendered what is referred to as the ICT revolution. One recent analysis concludes that it is unlikely that there will be any abatement of this revolution over the next 15 years.

In large measure the story of the ICT revolution is the story of globalization, since ICT advances have been a critical driving force of globalization over the last two decades, driving down the costs of communication and enabling sweeping changes to the transactional underpinnings of economies. Yet, the revolution is manifesting itself in other ways as well, including the creation of substantial communication divides. Although the Internet certainly existed 20 years ago, virtually no one outside of research and military organizations knew of it or used it. In 1989 the World Wide Web was an idea only and email usage, even within universities, was not yet common. Today, instant messaging, social networking and other ICT enabled modes of communication such as wikis and blogs have joined email and become standard issue in the lives of millions of people throughout the world. Most members of “Generation Y” – those born in the 1980’s and early 1990’s – have embraced these new modes of communication and woven them into the fabric of their daily lives, creating for themselves new norms of communication in the process. Individuals born after about 1994 – often called the Internet Generation – have no experience of a world without the Web or the wider ICT revolution with its constant stream of new modes of communication. Older generations, on the other hand, have had to adapt and adjust to these new modes of communication, by altering pre-existing norms of communication while also introducing a limited set of new norms.

Today’s university students (mostly members of Generation Y and soon the Internet Generation) employ modes and, perhaps more importantly, norms of communication that are considerably different than those in use by many university faculty and staff. At the time of writing, online social networking is the most significant example of this communications divide, for several reasons. First, huge numbers of younger people employ social networking via sites such as Facebook as an essential mode of communication. Second, social networking, when embraced fully as a mode of communication, appears to support norms of communication that are very different in form and effect from those supported by say, the telephone, email, or even instant messaging. Third, social networking is a mode of communication that may be utilized at many life-stages and at various levels of intensity since it does not demand synchronous participation (unlike other modes such as instant messaging). Social networking therefore is a mode of communication that has the potential to travel with younger people as they progress from high school to university and beyond.

New modes of communication are also presented by networked gaming environments such as World of Warcraft and virtual environments such as Second Life. These modes, while currently employed by far fewer individuals compared to social networking, are significant in that they present a highly mediated form of interaction between participants. People who have not immersed themselves in these virtual worlds often comment that they do not “get it.” In other words, the underlying value and authenticity of such highly mediated modes of communication escapes them; they do not or can not make room for the norms of communication that go along with such highly mediated modes of communication. These kinds of profound differences in accepted norms of communication form the basis of the communications divide that is being fuelled by the ICT revolution. Universities must grapple with the reality of this divide and work to discover the opportunities and threats presented by it; responses to the existence of the divide will surely form an important part of the struggle for competitive advantage amongst universities.

Libraries are major players in this regard and are responding in numerous ways, including finding ways to provide library resources and services through highly mediated virtual environments, creating high-tech learning commons, digitizing and archiving entire collections, and developing new knowledge search tools. A recent article in University Affairs notes that “students are still coming to the library in droves” but they expect new kinds of services from libraries. The ways they interact with information sources and the social norms associated with library usage are changing. The article continues:

A new class of librarians is emerging: forward-thinking men and women, attuned to the revolutionary trends affecting academic libraries, are leading the charge for change. These tech-savvy librarians are plugged into the needs of a new generation and adapting their services to keep libraries relevant and valuable. “We can’t expect to be successful only by doing the same things that we’ve been doing for 35, 40, 50 years,” (says McMaster University Librarian Mr. Trzeciak). “In order to be successful, we have to do things differently. We have to be innovative. We have to take risks.”
Following this logic, libraries will be at the vanguard of competition amongst universities in the years ahead. They won’t be alone. Whether the concern is with effective marketing, the provision of student services, or ICT-enabled pedagogies in the classroom, universities will distinguish themselves, and thus compete amongst each other, based on their ability to bridge the communications divide. To compete, universities must develop and maintain an up-to-date, deep understanding of new modes and (perhaps more importantly) new norms of communication brought about by the ICT revolution, and accurately gauge the full range of competitive opportunities and threats that they present.

There is another significant ICT-driven communications divide in the academy: broadly speaking, a disconnect exists between those who fully embrace new, ICT-enabled modes of scholarly communication – and who desire the wide-spread adoption of norms of scholarly communication that are friendly to these new modes – and those who do not. The fact is that significant changes in scholarly communication are now occurring (e.g. open-access electronic journals and books, virtual research communities, thematic research collections, digital archives, semantic web searching, knowledge mapping) and universities that embrace the full potential of these changes will have a competitive advantage over those who do not. And as dramatic as today’s developments appear, they pale in comparison to the full implications of these shifts, which will reach far into the heart of academe. “By seamlessly linking data, knowledge, and scholars, the emerging research environment promises to stimulate and accelerate discovery... The new digital scholarship gives scholars the potential to collaborate in dynamic new ways:

• It facilitates interdisciplinary approaches to complex questions by breaking down information silos.

• It enables researchers located across multiple time zones to easily share information and work effectively as teams.

• It allows the rapid development of new or ad hoc communities of scholars to respond to pressing questions and challenges.”

Universities’ attempts to compete globally and gain and maintain status as world-class teaching and research institutions will be aided, or thwarted, by their readiness and capacity to capitalize upon new modes and norms of scholarly communication. To gain competitive advantage in this arena, a university must place itself at the forefront of the deployment of new modes of scholarly communication and eliminate any scholarly communications divides that may exist. And here again, libraries will play a crucial role in the ability of a university to gain competitive advantage. Creative, tech-savvy, forward-thinking librarians – knowledgeable about the curating and communication of knowledge in the Internet Age – will become indispensable, active participants in the teaching and research programs of faculty across the university.

GOVERNMENT DECISIONS AND POLITICAL WILL

At first blush it may seem strange that “government funding” was not selected as one of the four broad themes describing York’s external strategy environment. After all, government grants and contracts are the largest income source for Canadian publicly supported universities, accounting for about 54 per cent of total revenues in 2002-2003. These grants and contracts comprised about 57 per cent of all operating funds (with another 35 per cent coming from tuition revenue and fully 70 per cent of capital funds). In short, publicly supported Canadian universities are, by design, dependant upon government funding regimes and at no point in the foreseeable future will institutions be immune from the effects of these regimes and their dynamics.

Yet, in spite of the fact that government funding regimes shape the terms of university finances and thus of what is possible for universities to accomplish, focusing squarely on government funding regimes as an external theme seems ill-advised for the simple reason that every scan participant expressed the opinion that the current regimes contain profound inadequacies that are likely to remain intact over the temporal scope specified for this environmental scan. It is recognized that specific elements of the regimes undoubtedly will evolve over the short and medium terms, but it is believed that the dynamics of the deeper issues plaguing the regimes – grossly inadequate funding levels, lack of stability, and increasing interventionism – are much more long-term in nature and will effectively form more-or-less static background conditions in York’s external strategy environment over the next half decade. These conditions are linked to the widespread entrenchment of neo-liberal free market thinking in government (also one of the key forces driving globalization), including deeply held commitments to the ideals of fiscal restraint, smaller government, competition in the broader public sector and performance management, as well as an abiding concern for economic and labour market outcomes.

To thrive and achieve its own strategic goals over the next decade, York University must adapt to a world in which government funding is targeted towards government objectives, with these objectives relating primarily (although not exclusively) to economic and labour market goals. Additionally, York must develop alternative, non-governmental revenue streams in order to recoup operating costs not covered by operating funds while simultaneously lessening the degree to which the University is beholden to government. While universities may reasonably concern themselves with attempts to foretell the precise nature of government funding decisions made over this time period, such forecasting activities are essentially reactive in nature; they help universities plan within the context of profound funding inadequacies (admittedly an important task) but do not provide guidance as to how a university might modify this context and redesign its relationship with government.

Actively modifying York University’s government funding context is a difficult objective and requires a focus on those environmental forces that drive funding regimes as opposed to a focus on the regimes as drivers of university finances. Accordingly, “government decisions and political will” is the final broad theme being used to describe York’s external strategy environment.

The key to unlocking additional government funding in the future will be to identify nascent government priorities and then develop meaningful responses to those priorities. If a single response can address multiple priorities, so much the better. This kind of approach is grounded in the idea that government decisions are
The interplay between deliberation and action find their full potential in the presence of powerful constitutencies and is further shaped by public perception and the political world-view held by governments of the day. The political world-view of government constrains the kinds of responses that are deemed acceptable by government and also operate as a pre-filter on the incoming messages (lobbying) being received from constituencies, in essence helping determine who gets to be a powerful constituent with the ear of government. Identifying nascent government priorities is thus an exercise in identifying which constituencies are – or are becoming – powerful and tracking issues that are important to those constituencies. Of those issues, some will be of sufficient complexity/breadth/depth and longevity to warrant developing proposals for government funding. Meaningful responses, therefore, are ones that solve government’s problem of having to address the concerns of powerful constituencies, and that do so in ways that are acceptable given government’s political world-view.

All of this means that York University must be finely attuned to the dynamics of politics and public opinion, and be highly astute in the content and timing of major funding proposals delivered to government, such that funding proposals reside at the intersection of the University’s own strategic goals and government’s agenda. Developing and maintaining meaningful relationships with influential individuals inside and outside of government is essential to the success of such undertakings.

The point warrants emphasis that York ought to include in its political calculus an accounting of its own core values, interests and strategic goals, and only develop proposals that are in keeping with them. The focal issue of a proposal might be diabetes prevention, disaster management, green technologies for environmentally sustainable communities, poverty reduction, artistic community development, or any one of a number of other issues. Whatever the proposals for funding might be, they must emphasize meaningful, direct linkages between the University and the communities and society it serves. Furthermore, the University must develop the means to communicate effectively the full social return on investment in York, both in the whole and in relation to specific funding proposals.

Diversifying the portfolio of non-governmental revenue streams will necessitate following a similar path: York must focus outward on the issues and needs that are important to potential partners and funding constituents, must develop meaningful relationships with influential individuals within these external groups, and must develop proposals that are mutually advantageous.

The Scan: York University’s Internal Strategy Environment

The Environmental Scan project was designed to focus primarily on York University’s external environment, participants nevertheless offered numerous observations regarding the University’s internal environment. (Forces operating within the University’s internal environment are, by definition, under York’s influence, if not outright control.) These observations generally fell into one of two camps: Some dealt with aspects of the University’s organization culture as it currently is, and others dealt with cultural aspects that ought to exist in order for York to best achieve its strategic goals. The desired characteristics can be thought of as forming part of an “operational model,” a conceptualization of the kind of organization York ought to be in order to operate at a maximum level of functionality.

CURRENT ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

York University’s current organization culture, like that of many universities, reflects in its complexity the many interests and perspectives that find a supportive home within the institution. This complexity may be usefully distilled and communicated via a set of trait dichotomies, each of which references cultural forces that are held in tension, exhibiting an ebb and flow in their relationship over time.

• Deliberation/Action: The interplay between deliberation and action is one of the defining characteristics of university life and is essential to universities’ role as social forces of enlightenment and transformation. The lives of humans benefit from enlightenment when deliberated upon – openly, rationally and fully. Universities provide space for and encourage this kind of self-aware reflection and debate. On the other hand, transformation requires that decisions are made and actions taken. Both deliberation and action find their full potential in the presence of the other. The challenge for any university is to manage the tension between deliberation and action to the maximum advantage of the university itself and the society it serves. Achieving this maximum advantage is more difficult – and more critical – during times of limited resources, uncertainty and change. Indeed, remaining open to organizational change in the pursuit of academic excellence must underlie the relationship between deliberation and action at York University.

• Aside from the essential tension between deliberation and action, York University’s organizational culture is characterized by other trait dichotomies that each play a role in the way the University operates. These include the tensions between central versus distributed responsibility; academic versus non-academic administration; outward versus inward focus; pure versus applied scholarship; research versus teaching; labour relations versus collegial governance; and stasis versus dynamism. Each of these dichotomies involves the interplay of various values, interests and goals, and while it is important to recognize the legitimacy and value of these dichotomies, York nevertheless must be able to manage their ebb and flow so that their dynamics do not at any point overwhelm the institution.

OPERATIONAL MODEL

An operational model is a high-level conceptualization of organizational behaviour, expressing in general terms the principles and practices by which an organization operates in order to achieve its goals. While the practices side of an operational model was not widely touched upon during the environmental scan interviews, several general principles of organizational behaviour did emerge:

• Outward-facing (responsiveness): York’s external strategy environment demands that the University redouble its efforts to recognize, understand and attend to the needs of its external
constituencies. Priority should be given to strategic initiatives that are crafted to respond to these needs. York must excel at evaluating the full social return on investment in its research and teaching activities and learn to communicate these outcomes to external constituencies.

• Forward-looking (strategic alignment): Major institutional initiatives undertaken by York University must clearly and strongly link to its strategic goals. Administrative processes should be implemented to reinforce and maintain these links.

• Engaging: York University is a large, complex organization. The potential to feel lost in the shuffle and to lose sight of one’s role, impact, and/or place within the organization is very real. This is true of students, staff and even faculty. Yet at the same time, achieving excellence on the global stage demands the full engagement of all members of the University community. The University must foster a sense of collegiality and common purpose, and create conditions in which all community members feel that they are authentically sharing their knowledge and skills.

• Agile: the creativity and energy of York’s academic community must be supported by innovative and adaptable administrative and organizational structures.

END NOTES

1. For more information regarding internationalization at York, go to http://international.yorku.ca/about/internat.htm. A somewhat dated but broad discussion of internationalization at Canadian universities is provided in A New World of Knowledge: Canadian Universities and Globalization, edited by Sheryl Bond and Jean-Pierre Lemasson, IDRC 1999.
3. http://www.globalization101.org was used as a source of additional information to expand upon the comments made by Scan participants regarding globalization. www.globalization101.org is a project sponsored by the Neil D. Levin Graduate Institute of International Relations and Commerce (SUNY) and previously by the Carnegie Endowment.
13. Ibid.
22. Life Online: Teens and Technology and the World to Come, by L. Rainie, speech to the Annual Conference of the Public Library Association, March 2006.
28. Ibid.
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A Note of Thanks to the Community

I want to thank the entire York community for the tremendous spirit of generosity and openness which has characterized the White Paper process. When we began this exercise in the fall of 2009, we knew that it could not succeed unless we were able to engage the community in a genuine dialogue about the future directions for this great institution over the next decade. The response we have received exceeded all of our hopes and expectations, beginning with the efforts of the Green Paper Working Groups (who drafted the Green Papers that formed the building blocks for the White Paper), the contributions of the hundreds of faculty, students and staff who attended one of the academic planning forums in the fall or winter, and the hundreds of others who shared their views and perspectives with us through their Faculty Councils or via email.

Of course, it has not been possible to capture every perspective or to respond to every concern that we heard through the process. At the same time, throughout the consultations there was a remarkable degree of convergence around a number of key priorities and themes. The White Paper seeks to capture those priorities and objectives that reflect the broad consensus among the hundreds of our members who offered input during the consultations.

The White Paper consists of two distinct but related documents: the White Paper Overview [reprinted below] and the White Paper Companion [available on the Provost’s Web site at www.yorku.ca/vpaweb/whitepaper]. The Overview sets forth the general themes, goals and initiatives that have emerged from this process, and identifies a number of key benchmarks. The White Paper Companion elaborates on the ideas in the Overview and explains in detail how we propose to advance our overarching goal of enhancing academic quality at York University over the next decade. The documents should be read together and form an integrated whole.

I would in particular like to acknowledge and thank the extraordinary efforts and contributions of the Green Paper Working Groups, as well as the members of the Office of the Vice President Academic and Provost, who contributed various sections and/or editing of these two documents. The White Paper would not have been possible without their dedication, commitment, teamwork and support.

Patrick Monahan
Vice President Academic and Provost
April 2010

WHY A WHITE PAPER?

York University’s President, Mamdouh Shoukri, initiated the White Paper planning process in the summer of 2009 for a number of distinct but inter-related reasons. First, it had been a decade since the University had engaged in a similar, long-range strategic planning exercise. Given the many changes in the post-secondary environment over the past 10 years, the increasing acceleration of the pace of change within the sector, and the prospect that government funding would be even more constrained in the future following the financial crisis of 2008-09, the time was right to chart an overall strategic framework and direction for the University over the medium to longer-term.

Second, over the past number of years, the need for closer linkages between academic priorities and resource allocation within the University had become apparent. The failure to explicitly and directly link these two planning processes had limited our ability to achieve substantial progress on some of our academic priorities. It was for this reason that Vice President Finance and Administration Brewer established the Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) framework in July 2007. However, despite significant progress made with IRP within Divisions, Faculties and units, the lack of a long term, institutional level strategic plan impeded the University’s ability to align academic and resource planning effectively.

The White Paper process is intended to fill this important gap. The White Paper will provide the foundational document needed to structure and align resource allocation decisions across the University in accordance with overall academic goals. Also significant is the positive contribution that the White Paper can make to the academic planning process. As an institutional-level document, the White Paper necessarily does not address Faculty and program level planning, but it can provide a sense of the overall strategic direction and a framework for the next decade that will better position the University to develop consensus on the next University Academic Plan (UAP) and to articulate the key academic priorities for York in the next five years.

The response of the York community to this process has been overwhelmingly positive and encouraging. Through the initial “Green Paper” phase in the process in the fall of 2009, leading to the release of a draft White Paper in early February of this year, hundreds of colleagues from all Faculties and units across the University, as well as numerous student representatives and staff members, have been directly involved in the drafting of this document. The comments received through the final consultation phase since the release of the draft White Paper in February have confirmed broad support amongst all parts of the community for the overall framework and direction of the White Paper, as well as a high degree of consensus for specific areas where amendments
or additions to the draft document were needed. Accordingly, we put forward this revised version in the hope and expectation that it accurately reflects what we heard from the community and will merit endorsement by our Senate colleagues.

CONTEXT FOR THE WHITE PAPER

Recognizing the need for an evidence-based approach to planning, early in the process the provost commissioned independent research on the University’s reputation from a market-research firm, Strategic Counsel. Strategic Counsel undertook two research projects, the first involving a survey of current students, of students who were offered admission at York but who did not accept, and of students who did not apply to York but who did apply to other GTA universities. This survey was designed to identify both positive and negative perceptions held by students studying or contemplating study at the University, with a view to identifying strategies or initiatives that would improve the student experience at York, and/or improve the reputation of the University amongst current and prospective students.

In addition to this quantitative analysis of student perceptions, Strategic Counsel undertook a number of one-on-one interviews with key leaders within the University community, as well as with knowledgeable observers outside York. These interviews were intended to elicit an understanding of current perceptions of York both on our campuses and in the broader community, along with the identification of steps that could be taken to further enhance our reputation in the future.

The University’s Office of Institutional Research and Analysis initiated an environmental scan of trends and developments both internal and external to the University. Reviewing the events of the past decade, a key development has been the tremendous enrolment growth at York in both undergraduate and graduate programs. Yet the University, along with other post-secondary institutions, will likely face pressure to grow even more in the future. Demographic projections suggest a continuing increase in demand for additional university spaces over the next decade, particularly in the GTA.

We cannot simply take it for granted that this overall increase in system demand will necessarily result in increased demand for York University programs. The strike of 2008-09 had a significant negative impact on our share of ‘first-choice’ applicants from secondary school and, while there has been a recovery in the current application process for September 2010 admission, we have not yet made up the ground that was lost last year. It will therefore be essential that we continue to focus efforts on building our reputation, and ensure that we continue to update current programs and introduce programs that meet evolving student and societal needs. To the extent that these efforts are successful and we do experience increased student demand over the course of this decade, we will have the opportunity to be more selective in our admissions process, enhance the academic qualifications of our students and promote greater student retention. Moreover, to the extent that we do wish to contemplate further enrolment growth, an increase in student demand will provide us with the opportunity to grow in areas of strategic priority.

The necessity for constant re-examination of what we do and how we can do it better is reinforced by the changing nature of the student population. Universities are now seeing the first wave of the so-called Millennial generation, those born after 1990 who have no experience of a world without the Web or the wider ICT revolution. The Millennials expect to communicate and interact in virtual as well as real time; indeed, the boundary between real and virtual environments is blurred as heavily mediated modes of communication become more prevalent and easily accessed. The traditional pedagogical methods of the 19th and 20th centuries will need to be adapted to meet the needs and expectations of this cohort of students, through better and more effective use of new technology to improve learning outcomes and student satisfaction.

We expect pressures on public finances to increase over the next decade as the provincial and federal governments attempt to cope with large fiscal deficits resulting from the recent financial crisis. Despite these fiscal pressures, governments still recognize the critical role that post-secondary education must play in providing the necessary foundation for a knowledge-based society. Indeed, the Ontario government’s recent Speech From the Throne set forth the Open Ontario Plan, a key element of which is additional investments in post-secondary education by increasing student spaces, promoting online learning through a new Ontario Online Institute, and increasing international student enrolment in Ontario by 50 per cent. As is apparent below, there is a high degree of convergence between these government priorities and the priorities of the York community.

BUILDING ON STRENGTH

In forward-looking documents of this kind, it is important not to lose sight of the many existing strengths of York University, and the importance of protecting and building on those strengths in the years ahead. We have nationally and internationally recognized Faculties, departments and programs right across the University on both the Keele and Glendon campuses. The humanities and social sciences have traditionally predominated and many of our programs in these areas are well-known and highly regarded. Over the years we have also gained a reputation for leadership in the fine arts, environmental studies, and professional education (law, business, and education). Many individual faculty colleagues have attained international pre-eminence in their fields through recognition such as membership in the Royal Society of Canada, appointment as Canada Research Chairs or Distinguished Research Professors, or through receipt of peer-reviewed honours or awards. York has been widely recognized for our interdisciplinary approach to research and to teaching and learning at the undergraduate and graduate levels; we have a long tradition of engagement with the community and a commitment to equity and social justice; our emphasis on internationalization has been recognized as innovative; we are a Canadian leader in the delivery of bilingual education through our distinctive Glendon College campus; and we have a developing reputation as a leader in sustainability.
It should also be recognized that the University has made considerable progress towards our long-standing goal of becoming a more comprehensive university. In 2006 the University established the Faculty of Health, which encompasses innovative teaching and research programs in health studies and the health sciences. Over the past decade, York has also expanded and strengthened our reputation in business and professional education, with the Schuleich School of Business having established a reputation as one of the world’s leading business schools and the development of significant business and professional programs in the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies. The Osogood Hall Law School has also been consistently ranked as one of the top Canadian law schools, recognized for its outstanding faculty, a commitment to achieving justice through law, and an innovative approach to legal education that combines theoretical and practical perspectives.

This is not to suggest that there is not further work still to be done in terms of becoming a more comprehensive university. For example, over the past decade, enrolments and associated faculty complement in the sciences have grown, and we now offer a much broader range of high quality programs in the basic sciences and other science-related areas, including a small School of Engineering. Nevertheless, in part because of the impact of the double cohort, enrolments across the University, and particularly in the humanities and social sciences, have also grown, such that the proportion of enrolments in the sciences remains small when compared to other universities of our size. Moreover, we have particular interests in achieving our long recognized ambition of creating a medical school and possibly a free-standing Faculty of Engineering.

It is, nevertheless, important to acknowledge and celebrate the growing presence and reputation we have established in areas that have not always been seen as areas of strength or priority at York.

THREE QUESTIONS: WHAT? HOW? HOW DO WE KNOW?

The White Paper is intended to ask and answer the following three fundamental questions:

1. **What**: What are our goals and what do we want to achieve over the next decade?

2. **How**: What are the strategies and initiatives that we must pursue in order to achieve those goals? and

3. **How do we know**: What are the measures and outcomes that we would expect to track or observe, so that we can measure our progress towards our goals and ensure that we remain on track over the next decade?

**a. What**: The Pursuit of Academic Quality

The current UAP identifies the pursuit of academic quality as the University’s highest academic objective, and there was broad consensus within the community that this must remain our overarching goal. There was also agreement that, in assessing quality, it is important to look to outcomes or outputs in addition to inputs or process-based variables; this emphasis has been reflected in the process of definition of learning outcomes for our undergraduate and graduate programs.

In the context of teaching and learning, there is increasing recognition of the fact that a quality postsecondary education is one that prepares students for success in life. As Jamie Merisotis, President of the Lumina Foundation for Education, recently argued, higher education should be directed at providing students with the knowledge and skills they need to thrive, both as citizens in a democratic society and workers in the 21st century global knowledge society. In striving to enhance the quality of teaching and learning at York, we need to focus on and better understand what it is that our students need to succeed in their lives and careers, and be able to demonstrate the acquisition by our students of these competencies through a York education.

In the context of research, quality is fundamentally driven through the peer review process. In the contemporary context, research of the highest quality has a tangible connection to the search for solutions to pressing social, economic, political and cultural issues. Research reputation and performance is built through measures that include externally-funded research, the dissemination of peer reviewed work, and the development of pan-university research collaborations, and connections and partnerships with research networks across and beyond the university sector. At the same time, it is incumbent upon us to promote the value and impact of research and creative activity across the range of disciplines we encompass, including those not captured by traditional measures.

**b. How**: Through Becoming a more Engaged University

The pursuit of academic quality through becoming a more engaged university has resonated strongly with many members of the community throughout the White Paper process. In part this reflects York’s long-established commitment to community engagement, as demonstrated by the recent report of the President’s Task Force on Community Engagement (the “Task Force”). As the Task Force Report notes, York is proud of its history as a socially responsible university with strong connections with community partners across all sectors of research, teaching/learning and service initiatives. We also have a long history of leadership in engagement with international partners.

The concept of engagement has been gaining increasing acceptance in higher education across North America. In this context, ‘engagement’ has been defined in terms of collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional, national and global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The concept of engagement has featured prominently in our previous academic plans. For example, the current UAP recommends that in both teaching and learning and research, the University should expand its efforts to partner with communities through Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) and other joint research projects; develop internship, co-op and practicum programs; implement Prior Learning Assessment; and seek and support innovative initiatives that further university-community partnerships, and acknowledge and integrate into curriculum learning acquired outside the classroom. Capitalizing on and expanding these opportunities is desirable given the fit with the University’s mission and values.
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But through the White Paper consultation process here at York, it has been emphasized that engagement should be seen as encompassing not just relationships between York and the broader community; engagement is also a vehicle to strengthen relationships and connections on campus. For example, there is a clear and well-established link between engagement and student learning. Indeed, the widely used National Survey of Student Engagement is organized around the theme of engagement, recognizing that students learn best when they are actively engaged in the learning process. The Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey provides similar results. What is also becoming more widely understood is that engaged students are better able to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in a knowledge society which (as discussed above) is increasingly seen as the hallmark of a quality university experience. The current UAP notes that, as a large university with a large population of students who commute daily, York faces a special challenge in engaging students and multiplying their opportunities to engage faculty and their peers in learning and co-curriculum situations.

We also believe that a commitment to engagement will enhance the quality of the research, and the contribution to knowledge, that is an essential part of the mission of a modern research intensive university such as York. Universities are increasingly being seen as key drivers of economic and social innovation. Governments, business and the public are looking to universities to provide the critical thinkers and the cutting-edge research that is essential to a knowledge-based society. Modern universities are now understood as having an obligation to contribute to the search for solutions to pressing social issues. For York, such a commitment comes naturally, since it has been part of our mission and heritage from the creation of the University.

c. How do we know?: Benchmarks for priority areas

Papers of this kind are of no real value if they are not accompanied by consistent efforts to measure progress towards the goals identified. Thus it is essential that we develop benchmarks or measures that will enable us to track our progress over the next decade. As is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8 of the White Paper Companion document, the development of such benchmarks is not a simple or straightforward matter and will require further and ongoing collegial discussion, analysis and refinement. The Senate APPR Committee should take the lead in ensuring that such collegial discussion does in fact occur, and the Provost should assume responsibility for providing regular reports to Senate on the progress made towards the achievement of the goals identified in this document.

While there will need to be further discussion on appropriate benchmarks, we believe it important to articulate at the outset a number of key outcomes or principles that have emerged from the discussions of the past number of months. We do so because colleagues have argued that such express commitments to particular outcomes or principles will be critical if this White Paper is to serve as a genuine guiding document for the next decade. We therefore offer below a number of fairly specific benchmarks or principles that we believe flow directly from the analysis in the White Paper, would give clarity and meaning to its goals, and which will enhance accountability.

We reiterate the fact that an overriding concern that has emerged through the collegial discussions of the past months has been the need to pay particular concern to issues of academic quality. Thus all of these outcomes or principles speak in one way or another to the issue of academic quality.

1. The paramount goal for York over the next decade is an increase in the full-time faculty complement.

Rationale: There is a near-universal consensus within the York community that the essential precondition for achieving the goals of the White Paper is an increase in the full-time faculty complement. This is not to diminish in any way recognition of the continuing important contributions made by the full range of our teaching complement, including in particular contract faculty members. Nevertheless, increasing engagement in our classrooms, on our campuses, and with the broader community, and strengthening the research profile and reputation of the University as well as our ability to provide supervision and instruction to support high quality graduate education, presupposes that we are able to replenish the losses in the full-time complement that have been experienced in recent years. This must be our paramount academic objective in the years ahead.

2. Over the next decade, there will be an annual systematic increase in our international peer reviewed performance in research and creative work, including efforts to secure externally funded research.

Rationale: Institutions across the globe continue to make significant advancements in their research performance and, in spite of our progress, the gap between us and many of our competitors continues to widen. If York is to compete as a serious research institution it is crucial that we increase our participation and performance in all forms of externally-sponsored research and disseminate our work through peer reviewed venues. Many of these measures have a direct bearing on key government funding allocations (CRCs, Indirect Cost Program). This commitment to increasing our research performance is not only key to realizing our research goals but is critical to enhancing our reputation, a consequence of considerable benefit to the University community as a whole. In order to build on the research excellence that exists in many academic units and organized research units, unit level research planning must be combined with a pan-university research strategy that fosters strong collaboration across disciplines.

3. Over the next decade there will be a deepening and broadening of our institutional engagement with research partners locally and globally and leading innovative networks and clusters.

Rationale: Universities are expected to engage with our communities for scientific, social, cultural and economic impacts. York scholars have developed a long tradition of engaging networks and partners in their research programs which have created areas of traditional research strength and emerging areas of research excellence. With the overarching goal of capturing larger research opportunities and increasing our research capacity, we will seek
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to leverage more extensive pan-university research collaborations and further develop mutually beneficial innovation networks and clusters – furthering the momentum of promising initiatives, leading to further sustainable institutional programs, and enhancing York’s reputation.

4. Over the next decade, York will continue our efforts to become a more comprehensive University, by continuing to expand the scope of the University’s teaching and research activities in the areas of health and medicine, engineering, applied science, business-related and professional programs.

Rationale: As is discussed above, York has made considerable strides in its ambition to become a more comprehensive university, with a view to achieving greater prominence and strength in the sciences, applied science, engineering, health and medicine, business-related studies and professional programs. We believe that further growth in these areas is warranted as there is both need for such programs in Ontario and demand especially on the part of students in nearby communities from which York draws a significant portion of its students. Greater comprehensiveness will also extend our outreach to community partners, attract top quality students in additional areas to those we now offer, and allow us to compete for research dollars to the benefit of the entire institution, as well as providing opportunities to advance York’s distinctiveness. The York Health System, a regional network involving the University, hospitals, primary care, community health care, public health, and health promoting organizations, will provide a foundation for development in the health field. Two key benchmarks will be the establishment of a Medical School and an increase in applied science enrolment such that it would support the creation of a separate Faculty of Engineering.

5. By September 2010, the academic standards for admission to all York undergraduate programs will have increased. A minimum GPA admission requirement for applicants from secondary school of 74 per cent will be set as the initial benchmark for September 2010; this minimum will rise to 75 per cent by September 2011, to 76 per cent by September 2014 and to 77 per cent by 2017.

Rationale: York has traditionally targeted a minimum GPA in the range of 74 per cent, although some Faculties/programs significantly exceed this cut-off. However the strike of 2008-2009 had a significant negative impact on our secondary school applications, and put at risk our ability to maintain this standard. Although there has been a modest recovery in applications for the September 2010 admission cycle, the overall number of applications, as well as first choice applications, remains significantly below the 2008 level. We believe, therefore, that it is essential that we commit to maintaining the established minimum GPA cutoff for applicants from high school for the current academic year, and to raising the minimum cutoff gradually over the remainder of the decade. Student ability is a key driver of the quality of the learning experience and it is therefore imperative that we admit students who have the necessary qualifications to succeed with the supports that they have available to them. An important – though not the only – predictor of success at university is entry grades. Projections of increased demand for university spaces provide an opportunity to achieve enhancements in this area and to improve retention and student performance. It will also send an important signal to prospective students and their families regarding the commitment of the University to maintaining and enhancing the quality of the student body. York will nevertheless remain committed to the wide range of access initiatives and supports for qualified students, and to the recruitment and success of students not coming directly from high school.

6. By September 2012, the University will have developed and implemented an enhanced first year program for undergraduate students.

Rationale: Numerous studies show that students are more likely to continue in higher education if they receive concrete support in negotiating the transition to University from high school, college, or, in the case of mature students, a return to academic studies. An enhanced first year program for undergraduates should help students understand university culture, promote connections between students and between students and faculty, and encourage a student’s active engagement in their own learning. The particular strategies that the University will employ must accommodate different Faculty environments and recognize and respond to the specific needs of both full-time and part-time students, domestic and international, as well as other particular communities such as our commuter students, First Generation and Aboriginal. Based on the input from the White Paper consultations as well as student surveys, we know that class size, student advising and contact time with full-time faculty are important. The creation of student learning communities offers a way to address these concerns and bring together many of the ideas discussed in detail in the White Paper Companion. The learning community model can be used in a variety of contexts including both living-learning communities rooted in on-campus residences and on-line, virtual communities either of which might involve block scheduling in first year and/or increasing the number of our colleagues who teach first year students as just two examples. In creating an enhanced experience for first year students, York has the opportunity to bridge to its existing college system and to build on the work that is already being done in individual faculties.

7. Over the next decade, there will be a significant increase in opportunities for students to participate in an experiential education activity, both domestically and internationally, as a component of their degree program.

Rationale: Instructional research shows that learning activities that integrate theory and practice by providing students with opportunities to apply what they are learning tend to support the development of higher cognitive abilities than do more traditional classroom methods. They also enhance the critical elements of a liberal education through promoting a deeper understanding of the subject matter and the relevance of that knowledge, and strengthening self-directed learning and the capacity for critical thinking and analysis. In the survey undertaken by Strategic Counsel, current students, as well as students who had declined an offer of admission or who had not applied to York, were asked what changes would have the greatest posi-
tive impact on the student experience. Of the factors identified, one of the most significant was an expansion of experiential education opportunities. Experiential education includes a wide variety of opportunities for students to apply their learning through co-op and internship programs, community service or community based learning, simulations, laboratory work, and capstone courses involving application of learning. It has sometimes been suggested that such programs lack the academic rigour or quality of traditional lecture style courses or seminars. In fact, as is detailed in Chapter 4 of the White Paper Companion, research has demonstrated that when properly planned and delivered, experiential education enhances student learning and better prepares graduates for success post-graduation. While most graduate programs involve elements of experiential education, there remain untapped opportunities to expand opportunities for internships.

8. **We commit to identifying benchmarks and developing policies and mechanisms to increase the number of students who successfully complete their PhDs by the end of Year VI.**

**Rationale:** Much of the attrition in doctoral programs at York, as in many other universities, comes during the later years of a student’s program of study, typically from the fifth year onwards. This represents a considerable loss to the student as well as to the institution, and moreover, attrition rates are increasingly used as a measure of successful graduate programming. York’s doctoral students are provided with funding for six years, a commitment which is unique in Canada and only found within 3 per cent of graduate programs in the US. An analysis of doctoral programs across North America indicates that six years is an appropriate median time to completion. By identifying benchmarks, establishing milestones and sharing best practices, our intention is to foster student success, so as to increase the numbers of students who complete or who are very close to completion by the end of Year VI.

9. **We will improve the overall research profile as well as the quality of graduate and postdoctoral programs by increasing both the number of successful applications from York students and postdoctoral fellows for externally-funded domestic and international scholarships and fellowships, as well as increasing the numbers of students and postdoctoral fellows coming to York with external awards to 25 per cent by 2015.**

**Rationale:** Graduate students not only comprise the largest community of researchers at York, but within many disciplines they, together with postdoctoral fellows, are critical to the research of our faculty members. Increasing the number of applications as well as raising our success rates will help strengthen the research culture at York, assist us in becoming a more comprehensive institution, while also assisting our students in building strong foundations for their subsequent careers. A more aggressive pursuit of scholarship and fellowship opportunities will also help us to increase in a sustainable manner the number of international graduate students at York.

10. **York University will improve accessibility for students by significantly expanding online delivery of courses and programs as part of its efforts to enhance learning through the use of technology.**

**Rationale:** The 1999 White Paper noted the importance of technology-enhanced learning to improve accessibility (particularly to commuter and part-time students), contribute to life-long learning, and lead to innovation in pedagogy. Chapter 2 of the White Paper Companion identifies the emergence of new technologies as one of the key drivers of change and opportunity for universities. As a large commuter university where most of our students spend relatively little time on campus outside of class time, there is a need and demand for the use of new technology, particularly for part-time students. Moreover, the use of new technology and the digital library can enhance student learning and satisfaction. Yet we have made relatively modest progress towards systematically incorporating new technologies in the learning process, particularly as compared to our competitors. We therefore propose a significant broadening of the use of web-based teaching and learning components over the next decade in addition to the other technologies that are discussed in Chapter 4 of the White Paper Companion to enhance learning.

11. **York will continue its efforts to enhance internationalization, including the recruitment of international students. By 2013, at least 7.5 per cent of York students will be international students; by 2017, at least 10 per cent of all York students will be international students.**

**Rationale:** York has long had a commitment to internationalization. International students add diversity to our student body and enrich the university experience for all. However the proportion of international students at the University is surprisingly low, particularly when compared to our leading competitors in the GTA and in our major Canadian urban centres. In fact, in recent years, the number of international students at York has fallen, both in relative as well as absolute terms. We believe it important to set a goal that will allow York to retain its leadership in this area, not only because of the importance of incorporating diverse perspectives but also in terms of maintaining York’s reputation and distinctiveness regarding its internationalization strategy.

12. **The vice-president academic & provost will lead and coordinate the development of a pan-university strategy for community engagement.**

**Rationale:** In the U.S. the Carnegie Foundation has been a leader in promoting community engagement in post-secondary education. Engagement is defined as the collaboration “between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.” The Carnegie framework highlights the importance of the incorporation of community engagement in academic plans and of institutional leadership in advancing the engagement agenda. At York, the President’s Task Force on Community Engagement catalogued initiatives already under way across the
University and highlighted opportunities going forward, building on those initiatives, in relation to learning and the student experience, partnership and community collaboration, campus culture, and knowledge exchange. The vice-president academic & provost will work with colleagues across the University to develop strategic plans to enhance capacity in this area.

York in 2020

If we pursue the goals and strategies outlined in this White Paper with determination and resolve, by the end of the decade York will be significantly different than it is today. Our students and faculty will be more engaged with the teaching and learning process and with each other. Our linkages with the broader community, both in terms of the teaching and learning process as well as through our research activities, will have broadened and deepened. We will have established a new Medical School and a separate Faculty of Engineering. Our reputation as a research intensive institution contributing to innovation, social and economic development in the Greater Toronto Area, the province, Canada and the world will have been solidified and enhanced. Aspiring to be Canada’s Engaged University, we will be seen as an innovator in pedagogy, making use of social media and other forms of technology to meet evolving student needs and creating life-long learning opportunities for part-time, mature and returning students. Our university will be a global magnet for students who will see York’s diversity as exemplifying and modeling values of global citizenship. Our reputation as a leader and innovator will have been strengthened and the pride on our campuses and amongst our alumni at where we have been and where we are going will be palpable. York at 60 will have built on the successes of our first 50 years, all the while creating new chapters and successes in a still-evolving York University story of innovation and contribution to the social good.

In short, York should expect to enjoy an international reputation as a leading engaged university that enhances learning and research through academic excellence, diversity, social relevance, and civic engagement.

END NOTES

1 We appreciated the many constructive comments we received; while we have not been able to incorporate all of them into a document of this level of generality, they have been compiled and will be provided to appropriate bodies for reference during planning and implementation.


4 See Towards an Engaged University: President’s Task Force on Community Engagement Final Report and Recommendations (February 5, 2010), http://www.yorku.ca/commeng/documents/finalreport.pdf. The Task Force identified over 100 pan-university examples of current community-university partnerships. Community engagement at York takes a variety of forms, from community based/service learning that takes university students outside of the classroom to comprehensive initiatives that foster post-secondary education among community groups that face barriers to accessing university education.

5 Senate of York University, University Academic Plan 2005-2010 (approved June 23, 2005) at p. 11.
University Academic Plan
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Introduction

While forward planning has been a feature of academic governance since the University’s founding, Senate approved its first comprehensive academic plan in 1986. The pioneering framework supplied by Senate’s University Academic Plan two decades ago is one of the factors that has helped York to grow and develop, often through turbulent times, into a prestigious university. This legacy, together with the enduring academic values we embrace, now enables us to chart a more strategic course.

This iteration of Senate’s University Academic Plan differs from previous versions in a number of respects. This document is far shorter than its predecessors. It is also more strategic and focused, with an accent on the identification and accomplishment of key planning objectives over a five-year period.

Since the early 1990s, the UAP has been constructed around a set of critical concepts. These concepts – which may also be called planning principles – actually point to the enduring values which York has embraced and will continue to pursue in its development. The UAP, together with the mission statement and other frameworks, emphasizes:

- excellence in research and teaching;
- valuation of the special opportunities and responsibilities that arise from the University’s setting in a uniquely dynamic, metropolitan and multi-cultural milieu;
- academic freedom and collegial self-governance;
- social justice and accessible education;
- equity;
- balance and diversity across a range of planning objectives;
- innovation and interdisciplinarity, together with diversification of academic activities.

These principles remain the essence of York University and the foundation for academic planning. Although this plan differs in format and focus, it reaffirms those principles.

Planning will continue to be an essential part of York’s future. Academic planning should be ongoing, engaging, informed, responsive and responsible. Planning takes place – appropriately – at many levels of a university. A university-wide plan emphasizes broad priorities, especially those that might not receive the attention they deserve from planners without agreed-upon guidance, but should not impede other processes. This document should be understood as a compass for planners and those who are engaged with the University rather than a blueprint.

The text of this document is divided into subjects that are interwoven. In this sense the division is somewhat artificial if not without logic. Each section concludes with a series of specific objectives related to each of the broader subjects to facilitate monitoring and reporting by the appropriate individuals and bodies.

Overarching Themes

I. ATTAINING THE HIGHEST ACADEMIC QUALITY

York’s academic plans are based on attaining the highest quality across a full range of academic activities. “Quality” has many meanings, meanings which are themselves surrogates for differing visions of the University. Thus, some will seek to apply the term – not unfairly – to describe York’s improved institutional reputation, selectivity in admissions, success in competitions for research funding or pedagogic innovation or by reference to similar “objective” or external indicators. Others will insist that the only legitimate aspiration for a university is to develop the talents of its students and faculty to the fullest – an aspiration whose attainment defies measurement.

The focus on quality calls on all members of the University to develop a capacity for rigorous self-criticism and to search constantly for new and higher levels of achievement.

II. KNOWING OURSELVES, AND SEEING HOW WE ARE SEEN

In the relatively short span of time beginning in 1959, York University has grown into a large and prestigious institution. This has been accomplished thanks to a sense of purpose forged around innovation, traditional disciplinary strengths, and interdisciplinarity. Together with an insistence on the inseparability of research and teaching, York’s distinctiveness is expressed through this triad.

Yet, at a critical moment for higher education in the province and in a global context, we need to ask a simple but significant question: do we know ourselves well enough? The answer is, we do not. In particular, we do not know enough about:

- the hopes, expectations and preparation of our students, and their experience of university life;
- the intensity and impact of our research, relative to our own standards and measured against competitors at other universities;
- the pedagogies we employ that have an enduring worth;
- the pedagogies that are opening to us through new technologies and practices;
- the success of our graduates in academic and career placements.

Not having better answers to these questions will be costly. Without more information, we will not know if we are truly improving in line with our objectives and our commitment to the highest quality education unless we are willing to learn about ourselves and to learn from others. It is also imperative that we document our achievements as a research and teaching university. If we do not, there is a risk that those outside the University will make decisions about York based on incomplete and inappropriate information.

In many of the passages that follow, this plan calls for reflection, understanding and candor. It argues in favour of developing and utilizing self-defined indicators of our activities and accomplishments so that we can know ourselves better while projecting ourselves more authoritatively externally. In the current climate, with its increasing demand for “measurement” and accountability, we must develop a self-knowledge and project our accomplishments in diverse, meaningful ways.

**Academic Priorities 2005-2010**

**I. RESEARCH PRIORITIES**

York University has a robust research culture, one that has intensified over time and has been enhanced in recent years as a result of various initiatives. At the same time, we take it as axiomatic that active researchers are active teachers, and we insist on the inseparability of research and pedagogy as part of this culture. Universities must teach in ways that reflect their culture and the unique learning opportunities that a rich research environment offers. Attaining the highest quality in both research and teaching represents a challenge, but it is one that is accepted willingly as part of York’s mandate and make-up.

There are other factors that impact on our research. York has not always been properly recognized for its diverse, innovative, socially relevant and influential research. Among the additional challenges facing York are the following:

- the relatively high proportion of scholars at York eligible for SSHRC grants, and the relative impoverishment of SSHRC;
- the relatively low proportion of scholars at York eligible for NSERC and other science and health related grants, especially for very large research projects;
- the external emphasis placed on monetary measures of research achievement;
- the diversity of scholarly activities – many of them path breaking – as illustrated by the work of practicing artists, artist/researchers, community activists, and scholars specializing in research on teaching and learning.

It must be acknowledged that the research terrain at York is also uneven. A truly transforming strategy must cultivate increased research activity across the entire professoriate. All of our research objectives depend on making outstanding faculty appointments. In a competitive milieu, it is imperative that York recruit and retain the kind of faculty members who will increase research funding, attract high quality graduate students, enhance York’s profile, and intensify the research culture.

Against this backdrop, the highest priority in this plan is the enhancement of the research culture at York. A strategic focus on research will help to overcome this gap over the next five years, allowing York to attract the very best faculty and students and to maximize our potential as a university community. The impact of our efforts must be felt by individual researchers, students, and the wider communities with which York is engaged.

Since we have a strong if uneven research culture, it is imperative that we consider new and better ways of increasing participation as well as deepening the research culture. Advancing this goal will require broad institutional steps as well as locally designed initiatives at the level of academic and research units.

Measures to foster research will necessarily take diverse forms across the University. As an overarching principle, however, research needs and impacts must move into the foreground of academic and administrative planning. To this end, governance structures should be reviewed to ensure that those with special responsibilities for research are directly involved in a wide range of planning matters that in the past may have been addressed primarily from the perspective of teaching needs (for example faculty complement and recruitment, libraries and information technology, space allocation and facilities improvement). Organized research units at the Faculty and University level serve the University well, but reviews of individual centres consistently raise fundamental questions about their status that must be resolved.

The assessment of research at York and other universities is often conducted by means of crude monetary indicators. If we are to assert our rightful place among top-flight research universities, we will need to enhance our performance and ranking on these indices to avail ourselves of opportunities based on indicators that exist while developing instruments of measurement attuned to York’s particular blend of research cultures. With these aids we will be able to present to ourselves and to those outside, a more accurate, complete and compelling picture. York is not alone in this regard, and the University should work with others, including granting agencies, in a concerted effort to devise better indices of research activity and impact.

The complement will change in profound ways over the next five years. York has made an abiding institutional commitment to the growth, greater diversity and renewal of the full-time faculty and librarian complement, and this commitment will be critical to sustaining the research culture and supporting other research objectives. At the same time, research goals must be closely related to Faculty and unit planning processes.
Funding
York has enjoyed dramatic growth in external research funding since the time of the last UAP, in part through stronger encouragement and better administrative support for individual faculty members to seek research grants, and due to enrichment of the available external funding. Further progress on this front will require close attention to how York can best position itself to seize emerging opportunities that fit well with our research strengths. A key priority will be to find ways of investing strongly in research infrastructure. This includes improving our research space, and investing in the library and information technology resources that are critical to research productivity and profile.

Productivity, Support and Integration
Research is conducted in different ways within the scholarly community. Strategies for encouraging productivity will vary across different types of research and among individual researchers and creators. For example, and depending on the context, it may require better administrative support, more opportunities to collaborate with like-minded faculty and graduate students, better access to seed funding, increased time to focus on research, more opportunities to travel to conferences and research sites abroad, more access to professional staff in the libraries, or intensified training in research methods and information literacy. New colleagues should be welcomed into the research culture through mentoring strategies, assisted in developing collaborative working relationships, and encouraged to integrate their teaching and research. At an institutional level, York must continue to develop its vibrant internal research culture. In particular it should facilitate cross-unit collaboration especially in areas where we have significant, but dispersed, strength, so that all researchers are plugged into the places that will most stimulate their work. The University should also find creative ways to recognize the accomplishments of its researchers.

Communications
A transforming research strategy must be accompanied by a sophisticated communications, government relations and outreach plan. It is essential that our manifold contributions to society, our role as a community of engaged public intellectuals, and our successes are described and celebrated in ways that situate York’s research in a local, regional, national and international context. This includes finding new ways to communicate the value of our distinctive research activities, and the profound impacts of that work that is less heavily grant funded. A coherent communications strategy depends on liaison and coordination involving researchers and the offices responsible for support and communication.

Libraries in Research
Central to fostering a research culture, libraries are critical to excellence in research and teaching. Technological changes have greatly improved access to a broader range of resources, and considerably eased library research, facilitating the work of researcher and teacher alike. Better communication between the Libraries and Faculties and programs will enhance the Library’s ability to be responsive to shifts in the University’s research and programmatic directions, as well as to support individual researchers. Particularly noted are the need for stable funding to support strong research collections and information technology.

In the next five years the University will:
• intensify and widen the research culture at the University and invest in more research infrastructure
• develop the means – both quantitative and qualitative – to measure and document York’s research successes
• complete a review of research structures and regulatory processes to ensure that they complement overall research priorities, and provide the resources to sustain the structures in place to realize research objectives
• foster cooperative research within the University and build cooperative partnerships outside York
• implement a communications plan in support of research
• provide the support needed for the Libraries to fulfill their mandates in support of teaching, learning and research in the context of evolving technology and with the goal of information literacy

II. OVERALL SIZE AND ENROLMENT PLANNING

For enrolment planners, the focus during the last five years fell on preparing for enrolment growth resulting from the double cohort, and ensuring that Faculties and programs met their targets. During the next planning cycle York should concentrate on a different set of equally important enrolment matters, and be especially attentive to quality.

Demographic forecasts for the Greater Toronto Area see a growing population and sustained demand for enrolments on the part of secondary school graduates and others. It is anticipated that there will be pressures on York to grow again, especially between 2010 and 2020 when a new surge is expected. Demand will be highest among direct-entry secondary school entrants (now called 101s) but there will also be demand from other segments of the population (including “105s” such as mature applicants, immigrant and diasporic communities, CAAT graduates and non-degree students).

York has already surpassed the enrolment levels forecast in Vision 2020 (1992). Without additional facilities and funding, the University cannot grow beyond planned targets. Instead, the primary goals in 2005-2010 should revolve around:
• completing the adjustment to recent growth;
• adapting to changes resulting from reforms to secondary school education;
• maintaining and extending quality in terms of the student experience, admissions and academic standards;
• supporting selective rebalancing of enrolments into priority areas, including graduate studies and professional programs;
• retaining commitments to accessible education;
• improving support for students in need of additional support, and students for whom English and French are second languages;
• enhancing accommodations for students with disabilities;
• promoting learning through the use of technology where appropriate.
In the next five years the University will:

- manage enrolments to ensure that overall and Faculty-specific targets are met while focusing attention on high quality
- make the ongoing adjustments necessitated by changes in student preparation and experiences resulting from reforms to the Ontario secondary school curriculum
- monitor system and government developments carefully and adjust targets upwards if there are sufficient resources for doing so or if we conclude that there are significant drawbacks in not doing so

III. GRADUATE EDUCATION

In the next five years, graduate enrolments will grow in absolute terms and in proportion to the overall total. Growth in graduate studies will be positive for York in many ways. It will contribute to York’s research culture and support overall objectives related to academic excellence, innovation, diversification, balance and reputation. Although York’s graduate enrolments are second in the province, in recent years they have not kept pace as a share of system-wide enrolments. The combination of double cohort flow-through, demographic growth, and increasing participation rates makes expansion of graduate programmes not only positive but essential. Growth must be targeted to specific areas, including the sciences and health, based on sophisticated planning and analysis. It must also reflect objectives such as equity and the commitment to training of scholars from diverse backgrounds to take their place in the professoriate.

Growth will require new resources (and thus, hard choices) and sophisticated planning across many dimensions: teaching, supervision (about which more is said below), offices, laboratories and studio space, libraries (collection, assistance, facilities) and infrastructure. The relative size of York’s existing programs gives the University an unusual profile within the system, with a heavy emphasis on studies in business and at the Master’s level. A target of approximately two thousand more students within five years also requires other significant choices:

- should growth be concentrated at the doctoral level, the Masters level or both?
- taking into account other planning objectives, what programs – existing or new – should grow?

Other planning objectives and observed trends must be factored into our growth scenario. In some disciplines, and with some exceptions, professorial energies expended on supervision are energies not invested in the professor’s own research (this is not true of science and engineering disciplines). There are also unequal distributions of supervisory responsibility, attributable to the popularity and currency of fields and topics, the reputation of faculty members, the compatibility of student and supervisor, and access to grants.

Any plan to increase significantly the size of doctoral enrolments at York – especially in Social Sciences and Humanities – must be done in an environment in which supervisory inequalities are acknowledged and compensated. Completion times have improved in recent years, and additional enrolments cannot be easily accommodated without ensuring that completion time improvements can be sustained through adequate supervision.

In the next five years the University will:

- increase the number and proportion of enrolments in graduate students, while maintaining high quality graduate education
- increase doctoral enrolments in selected areas
- address long-standing supervisory issues such as student needs and inequities of supervisory loads
- increase Masters levels enrolments in a manner that is consistent with other planning objectives and encourage the development of Masters programs that may or may not develop into doctoral programs

IV. THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

The enhancement of student experiences is a priority for York. Yet the paucity of available data suggests nothing less than a pressing need to learn more about student experiences. Understanding student experiences will be critical during the life of this plan. We have not been as attentive as we should to understanding our students’ lives, their needs, and their expectations. As a large university with a large population of students who commute daily, York faces a special challenge in engaging students and multiplying their opportunities to engage faculty and their peers in learning circumstance co-curriculum situations. Collecting the data and conducting other forms of research will help us sharpen other tools – not least communications – for enhancing York’s reputation. Students themselves must be active participants in the process of consultation as we find ways to improve their experiences inside and outside of the classroom.

In the next five years the University will:

- assign high priority to understanding student expectations and experiences, and to taking the steps necessary to enhancing the student experience throughout the University

V. STRATEGIC PRIORITIES IN HEALTH

As evidenced by Faculty and unit plans, activities related to health continue to be a priority for the University. Along with the establishment and development of research hubs around health, Senate’s approval in principle of a health-related Faculty in January 2005 is an important signal of York’s intentions.

Further developments in health over the span of this plan would be in line with this priority. One possibility on the horizon is a medical school. The need for additional physicians and surgeons, the continued population growth of the GTA, the expanding number of hospitals in adjacent regions, the development of health networks by the University: all of these argue in favour of pursuing any opportunity to house a medical school at York. It should be stressed that any medical school would be separate and apart from a health-related Faculty, which is intended to have a unique mission emphasizing innovative multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary activities.
In the next five years the University will:
- actively support initiatives in health, in particular the initiative to develop a health-related Faculty if such is approved by Senate and – separate and apart from a health Faculty – the articulation of a medical school proposal

VI. MAINTAINING AND EXTENDING YORK’S DISTINCTIVENESS

Innovation, Consolidating Strengths and Interdisciplinarity

The twinning of innovation and consolidation in areas of strength will continue to be a hallmark of academic planning across a full range of activities. Maintaining the right balance between the two is imperative. Innovation must lead to the development of programs that are authentically innovative and sustainable rather than merely faddish or transitory (indeed, claims to innovation that emerge in the future must be more forthright and compelling about the extent to which innovative aspects relate to student needs, changes in, between, or among disciplines, and the extent of collegial involvement and endorsement). Consolidation must not be allowed to prevent positive change within disciplines.

Interdisciplinarity is intrinsic to York’s mission and make-up. This will not change. However, our unshakeable confidence in interdisciplinarity should not be taken for granted. The term “interdisciplinarity” can be confusing to those inside as well as to those outside the University, including prospective students, employers, colleagues at other institutions, and the general public. Our best evidence is that students welcome the chance to explore interdisciplinary approaches after arriving at York, but that they are also aware that many careers require a degree of discipline-based credentials and that graduate programs elsewhere may require additional coursework prior to entry. For this reason, it would be appropriate and constructive to promote public understanding of interdisciplinary scholarship.

Internationalization

Internationalization – which can be conceived as building on Canada’s future in a global context – has been prized at York since its inception. Much has been accomplished in the domain of internationalization, especially since a special task force submitted its recommendations in 2000-2001. These achievements include the creation of a dedicated associate vice-president portfolio, joint programs with universities outside of Canada, a blossoming of exchanges, curriculum development throughout the university, and summer internships. There is a firm consensus around the desirability of expanding the concept and encouraging local, concrete expressions.

Community Education

Community education, broadly conceived, recognizes the world outside the walls of the academy as a source of education and research partnership, rather than only as an object of study. The Faculty of Education is at the forefront in developing a variety of ways to incorporate a range of community-based activities and requirements into its undergraduate teacher education program. Initiatives of this kind are designed to enable teacher candidates to understand the contexts of their students’ lives, to learn from and appreciate local knowledge, and to enable dialogue with the communities outside the schools in which they will teach. Other Faculties, notably Atkinson and FES, are building on long-standing traditions in “experiential learning” (understood as acknowledgment and support of learning acquired outside the classroom, and contributing to course and/or program curriculum). In both teaching and learning and research, the University should expand its efforts to partner with communities through CURA and other joint research projects; develop internship, coop and practicum programs; implement Prior Learning Assessment; and seek and support innovative initiatives that further university-community partnerships, and acknowledge and integrate into curriculum learning acquired outside the classroom.

Capitalizing on and expanding these opportunities is desirable given the fit with the University’s mission and values. Developing greater awareness of community involvements that do exist will also be necessary.

In the next five years the University will:
- promote and expand community education initiatives
- promote further internationalization initiatives at the Faculty-level and pan-University with a view toward ensuring that every student has the opportunity to have a significant “international” component in their studies

VII. IDENTITIES AND REPUTATIONS

Progress in the areas described above is a necessary but not sufficient condition for enhancing York’s profile as a prestigious research and teaching university engaged with multiple communities.

We must also develop and execute plans to better understand how York is perceived – and how we would like to be perceived – by different constituencies, to respond to those perceptions, and to project ourselves in ways that are consistent with our identify, missions, mandates and objectives.

York, like other universities, has multiple identities relevant to multiple constituencies:
- peer institutions, such as other universities from whom we recruit faculty and graduate students, and with whom we both compete and collaborate;
- secondary school applicants (along with their parents and families) and adult learners who together make decisions about who will populate York’s undergraduate programs;
- local communities, by which we mean both the local residents and the institutions that surround us;
- national and international communities;
- governments and granting agencies.

For some, such as peer institutions, granting agencies and to some extent public policy makers, we want to be known for the intensity and distinctiveness of our research – with its emphasis on international perspectives, social justice and social responsibility, and community embeddedness – and, in the case of Faculties or
their constituent units, for research excellence in particular areas. Prospective and actual students are likely to be more interested in the quality of the student experience. Local communities will look to us for relevance and responsible involvement.

We need to foreground our distinctiveness, but in doing so we must generate more reliable data about our reputations. It must be a priority in the next planning cycle to gain a better understanding of how we are seen by our various audiences relative to how we would like to be seen by them.

Reputations are a matter of substance – what we do, and do well – and perception. By way of an illustration, the University community understands that we need to intensify our research before we can be recognized as research intensive. Knowledge of this kind is only a first step.

**In the next five years the University will:**

- conduct and disseminate research on the University’s reputations
- make warranted substantive changes to improve our reputations
- implement communications plans in support of reputation

**VIII. ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

**Assessments and Actions**

Academic planning requires processes that are collegial, sophisticated and reliable. They must also be supple, capable of responding quickly to external phenomena in a timely and appropriate manner.

During the exercise leading to the development of this plan, correspondents argued that mechanisms for assessing existing programs and proposals (such as unit and Faculty plans, Undergraduate Program Reviews and the like) have sometimes failed to produce desired outcomes. We need to pay much closer attention to the evaluation of existing and proposed programs, and develop agreed-upon principles and methods.

In the spring of 2004 the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Senate noted that it would be timely to take a candid, disinterested and broad-based view of structures to ensure that they support the realization of academic planning objectives.

**Cooperation with Other Institutions**

York has a long, largely successful and constructive relationship with other institutions (from the standpoint of mobility, enrolments, program development, inter-institutional relationships). It is expected that York will continue to pursue opportunities of this kind during the next five years. Program development and agreements with institutions in Ontario, Canada and abroad must continue to be based on York’s planning objectives, and they must emphasize quality.

**In the next five years the University will:**

- improve governance processes in support of academic planning
- develop more sophisticated means of assessing ongoing and proposed academic activities
- review academic programs and unit structures (Faculties, schools, departments, interdisciplinary programs, Colleges, ORUs, etc.) to achieve a structural array that is appropriate to York’s overall mission and to the objectives set out in this plan
- pursue cooperation with other institutions on the basis of quality imperatives and consonance with other articulated objectives

**APPENDIX A: NOTES ON YORK’S ACADEMIC PLANNING PRINCIPLES**

Until this version of the University Academic Plan was approved, the document was organized around 5 core themes against which constituent objectives were set. As noted in the preface, these principles continue to have currency and are closely related to the University’s mission and mandates. The preceding version of the UAP also contained more than one hundred and fifty specific recommendations. Senate committees have been asked to review these specific recommendations and advise APPC and Senate Executive on those that have continuing relevance to their mandates and processes even if they are not strategic academic planning objectives per se.

**Quality:** “Quality” has many meanings, meanings which are themselves surrogates for differing visions of the University. Thus, some will seek to apply the term – not unfairly – to describe York’s improved institutional reputation, selectivity in admissions, success in competitions for research funding or pedagogic innovation or by reference to similar “objective” or external indicators. Others will insist that the only legitimate aspiration for a university is to develop the talents of its students and faculty to the fullest – an aspiration whose attainment defies measurement.

However, what is common to all these visions of quality is that they require that each member of the University conduct his or her activities with intelligence and learning, care and attention, effort and imagination, a capacity for rigorous self-criticism and a constant search for new and higher levels of achievement.

**Equity:** Academic quality and social equity are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, equitable treatment for all – irrespective of gender or sexual orientation, race or ethnicity, physical condition or social origin, creed or religion – is an indispensable means of assuring that excellence is served and that all members of the York community enjoy the opportunity to contribute fully and to the best of their ability to the common enterprise.

Although the University’s academic mission impresses an inner logic upon the academic planning process, that logic must also be infused with a sense of social responsibility and a spirit of social justice. Accordingly, in judging present academic structures and programmes, as well as proposals for change, attention should focus on the extent to which, in their respective contexts, they help to eradicate systemic and structural discrimination and promote equity for students, staff and faculty.
Recent efforts at York have focused on equity for women. These efforts must be maintained, while increased attention is also paid to the other dimensions of equity enumerated above.

Balance and Diversity: As the Green Paper proposes, the University should support academic discourse in all of its accents and idioms, and promote interchange and exploration across the arbitrary boundaries of disciplines and faculties. In so doing, it will provide not only the best possible intellectual atmosphere for its scholars and researchers, but also the widest possible range of learning experiences for its students and the greatest diversity of service for the community.

In responding to the challenge of the Green Paper, over the long run, we must therefore strive to achieve greater balance and diversity among and within our academic programmes. But at the same time, we must keep in mind three considerations: our willingness to “try the way” – our commitment to innovation and interdisciplinarity; the claims of existing programmes not to be further impoverished in order to support new programmes; and the interaction between the University’s academic ambitions and the public policies which might make it possible to advance the interaction between the University’s academic ambitions and further impoverished in order to support new programmes; and

Process: As the many challenges identified through the academic planning process materialize, the practical question arises of how to make things happen. Different injunctions of the UAP call on different actors to take action. Depending on the particular action required, responsibility may fall on “the University” as a collectivity, on Senate, Faculty Councils, or their committees, on central or local administrators, or on individual faculty members, staff or students. And the UAP speaks in different idioms, because it must respect the mandates and modes of operation of the actors, and because the nature of what they are asked to do varies so greatly.

In some cases, academic units are asked to translate the general principles of the UAP into more detailed operational plans whose local articulation and realization will in turn inform and influence the evolution of the UAP. In other cases, legislation is required. Such legislation can only be suggested in very general terms by a broad, forward-looking planning document such as the UAP: it must be enacted by Senate or Faculty Councils, acting on the advice of their committees. Yet again, the UAP may seek to achieve its ends by stimulating change in the academic or administrative culture, in attitudes and practices or simply in the way we perceive ourselves. Here the UAP may contain exhortations and practical suggestions but it is up to each and all of us to make these operational. And finally, the UAP may speak to academic administrators who must listen attentively, while integrating the UAP’s message with other, equally authoritative, signals received from government, collective bargaining, the university financial officers and elsewhere.

Apart from all of these, there is a residue of matters in which prescriptive language in the UAP would be premature because APPC or other mandated bodies have not yet completed their analysis of the problem and exploration of the available options. Here, the UAP can most appropriately recommend further study and ensure that it does take place. In sum, despite the necessarily varied and vague range of recommendations, each section of the UAP seeks to respond to the stern question: “what is to be done?”

That question in turn leads to a further question: “to what extent have we achieved the goals identified by the UAP?” We still lack the capacity to answer this key “process” question, with the result that unsettling doubts persist concerning the efficacy of both local and university-wide academic planning. Accepting that planning and implementation are not mechanical operations, that causality cannot always be demonstrated, that disjunctions will always occur amongst actors at different levels, this question must nonetheless be attended to. In order to verify that an investment of energy and effort in planning is justified, we must ultimately be able to point to the positive contribution of the UAP and of local plans to making York a better university.

It is imperative that Senate develop ways to ensure that better evaluation and feedback procedures are available at all levels. Evaluation may be qualitative or quantitative, ongoing or periodic, self-administered or conducted by external auditors. But these procedures must not generate burdens which exceed the benefits. We want practical procedures so that useful feedback can be provided at all levels to planners, to those charged with implementation, and to the community at large.

Resources: Academic priorities ought to be a prime determinant – the prime determinant, so far as it can be managed – of resource allocation. However, we cannot be insensitive to pressures other than academic concerns which determine resource allocation: salary negotiations, market prices of goods and services, legislation, unforeseeable developments in public policy and community concern, and the complexities of trying to coordinate all of these and other priorities. By assigning an order of importance or urgency to particular academic planning proposals, the Priorities section of the UAP will send a message to local and university-wide decision-makers and budget officers who have direct responsibility for allocating human, physical and financial resources. But this will only be possible if academic priorities are thoughtfully, realistically and explicitly articulated.

At the same time, there is something to be said for allowing resource allocation to be fine-tuned as close to the focus of activity as is practically possible. Thus, a good case may be made for allowing faculties to strike the right balance of expenditure amongst the several most important priorities defined by the UAP. This would permit a given faculty, say, to emphasize at any given moment considerations of quality rather than those of balance and diversity. But if a faculty’s discretion is unfettered, there is a risk that some major concerns will never be addressed, while others will be responded to fully.

What seems inescapable, therefore, is a dialogue between central and local budget authorities, with the UAP supplying the rules of debate and the criteria for judging outcomes.
Section B: Accountability

University Priorities
Introduction: Planning Context and Process in 2009-2010

Internal Planning Context

Academic planning at York proceeds within a framework provided by the University Academic Plan (UAP) and the President’s 2007 report to the Board of Governors, “Moving Forward with the University Academic Plan,” as well as Faculty academic and strategic plans and other planning documents and processes. Longer-term points of reference are provided by documents such as “2020 Vision: The Future of York University” (1992) and “Strategic Planning for the New Millennium” (1999). Recent years have seen the implementation of initiatives intended to better align resource planning with academic plans, ensuring that the allocation of resources is driven by and supports academic priorities, through the Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) process. While significant progress has been made with IRP within Divisions, Faculties and units, the lack of a longer term institutional plan was thought to be impeding the University’s ability to align academic and resource planning effectively.

In the summer of 2009, York University’s President, Mamdouh Shoukri, initiated the White Paper Planning process. The timing seemed appropriate in that it had been a decade since the University had engaged in a similar direction-setting exercise and given the many changes in the post-secondary environment during that period. The White Paper was intended to provide an overall direction for the University and a framework for the next decade that would better position the University to develop consensus on the next University Academic Plan and the key academic priorities for York in the future.

The White Paper Planning Process 2009-2010

As the chief academic officer of the University, the provost took up the White Paper planning process, in collaboration with the Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee of Senate. Designed to be widely consultative, the process involved several phases:

- the development by broadly representative working groups of Green Papers to raise issues and ideas for discussion in several areas:
  - student experience
  - teaching innovation and student learning
  - strategic expansion of research activity
  - strategic enrolment and program planning
  - internationalization
  - community engagement
  - York’s reputation

- initial consultations with all Faculty Councils
- two open fora, each involving about 150 members of faculty, staff, and students, at the outset of the process to discuss the green papers
- research on the University’s reputation and performance, including interviews with key internal and external stakeholders and a survey of current and prospective students conducted by the firm Strategic Counsel to better understand their perceptions of York, reasons for applying/not applying, accepting/rejecting an offer from York, and, among current students, level of satisfaction
- preparation of a draft White Paper based on input from the research and consultations
- a second round of consultations (Faculty Councils, two further open fora, open invitation for comment, discussions with Senate and committees) around the draft White Paper
- preparation of a final version of the White Paper (comprising an overview document and a more detailed companion document), taking into account advice received, for submission to Senate
- unanimous endorsement of the White Paper by Senate in April 2010

External Factors

Though academic planning at York cannot be driven by external factors, those factors provide the context for our activities, and therefore must be properly analyzed and taken into account in planning exercises. Most significant among these factors at the present time are the following:

- Demographics: Population trends in the GTA are expected to produce a significant increase in demand for University spaces in this region over the next decade. There is evidence that many of these students, often coming from immigrant families, will wish to study near home, leading to increased enrolment pressures for GTA universities, including York. These projections will present opportunities for York to grow in support of planning priorities, and to increase the quality of the incoming student body, but will require decisions about the extent and nature of growth and diversification.

- Government policy directions: A continuing constrained fiscal environment is anticipated over the short to medium term, together with increasing efforts by government to target funding towards government objectives, including economic and labour market goals and internationalization.

- Globalization/Internationalization: Increased global interaction gives rise to increased competition as well as new opportunities and challenges, and expands the context for institutional and government decision-making.
• Information and Communications Technology: Advances in ICT also create both opportunities and challenges, promoting interaction but also creating pressures to respond to the expectations of the “internet generation”.

• Actions of Competitors: Competition and opportunities for collaboration come from other GTA universities, as well as colleges of applied arts and technology – and increasingly from institutions beyond provincial and national borders.

The White Paper

The White Paper focused on the enhancement of academic quality as the overarching objective, and proposed that this objective be pursued through strategies and initiatives to build a more engaged University – an approach that garnered wide support during the consultations. The White Paper set out benchmarks for progress in priority areas as follows, with the expectation that achievement of and/or progress towards these benchmarks will see outcomes that support the enhancement of York’s quality and its reputation and profile:

• The paramount goal for York over the next decade is an increase in the full-time faculty complement.

• Over the next decade, there will be an annual systematic increase in our international peer reviewed performance in research and creative work, including efforts to secure externally funded research.

• Over the next decade, there will be a deepening and broadening of our institutional engagement with research partners locally and globally and leading innovative networks and clusters.

• Over the next decade, York will continue our efforts to become a more comprehensive University, by continuing to expand the scope of the University’s teaching and research activities in the areas of health and medicine, engineering, applied science, business-related and professional programs.

• By September 2010, the academic standards for admission to all York undergraduate programs will have increased. A minimum GPA admission requirement for applicants from secondary school of 74 per cent will be set as the initial benchmark for September 2010; this minimum will rise to 75 per cent by September 2011, to 76 per cent by September 2014 and to 77 per cent by 2017.

• By September 2012, the University will have developed and implemented an enhanced first year program for undergraduate students.

• Over the next decade, there will be a significant increase in opportunities for students to participate in an experiential education activity, both domestically and internationally, as a component of their degree program.

• We commit to identifying benchmarks and developing policies and mechanisms to increase the number of students who successfully complete their PhDs by the end of Year VI.

• We will improve the overall research profile as well as the quality of graduate and post doctoral programs by increasing both the number of successful applications from York students and postdoctoral fellows for externally-funded domestic and international scholarships and fellowships, as well as increasing the numbers of students and postdoctoral fellows coming to York with external awards to 25 per cent by 2015.

• York University will improve accessibility for students by significantly expanding online delivery of courses and programs as part of its efforts to enhance learning through the use of technology.

• York will continue its efforts to enhance internationalization, including the recruitment of international students. By 2013, at least 7.5 per cent of York students will be international students; by 2017, at least 10 per cent of all York students will be international students.

• The vice-president academic & provost will lead and coordinate the development of a pan-university strategy for community engagement.

Unanimous endorsement of the White Paper overview document by senate in April 2010 initiated the implementation phase of the process, as set out below:

• The long-term directions described in the White Paper are providing a framework for the collegial development, led by the Senate Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee (APPRC), of a new University Academic Plan identifying priorities for the five-year period 2010-2015.

• Faculty and Divisional academic plans and integrated resource plans are incorporating these directions and priorities.

• The provost established working groups to review options and best practices and to elaborate models to move forward in five priority areas as a basis for further consideration:
  – experiential education
  – the first year experience
  – e-learning
  – continuing education
  – international recruitment and retention

• Taking into account the research and analysis provided by these working groups, the provost has established working groups to support planning and facilitate coordination in four key areas; these groups will be defining and carrying forward their mandates in 2010-2011:
  – teaching and learning
  – the student experience
  – community engagement and outreach
  – research

• A key objective of planning at York is the alignment of resource allocations in support of academic priorities. The definition of those priorities through the White Paper process and the development of a new University Academic Plan and progress towards the articulation of objectives, strategies/initiatives and measures through the Integrated Resource Planning process are important components, as is the recent creation by the president of a Budget Resources Review to be jointly led by the provost and the vice-president finance & administration.


Note: The reports contributed by the Faculties and York Libraries (that follow at the end of this section) provide concrete examples of the directions described in general terms below. They include examples of initiatives undertaken in 2009-2010, as well as those planned for 2010-2011, within the Division.

Overarching Themes

Flowing from the institutional commitment to academic excellence, and reinforced in the White Paper process, planning is guided by the determination to enhance the quality of all of York’s activities, reflected in the quality of our students and their experience at York, academic programs, teaching and learning, the quality and intensity of institutional and individual research performance, and the quality of interactions with and contributions to local and international partnerships and other relationships. The vehicle for enhancing quality, as articulated in the White Paper, is the development of a more engaged University. During White Paper consultations, colleagues emphasized that engagement must encompass the building of relationships on campus (among colleagues, between faculty and students, for students with their learning, across disciplines, etc.) as well as outreach to the community. The commitments to access and equity, as well as to sustainability, have also been – and remain – hallmarks of all that we do.

A long-standing objective in York’s planning has been to increase its comprehensiveness – that is to broaden the representation of the range of disciplines encompassed by the institution’s programming (and associated enrolments, including the balance of undergraduate and graduate) and research activities. This has been taken to mean the diversification and expansion of professional programs, programming in the health sciences and health studies, including consideration of a medical school should that opportunity present itself, and expansion of the sciences and engineering in both size and range of programs offered in ways that could support establishment of a Faculty of Engineering. Business-related programming has expanded over the years and enjoys an outstanding reputation, and significant progress has been made, particularly since the establishment of the Faculty of Health in 2006, in relation to health-related program development and development of partnerships with the community and the healthcare sector. While science and engineering programs have expanded, further development remains a key priority going forward.

The full-time faculty cadre is fundamental to York’s performance in all areas of research and teaching. Financial constraints over the past several years have severely limited the University’s ability to make tenure stream appointments in order to protect and build on its current strengths and move in new directions. The strategic renewal and expansion of the full-time faculty complement is therefore key to our success.

Processes have been put in place to foster planning and to track progress in several priority areas identified in the White Paper. A priority for 2010-2011 will be to develop key performance indicators (KPIs) and other measures of our progress.

Research

Research was identified in the 2005-2010 University Academic Plan as a significant institutional priority, and significant efforts are being directed to enhancing York’s research intensification and profile. We have a tremendous opportunity to mobilize the University’s energies and strengths to work towards this strategic priority, as well as to harness the synergies that exist around research and teaching programs to attain the highest level of excellence at York. We must set in motion a comprehensive implementation plan in order to realize our goal of transforming into a top research intensive University.

Achievement of this goal requires a multi-pronged approach focusing on cultural change within the institution, internal strategies focusing on local level planning and pan-University capacity building, and external strategies in building partnerships, consortia, and reputation. York has remained steadfast in its focus on growing research as a priority and we have made solid progress on our strategic research plan as well as our objectives in developing robust research partnerships as part of our research outreach initiatives this year.

Research Performance:

York’s annual research performance results are detailed through grant and other research income tables (see Performance Measures section). Further, the office of the Vice-President Research & Innovation (VPRI) has successfully launched work with four departments (English, history, psychology, and biology) on bibliometric measures of publications and citations to benchmark departmental research performance against international best practices, appropriate comparison groups and disciplinary norms. We have had been encouraged by the keen participation of these departments to measure and evaluate research strengths and opportunities. Data analysis is in progress with reporting targeted for early fall 2010.

We have achieved significant performance successes this year in many research areas where we have considerable pan-university capacity, in areas of both established and emerging strengths. For example, we were awarded two out of four SSHRC Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI) research grants in the country. With these projects York is leading partnerships with over 50 universities, 21 countries, over 100 researchers, and 50 external partners.

Pan-University Capacity Building: Likewise, digital media and climate change are niche areas where we have tremendous potential to build on our research strengths and open opportunities to lead new emerging research paradigms requiring interdisciplinary collaborations across our scientists, social scientists and leading professional schools. We made a major break-through this year in digital media with the Ministry of Research and Innovation’s Ontario Research Fund Research Excellence award
supporting a York-led initiative on visualization and data driven design, and a project on 3D film innovation and stereoscopic cinema through the Ontario Media Development Corporation and the Ontario Centres of Excellence. Both these projects bring together a unique multidisciplinary team of expertise across the University, joining with significant international collaborators and industry partners.

As well, pan-university research capacity building initiatives unfolding in the area of climate change have led to several achievements this year. VPRI has facilitated the establishment of the Consortium for Climate RAI (Research Action Integration) in partnership with the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) to help support key climate change policy initiatives. Further, York and TRCA co-hosted a very successful Climate Science Workshop this year – ”Regional Climate Modelling Capacity in Ontario” – drawing together a remarkable group of climate scientists, researchers and modellers from 11 Ontario universities, private and NGO sectors, and government officials. We have been heavily involved in the Regional Adaptation Collaborative (RAC) initiative with the Ministry of the Environment to deliver programming aimed at capacity building, training and outreach for integrating climate adaptation in source protection plans. Some other projects have received external funding in 2009/10. We must develop and harness more intensive and innovative research with leading interdisciplinary approaches in these and other areas.

This year, we also achieved further success in our industrial partnerships in science and technology through “big science” initiatives such as TRIUMF, Canada’s National Laboratory for Particle and Nuclear Physics, and the Canadian Space Agency (CSA).

We secured full membership with TRIUMF, which will enable York researchers to diversify research efforts resulting in far-reaching national and international collaborative ventures. York has also secured a $1 million grant through the CSA for instrument development with key space science industries. These ‘big science’ associations are key for York as we diversify and become a more comprehensive University.

Infrastructure:
This year we have been very productive in moving forward major projects to provide research space, especially to address our deficit in science labs: the renovation of the former Ice Arena into the Sherman Health Sciences Research Centre, housing the IMRI suite; the expansion of the 4th Floor of Petrie Science & Engineering building to accommodate the expanding research agenda in the Centre for Research on Earth & Space Science (CRESS), as well as to allow for the construction of additional laboratory space for researchers in the Faculty of Science & Engineering, particularly in Chemistry; and the new wet labs in Lumbers building. The new Life Sciences Building, identified as a priority in VPRI planning several years ago, is well underway for occupancy in late 2011, and will house significant space devoted to research and teaching laboratories that will enhance the ability to aggressively build new clusters and foster collaboration with local industries in the biotechnology field. Additionally, the York Research Tower was opened this year, providing some of the best research facilities for our social sciences and humanities researchers. The YRT concept successfully maximizes interminning and collaborative research activity and allows for shared services for the many SS&H ORUs located in the YRT.

Research Centres & Institutes:
Two new research centres were launched – the Muscle Health Research Centre (MHRC) and the Centre for Research on Biomolecular Interaction (CRBI). Both are Faculty-based centres working across departments (in the Faculty of Health and the Faculty of Science & Engineering respectively).

ORU Review: ORUs provide important infrastructure facilitating the ability of our researchers to conduct interdisciplinary research, and to compete successfully for large-scale research. Yet the current ORU structure was put in place prior to the establishment of the office of VPRI; thus it is timely to review the model. This year a working group has undertaken a comprehensive review of the structure of ORUs and provided some guidance to the process of enhancing institutionally based research and related scholarly activities. This group, working on behalf of senate and VPRI, has collected data and consulted widely. It has resulted in the production of reports on the metrics for evaluating ORUs, international best practices and literature on the topic of organized research. The working group’s final report has been submitted to senate APPRC and to the office of VPRI. The final VPRI recommendations will be presented to APPRC in fall 2010.

Showcasing Research & Building Reputation:
In our effort to build reputation and connect and engage our internal and external research communities, a renewed effort was undertaken this year to promote our research achievements with various research recognition events. November has been designated as Research Month with workshops and exhibits to showcase our research to the University community and visitors. A highlight of the celebrations is the President’s Research Excellence Awards introduced as part of the 50th Anniversary celebrations. This year we re-launched our new Research Web site and a special research edition of the York U magazine, as well as a new monthly e-mail research newsletter.

VPRI continues to host the successful York Leadership Roundtable (YLR). YLR’s goals are to showcase York research in areas of current interest and bring together York Region’s business, government and community leaders with York researchers to make valuable connections, develop mutually beneficial relationships and help build our research reputation, with business and community leaders. This year we held three successful events with leaders in York Region and are planning the next event for fall 2010.

VPRI continues to organize and host events for politicians, government and business leaders and potential donors and other visitors to tour labs and ORUs.

Innovation Networks & Partnerships:
We have continued to develop a strong consortium approach, building sustainable partnerships with both private and public sector organizations, anchored in York Region. These partnerships include multinational enterprises (MNEs) with a global R&D mandate, e.g. IBM, small and medium enterprises (SMEs), e.g.
Our national
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Quanser, community hospitals, e.g. Southlake, and municipalities,
e.g. Markham and York Region. Our goal remains steadfast; we
wish to build York U’s research reputation, strengthen research
with external organizations, access new opportunities for non-
traditional research funding, and play a leading role in innovation
as a key hub in the emerging provincial Ontario Network of
Excellence program. This Fall VPRI is also launching Innovation
York (IY) in York Region to support and raise the profile of York
research, establish a point of presence in the Region, strengthen
and enlarge our partnerships, and support the dual objectives of
commercialization and social innovation through knowledge
mobilization. IY will move us to a new level of collaboration with
our external partners – accelerating commercialization and inno-
vation by bringing together industry and our faculty and graduate
students to optimize R&D opportunities. IY will be located within
the Markham Convergence Centre. This location will be shared
with partners who bring value-added expertise and experience to
complement the University’s contributions; and we will have a
location that centres us in an industrial community that is noted
as an advanced technology leader. VPRI in collaboration with the
Town of Markham are working toward the expected opening of
the Centre in the fall 2010.

Advancing the work of Knowledge Mobilization (KM): Our national
leader status in this specialized institutional research infrastruc-
ture draws social scientists and humanists into heightened R&I
engagement with the community. This past year we conducted a
rigorous evaluation of KM, and hosted a full-day assessment
symposium with external experts. It is clear from the evaluation
that KM has met our ambitious performance expectations. It
continues to connect SSH&R developers with government and
community agencies providing these external bodies with rele-
ance and impact from the research, and giving them capacity to
follow up through our KM graduate internships. Our third annual
KM Expo in York Region once again attracted a large audience,
drawn from NGOs, municipalities and school board personnel,
to connect to York researchers. As has been our intention from the
beginning, the KM activity in the community is brokering new
relationships, building our brand and attracting new research
activity and funding to York. Some examples of this year’s
achievements:

• We attracted $284K in funding for research projects/graduate
internships.

• We supported successful CURAs and two successful MCRIs,
SSHRC’s two largest community engaged research awards for a
total of $6M in funding over the life of the projects.

• We were awarded two successful CIHR grants to support the
work of the KM Unit and connect it to other universities in the
growing Research Impact network.

• We led a SSHRC Public Outreach Grant linking York researchers
with Peel, Durham, Toronto and York Region Municipalities and
TRCA and Pollution Probe. We are also the only Ontario
University partner in the Ministry of Ontario’s Regional
Adaptation Collaborative securing $309K for climate change
curriculum development and delivery.

• United Way of York Region has agreed to fund KM interns and
KM will have a unique presence in the Convergence Centre in
Markham.

• The development of a social innovation incubator lab hosted by
Innovation York at the Markham Convergence Centre, in collabo-
ration with the United Way of York Region, will provide invest-
ment in new social innovation ventures and link to York
University research, knowledge mobilization and graduate
student internships.

Moving forward, research remains a key priority area in relation
to York’s objectives to enhance institutional quality and reputa-
tion and to engage with and contribute to York’s multitude of
communities, both locally and internationally. While continuing
to provide support for all basic research activities across the acad-
emy, we must continue to focus on developing and increasing the
institutional scope of our research, through a more pan-university
approach with collaboration across disciplines in order to increase
our share of research opportunities, external partnerships and
funding, thus transforming York into a top research institution.

Research Intensification:
Enhancing research intensity requires strengthening and promot-
ing a pervasive and sustainable research culture throughout the
University. To compete as a serious research institution we must
be committed to improving our research intensity and perform-
ance both by bringing top-level scholars to York and by ensuring
that all possible sources of support are devoted to this
complex strategic goal. Our research performance has a direct
bearing on key funding allocations and supports such as CRCs and
Indirect Costs of Research, and as such has implications for our
recruitment, reputation and budgets. Encouraging our colleagues
to understand the importance of seeking and securing external
internationally peer reviewed publications and creative works,
and advancing participation in all forms of externally sponsored
research, are fundamental to our research reputation.

Enhancement of Faculty/Unit Level Planning
and Services:
It is crucial that Faculties develop robust Research Plans, includ-
ing complement planning. Faculties must be in a position to
utilize evidence-based decision-making in support of coordinated
research planning efforts, including the development of meaning-
ful comparators to identify research strengths based on discipline
norms and international standards. Faculty research planning
must also encompass consideration of broader opportunities for
 collaboration with other areas of the institution. A key considera-
tion in all research planning is faculty complement. Full-time
faculty complement is a crucial component of York’s quality in all
aspects, and the making of key strategic appointments is a signif-
icant priority in order to strengthen established areas of research
excellence and to build interdisciplinary capacity in thematic
areas where there are opportunities for York to play a leadership
role in defining and advancing the field.

Enhancement of Pan-University Research
Capacity Building:
In addition to the importance of key strategic appointments in
support of capacity building in areas of research strength and new
emerging and interdisciplinary areas, as noted above, it will be
important to work towards increasing the number of large scale
international multi-disciplinary funding applications by fostering
the development of multi-disciplinary teams. Faculty research
plans should be helpful in identifying opportunities for pan-university synergies. Larger research opportunities can be leveraged based on pan-university research collaborations. Steps should also be taken to enable York to respond to complex contemporary social and scientific research issues. Finally, the VPRI will also work with Senate APPRC to develop new policies around the organization and structure of organized research units.

Innovation Networks and Partnerships:
The planned opening of Innovation York in the Convergence Centre in Markham will create a presence in York Region from which to position York as the research University in York Region and provide a basis for the further development of faculty research outreach in the region. It will work to accelerate commercialization and innovation by bringing together both industry and entrepreneurial faculty and graduate students to optimize R&D opportunities. It will also provide opportunities to deepen and build on partnerships established through York’s Knowledge Mobilization unit and will work to create new social innovation networks, and support securing large grants in collaboration with private sector partnerships. This in turn will provide faculty and graduate students with broader research opportunities through connections with public policy leaders in York Region, including opportunities for experiential learning/research, and will enhance York’s research reputation and differentiation.

A White Paper working group on Research Intensification has been established to support and facilitate planning in relation to research in 2010-2011.

In summary, major priorities and initiatives for 2010-2011 include:
1. intensification of research and enhancement of research performance
2. enhancement of unit level planning and services
3. enhancement of pan-university research capacity building
4. expansion of engagement in innovation networks and partnerships

Teaching and Learning

A hallmark of an excellent University education is the preparation of graduates with the skills and knowledge to be active and contributing citizens of their communities and of a global society.

Experiential Education:
A priority for both students and the institution is the expansion of opportunities for students to apply what they are learning to real world issues and situations, thereby supporting deeper student learning through the integration of theory and practice, and in turn enhancing the quality of their experience at the University. Experiential education (EE) encompasses a range of options inside and outside the classroom (for pay or for academic credit), including co-ops and internships, practica or clinical placements, community service learning, problem-based learning, thesis or other major research project, simulations, capstone courses, etc. The White Paper set as a benchmark the expansion of availability of EE opportunities for every student.

The working group that explored EE models in 2009-2010 recommended a broadly-defined Faculty-based approach which incorporates reflection on the experiential component as part of the curriculum. Successful implementation will be dependent on the provision of support to build faculty capacity, simplification of administrative burdens, flexibility coupled with an element of coordination, and fostering of community partnerships.

E-Learning:
Online and Hybrid Courses: Coordinated efforts to expand e-learning opportunities have the potential to contribute to York’s commitments to accessibility, engagement and flexible learning opportunities, and to its ability to address enrolment pressures. Thus far, York has had a relatively limited presence in this area. The working group exploring E-learning in 2009-2010 concluded that there are significant opportunities for York to enhance initiatives to effectively engage students in e-learning and to become a leader in this field, through the development of quality e-learning courses and with appropriate investments in technical support and faculty training. Use of social networking opportunities will promote student engagement with each other and with faculty. It will be important to ensure that every course has a Web presence and that where possible entire programs are available online. In addition, there are important opportunities for partnerships with other institutions in this area.

Teaching Recognition and Support:
Increased support for teaching and curriculum design (including financial, coordination/administration, research), building on the work already under way through the Centre for the Support of Teaching and in the Faculties, and recognition of outstanding teaching through tenure and promotion, merit and internal and external teaching awards are crucial to the promotion of engaged teaching and to promoting the value attached to outstanding teaching.

The Libraries are crucial partners in all aspects of student learning. Development of a Learning Commons in the Libraries to coordinate learning supports and provide student study space has been proceeding throughout 2009-2010, culminating in the opening of the new facility in September 2010. The Learning Commons reflects an integrated approach, embedding information literacy and skills development into the curriculum. Access to the Libraries’ expanding digital collections will be particularly important for the success of online learning and can make library resources (including archival materials) available to the wider community. Study spaces in the Libraries promote collaborative learning and enhance the experience of all of our students, particularly the large cadre of commuter students.

Graduate Education:
While a number of teaching and learning initiatives apply primarily to the undergraduate level, attention must also be paid to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning and supervision for graduate students, including expanded opportunities to participate in faculty members’ research projects.
The White Paper sets benchmarks in relation to the quality of graduate students and support for their studies, as well as in relation to their success and completion times. These matters will be pursued by the Faculty of Graduate Studies through development of enrolment and recruitment/retention plans, and the FGS report (following) sets out initiatives already under way and planned in this regard. Key to the enhancement of graduate education will be expansion of support for professional/transferable skills training and of opportunities for graduate students to gain experiential education.

Program Development:

Development of new programs has been somewhat curtailed by budget restrictions over the past several years. Nevertheless some significant new initiatives have been introduced as described in Faculty sections. Notable among these are collaborative initiatives in Fine Arts and Science & Engineering around digital technologies, linked to research development in this area, and an innovative dual degree in Engineering and International Development Studies involving LA&PS and FSE. A number of new programs were also approved or commenced in 2009-2010 including a Masters in Information Systems & Technology (MAIST), a PhD in Études Françaises, a direct entry PhD in Health, and a Bachelor of Disaster and Emergency Management. (See Faculty sections for further details.) It is anticipated that program development going forward will focus on priority areas such as engineering, in support of the University’s objective of rebalancing its programming to advance comprehensiveness. New program initiatives also reflect York’s commitment to offer programming in areas of innovation and social/professional relevance; examples of program directions anticipated for development during 2010-2011 include an MFA in Ecological Design for Performance in Fine Arts, a Master’s Program in Conference Interpreting through Glendon’s School of Translation, a BEd in Technological Education, a BA in Global Health, and a BSc in Neurosciences involving the Faculty of Health and the Faculty of Science & Engineering.

Program development will need to take into account opportunities and imperatives for curricular innovation and flexibility in delivery modes afforded by technological advances. A component of program development is the review of existing programs to ensure their continuing currency and viability. Finally, robust quality assurance protocols, consistent with a new provincial framework, are being developed and implemented for both graduate and undergraduate programs.

A working group has been established for 2010-2011 to support and facilitate planning across the University around a range of teaching and learning issues. In summary, major priorities and initiatives for 2010-2011 include:

1. expansion of opportunities for students to engage in experiential education in support of deeper student learning
2. an increase in the number and range of online and hybrid courses and programs, in support of accessibility and active learning
3. continuing development of programs to respond to student interests and institutional priorities
4. enhancing accessibility through bridging programs and other agreements

Student Experience

Enhancing all aspects of the student experience in support of academic quality and engagement is a key priority of the White Paper; efforts are under way in a variety of areas, both pan-university and at the Faculty level.

First Year Experience:
Evidence indicates that the quality of the first year experience is a crucial factor in student retention and success and a major focus of planning going forward will be to put in place a strong foundation for entering students (beginning with their admission to York), including initiatives to foster community building through, for example, virtual interaction, peer mentoring, learning communities through course clusters, study groups, etc. as suggested in the report of the first year experience working group. These initiatives will build on efforts already under way in various Faculties, including, for example, peer mentoring initiatives that have been introduced in LA&PS, Fine Arts and Health and will provide models for other Faculties, an academic skills workshop offered at Glendon to help entering students make the transition to university, and initiatives in the new Faculty of LA&PS designed to promote engagement of both new and returning students and to build leadership skills. Outreach initiatives such as Science & Engineering’s Science Olympics acquaint high school students with our community even before they apply for admission. In 2010-2011, a Bethune College/FSE living/learning project, that aims to create in the college residence small communities of students in the same program, will be piloted and assessed. An important element of the student experience, particularly on a commuter campus such as York, is the provision of comfortable and appropriate study and social space for students at all levels of study, and this remains a priority.

Coordinated Advising Program:
A coordinated advising program will provide clearer and more consistent advising for students at all levels, including the graduate level, and will enhance opportunities to identify and assist students at risk. Elements of this more coordinated approach to advising include enhanced use of online tools, advising tracking mechanisms, and improved coordinated training for advisors. Implementation of online degree audit capability will be key to provision of improved coordinated advising.

Faculty/College Collaboration:
Colleges are important partners with the Faculties in promoting opportunities (both academic and social) for student interaction and community-building, as well as in providing supports, and these partnerships should be strengthened and expanded.

A working group whose mandate encompasses a range of aspects contributing to the student experience has been established for 2010-2011 to support and facilitate planning as appropriate in this area. In summary, major priorities and initiatives for 2010-2011 include:

1. realignment and expansion of the role of the Retention Council to coordinate development and implementation of initiatives intended to enhance the student experience, including student academic and social communities, student supports (financial and other), and the provision of student space to support engagement
2. support for the implementation of a range of elements as appropriate to the Faculties to engage entering students
3. development of a coordinated advising program across the institution, including technological and training supports

Community Engagement and Outreach

Community engagement and outreach also encompasses a number of key aspects and the White Paper calls upon the provost to lead development of a coordinated pan-university strategy in this area. This initiative will build upon the work of the President’s Task Force on Community Engagement, whose report was published in 2010.

Community Engagement:
York has been a leader for many years in a range of community engagement initiatives including connections with the local community (e.g., the York University – Toronto Dominion Community Engagement Centre and links with organizations in York Region), with international partners for research and programming, and with other institutions, including both universities and colleges. Recent developments include establishment of a Sustainable Energy Initiative in Environmental Studies to serve as a focus to foster partnerships around a new green energy economy and the Faculty of Health’s York-University Health Network Nursing Academy. Government interest in an Online Institute provides further opportunities to collaborate with other institutions for the benefit of students. York’s collaborative programs with other institutions position us well to play a leadership role in responding to government interest in development of clearer and more streamlined pathways throughout the postsecondary system in the province. Glendon’s recent articulation agreement with Collège Boréal as part of its mandate for the Centre of Excellence for French-language and Bilingual Postsecondary Education in Southern Ontario provides an example of York’s leadership in this area.

York is also a leader in serving its community through the offering of bridging programs in areas such as nursing, business and information technology for internationally-educated professionals to prepare them for positions in Canada.

International:
York is well known for its leadership in internationalization, including award-winning summer internships and exchange agreements and we must take steps to build on that leadership position. The past year’s highlights include the approval of a dual degree program – a Masters in Public and International Affairs – involving Glendon College and the University of Strasbourg, and the expansion of Schulich’s presence in India through the offering of an MBA program with the first two semesters taught at SP Jain Institute of Management and Research in Mumbai and the final two semesters taught at Schulich.

The presence on the York campuses of students from diverse cultures adds to the richness of the experience for all of our community members. In order to achieve objectives relating to the attraction and retention of increased numbers of international students, coordinated strategies will need to be developed involving the Faculties, the Admissions office, and York International, including the identification of strategic countries and regions for recruitment, the use of a variety of recruitment methods (in person and online, as well as connections with local communities), attractive programming, and provision of advising and support programs tailored to the needs of international students.

Continuing and Professional Education:
Several Faculties (principally Osgoode, Schulich, and Education, but also Liberal Arts & Professional Studies, Health and Glendon) and a university-based unit, the York University English Language Institute, currently offer continuing education programming under individual mandates and operational structures. Therefore, there is a need to bring greater coordination to this area of activity. A working group on continuing education recommended the creation of a pan-university structure, within which some units could continue to maintain operational autonomy, offering a range of (primarily) non-degree programming but also some programs and courses that could be credited towards degrees. This framework would provide opportunities to present a single “face” of continuing and professional education at York through coordinated advertising, Web site, etc., offer efficiencies through coordinated administrative and technological support, enable York to respond quickly and effectively to external needs and to support accessibility, and maximize opportunities to generate funds. Consideration will therefore proceed in 2010-2011 towards the development of this more coordinated structure for continuing and professional studies at York.

A working group whose mandate focuses on supporting and facilitating planning around community engagement and outreach has been established for 2010-2011. In summary, major priorities and initiatives for 2010-2011 include:

1. development of a pan-university strategy for community engagement, including greater coordination of activities and approaches, potentially through an office devoted to community engagement, and greater recognition/communication of those activities
2. development of a coordinated international recruitment plan involving the Faculties and central offices
3. development of a pan-university framework structure for continuing and professional education at York
Planning Processes in Support of Priorities

The White Paper development process highlighted the need for efficient and effective planning processes, in support of institutional priorities, in several areas:

Complement Planning:

Complement planning, particularly around the tenure stream faculty, is of crucial importance in supporting areas of strength and enabling the University to pursue emerging research and teaching areas of societal and student interest. Following a period of severely curtailed ability to make appointments, some increased capacity will be available for 2011-2012, and a call for Faculty complement plans leading to a total of 30 searches for appointments funded centrally from strategic funds was issued in the spring of 2010. The Faculties submitted detailed complement plans for directions over a three-year planning horizon, together with requests for over 60 strategic appointments (defined as addressing institutional or Faculty priorities). Thirty approvals were granted across the Faculties for searches to be undertaken in 2010-2011. These appointments are intended to maintain current strengths in areas such as international studies, vision research, and the pure sciences and to advance new areas, such as digital media, where York has the potential to be a leader through development of strategic research clusters.

At the same time, complement planning must take into account the full range of our teaching complement, in particular the large cadre of talented and dedicated contract and contractually limited colleagues who contribute significantly to the education of our students, including ways to better integrate and support their work. The emphasis in the White Paper on enhancing quality in teaching and learning provides an opportunity to creatively consider how to engage the range of instructors and librarians in dialogue about best practices and recognition of teaching quality and innovation.

Enrolment Planning:

Enrolment planning must take into account a number of factors:

• York’s objective to become a more comprehensive university through rebalancing of programming and enrolments (undergraduate and graduate) towards the sciences and engineering, health and professional programs;
• the opportunity to work towards this objective, as well as towards the objective of increasing students’ entry averages, provided by the anticipated increase in demand for university spaces in the GTA;
• the objective of increasing the proportion of international students in our community;
• consideration of the appropriate overall size of the University, taking into account limitations of space;
• consideration of the appropriate balance of graduate and undergraduate enrolments, including issues of quality of students and of the education and supports we can provide to students pursuing graduate programs; and
• the need to maintain the commitment to access and equity in our admissions policies.

Administrative Structures and Processes to Enhance Effectiveness and Support Priorities:

The year 2009-2010 saw the implementation of a significant structural change, planning for which had been under way for several years: the amalgamation of the former Faculties of Arts and Liberal and Professional Studies into the new Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies (LA&PS). The Faculty’s inaugural year has been both challenging and successful, as detailed in its report (following).

The year also saw implementation of new Senate structures, clarifying, realigning and consolidating committee functions in support of academic planning and priority-setting.

A major objective of planning at York is to maximize the alignment of human capital and organizational structures in support of university priorities and objectives. In order to advance this objective several processes are moving forward:

• The Integrated Resource Planning Process: The IRP process is continuing to move towards full implementation as a tool to support the alignment of resources to advance academic priorities and to promote the ongoing identification of outcomes and measures of success and the tracking of progress. During the 2009-2010 year, the IRP Office facilitated the alignment of the White Paper and the Integrated Resource Plan (IR Plan) processes to ensure that Divisions’, Faculties’ and units’ 2010-2013 IR Plans reflected institutional strategic objectives as they emerged. Using the draft 2010-2013 IR Plans as a basis, the IRP Office developed and piloted the Priority Based Resource Analysis (PBRA) budget management tool to demonstrate the linkages between priorities and resources. In 2009-2010 pilots were run to shape the development of the PBRA tool and to test its ability to demonstrate alignment between priorities and resources, inform resource decision making, strengthen accountability, and provide evidence-based information for resource management at the Faculty and unit levels. Findings from the pilots are being used to further develop the PBRA’s capabilities and utility for all levels of the University.

• Budget Resources Review: The President has initiated a Budget Resources Review (BRR) process, led by the Provost and the Vice-President Finance & Administration. The BRR process is intended to be the vehicle through which the University will achieve a better alignment of resource allocation processes and outcomes with overall university objectives. The BRR process will develop options and recommendations with a view to achieving the following goals across the organization:
  – achieving savings and capturing efficiencies;
  – increasing operational and organizational effectiveness;
  – identifying and implementing revenue generation opportunities and initiatives; and
  – ensuring that savings are utilized to advance the core mission of the University in teaching, research and public service.
• **Performance Measures:** An institutional level working group will be established, in conjunction with and reporting to Senate APPRC, to develop consensus around a set of key performance indicators and measures that can be used to track progress towards institutional priorities.

• **Provost’s Policy Committee:** A Provost’s Policy Committee, including senior members of the Division and representation from a number of the deans, has been established to advise the provost on matters central to the provost’s portfolio including White Paper implementation.

• **Graduate Studies:** Led by the Faculty of Graduate Studies, and arising from the 2009-2010 Report on Academic Planning and Graduate Education at York University, deliberations continue towards consideration and, where appropriate, implementation of recommendations on graduate planning, governance and administrative structures.

**Capital/Space Planning:**

Ongoing major initiatives to enhance the environment for research, teaching and learning at York include:

• the new Life Sciences Building
• significant renovations to Osgoode Hall Law School
• expansion and refurbishment of Glendon’s York Hall
• the Library Learning Commons

The next several years will also see extensive planning and construction associated with the extension of the subway to York University, a development that will have implications not only for the physical campus but for planning in a range of other areas including enrolments, the student experience, and the University’s relationships with the community.
Faculty Reports on Progress Towards Objectives in Priority Areas in 2009-2010 and Plans for 2010-2011

Each of York’s ten Faculties and the University Libraries provided reports on their priorities, within the context of institutional priorities, for 2009-2010 and looking forward to 2010-2011.

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Overview

The Faculty of Education has continued the process of developing new initiatives selectively and building upon current strengths in each of its program areas in 2009-2010. Its activities have been guided by the 2009-2014 Faculty Plan and university planning processes, notably the 2005 University Academic Plan and the Provostial White Paper. The Faculty’s overarching commitments to inclusion, equity, diversity and social justice continue to inform our planning decisions and choices in a context of the need to respond in innovative ways to shifting and unexpected external currents. The Faculty Plan identifies strategic priorities in the areas of programmatic offerings, reputation and visibility in the professional and academic fields, research culture and productivity, and operational effectiveness. The objectives we achieved in 2009-2010 relate to these priorities and consolidate our capacity in community-based education across all program areas.

The highlights of Faculty activities and plans provided below have been selected to draw attention to the alignment between our strategic plan and the Provostial White Paper. We have grouped our achievements in relation to the strategic priorities of our Faculty plan; however, the selection favours achievements in the areas of community engagement, technologically enhanced education, and internationalization. In our Faculty plan, we strive to develop coherence across activities and program areas. As a result, many of our achievements and future objectives touch on more than one priority. Moreover, the nature of academic life is such that the outcomes of one year’s efforts cannot entirely be captured in a one-year snapshot because several additional years are required to fully realize the developments attached to the objective. In a similar way, many strategic priorities are complex and unfold over several years.

REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF 2009-2010 OBJECTIVES

Programmatic offerings

Implemented proposal to create a graduate diploma in Education in the New Urban Environment: The diploma program was approved by Senate in October of 2008 and admitted students in 2009.

Implementing a curriculum review of the graduate program: A comprehensive review of course offerings in the graduate program was undertaken as part of a regular program review to be completed in 2010.

Implemented curriculum initiatives in the pre-service program: An undergraduate specialization in Indigenous Education was approved and students were admitted in 2009. An undergraduate elective, Teaching Internationally and Interculturally, was approved.

Continuing with review of undergraduate program in view of possible shifts in provincial funding policy: The supply of new teachers in Ontario continues to exceed demand. New Initiatives: A new pattern of study was developed for teacher preparation in the area of Science Education in order to attract well-qualified applicants in an area of demand. A pilot project in at our Georgian College site provided students with placements in an Aboriginal/First Nations community and enhanced curriculum in Indigenous perspectives. A proposal to admit students directly from secondary school was approved as a pilot in collaboration with Glendon College and the Faculties of Fine Arts and Science and Engineering. A proposal for teacher education in Technological Studies has been developed and will seek Senate approval and Ontario College of Teachers accreditation in 2010-2011. The 2010 provincial budget announced reductions in the funding for initial teacher preparation. Tentative plans to reduce enrolments in primary/junior certification while continuing to strengthen enrolments in areas of distinctiveness will be finalized once we learn how the province plans to implement its decision.

Continuing to create coherence in strategic areas across programs: Building on the Faculty’s emerging strengths in education in environmental sustainability, a summer institute cluster of graduate, undergraduate and professional courses was designed to coincide with a one-day conference hosted by The Sustainability and Education Academy, a leadership program. The institute featured York faculty members, professional educators, an international speaker as well as a visiting scholar from the UK who taught the graduate course. This model contributes to our efforts to enhance our international programs and relationships as well as providing new opportunities for research and community engagement collaborations.

Reputation and visibility in the professional and academic fields

Faculty recruitment strategy: As planned, the Faculty appointed the inaugural Jean Augustine Chair in Education in the New Urban Environment. Three additional members of the professoriate joined the Faculty on July 1, 2009. These included appointments in the Koschitzky Chair in Jewish Teacher Education (jointly with LA&PS), in Urban Education and in French Immersion Education with Glendon College.
Review of the Westview Partnership: An arms-length review of a long-standing partnership designed to improve access to post-secondary education and educational practices in urban contexts between the Faculty of Education and the Toronto District School Board culminated in a one-day conference involving participants of the program’s initiatives and stakeholder groups. Discussions are underway to renew the partnership on the basis of the review’s recommendations, current research, and demographic changes in the board.

Implemented initiatives in International Education: Undergraduate students participated in international practicum placements and internships in places such as Kenya, Nicaragua and the People’s Republic of China. Seed funding was secured to explore opportunities to strengthen the Faculty’s relationship with the Pädagogische Hochschule (PH) Freiburg and expand European connections with Sweden. In collaboration with the Faculty of Education Student Association (FESA) a mini-conference was created with a focus on teaching internationally. A graduate colloquium for students featured the international research of our faculty members.

Enhanced Communications: The International Program developed a new media strategy that included promotional materials and Web content, including videos of students who have participated in international learning opportunities. The undergraduate program, in preparation for an undergraduate program review and Ontario College of Teachers accreditation review, developed ‘a virtual exhibits room’ to house materials for the reviews and information about our programs that will form the foundation for ongoing communications initiatives.

Enhanced Knowledge Mobilization: The York Centre for Education and Community and L&PS researchers received SSHRC funding to create inclusive curriculum materials using African Canadian autobiographies. YCEC hosted successful ‘town hall’ (Conversations in Education) sessions for educators and community members on selected topics; they formed the basis for successful SSHRC funding to expand the program with suburban area school boards and communities on issues relating to inclusive education and diverse student populations. A required Teacher Education Advisory Committee meeting was enhanced by a panel discussion on pandemic planning, an important topic for the educational community, with presentations by University researchers from a number of disciplines.

Research culture and productivity

Implemented a proposal to establish a Faculty-based Organized Research Unit in Education and Community: The York Centre for Education and Community was approved in 2008. An ad hoc steering committee and the Director of the Centre established the mandate and governance structure. In 2009-2010 an Executive Committee established an Advisory Council and developed a strategic plan that will contribute to the enhancement of our research culture and productivity, our reputation in the professional and academic fields, and the development of community engagement initiatives.

Enhanced Research Culture and Productivity: SSHRC has funded a collaboration between Faculty of Education researchers and graduate students and colleagues from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid that compares educational challenges in terms of learning and achievement for Caribbean (Canada) and Ecuadorian (Spain) immigrant students. Efforts to diversify research funding sources included attaining ‘Vendor of Record’ status with the Ministry of Education, service research grants from the Police Services Board and the Toronto District School Board, a major international not-for-profit sub grant in the area of technology, as well as two CIHR-funded projects.

Operational effectiveness

Implemented Faculty Plan for Technological support and On-line Learning Capacity: The Faculty completed its transition towards a consolidated Microsoft infrastructure for communications and collaboration purposes. We moved to a Moodle-based learning platform and developed an intranet service (Sharepoint) as part of a planned strategy to provide equitable access to technological services and opportunities to explore pedagogical aspects of technology use. The Deaf and Hard of Hearing Education unit designed and delivered a customized blended multi-platform learning experience. An initial SMARTboard program provided access to an interactive white board and associated software titles for all undergraduate students. Research and Field Development’s broad portfolio of online Additional Qualification courses were migrated from webCT to a dedicated Moodle environment. A research newsletter augmented its print version with an on-line version that is archived.

Strategic Priorities, 2010-2011

Programmatic offerings

• Develop and implement long-term plans for undergraduate, graduate and continuing education enrolment.

• Complete the Undergraduate Program Review, the Graduate Program Review, and the Ontario College of Teachers Accreditation Review.

• Approve the undergraduate program in technical studies; prepare for the 2011-2012 intake of its first student cohort.

• Increase participation in international education; develop priorities and long-range plans.

• Develop new continuing and professional education programs and activities, particularly in the area of leadership for sustainable communities.
Reputation and visibility in the professional and academic fields
• Implement a renewed partnership agreement with Toronto District School Board (The Westview Partnership).
• Develop a multi-faceted communications and knowledge mobilization strategy for the Faculty and in all program areas that includes accessible discussion fora, pod-casting capacity, story-writing capacity, and web-based activities for showcasing faculty activities.
• Develop strategies for tracking and communicating with alumni.
• Renew fundraising priorities and develop a strategic plan for fundraising activities.

Research culture and productivity
• Renew a faculty complement plan that reflects and supports academic planning priorities across program areas.
• Develop a research strategic plan and strategies for capturing, evaluating and sharing the diversity and range of research activities.
• Enhance existing institutional frameworks and structures to support research; establish a research and community engagement plan with the Jean Augustine Chair in Education in the New Urban Environment; strengthen capacity to support research funded by a diversity of sources.

Operational effectiveness
• Implement a review of face-to-face Additional Qualification course offerings and include an e-learning component for all courses.
• Increase e-learning capacity and sophistication; expand on-line offerings in undergraduate, graduate and continuing education programs.
• Establish an e-learning community to help faculty learn and implement technologically enhanced learning methods into undergraduate and graduate courses.
Overview

The Faculty of Environmental Studies (FES), the first and largest Environmental Studies program in Canada, continues to be a leader in interdisciplinary, experiential and contextual learning. Faculty and students explore systems and relationships in built, natural and social environments, emphasizing the integration of theory and practice. FES offers BES, MES and PhD degrees.

In 2009-2010, FES met all of its financial obligations, including a required budget cut of 3.5 per cent. We achieved this primarily through the departure of faculty members who we did not replace. Our reduced faculty complement presents challenges as enrolments in our BES program continue to grow. We are addressing this by a decreasing enrolment in the MES program, by raising admissions standards in all of our programs, and by improving our communications to attract highly motivated environmental studies students from across Canada and abroad.

REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF 2009-2010 GOALS

Research: Advance our reputation for groundbreaking critical interdisciplinary research while enhancing the Faculty’s existing research profile and developing strength in long-term strategic areas.

- Purchased land for the development of a research and teaching facility associated with the Las Nubes Project in Costa Rica thanks to a generous donation from the Don and Lillian Wright Foundation
- Established a Sustainable Energy Initiative (SEI) to serve as a nucleus connecting faculty and student researchers with external partners interested in fostering a new green energy economy
- Published Sense and Sustainability: Interdisciplinary Research in Environmental Studies to showcase outstanding collaborative faculty/student publications from the past decade
- Provided competitive course releases for outstanding FES faculty researchers
- Developed more focused recruitment and admissions materials and processes to improve alignment between graduate student and faculty research interests
- Developed individual faculty member Web sites to improve research promotion and graduate student recruitment
- Significantly increased the number of visiting scholars, postdoctoral fellows, and adjunct faculty collaborating on research with FES faculty and students

Student Experience: Offer students a learning environment that reflects the Faculty’s culture of community and inclusion, and provides support for the development of active learners and engaged citizens.

- Improved advising for and retention of Bachelor in Environmental Studies (BES) students through outreach, new opportunities for individual and group advising, and learning strategy workshops
- Improved advising for graduate students through focused retreats and professional development workshops for faculty members
- Improved graduate student/faculty member ratios by reducing the numbers of Masters in Environmental Studies (MES) students
- Created a hub for community activities by consolidating co-curricular activities within an expanded Student and Alumni Resource Centre, including student engagement in campus sustainability initiatives
- Continued to develop and implement recruitment strategies specifically designed to attract students from diverse backgrounds, particularly international students

Curriculum Quality: Deliver strong, distinctive curriculum that reflects interdisciplinary in substance and pedagogy, combines critical thought with agency to offer students a unique learning experience that prepares them to lead change related to social and environmental sustainability.

- Reviewed and streamlined BES core curriculum to improve focus of student learning within each of four Areas of Concentration
- Continued to actively involve alumni in the creation of internships, in mentoring of students, and in various capacities as speakers and instructors

Overall Academic Quality: Increase the overall quality of our academic programs by enhancing all aspects of the learning experience, as well as directly and indirectly improving the reputation of the Faculty.

- Increased the minimum GPA (to 74 per cent) and the proportion of students entering the BES program with an average of 80 per cent or higher
- Increased the minimum GPA for students entering the MES program and more tightly screened for factors known to contribute to success in a self-directed graduate program
- Continued to improve match between graduate student admissions and faculty members’ research interests
Capacity Building: Engage in operational renewal and leadership development to better address change and to open capacity for new initiatives.

• Extended mentoring for junior faculty members beyond initial year of hire in order to better support the development of their research and teaching skills
• Reviewed staff roles and responsibilities to improve service delivery and ongoing alignment with strategic priorities
• Developed intensive coaching system for CPM staff to improve collaborative managerial skills
• Continued to introduce new computerized processes for graduate student admissions, program records and general administration

GOALS FOR 2010-2011

Research
• Hire a Chair in Neo-Tropical Conservation to lead the Faculty’s increasingly popular Las Nubes Project in Costa Rica
• Develop and implement a Communication Plan, including a research communication plan, to better promote Faculty research strengths to internal and external audiences
• Continue to develop partnerships with other Faculties and with both local and international partners to promote community-based research on climate change, renewable energy, health and environmental education
• Continue to expand the number of visiting scholars, postdoctoral fellows, and adjunct faculty collaborating on research with FES faculty members and students

Student Experience
• Implement a peer mentoring program in cooperation with the BES Student Association (BESSA)
• Continue to offer annual faculty workshops on advising to provide training and support, as well as opportunities to collectively develop new approaches and models for graduate student advising
• Continue to improve students’ timely progress through and completion of MES and PhD programs
• Continue to expand opportunities for internships and field placements for both undergraduate and graduate students on campus, locally, nationally, and internationally

Curriculum Quality
• Review the graduate curriculum, including graduate diploma offerings, to ensure continued innovation and relevance, and to reflect strategic priorities and expertise of recent faculty hires
• Successfully complete accreditation review of the graduate planning programs by the Ontario Professional Planning Institute and Canadian Institute of Planners

Overall Academic Quality
• Update recruitment materials to highlight specific experiential education opportunities, such as the Costa Rican field course
• Continue to encourage stronger linkages between graduate student and faculty research interests in the recruitment and admissions process
• Implement a Communications Plan that provides clear and consistent information about FES and its programs to internal and external audiences
• Offer professional development workshops for faculty on media relations and knowledge mobilization to better promote external awareness of faculty expertise
• Continue to review staff roles and responsibilities to improve service delivery and alignment with strategic priorities
Overview

York University’s Faculty of Fine Arts enjoys a reputation for integrated education at the undergraduate and graduate levels, bringing together artists and scholars in all the fine arts disciplines. This mix of studio and studies engenders synergies in research and pedagogy, grounding our students’ education in the finest traditions of humanist and artistic training. Graduates of the Faculty play a significant role in Canada’s creative economy as artists, performers and writers; producers, directors and designers; historians and ethnographers; critics, policy-makers and educators. The research of our faculty members in scholarly settings, labs and studios, on stage and on screen, helps define, and contributes to our understanding of, Canada’s history, culture and global contributions, including the development of innovative approaches in the areas of digital technology and the environment. Thus, the recently revised 2010 vision states:

York University’s Faculty of Fine Arts is a center of creative exploration, wide-ranging critical intellectual enquiry and innovative research. It is an energetic and stimulating community of artists and scholars who engage Canadian and global perspectives to assess the production, circulation, and reception of the visual and performing arts. Through its undergraduate and graduate programs spanning all the fine art disciplines, the Faculty promotes a synthesis of thoughtful, socially-informed scholarly research and pedagogy, grounding our students' education in the finest traditions of humanist and artistic training. Graduates of the Faculty play a significant role in Canada’s creative economy as artists, performers and writers; producers, directors and designers; historians and ethnographers; critics, policy-makers and educators. The research of our faculty members in scholarly settings, labs and studios, on stage and on screen, helps define, and contributes to our understanding of, Canada’s history, culture and global contributions, including the development of innovative approaches in the areas of digital technology and the environment. Thus, the recently revised 2010 vision states:

REPORT ON PRIORITIES

To achieve this vision the Faculty of Fine Arts has outlined five priorities that integrate teaching and research to enhance student experience on the undergraduate and graduate levels and to contribute to knowledge mobilization and community outreach.

Priority 1: Building on the Faculty’s current national reputation as a leader in arts education, to continue to develop an international reputation as an institution operating on the cutting edge of the arts in the 21st century.

The Faculty comprises six departments: Film, Visual Arts, Music, Dance and Theatre which offer BA, BFA, MA, MFA and PhD degree programs as well as a BA in Digital Media and a BDes and MDes in Design. These degrees support the education of 3,573 undergraduate FTEs and 287 graduate FTEs and are supported by 123 FTEs of tenure stream faculty and 117 FTEs of part-time faculty. The increase of graduate FTEs since 2005 represents the addition of 346 full-time equivalents to the FFA.

In 2011-2012, the Faculty of Fine Arts will add three new positions in Dance Pedagogy, Interactive Design and Music of the Americas. These positions will deepen already existing expertise in dance education, graphic design and world music. A fourth new position will be in the area of Digital Media. The ‘Digital Interactive Media Production’ position will expand the FFA’s teaching and research strength in digital media and the joint BA degree with Computer Science and Engineering (CSE/FSE). New technologies in digital film, photography, musical instrumentation, and stage technology are creating and redefining visual techniques and stage aesthetics. This focus in Digital Media is supported by a variety of teaching/research labs in the Faculty of Fine Arts which include physical computing and interactivity (Dance, Design, Film, Visual Arts); Augmented Reality (CRC Lab); digital sculpture (Visual Arts, Design); 3D cinema (Film); mobile media (Design, Film); and extensive related theoretical strengths in Future Cinemas and New Media studies. These labs will be the basis of a new BFA in Digital Arts which is in the design phase in 2010-2011. The goal of the BFA degree will be to center the arts of the future through the evolving technology of digital frameworks.

The FFA will be facing some future complement challenges as it is anticipated that 12 tenure stream faculty will retire by 2014. They include two in Design, two in Film, four in Dance, two in Visual Arts and two in Theatre. This does not include the four faculty who have retired between 2008-2010. Thus, there will be between 2008 and 2014 a total of 16 retirements. One goal for the FFA will be to hire new faculty to sustain historic strengths in the BFA and MFA programs and to fulfill strategic research initiatives associated with BA, MA and PhD programs.

Priority 2: Expansion of Research.

The Faculty of Fine Arts has had a success rate of 47.8 per cent this year in its applications to tri-Council grants agencies. Many of our faculty members also receive grants as individual artists and for their production companies from the Canada Council for the Arts and the Ontario and Toronto Arts Councils. York film makers and theatre producers receive further support from broadcasters, corporations, private donors and foundations. Following extensive internal consultation and examination, the Faculty of Fine Arts has identified two areas that are at the forefront of knowledge mobilization in the 21st Century. These priorities are digital technology and sustainability. While each can stand alone, they also overlap, allowing the FFA to build these research areas from current areas of expertise. Each area anticipates the incorporation of students in mentoring relationships, engagement in research projects at undergraduate and graduate levels and internships through programs such as MITACS and others.

Digital Technology: With funding of over 1.5 million dollars from SSHRC, CFI and corporate support, the FFA is building this area of specialization. Some of our noteworthy funded projects include an Ontario Media Development Corporation (OMDC) grant led by Nell Tenhaff in the Department of Visual Arts for the support of a 3D...
Sustainability is a philosophical and analytic framework which draws on and connects with many different disciplines and fields from both the arts and sciences. More frequently, the term is framed within a reference to the environment. The Faculty of Fine Arts integrates the concept of environmental sustainability with cultural sustainability. For instance, the latter would include the history of Canadian arts and culture and the evolution of Canada’s visual and performing arts and their contributions to global engagement with the arts, all as part of the FFA sustainability mandate. The focus on cultural sustainability is historically a constitutive aspect of each program within the FFA. As part of a sustainability focus, the FFA has completed a feasibility study to environmentally renovate the 625 seat lecture/performance space Burton Auditorium. In April of 2011, the FFA will hold a SSHRC funded international conference on "Staging Sustainability: Arts, Community, Environment and Performance" which will bring together artists, environmental theorists, and policy makers to determine new directions for the development of green technologies in the performing arts both in Canada and abroad. This conference is also in support of an MFA in Ecological Design for Performance which will make the Faculty of Fine Arts a global leader in the area as it will be the first such degree anywhere.

Priority 3: Engagement/Community: Promote an open environment that allows for a vibrant and mutually enriching conversation between faculty, students and myriad external communities in support of research, teaching, and student academic and professional success.

In the Faculty of Fine Arts, the integration of teaching and research takes place on campus in classrooms, laboratories, stages and studios and is ultimately shared with many different communities through the professional lives of both faculty and students. In this past year, their creative and scholarly work has been presented in distinguished galleries and exhibits and on esteemed professional stages throughout Canada and the U.S., in Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Africa. At the center of this discourse between the FFA and the community are the 10,000 plus alumni who mentor students through special day long workshops such as Connect/Re-Connect which brings alumni to campus, internships, and through individual faculty engagement with arts organizations and industrial partners. The FFA actively works with several arts organizations and industry partners across the GTA including but not limited to York Regional Arts Council, Toronto Arts Council, Toronto City Summit Alliance, Markham Theatre, Harbourfront, Varley Gallery, MOCCA, Canadian Stage, Cinespace, and AC Lighting.

Priority 4: Internationalization

An already well-established program of international participation exists across all FFA departments, including student and faculty exchanges and research opportunities. In October 2009, the FFA held a joint symposium with Peking University on art and technology which included scholars from Canada, United States and China. The Design Department has a successful International Internship Program (at the third year level). Consequently, the Design Department has a growing number of students who have found employment in companies located in Tokyo, San Francisco, Istanbul, Hong Kong, New York, etc. The FFA has also established exchanges with the following institutions: Dance (Chichester); Film (Helsinki, Copenhagen, Leeds, Valencia); Visual Art (Leeds, Monterrey, Bezailel); Design (Bauhaus); Theatre (Northumbria). Plans for increased internationalization in the six FFA departmental plans focus on developing long term relationships with universities in Europe, Asia and South America.

In the academic year 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, there were respectively 83 and 81 international FFTE in the FFA. With the economic downturn this figure had dropped in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 to 69 and 62 FFTE. There is the goal to increase the number of international students to ten per cent of the student population. Currently, the FFA is creating the infrastructure through Student Academic Services to support this number of students.

Priority 5: Enhancing operational effectiveness

The teaching/research mission of the Faculty of Fine Art is supported by an infrastructure that includes faculty, staff and space. In 2009-2010 the FFA initiated two projects to increase operational effectiveness. The first is in the area of sustainability and green technology. The computing program through the FFA has been revised to focus on low energy systems and the laboratory spaces have been evaluated for their use of sustainable environmentally enhancing practices. The second initiative addresses effectiveness by fully extending our integrated resource plan into operations for clearer alignment of resources with strategic priorities. To this end, we began a review of organizational structures, practices and human resource allocation such that our operational activities become more consistently directed toward strategic outcomes and become more streamlined with the development of coherent functional plans. This second initiative will continue in 2010-2011.
Overview

Situated on a separate campus in mid-town Toronto, Glendon is York’s bilingual faculty, offering a unique environment for excellence in liberal arts education while studying and living in Canada’s two official languages. It is a place of learning that is in tune with today’s educational needs for the success of its graduates. Glendon’s distinctive bilingual immersion, coupled with a continued dedication to programs exploring Canadian issues and Canada’s place in the world, provides an excellent preparation for a future in public service and the global marketplace. Students express clear approval and satisfaction with their courses and campus life, benefitting as they do from the close-knit community on campus and from individual help with their academic, social and financial concerns.

The only site of French-language university programming in Southern Ontario, Glendon has a special responsibility toward Ontario’s Francophone community. Southern Ontario now contains a third of the province’s Francophones. In addition, it contains Canada’s largest concentration of French immersion students in the country. In 2008, the Ontario government awarded $20 Million in capital funds so that Glendon can be Southern Ontario’s Centre of Excellence for French-language and Bilingual Postsecondary Education.

GLENDON’S GOALS FOR 2009-2010
WERE TO:

Develop academic programming and initiatives at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

In 2009-2010, the Glendon bilingual and trilingual international Baccalaureate of Arts (iBA) was extended to 18 of the 20 undergraduate programs offered at Glendon. Unique in Canada, the iBA encourages the mastery of English & French (and a third language for the trilingual variant). Both programs include an international exchange and internationally-oriented courses.

Through our mandate as Centre of Excellence for French-language and Bilingual Postsecondary Education in Southern Ontario, we have signed articulation agreements with the Collège Boréal, in the areas of Adjoint juridique et Philosophie, Education en services à l’enfance et Psychologie and Techniques de travail social et Sociologie. Together with our previously signed collaborative agreement with La Cité Collégiale on Communications and Multidisciplinary Studies, we will soon be able to provide additional post-secondary options to the Francophone and Francophile population of southern Ontario.

Recently, the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies approved our proposal for a PhD in Études francophones, the first PhD program to be offered on the Glendon Campus; a cohort of three doctoral students will begin their studies in fall 2010.

A draft proposal for a Master’s in Conference Interpreting (MCI) has been submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies. The MCI, offered through the Glendon School of Translation, would meet a serious need for locally trained professionals in both official languages but also in additional languages, such as Mandarin and Spanish. The Glendon MCI would also expand its training beyond conference settings to include health-care related interpretation, a growing need in health centres throughout the GTA. Expected start of the MCI is fall 2011. Special federal government funding has been secured to support the program.

Guide the development plans for the campus.

To fulfill the $20 Million capital grant, a final construction plan has been approved for expansion of York Hall (A-wing). Providing a formal entrance to the new structure, the expansion will feature a 250 seat amphitheatre, additional classrooms and a state of the art interpretation laboratory, as well as new student space. Extensive consultations have been held with the Glendon community during the planning stage; a users-community composed of representatives from the faculty and student body has been consulted regularly. To support the full development of the project as conceived, a fundraising campaign has been initiated by Glendon’s Advancement Office. This follows upon the Office recently attaining a first phase goal of $5 Million in support of campus infrastructure improvements, student financial needs and academic programming.

Intensify and reinforce research culture and launch new initiatives.

2009-2010 was an important year for research at Glendon. In particular, we launched a new Centre for Global Challenges (CGC). The CGC is led by Alex Himelfarb, former Clerk of the Privy Council, who is also Director of the Glendon School of Public and International Affairs, and supported by the Glendon Research Office. It was officially launched at an inaugural event featuring three world-renowned economists, including one Nobel Prize recipient, discussing and debating the recent worldwide meltdown and the future of the global economy. The CGC also sponsored a luncheon conference in Ottawa by Harvard Economics professor Kenneth Rogoff. Students and alumni of the MPIA attended the event. The Glendon Research Office also launched in 2009 a new Web site highlighting research achievements and accomplishments of our faculty members.

Meet enrolment targets, while continuing to improve the quality of incoming students.

Glendon continues to meet and exceed its enrolment targets, especially in 1st-year students. Potential students aspire to join Glendon and pursue a unique bilingual education in both of Canada’s official languages and, increasingly, add a third language, such as Spanish, to their studies. Glendon’s proportion of 1st-year students entering with an average of 80 per cent or above continues its rise. Our bilingual offerings, engaged student community (more than 80 per cent of first-year and final-year students rate their overall experience as “good” or “excellent”, one of the highest in the University) and small-scale university education experience continue to attract strong students.
Develop and reinforce external strategic partnerships.

Building strong relationships with external groups and communities is crucial to Glendon. An important constituency of Glendon are the Francophone and Francophile populations of Canada. As such, Glendon representatives were active members in a number of major Francophone and French support organizations including the Agence des universités de la francophonie, the Association des universités de la francophonie canadienne, the Consortium des universités de la francophonie ontarienne and others, such as the Canadian Association of Programs in Public Administration. Glendon maintained active partnerships with Canadian Parents for French and French for the Future. Glendon also maintained important links with the Canadian federal government: it has hosted a Federal Public Servant in Residence at its School of Public and International Affairs; has been supported by a federal Deputy Minister Champion for Glendon College and York University who has secured graduate level internships; has participated in the On-line Second Language Learning Pilot Project; and has provided French language courses to a group of local federal public servants with the Canada School of Public Service. At the provincial level, Glendon also benefits from the support of a Deputy Minister Champion, who has been key in obtaining a high number of graduate level internships for students in the bilingual master’s in public and international affairs. Both Deputy Ministers also joined the Glendon School of Public and International Affairs Advisory committee in 2010. Also in 2010, Principal McRoberts was named President of the Association des universités de la francophonie canadienne. This AUCF, an important voice for Francophone post-secondary institutions outside of Québec, has selected for the first time in its history a Francophile leader. Glendon also hosted and/or ran several events with its community partners, such as: the annual Concours de français provincial, the launch of the 100th anniversary of the Assemblée de la francophonie ontarienne and the Fête nationale de la France.

In 2010-2011 Glendon will aim to pursue the following objectives, taking into account the directions set forth in the Provostial White Paper:

• Increase external visibility and pursue external strategies partnerships
• Reinforce internationalization initiatives
• Successfully implement the Glendon campus development plans
• Increase our internationalization initiatives
• Pursue research excellence activities
• Further improve student quality

Admissions Data

In 2009-2010, Glendon’s minimum admission average reached an all-time high at 77 per cent, placing it in the top range of BA cutoffs in the province. Strategies to attract top-achieving students included a Circle of Scholars program offering hand-delivered offers of admission, preferred invitations to campus events, networking opportunities, and personal advising from the Director of Recruitment. A telephone program provided personalized service from the Principal and the recruitment team to top achievers, and active outreach from Student Financial Services helped to maximize scholarship opportunities for these applicants.

Internationalization

Thanks in part to our bilingual and trilingual international Baccalaureate of Arts (iba), an option in 18 of our 20 undergraduate programs, 10 per cent of all Glendon’s third-year students have participated in an international exchange (far above the national average). At the graduate level, the recently approved Double Degree Master’s Program in Public and International Affairs between York University and the Université de Strasbourg in France will provide a unique opportunity for an international experience.

Student Engagement

In 2009-2010 Glendon maintained its high-level results in terms of student satisfaction with the entire educational experience. More than 80 per cent of first-year and final-year students rate their overall experience as “good” or “excellent”, one of the highest in the University. Students have also positively enjoyed new space dedicated to their needs: the new Student Centre in B-wing; the expansion of A-wing will also see the addition of new student spaces. New Student Orientation & Parent’s Orientation attracted once again a high number of new students and parents. This year, an academic skills workshop is being offered: Transitioning to University: Academic Skills 101, designed to provide valuable academic skills to help new students succeed in university.

TS & Faculty Complement

Glendon made one and a half full-time appointments in 2009-2010 involving a position in International Studies and a shared appointment (50 per cent) with the Faculty of Education.
Vue d’ensemble

Situé sur son propre campus au centre de Toronto, Glendon – la faculté bilingue de York – offre une formation de haut niveau en arts libéraux, dans un environnement unique qui permet d’étudier et de vivre dans les deux langues officielles du Canada. C’est un lieu d’apprentissage qui répond aux exigences éducatives d’aujourd’hui afin d’assurer la réussite de ses diplômés. Le cadre d’immersion bilingue qui caractérise Glendon, combiné à des programmes axés sur des questions concernant le Canada et sa place dans le monde, fournit une excellente préparation en vue d’une carrière dans la fonction publique ou sur la scène internationale. Les étudiants se disent clairement satisfaits des cours et de la vie sur le campus, et apprécient la communauté unie de Glendon ainsi que le soutien individuel dont ils bénéficient sur les plans académique, social et financier.


LES OBJECTIFS DE GLENDON POUR 2009-2010 ÉTAIENT LES SUVANTS :

Développer les programmes d’études et les initiatives aux niveaux du premier cycle et des études supérieures

En 2009-2010, le Baccalauréat ès arts international (iBA) bilingue et trilingue de Glendon a été étendu à 18 des 20 programmes de premier cycle. Unique au Canada, le iBA permet de maîtriser le français et l’anglais (et une troisième langue dans le cas de l’iBA trilingue). Les deux programmes comprennent un échange international et des cours axés sur des questions internationales.

Dans le cadre de notre mandat de Centre d’excellence pour l’enseignement postsecondaire bilingue et en français dans le Sud de l’Ontario, nous avons signé des ententes de représentation avec La Cité Collégiale concernant les programmes Adjoint juridique et Philosophie, l’Éducation en services à l’enfance et Psychologie, et Techniques de travail social et Sociologie. En outre, grâce à notre entente de collaboration avec l’École des affaires publiques et internationales de Glendon, le CDM est appuyé par les Services à la recherche de Glendon. Il a été officiellement lancé à l’occasion d’une conférence inaugurale présentant trois économistes de renommée mondiale, dont un récipiendaire du Prix Nobel, qui ont discuté et débattu de la récente crise économique et de l’avenir de l’économie mondiale. Le CDM a également organisé un déjeuner-conférence à Ottawa, dont le conférencier était Kenneth Rogoff, professeur d’économie à Harvard. Des étudiants et des diplômés du programme de Maîtrise en affaires publiques et internationales ont assisté à la conférence. En 2009, les Services à la recherche de Glendon ont lancé un nouveau site Web qui présente les réalisations et les travaux de recherche de nos professeurs.

Atteindre les objectifs d’inscription tout en continuant à améliorer la qualité des étudiants entrants

Glendon continue d’atteindre et de dépasser ses objectifs d’inscription, particulièrement en ce qui concerne les étudiants de première année. Les étudiants potentiels souhaitent venir à Glendon pour suivre une formation unique dans les deux langues...
Développer et renforcer les partenariats stratégiques externes


Les données sur les admissions

En 2009-2010, la moyenne minimale d’admission à Glendon a été de 77 pour cent, soit la moyenne la plus haute jusqu’à présent. Glendon se classe ainsi parmi les établissements de la province, offrant des programmes de BA, ayant les seuls des admissibilité les plus élevés. Pour attirer les meilleurs étudiants, plusieurs stratégies sont déployées, notamment le programme du Cercle des meilleurs étudiants qui remet en main propre des offres d’admission, envoie des invitations spéciales à des événements sur le campus, et offre des occasions de réseautage et des conseils personnalisés donnés par la directrice du Recrutement. Grâce à un programme téléphonique, les meilleurs candidats bénéficient aussi d’un service personnalisé assuré par l’principal et l’équipe de recrutement, et des démarches proactives des Services financiers aux étudiants qui les aident à maximiser les possibilités d’obtention de bourses d’études.

Internationalisation

Grâce en partie à notre Baccalauréat est arts international (IBA) bilingue ou trilingue – une option offerte dans 18 de nos 20 programmes – 10 pour cent de tous les étudiants de troisième année à Glendon ont participé à un échange international (un taux nettement supérieur à la moyenne nationale). Au niveau du deuxième cycle, le double diplôme de Maîtrise en affaires publiques et internationales entre l’Université York et l’Université de Strasbourg en France – qui a été récemment approuvé – fournira aux étudiants une occasion unique d’acquérir une expérience internationale.

Participation des étudiants


Personnel enseignant et effectif professoral

En 2009-2010, Glendon a procédé à une nomination et demie à plein temps. Il s’agit d’un poste dans le programme d’Études internationales et d’une nomination partagée (50 pour cent) avec la Faculté d’éducation.
Overview

The mission of the Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS) is to provide pan-university leadership and support for graduate education at York University, with a particular emphasis on the quality, innovation, and sustainability of our programs, and how these programs in turn contribute to York’s objective of becoming a more comprehensive and research-intensive university. We do this by working closely and collaboratively with other Faculties and units on campus through an increasingly integrated approach to graduate planning and support that balances York’s reputation for interdisciplinarity and our role in quality assurance with improved accountability and more efficient use of resources.

In response to the Government of Ontario’s Reaching Higher strategy, and as is the case with most Ontario universities, York has experienced a surge in graduate student enrolments as well as an increase in the number of graduate programs offered. Currently there are 1792 doctoral students and 4248 masters students, an increase of 28.4 per cent over the past five years. This past year saw the launching of several new graduate programs, namely the Master of Finance (MF), Master of Financial Accountability (MFAC), a MA/PhD in Health (which is also our first program to allow for direct entry into the PhD), and a MA/PhD in Science and Technology Studies. In addition OCGS approved the following new programs with a projected first intake in September 2010: PhD in Études Françaises, a MA in Information Systems and Technology, and a PhD in Socio-Legal Studies. A combined JD/MA program between Osgoode and the Graduate Program in Philosophy was recently approved. We also secured through OCGS approval for our first dual-degree program – a masters program in public and international affairs between York and the University of Strasbourg. Ten of our graduate programs were also subject to periodic review during the past year, and another four programs that had been previously deemed to be good quality with report were upgraded to good quality following the submission of a report.

Our dual-degree program with Strasbourg is an important component in our internationalization strategy. European universities have made dual degrees, particularly at the masters level, a priority and there are signs that universities in Latin America and Australasia are following suit. Interest is also growing in the US, and FGS is committed to taking advantage of the opportunities afforded by dual-degrees to provide our students and faculty with greater international exposure. On the international front, we are also actively pursuing agreements with other parties which would enable more international students to come to York. The recent MOU with Saudi Arabia is one example and we continue to solicit others. We would like, for example, to become one of the ‘preferred’ universities for recipients of scholarships from the China Scholarship Council.

The addition of new programs and additional students at York University over the past several years has not come without some challenges, some of which were not fully anticipated, and FGS in association with other units on campus is responding to these. A much greater degree of collaboration with resource Faculties is required (which was confirmed in the “Report on Academic Planning and Graduate Education at York University,” prepared by George Fallis), and steps have been taken to provide for ongoing consultation through integrated planning. Ensuring that our programs are sustainable, both academically and financially, is uppermost in our priorities. At the same time, the addition of new programs has not always led to a concomitant increase in the overall number of applicants as we find an increasing number of students applying to several programs, as many as five in some cases, and we will be working with programs to secure a greater degree of clarity as to their differences, and will continue to monitor multiple applications. Our objective is to secure by June 2011 from all programs a vision statement that will identify their unique strengths and aspirations and so help prospective students to understand better the different options before them. The addition of new programs has also appeared at times to add even more pressure on supervisory resources. To that end, we have made substantial revisions to the policy on appointments to the Faculty of Graduate Studies that are intended to provide greater flexibility and more timely responses while upholding academic quality. All programs have been asked to review their appointments criteria and submit to us any revisions by July 2011.

REPORT ON OBJECTIVES

In our Integrated Resource Plan for 2010-2013, FGS identified four priorities: promote quality and success in graduate education, enhance the research culture, strengthen leadership, and improve operational effectiveness.

Promote Quality and Success in Graduate Education

In keeping with the principles of strategic enrolment planning and the emphasis on quality articulated in the White Paper, the emphasis this past year in FGS has been on developing enrolment plans that stress quality and sustainability. We have made significant strides this past year in developing enrolment targets through close collaboration with both the programs and the resource Faculties upon whom they depend for their curriculum. We are working with the office of the VPABP, OIRA, and the resource Faculties to develop a long-term enrolment plan which we intend to have completed by the end of 2010. Closely coupled to this will be a review of graduate recruitment so as to ensure that our efforts and resources are best aligned with the strategic priorities that will inform the enrolment plan. In addition, and in recognition of the changing nature of graduate education, particularly at the masters level where increasing numbers of students are seeking career-oriented training, we are developing a framework that will assist in the identification of new opportunities for program development.
In keeping with the vision expressed in the White Paper and the recommendations in the Fallis report, we have introduced a number of processes and structures to foster closer communication and collaboration in the future. These include a recently constituted committee that brings dedicated associate deans from each resource Faculty into regular contact with FGS and with one another—through these meetings, for example, we have begun to improve curricular planning by looking at course duplication, sharing enrolments, etc. FGS is also working with the office of VPRI to expand opportunities for graduate students to participate in the activities of the Organized Research Units.

FGS identified the provision of more support for professional/transferable skill training as a priority, in large part because so many of our graduate students will be pursuing career paths outside academe, and with the growing emphasis on knowledge mobilization/translation, even those intent on a career in the university sector would benefit from this kind of training. We offered several very well received presentations, including one in conjunction with LA&PS on getting a first book published, that attracted more than 100 graduate students and new faculty. Another workshop on journal publications was attended by more than 30 students, and a session on thesis/dissertation proposal writing drew 40. We will be adding to and expanding these workshops in 2010-2011, and are currently looking at various non-credit certificate options to acknowledge students who participate in professional/transferable skills programs at York. We are also looking at other ways to increase the experiential opportunities for graduate students, and will be looking at internship and other mechanisms that can enrich our programs.

Enhance the Research Culture

FGS continues to invest heavily in the promotion of research through a variety of events, one-on-one meetings, targeted funding, and robust adjudication processes. The results continue to be very encouraging. One of our more notable successes this past year was the receipt of four Vanier scholarship holders, three of whom are international students. We introduced a multi-stage nomination process which included mentoring designated nominees, close scrutiny of the file, and careful preparation of letters of nomination, with positive results, and we will continue to employ the same rigor in this year’s competition. We will be using a modified version for the recently-launched Bantering postdoctoral fellowship competition; this competition is an important opportunity for us to attract top quality postdoctoral fellows which has been identified in the White Paper as one of the major planks of research intensification. We are currently working with the office of VPRI and the resource Faculties to develop a strategy intended to make York a more attractive destination for postdoctoral fellows.

Our success at the Masters level with SSHRC was equally impressive: we had been assigned a quota of 71, but have to date already received 74 awards and there could be more. In addition, we had a quota of 11 for the special call for business-related Masters scholarships and ended up with 15 scholarships.

Much of this success can be attributed to the increased numbers of workshops, information sessions, and even a Saturday drop-in clinic for grant writers, that were mounted by FGS, as well as to the mentoring efforts undertaken at the program level. We also introduced a new funding package model that was intended to remove some of the unintended disincentives that had led to decline in researcher contributions to graduate funding as well as those that had raised barriers to researchers wishing to identify and provide financial support to the most appropriate students. Early indicators are that this has been well received by the community, but the full impact will not be known until this time next year.

Another initiative that was launched this year to help promote our research culture was a series of improvements to the research ethics approvals process. These have reduced turnaround time to two weeks except for some difficult files. We have also been providing more workshops and information on research ethics. In 201-2011 we will be reviewing the current policies and practices surrounding Intellectual Property as it pertains to graduate students and will be making necessary changes to ensure their rights and responsibilities are more clearly defined and understood.

FGS Leadership

In keeping with the recommendations of the Fallis report, and as noted above, we continue to work, and are making progress, on better coordination with resource Faculties. Regular meetings with associate deans from resource Faculties, scheduled enrolment planning meetings that bring together representatives from FGS and the resource Faculties together with department chairs and graduate program directors, are but two examples of this. As noted above, FGS has introduced a new policy for appointments to the Faculty following approval by senate. We have nearly completed the redesign of all the Web sites for our graduate programs and the reconceptualization and design of our own Web site is well underway. Our first dual degree with an out-of-country institution has been approved, and we will be using it as a template to develop further collaborative degrees.

The changes that we introduced to the funding packages were informed by our recognition that owing to the differences between programs, a system-wide and standardized approach was not meeting the needs and aspirations of our programs. We have therefore moved to a more decentralized process in which programs have more latitude in how they choose to make up their funding packages, while at the same time we have improved our ability to monitor financial commitments. We will be undertaking a review of the changes early in 2011 to see how successful they have been, and will then consider, following consultation, whether any further revisions are needed in our effort to meet the objectives of quality and sustainability.
Strengthen Operational Effectiveness

To meet the objectives outlined in the White Paper, some of the gains associated with which have been noted above, FGS has had to carefully review its internal structures and processes. We have made a number of changes in the job descriptions of some of our staff to accommodate these new priorities, closed one position, and are continuing to review our operations to identify areas for improvement and/or investment. We are consulting with the programs and the resource Faculties to identify the anchor Faculties for all our programs as recommended in the Fallis Report. An important development has been the approval by COU of a new Quality Assurance process, and we have been working closely with the office of the Vice-Provost to develop robust quality assurance protocols which we will also be helping to implement. As part of that process, and in order to help us determine how effective we are in meeting the objectives of the White Paper, particularly with respect to measuring the quality of our programs and of the student experience, we are in discussions with the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis as to how best to develop appropriate metrics and benchmarks for program evaluation. These measurements, while sensitive to the different demands and objectives of our programs, will enable us to compare our programs with their analogues elsewhere, and thereby help foster a culture of continual improvement. To that end, we will be examining systems in place elsewhere in Canada as well as in the US and overseas.
Overview

The Faculty of Health has an ambitious mission to be an integrative force for promoting health and improving health care – locally and globally. Our vision is to educate future global leaders who will redefine and advance health and human science. We believe the solution (BIG Idea) to the crisis in health care is ‘keeping more people healthier, longer’. Towards this goal, our emphasis is on prevention first, then care when needed, to make health and health care sustainable. This is reflected in our course and program offerings, our research and our engagement with the local and global community. Each year we graduate 2,000 agents of change!

REPORT ON 2009-2010 OBJECTIVES

The Faculty of Health made substantial contributions this year for accomplishing the White Paper 2020 strategic directions:

a. Enrollment Growth: created initial plans for two new interdisciplinary programs targeting enrollment growth in York region: i) BA in Global Health and ii) BSc in Neurosciences (with FSE);

b. Quality of Student Experience: developed innovative initiatives for first year students (HealthAid mentoring), experiential education opportunities in the community (Jane-Finch Yorkgate Mall, Black Creek Community Healthy Centre), and expansion of blended online learning;

c. Research Growth: strengthened our capacity for studies with hospitals in York region, and supported integrative cross platform research that will maximize opportunities for research funding from the CIHR and related funders; and,

d. Community Engagement: worked locally in building the York Health System network in the GTA/York region (Central LHIN, hospitals, primary care, community care, public health, health promoting organizations, schools), and internationally with partnership development focusing on India, China, Brazil, Middle East.

Some Specific Accomplishments in 2009-2010

- York – UHN (University Health Network) Nursing Academy: a first for York
- Pan-university interdisciplinary PhD in Health program was implemented
- Psychology Research and Training Clinic: unique network model
- Muscle Health Research Center: one of three worldwide
- Health Leadership and Learning Network (HLLN) was launched: continuing education and professional development division
- Research productivity increased: up $3.3 million in funding

- Life Sciences Building implementation: $70 million from federal infrastructure
- Sherman Health Sciences Research Centre was completed: state of the art laboratories
- Building the York Health System: an innovative network linking academic, clinical, community and public health partners in the GTA-York region addressing research and educational partnerships.
- Curriculum renewal: online learning task force; experiential education task force
- Plans under development for two interdisciplinary undergraduate degrees; BA in Global Health; BSc in Neuroscience
- Collaborated on a People Centered eHealth initiative involving key private sector, healthcare and Canadian Association for People Centered Health
- Building a global network: China: MOU with Chongqing Health Bureau (Chongqing is a twin city with Toronto)
- Task Force on Neuroscience (with FSE) report was completed: Canada Research Chair Tier I in Neuroscience search completed
- Quality Improvement: survey and action plans for better addressing support for full- and part-time faculty members.

LOOKING AHEAD: 2010-2011

Our number one priority for 2010-2011 in the Faculty of Health is advancing Undergraduate Education. All other program areas (e.g. research, continuing education) are being aligned to support this primary goal. The major areas of emphasis within Undergraduate Education include:

a. Improving the Current Curricular Offerings
   i. Expanding Experiential Education opportunities
   ii. Expanding eLearning opportunities including: use of Enhanced Technology, Blended Learning and Distance Learning
   iii. Development of a Teaching and Learning Support Strategy
   iv. Strengthening the School of Nursing Collaborative Program
   v. Strengthening the School of Health Policy and Management BHS Program

b. Exploring New Curricular Offerings
   i. Testing the feasibility of mounting a new undergraduate degree in Global Health
   ii. Testing the feasibility of mounting a new undergraduate degree in Neuroscience
c. Creating More Extra-Curricular and Co-curricular Opportunities
   i. Enhancing the First Year Experience including: the creation of a peer mentor strategy called ‘HealthAid’, pilot testing of the ‘learning community’ approach, development of transition and career exploration workshop series
   ii. Maintaining and continuously improving a harmonized approach to academic advising

d. Capturing New Funding Opportunities
   i. Develop plans within units to increase enrolment under the Revised Enrolment Funding Model: e.g. Certificate programs building on existing courses
   ii. Develop a plan for expanding International Students to reach 10 per cent of undergraduate enrolment within five years
   iii. Develop a plan to capture funding under the Online Ontario government initiative

e. Aligning Our Other Programs With Undergraduate Education
   i. Research: continue seeking new opportunities for our undergraduate students to engage in meaningful research and training experiences and have such opportunities built into faculty research grant applications. A key element will be the conduct of thesis research in applied locations (i.e., community and healthcare settings) and contributing to programs of research already underway in these locations.
   ii. Graduate Program: facilitate joint ventures that require undergraduate and graduate students to work together so that they may learn from each other. A related goal is to facilitate and identify ways for graduate students who are interested in the mentoring of undergraduate students to develop the necessary skills and have opportunities for mentoring.
   iii. Continuing Education (HLLN): continue to build our partnership with Schulich (SEEC) including delivery of two Masters Certificate programs (Integrated Health Leadership; Nurse Front Line Mentorship & Leadership); and discuss a partnership with a pan-university coordinating structure for continuing and professional education at York, to be under consideration in 2010-2011. These will support graduates (alumni) from our undergraduate program in their lifelong learning and professional development (Agents of Change).

iv. York Health System: develop a three year community engagement plan for the York Health System, including opportunities to expand experiential education options for undergraduate students. Three major planning and action forums are scheduled for 2010-2011.

v. International Activities: develop a three year plan outlining priority partnerships with strategic locations and foci. Beginning in January 2011, nursing practice placements overseas will support the undergraduate program, with more possible student and faculty exchanges to be developed over the year. Planning for a global health conference in conjunction with York International is underway.

vi. Branding: a Think Tank meeting (September 15) will create a Branding protocol for the Faculty of Health and strategic communication plan that will target key stakeholders. A special initiative using social media marketing techniques will focus on engaging prospective students (and family) for undergraduate programs in the Faculty.

COMPLEMENT PLANNING

Building on the White Paper and the Faculty’s academic plan, a case is made for the investment of 30 new faculty positions over the next three years to address:

Health IMPERATIVES: 1) Positive Aging across the life course, 2) Mental Health promotion and care and 3) Physical Health – activity, nutrition, weight – based on research and education across four CIHR pillars.

Integrative PLATFORMS aligned with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research pillars: biomedical, clinical, health services & systems, population health research.
Overview

2009-2010 was a year of new beginnings for the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies (LA&PS). On July 1, 2009 the Faculty was created from the merger of the former Faculty of Arts and the former Atkinson Faculty of Liberal & Professional Studies. With nearly 27,000 students, the result is Canada’s largest Faculty, home to over 1,200 full-time and contract professors, 21 academic departments and schools, four colleges, and almost one hundred undergraduate and graduate programs.

PLANNING: REPORT ON OBJECTIVES

The inaugural year focused on launching the new Faculty. The LA&PS Faculty Council was established, with a committee structure, detailed terms of reference, and a supporting secretariat. A new dean was recruited, in the person of Professor Martin Singer, a seasoned academic leader with a solid track record as a department chair, dean, and provost. An accomplished team of five associate deans was assembled, including newly dedicated associate decanal positions for research and international & community relations. An executive officer, an executive director of strategic planning, a financial officer, and a continuing education director were recruited to support the decanal team.

Stabilizing the new Faculty’s finances was a key objective. The Faculty was created with a $25M deficit (which included both a structural deficit and a historical deficit accumulated from its antecedent Faculties), but by the end of 2009-2010 has been able to reduce this deficit significantly. Looking forward, the Faculty aims to further reduce its deficit through a combination of internal economies, enrolment growth, and pan-university reforms to allow Faculties to keep a higher share of the revenues that they generate for the University.

Another key objective was to develop a long-term strategic vision for the Faculty. To this end, the Faculty developed a mission and guiding principles and the dean embarked on a massive consultation with over a thousand students, professors and staff. The insights from this consultation are collected in a 10-year strategic plan that lays out the Faculty’s strategic goals for advancing student engagement, enriching the faculty experience, enhancing and strategically developing academic programs, building partnerships locally and internationally, and transparently and collegially managing resources. In 2010-2011 the Faculty will be developing implementation plans that operationalize specific facets, such as faculty complement planning, staff deployment, research support planning, fundraising, resource allocation, and space planning.

The Faculty’s inaugural year has been a successful one in terms of attracting students to humanities, social sciences, and the professions. Undergraduate enrolment (measured in full-time equivalencies, or FTEs) increased by 4 per cent while graduate enrolment increased by 5 per cent. Our most marked success, however, is international, where our international student enrolment increased by over 10 per cent.

The increase in student enrolment lies in contrast to a decline in tenure-stream faculty. As LA&PS’ aging professoriate continued to retire or leave at a faster rate than new hires, professorial ranks declined by 4 per cent in 2009-2010. In response, the University has hired 25 contractually-limited appointment (CLA) professors for 2010-2011 as a transitional measure and authorized the hiring of 13 LA&PS tenure-stream professors in areas of highest academic priority in 2011-2012.

Research

The Faculty recognizes the centrality of research and scholarship to its mission and the University’s. LA&PS faculty distinguished themselves this past year in a wide array of individual and collaborative research initiatives and outcomes. The number of Tri-council grants awarded to LA&PS faculty members increased by over 14 per cent in 2009-2010 compared to the prior year, while the dollar value of these awards increased by 22 per cent. LA&PS Principal Investigators to the SSHRC Public Outreach Grant program thrilled us with a success rate of 100 per cent! Much to our delight collaborative teams led by York principal investigators Pat Armstrong (Sociology) and Carla Lipsig-Mummé (Social Science) received substantial awards, respectively, through SSHRC’s Major Collaborative Research Initiatives and Community-University Research Alliances programs while Jimmy Huang (ITEC), as a co-principal investigator, was awarded $11.5 million through the Ontario Research Fund – Research Excellence Grant program. In turn, as co-applicants, Verena Gottschling (Philosophy), Bernard Lightman (Humanities), and Andrea Daley (Social Work) received major grants, respectively, through the VolkswagenStiftung European Platform, the American National Science Foundation, and the CIHR Institute of Gender and Health, in partnership with ECHO: Improving Women’s Health.

Since the launch of LA&PS on July 1, 2009, Pat Armstrong (Sociology) has been named Distinguished Research Professor while Brenda Spotton Visano (PPA/Economics) and Ian Greene (PPA) have been honoured as University Professors. Paul Lovejoy (History) received the Distinguished Africanist Research Excellence Award from the University of Texas at Austin, Sheila Emslie Embleton (DLLL) was elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus Michael Herren of classics and history was elected Fellow of the Medieval Academy of America, and Jody Berland (Humanities) brought home from the Congress the Canadian Communication Association’s Gertrude J. Robinson Book Prize for her work North of Empire. Also at the Congress this year, the Association of Canadian and Quebec Literatures announced, just two weeks after Professor Emerita Barbara Godard’s death, her receipt of the Gabrielle Roy Prize in English for Wider Boundaries of Daring: The Modernist Impulse in Canadian Women’s Poetry, a collection she co-edited with Di Brandt. In addition, conferences, workshops and symposia organized by LA&PS faculty members kept the campus busy during this past year.
Teaching and Learning

In its inaugural year LA&PS focused on integrating the vast array of programs it inherited from the two antecedent Faculties. The year was one of consolidation, of surveying the transformed landscape, ordering the new terrain, and pondering improvement. This essential breathing space was marked equally, though in differing manners, by the Faculty’s three newly independent academic units – the School of Human Resources Management, the Department of Communications Studies, and the Department of Equity Studies, by its nine merged departments, by the nine “unaffected” academic units, and by its four colleges. The newly independent found their feet as autonomous entities; the merged units came to terms with their greater resources and expanded curricular responsibilities; the unaffected studied their places in the changed constellation of pedagogical commitment. And all units addressed the challenge of offering their curricula in a Faculty that teaches day and night; winter, summer, fall; live, online, and in amphibious modes. Looking forward, the Faculty remains unwavering in its commitment to offer a broad spectrum of high quality program choices, and keeping its programs accessible to academically-promising students from all walks of life.

Despite a formal moratorium on curricular initiatives within the Faculty, awaiting the outcome and directions prescribed by the strategic planning process, LA&PS continued its participation in inter-Faculty projects. Three significant instances of inter-Faculty cooperation were approved during 2009-2010. The first is a path-making dual degree in Engineering and International Development Studies, a highly innovative program that affirms both the university-wide commitment to further development in the sciences and to internationalization and social justice. The second is a degree program in Health Policy and Management, an instance of cooperation between our School of Administrative Studies and the Faculty of Health that responds to the increasing demand upon and complexity of health care in an aging society. The third is a partnership between Osgoode Hall Law School and the Department of Philosophy that will allow graduate students in Law simultaneously to earn a Masters degree in Philosophy. This project capitalizes on Osgoode’s commitment to the ethical dimensions of law and on the Philosophy Department’s acknowledged strength in ethics.

The Student Experience

Nearly half of the students at York University are enrolled in LA&PS courses and programs. Students are the animating spirit of our Faculty, and without them LA&PS would be little more than a think-tank. Our efforts aim at making students’ experience more than educational; it aims to create life-defining personal and intellectual growth. The Faculty used its inaugural year to establish the Centre for Student Success, which combines the strength of the former Atkinson and Arts student advising offices. Initiatives to support student engagement have been expanded, including peer mentoring, student volunteering, student ambassadors, SOARING (Success, Opportunities, Achievement and RealizING them – designed to build leadership skills through participation in campus life activities) and COACH (Come On And Come Home – designed to re-engage students who have returned to York after an absence of a year or more), and Steps to Liberal Arts (designed to prepare academically promising students from disadvantaged contexts for studies at York).

The Faculty has also worked to better integrate its colleges into student orientation activities. More orientation activities are now held in college facilities than in prior years, and colleges have been given the mandate to play a lead role in organizing students’ first year experience. In support of this new emphasis on colleges, the Faculty launched New College in 2009, York’s first new college in almost forty years.

Student associations are key partners to the Faculty, and 2009-2010 was also the inaugural year for both SCOLAPS (Student Council of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies) and NCC (New College Council). The Faculty has worked diligently to create a strong working relationship with these and other student groups. In recognition of student engagement, the Faculty and SCOLAPS have collaborated on increasing the number of awards established to recognize student engagement.

International and Community Partnerships

As distances shorten and our planet becomes ever smaller, graduates must become globally cosmopolitan, at ease across a growing diversity of cultures and jurisdictions. In addition to creating an associate decanal position dedicated to internationalization and community engagement, the Faculty aims to almost double its number of international students, to 10 per cent of the student body. This will accomplish two goals: it will help bring the world to domestic students, and create matching opportunities for domestic students to study abroad. We have forged new links with several university partners: memoranda of understanding have been signed with the University of Sao Paolo, the Universidade Nova de Lisbon, and Methodist University of Sao Paolo.

This cosmopolitanism is also a defining characteristic of our culturally and intellectually diverse professors, drawn from leading universities around the world, and whose teaching and research interests span the globe.

A global outlook does not stop us from also acting locally. Looking ahead, we plan to fundamentally re-design and expand the continuing education services offered to the Faculty’s partner communities. Already embedded within a rich and diverse group of cultural, neighbourhood, and professional communities, LA&PS will endeavor to initiate dialogues with even more, to ensure that community-members’ educational needs and aspirations are being met.
Overview

Osgoode Hall Law School was founded in 1889 by the Law Society of Upper Canada, and became affiliated with York University in 1968. Osgoode offers a three-year Juris Doctor (JD) Program, a research-stream Graduate Program leading to a Master of Laws (LLM) or Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degrees, and a part-time LLM through Osgoode Professional Development (OPD). OPD also offers a variety of non-credit Continuing Legal Education courses for those who wish to enhance their understanding of the law.

PLANNING: REPORT ON OBJECTIVES

As Osgoode’s current strategic plan nears conclusion, the Law School is actively engaged in developing the next strategic plan, which will cover 2011-2015. The strategic planning process will provide an important opportunity for the Osgoode community to build on and coordinate other planning initiatives, refine the Law School’s vision and renew its commitment, and chart the course for the next five years.

Osgoode is committed to investing in its priority areas to maintain its leadership position among Canadian law schools and to implement fully the initiatives called for by the Provostial White Paper. The Law School’s priorities are:

1. To be recognized as a leading research-intensive law school in Canada and the world;
2. Prepare JD students for the multiplicity of lawyering roles in a globalized world;
3. Maintain Osgoode’s leadership position in graduate education and professional continuing education;
4. Improve the quality of students and student experience;
5. Increase the faculty complement;
6. Build on Osgoode’s reputation as a pre-eminent law school in Canada and the world; and
7. Enhance operational effectiveness and promote a positive and supportive working environment.

Research

One of Osgoode’s key priorities is to be recognized as a leading research intensive law school in Canada and the world. This means that we commit ourselves collectively to:

- achieving consistently high levels of scholarly output, in terms of both quality and quantity;
- maximizing the visibility and influence of our research within and beyond the academic community; and
- fostering a vibrant intellectual community that attracts excellent faculty and students and engages communities outside the Law School.

During 2009-2010, the Law School gathered data about our institutional research output, supports, and reputation. The information and evidence gathered in this review suggests that: (1) our well deserved reputation as a research intensive law school is a key strength that distinguishes us from other law schools in Canada and internationally; and (2) Osgoode will need to invest additional resources and energy in order to maintain this reputation in the face of external competitive pressures, and internal pressures on faculty members’ time and other resources.

The Law School has identified a number of specific priorities and strategies for increasing our research intensity in the coming years. These include:

- supporting high levels of scholarly productivity;
- supporting knowledge mobilization;
- maximizing dissemination of research;
- fostering a vibrant research culture; and
- enhancing research communications and reputation.

Taking our priorities seriously requires that Osgoode track its progress toward achieving these goals, and evaluate the success of the different strategies employed to do so.

Teaching and the Student Experience

JD Program

Osgoode met its student enrolment target in the JD Program in 2009-2010. The Law School continued to use its large scholarships for incoming students (Halletts, Howlands, etc.) as a means of attracting the strongest students. As well, the Law School enhanced its student recruitment efforts by hosting two Open Houses (one in the fall and one in the spring) for prospective JD students.

Osgoode continued a process of comprehensive reform to the upper-year curriculum, which is expected to result in significant reform that will be implemented in September 2011. In addition, the Law School’s Standing Committee on Teaching and Learning organized the annual Osgoode Course Design Institute (OCDI). This tremendously successful full-day workshop, which was held in June 2010, allowed a large number of the full-time and adjunct faculty members to explore innovation in teaching and learning.

Graduate Program in Law

The graduate program has experienced unprecedented growth in student numbers in recent years; however, Osgoode is increasingly shifting its focus from growth to enhancing the graduate legal experience.

Additionally, the LLM program has undergone substantial reform over the past year. A new stream within the LLM program has been created giving students the option of completing the degree by taking two extra courses and writing a Major Research
Paper, in lieu of the full thesis. This new stream is available to any new LLM student entering from September 2010. Furthermore, any existing LLM student can (with FGS approval) switch to the new stream.

Osgoode Professional Development

OPD is a critical part of Osgoode in terms of providing flagship professional continuing education, internationalization, and innovative pedagogy. OPD will continue to identify growth areas in the market and to develop competitive and high-quality programs, including, increasingly, certificate programs aimed at providing legal education programs to non-lawyers.

Community Engagement and Experiential Learning

Osgoode is already a leader in community engagement through clinical legal education. While many other law schools are talking about the need to increase “skills” education, we are well positioned to establish our superiority in terms of both quality and scope of experiential learning opportunities. Our clinical and intensive programs are the best in the country. We have just created a new Mediation Clinic to provide more opportunities for students.

The first-year curriculum reforms implemented in 2007-2008 introduced more elements of experiential learning through the Legal Process course and Ethical Lawyering in a Global Community. With the successful introduction of the Osgoode Public Interest Requirement we became the only Canadian law school that commits to providing an experiential learning opportunity to every single JD student.

Osgoode offers many upper-year electives that incorporate simulations or live client work, and our Intensive Trial Advocacy Workshop has an international reputation as a first-rate hands-on continuing education program. Our newly renovated and expanded building will have a state-of-the-art electronic dispute resolution centre.

Apart from the sheer variety of programs and opportunities available to students, a distinguishing feature of Osgoode’s approach to experiential learning is our commitment to a deep integration of theory and practice.

In the coming years Osgoode will build on these strengths by reforming our upper-year curriculum. The Curriculum Reform Working Group has already succeeded in generating a strong consensus that the reforms should be designed to integrate knowledge, skills and values in the development of reflective legal practitioners. This will include creating more structured and sustained opportunities for experiential learning in the upper years.
Introduction

By combining science and engineering under one Faculty, York’s Faculty of Science and Engineering (FSE) is unique in Canada. Such an amalgamation stimulates interdisciplinary interactions between professors and offers exceptional opportunities for our students. 2009-2010 was a transitional year during which the search for a new Dean was successfully concluded with the hiring of Dr. Janusz Kozinski who will join FSE on July 1, 2010.

The challenge of the new is always invigorating; it forces us to see and think afresh. The Faculty’s new challenge will be to establish meaningful partnerships with other Faculties on campus and beyond, with industry, government, and international institutions.

REPORT ON OBJECTIVES

Teaching, Learning and Student Experience

Our students rank among the top in Canada. They are well-rounded, motivated people who are primed for leadership in society across all fields of science and engineering and beyond. They are also community-minded with a great many engaged in volunteer work of one form or another. It is important to recognize that our Faculty’s quality is best evaluated through the success of our students. What matters most is that we offer an excellent education to the students who select us. Therefore, investing in students’ education and the future of Canadian talent is a strategy we are delighted to endorse.

We are proud of the accreditation achievement of the School of Engineering. All engineering programs went through a rigorous accreditation process and received a six-year accreditation from the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board – the maximum attainable and rather rare in Canada.

The past year has seen Professor Hamzeh Roumani (Department of Computer Science and Engineering) honoured with a national 3M Teaching Award for the 2009-2010 year. In addition, the Faculty has recognized excellence within its ranks via four new teaching awards: Innovation in Teaching (Zheng Hong Zhu, Earth & Space Science & Engineering; Jason Keltz, Melanie Baljko, Franck van Breugel, Computer Science and Engineering); Junior Tenure Stream (Gino Lavoie, Chemistry; Jinjun Shan, Earth & Space Science & Engineering); Senior Tenure Stream (Ruthanna Dyer, Division of Natural Science); Teaching Assistant (Mario Orestano, Chemistry; Jennifer Rose, Biology). Hand-in-hand with teaching excellence the Faculty continues to create new programs that meet student and societal needs as well as open new and innovative possibilities.

The School of Engineering has introduced a Software Engineering program and a dual degree with International Development Studies (both accepting students in 2011); the Department of Biology has created an Environmental Biology program and the Department of Mathematics and Statistics has created an Actuarial Mathematics stream.

The Faculty continues to emphasize research as a key part of the student experience. This past year, research experience terms have been introduced at the 1st year level. These complement senior level research-based project courses. The Faculty also continues to be a major provider of Research at York placements for undergraduate students. Additionally, the student experience is enriched by participation in many activities that faculty members and staff support through their time, energy and expertise – to name just a few, our York University Rover Team placed second in the International University Rover Challenge, the ACM International Collegiate Programming competition team placed second amongst Ontario universities in the regional competition, Ontario Biology Day hosted at York drew attendees from all Ontario universities and profiled student research projects. Experiential learning has been a focus for many years in select programs where internship opportunities have been available through the Technology Internship Program. This past year the internship opportunity was expanded to include students in the Physics and Astronomy programs.

The spark program, developed by Associate Dean Peter Cribb, provides a paid summer research work experience opportunity for two high achieving high school students to work in a research lab in FSE under the direction and mentorship of research faculty members. The desired result is to raise our profile and advertise FSE and York University to Ontario high school students and their teachers.

Planning and Partnerships

The commitment of our faculty and our administrative and support staff to the Faculty and to our students is extraordinary. They care deeply about this Faculty – beyond what can be seen elsewhere. There is a strong sense of community within the Faculty of Science and Engineering.

Much of what we do is conducted with international partners. Opportunities for students to gain international experiences are fostered by numerous ongoing and new initiatives. For example, in the past year a Memorandum of Understanding was signed with the Chinese University of Geosciences in Beijing aimed at promoting collaboration and exchanges at all levels including the development of a dual degree. International Summer Schools in Computer Science and Engineering saw students visiting Germany, Poland, and Greece with students from the same partner institutions attending a summer school at York, and students from the Faculty participated in International Internships (South Africa, Caribbean).

The annual Science Olympics reaches out to high schools throughout Ontario and brings together over 30 teams and more than 1000 students to compete in various science events for a whole day. A key component of the Science Olympics is the sponsorship of a First Nations Team to travel from Northern Ontario to participate in the event.
FSE also runs several Summer Science Explorations Camps over the course of the summer months for children. An Engineering camp was added for the first time in August 2009 and it proved so popular that two camp sections were added for 2010. The intent of the camps is to stimulate interest and excitement in science and engineering for young children.

FSE has hired four new professors and advertised for an additional eight positions in a variety of fields. Several of these new hires will be housed in a new Life Sciences Building for which FSE along with Faculty of Health have been awarded $70 million under the Federal-Provincial Knowledge Infrastructure Program. The building, which will be completed in March 2011, will host state of the art facilities and enable life science training both for undergraduate and graduate students in high demand areas such as biology, chemistry, biochemistry and health. In addition, construction of the 4th floor of the Petrie Building will be completed in August 2010. It will provide consolidated space for the Centre for Research in Earth and Space Science (CRESS).

Research, Awards and Impact

Central to the FSE’s vision for the future is a vibrant, entrepreneurial, and robust research enterprise. The theme of scholarship and research is woven throughout our vision for the Faculty, which emphasizes goals such as quality as a hallmark of all activities, growth in interdisciplinary research, the creation of stronger industry ties and economic development activities, and the promotion of an engaged and energized Faculty operational climate.

Overall, it has been an exceptional year for our Faculty. Professor Michael Siu (Chemistry) has been elected to the prestigious Royal Society of Canada. The RSC fellowship is the highest honour for a scientist in Canada. Paul Delaney (Physics & Astronomy) has received the Sandford Fleming Medal from the Council of the Royal Canadian Institute in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the public awareness of science. Professor John Tsotsos (CSE) has been awarded the inaugural President’s Research Excellence Award. The award, introduced during York’s 50th year, recognizes outstanding research achievement and significant contributions to advance the University’s international reputation for research excellence.

Professor Michael Jenkin (Computer Science and Engineering) has received an award from the Canada Foundation for Innovation – New Initiative Fund for the Canadian Centre for Field Robotics, while professors Bridget Stutchbury, Eric Hessels and Wendy Taylor have renewed their respective Canada Research Chairs.

The Faculty has launched a new Centre for Research in Biomolecular Interaction with Professor Sergey Krylov as Director, and obtained approval for the Centre for Science and Technology Studies.

Three of our faculty, Jane Heffernan (Math & Stats), Patrick Hall (Physics and Astronomy), and Suraj Unniappan (Biology) have received Early Researcher Awards from the Ministry of Research and Innovation.

Professor Walter Whiteley (Math & Stats) was the recipient of the Adrien Pouliot Award from the Canadian Mathematical Society in recognition of his outstanding contribution to mathematics education, while Professor Suraj Unniappan (Biology) was the recipient of the CIHR New Investigator Award, one of only forty researchers in Canada.

York’s Centre for Research in Earth and Space Science (CRESS) hosted a Space Science Symposium, “Reflections on Canada’s Past and Future Achievements in Space Science” in honour of the 50-year career of Gordon G. Shepherd, a Distinguished Research Professor in the Faculty of Science and Engineering.

The results of the MARS mission have been published in Science by Professor Jim Whiteway (Earth & Space Science & Engineering) and his co-authors in an article, "Mars Water-Ice Clouds and Precipitation". The report summarizes the scientific findings of the five month Phoenix-MARS mission, during which the team’s laser instruments detected snow falling from Martian clouds.

The Centre for Innovation in Information Visualization and Data-Driven Design has obtained $11.5 million for a project on developing visualization tools in partnership with the Ontario College of Art & Design.

Looking over our accomplishments of the past year, we are confident that we are moving in the right direction. The FSE’s distinctive strengths position us well to remain one of the leading Faculties and an ever-more-valuable asset to Toronto, Ontario and Canada. We are committed to ensuring our programs rank with the best anywhere; to optimally support our students’ needs both academically and in their career choices; to generate the resources our professors deserve for their vital teaching and research; and to reach out effectively to our community and to our world.

The Libraries are actively involved in contributing to the success of the University’s White Paper. Constant attention to changes in research, teaching, scholarship and learning have allowed the libraries to be well positioned to advance many White Paper priorities. In addition, the recent LibQual+ survey results will be studied to inform planning and improvements to library services and collections at York.
RESEARCH INTENSIFICATION

York University Libraries play a key role in supporting York’s research infrastructure by continuing to build relevant collections, expanding our digital and data cyber infrastructure initiatives, and highlighting and disseminating York’s research accomplishments to new audiences.

Research by Librarians – Goal: Continue to make important contributions to research in library science and across the disciplines. This year several librarians were co-applicants and investigators on a variety of grants and projects, including SSHRC, Library and Archives of Canada, CFI Synergies, etc. Toni Olshen received the OCULA Lifetime Achievement Award. The first Chair in E-Librarianship Research, Adam Lauder, joined York Libraries in May. He is researching new modes of scholarly communication and digital publication in the fine arts.

Physical collections and preservation – Goal: Ensure adequate space for physical collections. Over one mile of print volumes is added each year putting tremendous stress on library facilities. Space for collections is approaching steady state: one book in – one book out. Capacity for new materials was possible by removing some serials available in electronic format. Compact shelving may provide some relief. Other solutions may come from consortial initiatives: the Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL)’s Thunder Bay Agreement to collectively keep one print copy of journals, and the OCUL Scholars Portal trusted digital repository project. We will need to monitor growth, assess future needs, identify solutions and keep the University informed.

Data – Goal: Continue to enrich York’s data infrastructure. ORION highlights that “increasingly [researchers] operate in real-time, across disciplines and institutions, and rely on collaborative technologies and digital data resources”.1 Library data resources are key to York’s research. Three OCUL initiatives provide Web-based data infrastructures. odesi is part of OCUL’s digital library and allows faculty and students to store and share quantitative and qualitative data sets. The geospatial and health informatics modules, currently under development, will enrich teaching and facilitate collaborative research.

Digital Services – Goal: Promote York scholarship internationally by increasing its online profile. The Libraries play a strategic role in promoting York research in an online environment. We provide online journal and conference publishing service, an institutional repository to house digital materials, and assistance with digitization. Use of electronic journals published at York has grown from 68,000 downloaded articles in 2007 to 346,000 in 2009. The top five hosted titles were Social History, Refuge, Canadian Woman Studies, CAML Review, and Journal of the Association for Research on Mothering. Future initiatives include supporting electronic theses, working with more research institutes, exploring e-book publishing, and investigating DOI (digital object identifiers) to aid in the discovery of e-journal articles by internet search engines.

Scholarly Communications – Goal: Strive to keep the campus on the cutting edge of trends in scholarly communications. Our institutional repository, YorkSpace, allowed us to meet the new requirement that CIHR-funded research be made accessible to the public. Librarians also led by example by endorsing a mandate to make their research open access. This initiative received international recognition at the 2010 American Library Association Conference. We will continue to support faculty in exploring open access initiatives, new publication practices and alternative bibliometric measures.

TEACHING AND LEARNING

York University Libraries places the highest priority on student success and student engagement.

E-learning – Goal: Contribute to the growth and success of online learning. Online learning is a priority for the province and for the University. The Council of Ontario Universities (COU), in a report to the Ontario Government, highlighted the role of academic libraries for the Online Institute. The digital library collaborations within the Ontario Council of University Libraries provide excellent, unsuppassed library support for online learning initiatives. COU has proposed that, in the first year, it would . . . collaborate with the Ontario Council of University Libraries to plan the enhancements to Scholars Portal to support an integrated elearning environment and consortial licenses for media for online courses.2

According to Educause Review, course management systems are increasingly mission critical at all levels of education.3 In anticipation of this development, an e-learning Librarian was hired three years ago. Many librarians now have experience integrating online collections and services such as virtual reference (now in its eighth year) into Moodle. Future priorities include involving librarians in York’s e-learning initiatives and expanding e-resources, virtual services and online learning modules.
E-Resources – Goal: Improve access to electronic books. E-books are regarded by Educause as an up-and-coming technology. OCUL anticipated this trend and has launched an e-book platform and negotiated more e-book purchases. York now accesses over 300,000 e-books.

Integrated Academic Literacies – Goal: Collaborate with faculty to embed academic literacies (including information literacy instruction) into the curriculum. Academic literacies such as writing, research and learning skills are best taught when embedded into the curriculum. Our information literacy librarians are forming collaborative relationships with faculty and other academic literacy supports (such as the Writing Centre, Learning Skills Program, CST, etc.). This is evident in the integrated approach in the Scott Learning Commons, but also in initiatives to embed information literacy into the curriculum of General Education courses, the Transition Year Program, and other programs.

ENHANCING THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

In a recent research report from the UK, it was noted that academic libraries . . . play a crucial role in supporting the teaching, learning and research missions of their universities. The quality of libraries and their services is an especially important part of the student experience, and students are increasingly vocal about any perceived shortcomings. The Presidential Task Force on Student Life, Learning & Community recommended more study space and 24 hour library service. The library and the University heard these requests.

Late night study: The Libraries provided 24/5 hour late night study in the Scott Library offering study space, computers, wireless access, network drops, photocopiers, printers, access to the Scott reserve collection and group study rooms. The area is frequently filled to capacity (155 study seats).

More library study space: – Goal: Improve the ratio of students per seat from 15 to 11. York’s students have one of the highest students per library seat ratios in the province with 15 students competing for a library seat compared to nine at the University of Western Ontario and 11 at McMaster University. Over 300 additional library study spaces in the Scott Library will be available for the fall term. 1000+ additional seats are still needed.

Learning Commons – Goal: Extend the success of the Learning Commons on campus. The Scott Learning Commons will offer students a place to go for a variety of academic supports. It will be the home of library research, writing and learning skills support, and will help students refine their academic literacies. Libraries have always had research assistance. But the integration of writing and learning skills in the learning commons recognizes the non-linear nature of academic work. Research, writing and learning do not happen separately . . . so the approach we are taking is more holistic and more convenient for students. Future plans include Phase 2 of the Scott Learning Commons and a pilot project with Steacie Science and Engineering Library.

Easier access to York’s collections – Goal: Incorporate more resource centre holdings into the online catalogue and create an advanced search interface for VuFind. Having a robust portal to all collections at York is a key priority. VuFind has been implemented providing a central “Google-like” interface to students looking for campus collections. The Education Resource Center will include their holdings in the main integrated library system effective September 2010.

Enhancing the quality of graduate student experience – Goals: Collaborate with FGS and other faculty to deliver a comprehensive seminar series on scholarly communications and other topics in 2010-2011. Librarians and FGS developed workshops for graduate students on issues related to scholarly communications including how to publish and how to get published. One outcome was two new scholarly journals initiated and launched by graduate students and faculty collaborations using the library’s electronic journal publishing service.

STRENGTHENING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND PARTNERSHIPS

Bridging the Scholar/Practitioner Divide – Goal: Make scholarly materials accessible online and to the world. Futurists predict greater collaboration and dialog between scholars and practitioners. York Libraries offer faculty and students assistance and infrastructure for the creation, organization, storage and Web access to research output. They make Canadian heritage and scholarly materials accessible online to the world. Two new journals launched by students at York and published on the Libraries’ electronic publishing service are openly available (at no cost) to researchers and citizens worldwide:

- The Journal of Public Policy, Administration and Law (JPPAL) encourages students, public servants and scholars to share knowledge and research concerning public policy, administration and law issues.

- Critical Disability Discourse/Discours Critiques dans Le Champ du Handicap brings disability-related issues to mainstream scholastic conversations by promoting and publishing arguments that critically assess disabling social conditions.

Digitization of scholarly and heritage materials – Goal: Improve community access to unique York collections through digitization projects. Over 2500 items from York’s libraries and archives have been digitized and made openly accessible over the internet. Research materials from several research institutes on campus (such as YSIS and CRS) have been digitized, stored in the Libraries’ institutional repository and are findable on the web. Further initiatives include loading copies of York’s digitized theses from 2003 onward, and improving the ability to report on use of scholarship in YorkSpace.
PLANNING

Complement Planning – Goal: Improve librarian per student ratio and support new library roles. Several continuing appointments were modified to support changing research and scholarship trends. A recent study of university students revealed over 85 percent use spreadsheets applications once a month. Three new librarian positions require data skills and will increase support for our campus to a total of four people with expertise in data analysis. Efforts will also expand the Libraries’ base of support for geospatial data and health informatics. To address York’s low librarian-per-student ratio (one of the lowest in Ontario) five additional positions are identified to better support priorities in the White Paper: digital assets librarian, user experience librarian, learning services librarian, scholarly communications & research librarian, and a “Scott” Librarian to lead and coordinate the public service activities of one of York’s largest libraries. In addition, a risk analysis study of academic libraries by OCLC reported more staff need to have high level technological skills. Library planning activities underscored the value of IT skills and improved formal communications. Priorities therefore include more staff with strong IT skills and position(s) with professional communications expertise.

Resource management – Goal: Collect data to assist in future decisions, review hours of service, explore further changes to service and modify workflows, policies and standards of service that achieve further cost savings. The Library absorbed a 3.5 percent cut in operating expenses in 2009-2010. The Libraries managed resources in creative ways. For example, services were merged to achieve savings. One service point now supports both print-photocopy services and microtext services. Microtext service is now “on-demand”. Students can receive assistance with using library resources and library public workstations from one person. Hours of opening were modestly reduced. A small carry forward balance was accrued which will be used to finance additional student seating and compact shelving.

In the upcoming year LibQual+ online survey results collected in 2010 will be studied to guide improvements to YUL. The survey of student and faculty identifies perceived gaps between desired and actual levels of library services. Comparisons with past results from 2002, 2004 and 2007 reflect ongoing improvements in library support for undergraduate students. However, comparisons with the Ontario provincial aggregate and the national aggregate suggest York University needs to improve substantially in library space for students and to retain a very strong focus on developing its collections and access to its collections. The Libraries are also participating in the Association of Research Libraries’ MINES Survey (Measuring the Impact of Networked Electronic Services) which collects data on user demographics and the purpose of use of electronic resources.

END NOTES

3 Educause review page 56 May June 2010.
4 Challenges for academic libraries in difficult economic times A guide for senior institutional managers and policy makers. March 2010 Research information network (rin) in association with Society of College, National and University Libraries (SCONUL) www.rin.ac.uk/challengesforlibraries
6 Kolowich, Steve. The Librarian’s Crystal Ball. ACRL
7 EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research, Students and Information Technology, 2009 ECAR Research Study 6, 2009
Section B: Accountability

Key Performance Indicators
ENROLLMENTS

Undergraduate Enrolment Planning: Eligible and Ineligible FTEs

Description: Enrolment planning is a key priority in the University Academic Plan. York continues to manage enrolment to ensure that overall targets and faculty-specific targets are met with a key focus on high quality.

The graphs below show the number of eligible and ineligible full-time equivalent undergrads who were enrolled at York between 2005-2006 and 2009-2010, and the plans for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 by the teaching faculty.

Performance/Result: In the 2009-2010 fiscal year, actual undergraduate FTE enrolments were above plans for both eligible and ineligible enrolments.
### Undergraduate FTEs – Faculty of Fine Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>3,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>3,274</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>3,223</td>
<td>3,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Undergraduate FTEs – Glendon College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,938</td>
<td>19,517</td>
<td>19,232</td>
<td>25,837</td>
<td>20,889</td>
<td>19,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>18,518</td>
<td>17,243</td>
<td>17,053</td>
<td>17,136</td>
<td>17,105</td>
<td>17,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data prior to 2009/10 represents the sum of Arts and Atkinson.

### Undergraduate FTEs – Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies (created fall 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,377</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>1,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduate FTEs – Osgoode Hall Law School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>2,037</td>
<td>2,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>1,944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduate FTEs – Faculty of Science & Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,798</td>
<td>17,418</td>
<td>16,798</td>
<td>17,718</td>
<td>18,099</td>
<td>18,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>17,051</td>
<td>14,144</td>
<td>13,445</td>
<td>14,383</td>
<td>14,968</td>
<td>15,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mathematics, Natural Science and Science & Technology Studies moved to the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2007/08.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Key Performance Indicators – 79


**Eligible and Ineligible Undergraduate & Graduate FTEs**

**Description:** The University Academic Plan identifies the need to increase the proportion of graduate students as a key enrolment planning priority. Graduate students contribute to the research culture and support overall objectives related to academic excellence, innovation, diversification, balance and reputation.

The graphs below show the number of Eligible and Ineligible Undergraduate and Graduate Full-Time Equivalents at York University by responsible Faculty.

![Graph](image)

**Performance/Result:** York has increased the number of graduate FTEs over the last several years. This trend is expected to continue as York works with the Provincial government to support their commitment to increase graduate enrolments in Ontario.
ADMISSIONS

Undergraduate Admissions: New Eligible Direct Entry Undergraduates in the Fall Term

Description: Undergraduate admissions are an important part of enrolment management at the University. York’s ability to attract a large number of highly qualified undergraduate students is vital to the University’s long term sustainability.

The graphs below represent the total number of new eligible undergraduates for the Fall term by home Faculty.

Performance/Result: In the 2009-2010 academic year, admission rates were marginally higher than planned for almost every Faculty. The 2010-2011 plan is to hold eligible intakes constant for most Faculties.
Admissions: New Eligible Fall Undergraduates on November 1st – Glendon College

Admissions: New Eligible Fall Undergraduates on November 1st – Faculty of Health (created Fall 2006)

Admissions: New Eligible Fall Undergraduates on November 1st – Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies (created Fall 2009)

Admissions: New Eligible Fall Undergraduates on November 1st – Faculty of Science & Engineering

Data prior to 2009/10 represents the sum of Arts and Atkinson. Psychology, Kinesiology, Nursing and Health Management moved to the Faculty of Health in 2006/07. Mathematics, Natural Science and Science & Technology Studies moved to the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2007/08.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Key Performance Indicators • 83
Undergraduate Admissions: Percentage of New Year 1 Registrants from Secondary School With an Entry Average of 75 per cent or Better

Description: Undergraduate admissions are an important part of enrolment management at the University. York’s ability to attract a large number of highly qualified undergraduate students is vital to the University’s long term sustainability.

The graphs below represent the number of students with an average of 75 per cent or higher who registered at York University in the Fall of 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009.

Performance/Result: The proportion of students who entered University with an average over 75 per cent or better reached a high in Fall 2006. Since that time, average entrance grades have declined. However, there has been significant improvement in entering averages at the Faculty of Environmental Studies and at Glendon College.
Glendon College

Faculty of Health (created Fall 2006)

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies (created Fall 2009)

Data prior to 2009/10 represents the sum of Arts and Atkinson.
Psychology, Kinesiology, Nursing and Health Management moved to the Faculty of Health in 2006/07.
Mathematics, Natural Science and Science & Technology Studies moved to the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2007/08.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Key Performance Indicators • 85
Graduate Admissions: Eligible New Graduate Students in the Fall Term

Description: The University Academic Plan commits to an increase in the proportion of graduate students to the total population while maintaining a high overall quality and a direct increase in the number of Doctoral enrolments in specific areas.

The graphs below represent the enrolment of new Masters and Doctoral students at York University in the Fall term.

Performance/Result: Growth in graduate enrolments at all Ontario universities, fueled by a Provincial Government commitment to create 14,000 additional graduate spaces, has increased the competition for high quality graduate students. York, like all other Ontario universities, has had difficulty achieving targets. In contrast, the Doctoral pool remains strong and York has significantly increased its intake of high quality doctoral students over the past five years.
Graduate Admissions: Eligible New Graduate Students
(Fall Term) – Faculty of Fine Arts

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Graduate Admissions: Eligible New Graduate Students
(Fall Term) – Glendon College

Data prior to 2009/10 represents the sum of Arts and Atkinson.

Psychology, Kinesiology, Nursing and Health Management moved to the Faculty of Health in 2006/07.

Mathematics, Natural Science and Science & Technology Studies moved to the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2007/08.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Graduate Admissions: Eligible New Graduate Students
(Fall Term) – Osgoode Hall Law School

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
Graduate Admissions: Eligible New Graduate Students (Fall Term) – Faculty of Science & Engineering

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
INTERNATIONALIZATION

International Undergraduate FTEs by Faculty

**Description:** Internationalization remains a key strategic goal of the University. The total number of international students who study at York enriches both the in-class experience and campus life of all York students.

The chart below represents the number of International FTEs in each Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendon</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>153.9</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>130.6</td>
<td>118.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>141.3</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>153.0</td>
<td>152.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA&amp;PS/Arts/Atkinson</td>
<td>1,726.8</td>
<td>1,445.9</td>
<td>1,333.4</td>
<td>1,332.4</td>
<td>1,474.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgoode</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td>173.8</td>
<td>192.5</td>
<td>231.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulich</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,235.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,080.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,964.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,976.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,130.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Faculty of Health was created in Fall 2006 and LA&PS in Fall 2009.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

**Performance/Result:** The total number of international students has risen steadily since 2007-2008. Future growth is expected, consistent with the goals of the White Paper.

Regional Representation of International Students Studying at York

**Description:** The graph below represents a breakdown of the number of international students by country/region of origin.

![Regional Representation of International Students](image)

**Performance/Result:** York receives students from all over the globe. The highest proportion of international students comes from Asia.
Undergraduate Student Engagement: National Survey of Student Engagement

**Description:** Improving the student experience at York is a priority identified in the University Academic Plan. Having engaged students and faculty enriches the experience for York students.

The charts below show how students rate their entire educational experience as either good or excellent at the University. The data is from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and provides information on the entire student experience, taking into account how students perceive the University from a standpoint of both in and outside the classroom.

**Performance/Result:** Over 70 per cent of all undergraduate students had a good experience as of our last NSSE questionnaire, and almost 1 in 5 students said they had an excellent experience.

---

**Faculty of Environmental Studies**

**Faculty of Fine Arts**

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
**Glendon College**

**Faculty of Health (created Fall 2006)**

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

**Liberal Arts & Professional Studies (created Fall 2009)**

Data prior to 2009/10 represents the sum of Arts and Atkinson.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

**Faculty of Science & Engineering**

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

---

**Key Performance Indicators • 91**
Graduate Student Engagement: Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Engagement

**Description:** Improving the student experience at York is an identified priority in the University Academic Plan. Engaged graduate students help to enrich the experience for all York students and faculty and advance other important UAP goals such as intensifying the research culture.

The data below is from the 2005, 2007 and 2010 administration of the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey. The results presented below track student satisfaction with York University by asking students whether or not they would recommend their program to others. The charts show the proportion of students who would probably or definitely recommend their York programs to others seeking graduate training in their program. In 2010, the Canadian Graduate and Professional student survey differentiated between students in professional masters programs (e.g. MBA and part-time LLM) and students in research based masters programs. 2010 results are shown separately for these two groups.

**Performance/Result:** The results show that almost 70 per cent of research based masters and over 80 per cent of professional based masters would probably or definitely recommend their program to others. This result is not directly comparable to the 2007 figure as the latter represents a weighted average of both professional and research stream students. In total, over 65 per cent of doctoral students would probably or definitely recommend their program to others, down from 2007.

**Faculty of Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty of Environmental Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students With External Awards

**Description:** Providing adequate funding for full-time graduate students is critical to ensure that York attracts the best students and to ensure students complete their studies in a timely manner. The proportion of full-time students who receive externally funded awards is a direct measure of student quality.

The charts below represent the graduate students who received external awards.

**Performance/Result:** At least 6 per cent of the total number of Masters students and over 19 per cent of all doctoral students have received external funding. Overall, the Faculty in which the highest percentage of both masters and doctoral students received funding was the Faculty of Health.
Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students With External Awards – Faculty of Fine Arts

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students With External Awards – Glendon College

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students With External Awards – Faculty of Health (created Fall 2006)

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students With External Awards – Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies (created Fall 2009)

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Data prior to 2009/10 represents the sum of Arts and Atkinson.
Psychology, Kinesiology, Nursing and Health Management moved to the Faculty of Health in 2006/07.
Mathematics, Natural Science and Science & Technology Studies moved to the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2007/08.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students With External Awards – Osgoode Hall Law School

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Percentage of Full-Time Graduate Students With External Awards – Faculty of Science & Engineering

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
**Tenure Stream Faculty as of October 1st**

**Description:** The hiring and retention of excellent tenure stream faculty remains a major priority in support of the achievement of York’s academic objectives, particularly those related to graduate education and research.

The charts below show the total number of tenured and probationary faculty at York.

### Total Faculties and Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Lecturer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Chief Law Librarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarian 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Librarian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Librarian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Librarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excludes new appointments beginning after Oct 1/09

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
### Faculty of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Tenure Stream Faculty: 13, 33, 46, 14, 35, 49

Excludes new appointments beginning after Oct 1/09
Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Faculty of Environmental Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Tenure Stream Faculty: 13, 31, 44, 12, 29, 41

Excludes new appointments beginning after Oct 1/09
Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Faculty of Fine Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Tenure Stream Faculty: 46, 83, 129, 32, 91, 123

Excludes new appointments beginning after Oct 1/09
Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
### Glendon College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total      | 177        | 433        | 610        | 134        | 453        | 587        |

### Faculty of Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total      | 177        | 433        | 610        | 134        | 453        | 587        |

### Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total      | 177        | 433        | 610        | 134        | 453        | 587        |

Excludes new appointments beginning after Oct 1/09.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis.
### Osgoode Hall Law School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excludes new appointments beginning after Oct 1/09

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Faculty of Science and Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Lecture</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Lecture</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Lecture</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>150%</td>
<td>204%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>158%</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excludes new appointments beginning after Oct 1/09

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Tenure Stream Librarians as of October 1st

### Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Chief Law Librarian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Librarian 1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Assistant Librarian</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Associate Librarian</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>Senior Librarian</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Librarians</td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excludes new appointments beginning after Oct 1/09

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
Faculty and Librarian Complement as of October 1st

Description: An overarching institutional objective is to continue to make outstanding appointments to have sufficient faculty complement in order to enhance the research cultural and to offer students an outstanding learning experience, including improving student/faculty ratios.

The tables below provide a time series of tenure stream and contractually limited appointments as well as undergraduate and graduate student faculty ratios. Definitions follow the Faculty-specific tables.

### Faculty Complement – Faculty Totals (not including Librarians)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Complement (Home Faculty Heads) @ October 1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1401</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>1365.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of FT Faculty</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1528</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1465.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>127.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>41022</td>
<td>41479</td>
<td>40771</td>
<td>40554</td>
<td>41927.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>3492</td>
<td>3764</td>
<td>4074</td>
<td>4277</td>
<td>4408.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1395</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>1408.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>1227.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1405.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>2427.5</td>
<td>2511.1</td>
<td>2614.9</td>
<td>2627.8</td>
<td>2633.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Student/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Full-Time (on-site) &amp; Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a) Full-Time Faculty FTEs includes Tenure Stream, CLAs and SRCs who are not on LTD or Leave Without Pay. It includes those on Sabbatical. These have been adjusted for joint appointments and reduced loads.

b) On Site FTEs adjusts for all types of leave including LTD, Paid Leaves, Unpaid Leaves, Sabbaticals and Reduced Loads. These have been adjusted for joint appointments.

c) Part Time FTEs includes Teaching Assistants (excluding Marker/Graders), CUPE2, CUPE Exempt, YUFA/OHFA Retirees, YUFA/OHFA Overload.

d) Full-time complement is based on an October 1st count. Authorized and appointments made are counted as of July 1st; departures are counted as May 1st. Consequently the difference between appointments and departures will not be equal to the change in the full-time complement counted as of October 1st.

e) New Faculty LABPS was launched in Fall 2009. Psychology, Kinesiology, Nursing and Health Management moved to the Faculty of Health in 2006-2007. Mathematics, Natural Science and Science & Technology Studies moved to the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2007-2008.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Faculty of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Complement (Home Faculty Heads) @ October 1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of FT Faculty</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>1363.7</td>
<td>1355.0</td>
<td>1367.1</td>
<td>1271.6</td>
<td>1251.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>142.0</td>
<td>143.8</td>
<td>161.9</td>
<td>176.5</td>
<td>189.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Student/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Full-Time (on-site) &amp; Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
### Faculty of Environmental Studies

Full-Time Complement (Home Faculty Heads) @ October 1st

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of FT Faculty</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>473.3</td>
<td>520.6</td>
<td>560.0</td>
<td>613.9</td>
<td>667.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>334.7</td>
<td>358.2</td>
<td>357.6</td>
<td>348.9</td>
<td>330.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraduateStudent/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Full-Time (on-site) &amp; Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Faculty of Fine Arts

Full-Time Complement (Home Faculty Heads) @ October 1st

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of FT Faculty</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>3542.4</td>
<td>3553.4</td>
<td>3457.3</td>
<td>3581.6</td>
<td>3573.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>159.4</td>
<td>212.9</td>
<td>258.6</td>
<td>279.1</td>
<td>287.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>120.6</td>
<td>123.8</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>209.9</td>
<td>215.5</td>
<td>223.6</td>
<td>233.5</td>
<td>223.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraduateStudent/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
### Full-Time Complement (Home Faculty Heads) @ October 1st

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of FT Faculty</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;apts/departures made to date)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>1826.9</td>
<td>1889.9</td>
<td>1900.4</td>
<td>1887.6</td>
<td>1978.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs(on-site only)</td>
<td>157.7</td>
<td>159.7</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>172.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraduateStudent/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Full-Time (on-site) &amp; Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

---

### Faculty of Health (created Fall 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of FT Faculty</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>170.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;apts/departures made to date)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>5743.7</td>
<td>5765.1</td>
<td>5680.3</td>
<td>5861.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>328.4</td>
<td>388.0</td>
<td>436.0</td>
<td>473.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>161.2</td>
<td>170.3</td>
<td>170.3</td>
<td>164.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>143.9</td>
<td>146.4</td>
<td>154.6</td>
<td>148.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>166.6</td>
<td>182.2</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>160.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs(on-site only)</td>
<td>310.5</td>
<td>328.6</td>
<td>322.9</td>
<td>309.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraduateStudent/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Full-Time (on-site) &amp; Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
### Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies (LAGPS) (created Fall 2009)

#### Faculty Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Complement (Home Faculty Heads) @ October 1st</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of FT Faculty</strong></td>
<td>833</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>27538.6</td>
<td>22197.1</td>
<td>20683.1</td>
<td>20172.1</td>
<td>20937.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>1392.5</td>
<td>1194.7</td>
<td>1235.0</td>
<td>1341.8</td>
<td>1407.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>780.7</td>
<td>664.8</td>
<td>642.4</td>
<td>639.8</td>
<td>599.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>699.0</td>
<td>580.0</td>
<td>569.2</td>
<td>565.6</td>
<td>512.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>721.3</td>
<td>609.7</td>
<td>603.1</td>
<td>593.1</td>
<td>666.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>1420.3</td>
<td>1189.7</td>
<td>1172.3</td>
<td>1158.6</td>
<td>1179.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Full-Time (on-site) &amp; Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data prior to 2009/10 represents the sum of Arts and Atkinson.

Psychology, Kinesiology, Nursing and Health Management moved to the Faculty of Health in 2006/07.

Mathematics, Natural Science and Science & Technology Studies moved to the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2007/08.

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

### Osgoode Hall Law School

#### Faculty Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Complement (Home Faculty Heads) @ October 1st</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of FT Faculty</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>894.3</td>
<td>939.0</td>
<td>932.9</td>
<td>928.6</td>
<td>908.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Full-Time (on-site) &amp; Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
### Faculty of Science and Engineering


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Complement (Home Faculty Heads) @ October 1st</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Tenure Stream Faculty</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>202.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Contractually Limited Appointments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total # of FT Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>212</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>212.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tenure Stream Appointments (Heads)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Authorized Appointments (New + Carry-forwards) (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Appointments Made (July 1 to June 30)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(‘appts/departures made to date)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures: Retirements, Resignations &amp; Deaths (May 1 to April 30)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Student/Faculty Ratios (FTEs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG FTEs</td>
<td>4412.7</td>
<td>4083.9</td>
<td>5059.0</td>
<td>5334.8</td>
<td>5618.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad FTEs</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>359.0</td>
<td>478.8</td>
<td>491.4</td>
<td>493.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs</td>
<td>148.9</td>
<td>149.3</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>204.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty FTEs (on-site only)</td>
<td>137.7</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>182.6</td>
<td>179.4</td>
<td>188.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time FTEs</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty FTEs(on-site only)</td>
<td>232.9</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>281.3</td>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>273.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GraduateStudent/Full-Time Faculty FTE</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student/Full-Time (on-site) &amp; Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis
New Tenure Stream Appointments by Equity Category

**Description:** York’s process for appointing new tenure stream faculty reflects the institutional commitment to equity and affirmative action. The table below illustrates considerable success in attracting a significant proportion of outstanding women candidates, while there has been less success in attracting visible minorities and other designated groups. The objective is to increase the numbers in all of these categories, though success in this regard is frequently dependent on the disciplines in which the appointments are being made in any given year.

### Distribution of New Tenure Stream Appointments by Equity Category (including Librarians)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appt Year</th>
<th>Total Appts</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Visible Minority**</th>
<th>Disability**</th>
<th>Aboriginal**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Includes all appointments made July 1 to the subsequent June 30 plus any appointments made effective in that year with a LOAWOP

**Includes only those applicants who self-identified as part of hiring process.

Source: Office of Vice-Provost (Academic)
Tenure Stream Searches

**Description:** The table below shows the results of the 2009-2010 searches for tenured stream faculty and the authorized appointments for the 2010-2011 cycles by Faculty.

| Faculty         | Appointments Authorized for 2009-2010 | Appointments Made in 2009-2010 | Delayed/Failed Appointments | Appointments Authorized for 2010-2011 | Appointments Made in 2010-2011 (to date) | Appointments in Progress/on Offer 2010-2011 | Delayed/Failed Appointments (includes CLA placeholders)/ Carried Forward |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|..................................................................................|
| LA&PS           | 5.5                                  | 5.5                           | 0                            | 2                                    | 2                                        | 0                                          | 0                                                                                           |
| Education       | 4                                    | 4                             | 0                            | 0                                    | 0                                        | 0                                          | 0                                                                                           |
| FES             | 0                                    | 0                             | 0                            | 0                                    | 0                                        | 0                                          | 0                                                                                           |
| Fine Arts       | 1                                    | 1                             | 0                            | 0                                    | 0                                        | 0                                          | 0                                                                                           |
| Glendon         | 1.5                                  | 1.5                           | 0                            | 6.5                                  | 5                                        | 1.5                                        | 0                                                                                           |
| Health          | 1                                    | 1                             | 0                            | 0                                    | 0                                        | 0                                          | 0                                                                                           |
| Osgoode         | 1                                    | 1                             | 0                            | 2                                    | 2                                        | 2                                          | 0                                                                                           |
| FSE             | 2                                    | 1                             | 1                            | 3.5                                  | 2                                        | 1.5                                        | 0                                                                                           |
| Schulich        | 1                                    | 1                             | 0                            | 0                                    | 0                                        | 0                                          | 0                                                                                           |
| Libraries       | 2                                    | 2                             | 0                            | 3                                    | 0                                        | 2                                          | 1                                                                                           |
| **Totals**      | **19**                               | **18**                        | **1**                        | **17**                               | **11**                                   | **5**                                       | **1**                                                                                      |

* Includes 2 LA&PS conversions, new Dean in LA&PS
** Includes 2 LA&PS conversions, new Deans in FSE and Osgoode

Source: Office of Vice-Provost (Academic)

Tenure Stream Appointments: Annual Authorized Appointments/Appointments Made

**Description:** The table below shows a time series of successful searches for the past five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Stream Appointments ~ Annual Authorized Appointments/Appointments Made (including Librarians)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes all appointments made July 1 to the subsequent June 30 plus any appointments made effective in that year with a LOAWOP

**Notes:**
1. Includes professional librarians, conversions and external CRCs; some authorized appointments are re-authorizations from earlier unsuccessful searches.
2. 2006-2007: Schulich Chair authorized, filled internally and not counted as appointment made or carried forward
3. 2007-2008: three 15 authorizations changed to limited term positions and not counted as appointments made
4. 2008-2009: Director of School of Nursing authorized, filled internally and not counted as appointment made or carried forward
5. 2009-2010: Includes 2 LA&PS conversions and new Dean

Source: Office of Vice-Provost (Academic)
Diversification

Distribution of Undergraduate FTEs (Eligible and Ineligible) by Discipline of Students

Description: A long-term priority of the University is to rebalance and diversify enrolment with particular emphasis on professional programs, health, applied science and engineering within the context of the overall enrolment plan.

The charts below provide information on the distribution of undergraduate students and full-time faculty by discipline.

Distribution of Undergrad FTEs (Eligible & Ineligible) by Discipline of Student

![Distribution of Undergrad FTEs](image)

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Distribution of Full-Time Faculty by Discipline

![Distribution of Full-Time Faculty](image)

Source: Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Performance/Result: York continues to make progress in rebalancing and diversifying faculty and enrolments across priority areas. Faculty and enrolments in the key areas of health, applied sciences and engineering continue to increase.
Research Performance 2009-2010

Description: The University Academic Plan provides the University with an important opportunity to grow its research performance and research intensity. Increasing participation rates (defined as percentage of faculty members holding an external research grant or contract) and research income intensity (calculated as total research income divided by total full-time faculty members) in externally sponsored research are critical challenges for the University.

York’s Annual Research Income from All Sources

![Research Income Chart]

Source: CAUBO data

York’s Scholarly Output from Publicly Available Databases

![Scholarly Output Chart]

Source: Thomson ISI Web of Knowledge and Scopus (data as of August 12th, 2009)

Performance/Result: In 2009-2010, 30.1 per cent of full-time faculty held an external research grant or contract. This is unchanged from last year, with a decrease in NSERC funding being offset by an increase from both CHIR and SSHRC. Research intensity was $35,000, up from last year. Research intensity remains a critical issue for York as the University is consistently ranked at 38th or lower among Canada’s universities by this measure.

1 CAUBO data prepared by Statistics Canada represents all research income paid to York University in a given fiscal year, including, but not limited to, research grants and contracts. It also incorporates student fellowships & scholarships from the Tri-Councils.

2 Figure is preliminary as it has not been approved by York Finance

3 Thomson ISI & Scopus are the two commonly used public databases which index scholarly output through peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, and letters, but exclude books and book chapters.
### Research Performance 2009-2010 – University Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Performance by Eligible Tri-Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIHR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
<td>$9,662,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
<td>$119,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
<td>$4,427,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
<td>$54,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

---

### Research Performance 2009-2010 – Faculty of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance by Eligible Tri-Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

---

### Research Performance 2009-2010 – Faculty of Environmental Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance by Eligible Tri-Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

---

These totals are based on ORS data but exclude student fellowships & scholarships, and research awards that are not administered through Fund 500 accounts. The table includes all individual Faculty awards and institutional awards (e.g. CFI, KM). These data are a subset of the CAUBO data, hence the totals in the Research Performance table will not match the annual CAUBO total.
### Research Performance 2009-2010 – Faculty of Fine Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,655,925</td>
<td>$1,655,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,463</td>
<td>$13,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$542,299</td>
<td>$542,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,409</td>
<td>$4,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

### Research Performance 2009-2010 – Glendon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$712,443</td>
<td>$747,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,222</td>
<td>$9,253</td>
<td>$8,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$149,635</td>
<td>$169,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,222</td>
<td>$1,943</td>
<td>$1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

### Research Performance 2009-2010 – Faculty of Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
<td>$5,726,157</td>
<td>$3,575,509</td>
<td>$2,375,667</td>
<td>$11,677,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
<td>$102,253</td>
<td>$155,457</td>
<td>$31,676</td>
<td>$75,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
<td>$2,163,335</td>
<td>$691,677</td>
<td>$1,063,878</td>
<td>$3,981,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
<td>$38631</td>
<td>$30,073</td>
<td>$14,185</td>
<td>$25,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation
## Research Performance 2009-2010 – Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Performance by Eligible Tri-Council</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
<td>$156,977</td>
<td>$636,130</td>
<td>$7,842,886</td>
<td>$8,635,993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
<td>$17,422</td>
<td>$37,419</td>
<td>$13,980</td>
<td>$14,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
<td>$106,977</td>
<td>$197,160</td>
<td>$4,146,366</td>
<td>$4,450,503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
<td>$11,866</td>
<td>$11,598</td>
<td>$7,391</td>
<td>$7,582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

## Research Performance 2009-2010 – Osgoode Hall Law School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Performance by Eligible Tri-Council</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,099,706</td>
<td>$1,114,706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21,563</td>
<td>$21,032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$210,535</td>
<td>$210,535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,128</td>
<td>$3,972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

## Research Performance 2009-2010 – Faculty of Science & Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Performance by Eligible Tri-Council</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FT faculty members (as of October 1st)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding an external grant or contract</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty members holding a tri-council grant</td>
<td>116.7%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from all sources</td>
<td>$35,97,805</td>
<td>$15,299,844</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>$18,921,149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research income intensity</td>
<td>$2,99,817</td>
<td>$84,143</td>
<td>$11,214</td>
<td>$94,606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty research income from the tri-councils</td>
<td>$2,057,506</td>
<td>$6,134,430</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>$8,285,436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tri-council research income intensity</td>
<td>$171,459</td>
<td>$33,892</td>
<td>$11,214</td>
<td>$41,427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of tri-council applications by faculty members</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation
Total Annual External Awards by Source

Description: Success in obtaining external funding to support research is a key measure of progress towards the UAP goal of promoting and intensifying a research culture.

Performance/Research: In 2009-2010, York received $49.2 million in external funding from all sources, an increase of $8.7 million over last year.
Total Annual External Awards by Source – Faculty of Fine Arts

Source: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

Total Annual External Awards by Source – Glendon College

Source: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

Total Annual External Awards by Source – Faculty of Health

(created Fall 2006)

Source: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

Total Annual External Awards by Source – Liberal Arts & Professional Studies (created Fall 2009)

Source: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

Data prior to 2009/10 represents the sum of Arts and Atkinson. Psychology, Kinesiology, Nursing and Health Management moved to the Faculty of Health in 2006/07.

Mathematics, Natural Science and Science & Technology Studies moved to the Faculty of Science and Engineering in 2007/08.

Source: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation.
Total Annual External Awards by Source – Osgoode Hall Law School

Source: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

Total Annual External Awards by Source – Faculty of Science & Engineering

Source: Office of Research Services and Office of VP Research and Innovation

Dollars Awarded

Other (Govt & Non-Govt Grants/Contracts)

Awarded but not previously reported*

Tri-Council Grants

Fiscal Year

2006-07 2007-08 2008-09 2009-10

$0 $200,000 $400,000 $600,000 $800,000 $1,000,000 $1,200,000 $1,400,000 $1,600,000

$32,215 $36,000 $89,998 $504,171

$490,108 $841,598 $745,977 $904,171

$480,001 $213,490 $212,707 $210,535

$0 $200,000 $400,000 $600,000 $800,000 $1,000,000 $1,200,000 $1,400,000 $1,600,000

$72,105 $0 $593,900 $379,739 $698,953 $234,215 $672,567 $257,978 $549,135 $562,268 $1,041,291

$0 $200,000 $400,000 $600,000 $800,000 $1,000,000 $1,200,000 $1,400,000 $1,600,000

$32,215 $36,000 $89,998 $490,108 $841,598 $745,977 $904,171

$480,001 $213,490 $212,707 $210,535

$0 $200,000 $400,000 $600,000 $800,000 $1,000,000 $1,200,000 $1,400,000 $1,600,000

$72,105 $0 $593,900 $379,739 $698,953 $234,215 $672,567 $257,978 $549,135 $562,268 $1,041,291

* Awarded but not previously reported.
Section C: Budgets
This section of the Planning, Budget and Accountability Report discusses York University’s financial results for the 2009-2010 fiscal year. These results are reported in York’s audited Financial Statements for the year ended April 30, 2010.

In 2009-2010, the University continued to manage its finances in a very challenging fiscal environment. The current year was characterized by a recovery in capital markets and stronger enrolment growth than originally anticipated after the extended labour dispute of the prior year. Graduate enrolment growth remained a key priority for the University as part of an overall focus on achieving the objectives of the University Academic Plan. Increased tuition fees, additional quality grants from the Province of Ontario and higher enrolments provided additional operating income. However, cost pressures largely associated with salaries and benefits continued to grow.

The University follows a multi-year approach to financial planning and an essential element of the budget plan is to ensure a sound financial position on an ongoing basis. The University is planning for budget cuts of 3.5 per cent for 2010-2011, 2.0 per cent in 2011-2012, and no budget cut is planned for 2012-2013.

Highlights

- The University’s unrestricted deficit has decreased from $120 million in 2009 to $68 million in 2010. The decrease in the deficit is the result of a planned operating budget deficit, the reversal of the deferral of revenue required due to the labour disruption in 2008-2009, and positive results in ancillary operations. The primary elements of the unrestricted deficit balance include the liabilities associated with providing post-employment benefits other than pensions to employees; the amount of internally-financed capital projects; and ancillary deficits that are required to be paid down as part of the University’s budget plan. (See Figure 1)
- Total expenses increased by 4.0 per cent in 2009-2010 while total revenues increased by 5.2 per cent. Increased expenses were primarily attributable to higher salary and benefit costs after the labour disruption and higher student support costs. A more detailed analysis is included later in this Year-End in Review.
- As a result of positive returns in capital markets, the University’s endowments increased in market value by $46 million. The size of York’s endowment fund continues to rank 11th among Canadian universities at the end of calendar year 2009.
- Overall, spending on scholarships and bursaries increased from $55 million to $59 million.
- Grant income decreased by $10 million to $376 million. This was primarily due to one-time funding received for deferred maintenance projects in the prior year.
- Revenue from student fees (before adjustments for labour disruption) increased by $31 million. This reflects the impact of tuition fee increases and increased enrolments at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Figure 1: Deficit (Net Assets Balance)

Source: Office of the Assistant Vice-President Finance & CFO

Introduction

York University’s Financial Statements are subject to external audit. Ernst and Young LLP expressed an unqualified audit opinion on the statements for fiscal 2009-2010. This means the Financial Statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the University at April 30, 2010, as well as the results of its operations and its cash flows for the year then ended, in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles.

Balance Sheet

The Balance Sheet outlines the financial position of the University, setting out the assets, liabilities and net assets at a specific point in time – typically at the end of the fiscal year. (Appendix 1 sets out the Balance Sheet as at April 30, 2010 and 2009.)

ASSETS

Total assets increased by $39 million to $1.398 billion in 2009-2010.

The most significant changes in the composition of the Balance Sheet were with cash, investments and capital assets. Cash and cash equivalents decreased by $48 million, investments increased by $78 million and capital assets increased by $24 million at April 30, 2010.
The increase in investments resulted from a transfer from cash of $50 million to the structured fixed income portfolio in addition to positive capital market performance of $46 million offset by distributions from the endowment to cover previous years spending.

The Pension cost deferral is an accounting-related item. It reflects the difference between actual employer contributions to the pension plan and the amount of pension expense reported on the Statement of Operations and Change in Deficit, in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles. The pension cost deferral increased by $4 million in 2009-2010.

LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS

Total liabilities decreased from $954 million at the end of fiscal 2008-2009 to $887 million at the end of fiscal 2009-2010, a decrease of $67 million. The most significant change is the decrease in deferred income representing the reversal of the accounting deferral for tuition and grant income of $55 million related to the academic term from the prior year and the maturity of $26 million in long term debt. Long-term liabilities for post-employment benefits, other than pensions, increased by $7 million to $75 million at the end of fiscal 2009-2010 as determined by an external actuarial valuation.

Long-term debt decreased by $4 million to $309 million at April 30, 2010, based on scheduled debt repayments in 2010-2011.

Deferred capital contributions represent grants and donations associated with the University’s capital projects. These contributions are recognized in the Statement of Operations when the associated capital assets are brought into service. During the year, new capital contributions of $37 million were received and were offset by the amortization of $13 million into income.

The net assets section of the University’s Balance Sheet includes three components:

- Unrestricted deficit – the University’s cumulative deficit position since the University’s inception (see Figure 1);
- internally restricted net assets (discussed below and shown in Figure 2);
- endowments.

Total net assets increased from $405 million in 2008-2009 to $511 million in 2009-2010. The overall increase of $106 million resulted from the combined effects of:

- a decrease in the unrestricted deficit of $52 million explained in the Highlights section above;
- the $58 million increase in internally and externally restricted endowments attributable to the recovery of capital markets;
- the $3 million decrease in internally restricted net assets resulting from a withdrawal from the sinking funds to fund a mortgage which had matured, and an increase in investment in capital assets.

Figure 2 provides a listing of the University’s internally restricted net assets. Descriptions of internally restricted net assets are set out below:

- Departmental carryforwards decreased from $44 million to $40 million. Faculties and divisions are permitted to carry forward the net unspent funds from previous years’ allocations to encourage prudent budget management and provide a measure of flexibility to respond to budget pressures.
- The PTR deficit decreased from $28 million last year to $25 million this year. This deficit is the cumulative difference between amounts paid annually for progress through the ranks (PTR) salary adjustments and the funds recovered by the University when faculty members retire/leave through the salary recovery policy. The PTR requirements are intended to be self-funding over time, and hence have no overall incremental budget impact. The long-term self-funding result is expected to be achieved through the implementation of York’s salary recovery budgeting framework. While the cost of PTR adjustments is expected to be “budget neutral” over time, on a year-over-year basis, the cost of providing for PTR can be more than, or less than the amount of funds actually provided through the salary recovery framework. This depends on the number of retirements that occurred during the year.
- The Computing Systems reserve increased from $2.4 million last year to $3.7 million this year. The University continues to budget for computing system development to upgrade major administrative computing and information systems. This internally restricted amount, which is embedded in departmental budgets, is to support future commitments for the systems work in progress as well as planned future stages of system implementation not yet contracted at fiscal year-end.
- Contractual commitments to employee groups of $2.9 million represent the net carryforward of funds from accounts that are defined under collective agreements with various groups.
- Sinking fund represents funds set aside for the retirement of debt. The total debt associated with the sinking fund is $300 million.
- Investment in capital assets represents the net amount of capital assets funded using internal capital.
- The Capital reserve decreased to $42 million. This represents funds restricted for deferred maintenance, capital emergencies and capital projects planned or in progress.

Source: York University Financial Statements, April 30, 2010

Figure 2: Internally Restricted Net Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(millions)</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental carryforwards</td>
<td>$39.9</td>
<td>$43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress through the ranks</td>
<td>(25.3)</td>
<td>(28.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing systems development</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual commitments to employee groups</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension cost deferral</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinking fund</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in capital assets</td>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital reserve</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance, end of year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$285.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$288.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: York University Financial Statements, April 30, 2010
STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND CHANGES IN DEFICIT

The Statement of Operations and Changes in Deficit records the University’s revenue from all sources, expenses, the excess of revenue over expenses and the change in the University’s deficit position. (Appendix 2 sets out the Statement of Operations and Changes in Deficit for the fiscal years ended April 30, 2010 and 2009.)

Decrease in the Deficit

The unrestricted deficit decreased by $52 million to a cumulative $68 million by the end of fiscal 2009-2010 (see Figure 1). The decrease in the deficit is the result of a planned operating budget deficit, the reversal of the deferral of revenue required due to the labour disruption from the prior year, and positive results in ancillary operations.

Revenue

Total revenue (before adjustments related to the labour disruption) increased by $43 million to $890 million (see Figure 3).

Grants and contracts decreased by $10 million to $376 million for fiscal 2009-2010 primarily due to one-time funding from the Province for deferred maintenance projects in the prior year.

Revenue from student fees increased to $370 million from $339 million last year. This was attributable to approved tuition fee increases and increased enrolments at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Student fees include ancillary and referenda fee-related amounts, which are designated for student organizations and student services.

Expenses

Total expenses increased by $37 million to $895 million in 2009-2010 (see Figure 4).

The University devotes the largest proportion of its spending to salaries and benefits. Spending on salaries and benefits increased by $50 million to $607 million reflecting a number of factors, including wage increases resulting from negotiated settlements, an increase in the total number of employees at the University and the return to normal salary expense levels related to the labour disruption in the prior year.

Operating costs decreased by $14 million to $111 million for fiscal 2009-2010. The decrease is related to costs associated with the labour disruption and a reduction in discretionary expenditures as a result of departmental budget pressures.

Taxes and utilities remained constant at $33 million.

Spending on scholarships and bursaries increased from $55 million in 2008-2009 to $59 million in 2009-2010.

Total interest on long-term debt decreased from $23 million to $21 million reflecting the maturity during the year of a $26 million mortgage. The current level of expenses includes the full cost of the two debentures issued in 2002 and 2004, as well as the costs associated with term loans associated with a number of student facilities.

Figure 4: Total Expenses (2006-2010)
Capital Expenditure Program

York University has undertaken a significant capital expenditure program over the past several years to assist in meeting the growth in academic programs, the impact of increased enrolments, and related ancillary services required to support a larger student population.

The total capital expenditures by project are summarized below in Figure 5.

The capital expenditure program is being funded from a combination of debt, donations and capital grants summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital plan value</th>
<th>805</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding sources**

- Debentures 300
- Government grants 216
- Donations 42
- Investment income 11
- Internal funding 191
- Third Party Lease 45

**Total** 805

Note: Forty per cent of the value of borrowing was required for self-financing residences, conference facilities and ancillaries. The remaining 60 per cent was for Academic projects, provided by government grants, donations, interest and internal financing from University cash resources.

Summary

For fiscal 2009-2010, the year-end Unrestricted Deficit Balance of $68 million was lower than the previous year’s level of $120 million due to a planned operating budget deficit, the reversal of the deferral of $55 million in revenue required due to the labour disruption in the prior year, and positive results in ancillary operations.

The University will update its net asset plan in 2010 to reflect a number of significant changes with respect to the University’s key planning assumptions, particularly enrolment levels and timing of capital projects.

Heading into 2010, the University will continue to manage its finances responsibly. The challenges for the next year are as follows:

- the variability of investment returns and the potential impact on pension costs and future endowment distributions;
- the increasing pressures on salary and benefit costs;
- the implications of potential changes in government grant funding allocations;
- the uncertainty associated with the tuition fee framework beyond 2012; and
- the achievement of planned budget cuts across the institution.

These challenges are expected to impact through fiscal year 2010-2011 and beyond.

Figure 5: Summary of Capital Project Expenditures ($ millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Small Centre &amp; Arboretum Parking Garage</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Enhanced Learning Building</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pond Road Residence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour Schulich Building</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Learning Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Centre &amp; Student Services Parking Garage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accolade Project, East &amp; West Buildings and “ripple” costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended “Ripple” Costs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accolade Colonnade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pond Road West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Boulevard Upgrade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Performance Contracting Projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Health Science Research Centre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendon Centre of Excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgoode Hall Law School Expansion/Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences Building</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethune &amp; Petrie Space Modification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadal Centre Renovation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrie 4th Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumbers Wet Labs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Research Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of the Assistant Vice-President Finance & CFO
Key Accounting Principles

Revenue Deferral: Under the deferral method of accounting, revenue is recognized in the Statement of Operations and Changes in Deficit only when the associated expenses are incurred. This change mainly affects revenue received for explicitly directed (or “externally restricted”) purposes (i.e.) a grant received for capital construction or a donation to be used only for a particular award. Revenue from these externally restricted sources is, therefore, matched to expenses in the period in which the expenses are incurred. Until this happens, the funds received are considered as deferred and are recorded as liabilities in the Balance Sheet, and are recorded as either deferred contributions and income or deferred capital contributions.

Endowments: Endowments sourced from external donations are permanently maintained by the University in accordance with donor restrictions. These external donations are recorded as direct increases in endowments in the net assets section of the Balance Sheet, rather than as donation revenue, since no matching of expense is required.

Capital Assets: Capital assets are shown on the Balance Sheet at historical cost, less accumulated amortization. Amortization (or depreciation) is the means used to expense the cost of an asset over its useful life. The impact on the Statement of Operations and Changes in Deficit is that the amortization expense is recognized over the life of the asset. The University must write off assets that are no longer in use, and also expense major maintenance costs that do not extend the useful life of an asset.

Post-Employment Benefits other than Pension: The value of the future benefits earned by employees to the end of the 2009-2010 fiscal year, which the University is obligated to pay, is recognized in the Financial Statements even though actual payment of these benefits may not occur for many years. The estimated cost of these benefits amounts to $75 million as of the end of 2009-2010, an increase of $7 million over last year. These amounts were actuarially determined.

Other Financial Performance Indicators

In addition to the unrestricted deficit balance discussed earlier in the Highlights section of the Financial Year-End in Review, two additional financial indicators are presented below.

UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT

Endowments include donations received by the University that are restricted for the purposes designated by the donors. The restricted purposes generally include scholarships and bursaries, Research Chairs and other specific projects.

The endowments are invested in long term investments in accordance with a Board approved Statement of Investment Policies and Procedures.

The investment returns preserve the value of the endowment over time. The returns fund the annual inflation adjustments, the annual distribution to support the purpose of the endowment, and maintain a reserve to ensure continuity of distributions in years of poor investment performance. As a result of the extreme volatility in capital markets in the last two years, the University changed its normal distribution policy to reduce the level of distributions in order to preserve the capital of the endowments. The University operating budgets subsidized the reduced distributions to minimize the impact on students and Faculties in receipt of these distributions.

Figure 6 reports the annual investment performance over the last five years as compared to the performance benchmark. The benchmark is a weighted composite of market indexes representing the main asset classes in which the fund is invested. Over that time period, the investment performance of the endowment has exceeded the policy benchmark in four of the last five years. The Endowment Fund achieved a 5-year annualized performance return of 5.08 per cent compared to its 5-year average performance benchmark of 5.12 per cent.

Over the past six years, the value of the endowments, at December 31, has increased (see Figure 7) from $221 million in 2004-2005 to $294 million in 2009-2010, representing a 33 per cent increase over that period. The growth is the result of fundraising efforts, internally restricted contributions, matching contributions, grants from the Provincial Government and investment performance. Due to the positive investment performance in capital markets, the market value of the endowments increased by $49 million in the current year to $294 million.
The York University Pension Plan was established by York University to provide pension benefits to its faculty and staff as an essential element of the University’s compensation policy.

The investment performance (see Figure 8) has exceeded the performance of its policy benchmarks in five of the last six years. The policy benchmark is a weighted composite of market indexes representing the main asset classes in which the fund is invested. In 2009 the investment performance was below the benchmark performance. This is mainly attributable to the impact on investment returns of the strengthening of the Canadian dollar. The Pension Fund achieved a 6-year average return of 4.9 per cent compared to its 6-year average performance benchmark of 4.9 per cent.

The funded status for the Pension Fund (see Figure 9) is significantly impacted by the annual investment performance, as well as changes required to the actuarial assumptions.

In the past five years, the funded status of the plan has been impacted by changes to the following actuarial assumptions:
- 2003 – Adoption of new mortality tables
- 2004 – Changes to the Income Tax Act maximum pension limits
- 2005 – A reduction in the valuation interest rates and an increase in the non-reduction reserve requirements
- 2006 – Adjustments to the mortality tables (first of three phased-in adjustments) and a change in current service cost methodology
- 2007 – An increase in the valuation interest rates and (second of three phased-in adjustments) planned to the mortality tables
- 2008 – Final adjustments to the mortality tables
- 2009 – A reduction in the valuation interest rates

As a result of unprecedented volatility and decline in capital markets during 2008 the University Pension Fund experienced significant negative investment returns. During 2009 the capital markets experienced strong positive returns; however they were not sufficient to offset the negative performance experienced in 2008. This has resulted in a continued significant unfunded position at the end of the year. The University is required to file actuarial valuations every three years which determine additional special payments to fund the deficit. The University filed its last valuation for 2007 and will be required to refile for the calendar year 2010.
### APPENDIX 1

#### Balance Sheet

(Thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ended As at April 30</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>32,953</td>
<td>81,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>62,290</td>
<td>79,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>4,489</td>
<td>4,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>8,827</td>
<td>10,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current assets</td>
<td>108,559</td>
<td>175,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension cost deferral</td>
<td>42,159</td>
<td>38,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>527,489</td>
<td>448,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in lease</td>
<td>44,634</td>
<td>44,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets, net</td>
<td>675,135</td>
<td>650,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>1,397,976</td>
<td>1,358,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>88,130</td>
<td>94,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current portion of long-term debt</td>
<td>4,181</td>
<td>30,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred income</td>
<td>38,031</td>
<td>94,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred contributions</td>
<td>83,086</td>
<td>86,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current liabilities</td>
<td>213,428</td>
<td>306,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term liabilities</td>
<td>120,059</td>
<td>113,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt</td>
<td>308,899</td>
<td>313,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred capital contributions</td>
<td>244,651</td>
<td>220,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>887,037</td>
<td>953,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments and contingent liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted deficit</td>
<td>(68,145)</td>
<td>(119,526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internally restricted</td>
<td>285,264</td>
<td>288,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>293,820</td>
<td>235,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net assets</strong></td>
<td>510,939</td>
<td>404,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted deficit, end of year</strong></td>
<td>(68,145)</td>
<td>(119,526)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: York University Financial Statements April 30, 2010

### APPENDIX 2

#### Statement of Operations and Changes in Deficit

(Thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ended April 30</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts before adjustment</td>
<td>375,678</td>
<td>386,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees before adjustment</td>
<td>370,042</td>
<td>339,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>6,755</td>
<td>5,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>21,256</td>
<td>10,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services before adjustment</td>
<td>67,999</td>
<td>64,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of deferred capital contributions</td>
<td>12,846</td>
<td>11,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery of salaries, benefits and other expenses</td>
<td>27,405</td>
<td>25,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8,404</td>
<td>3,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>890,385</td>
<td>846,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>606,737</td>
<td>556,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>110,800</td>
<td>124,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of capital assets</td>
<td>41,225</td>
<td>44,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of sales and services</td>
<td>23,429</td>
<td>21,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and utilities</td>
<td>32,641</td>
<td>33,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and bursaries</td>
<td>58,911</td>
<td>54,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on long-term debt</td>
<td>21,060</td>
<td>22,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>894,803</td>
<td>858,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficiency of revenue over expenses for the year before adjustment related to labour disruption</td>
<td>(4,418)</td>
<td>(11,707)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour disruption</td>
<td>55,360</td>
<td>(55,360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficiency of revenue over expenses for the year</strong></td>
<td>50,942</td>
<td>(67,067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in internally restricted net assets</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>(30,657)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net transfers from (to) internally restricted endowments</td>
<td>(2,659)</td>
<td>13,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in unrestricted deficit in the year</strong></td>
<td>51,381</td>
<td>(84,699)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted deficit, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>(119,526)</td>
<td>(34,827)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unrestricted deficit, end of year</strong></td>
<td>(68,145)</td>
<td>(119,526)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: York University Financial Statements April 30, 2010
The Planning and Budgeting Process

Description of Multi-Year Operating Budget Process

Budget strategies and plans are developed and implemented in the context of all assets and funds associated with the University’s finances. This comprehensive approach reflects the integrated nature of the operations of the University, and the relationships that exist between operating, ancillary, capital and research activities.

Responsibility for the development and implementation of financial plans rests with the Vice-President Finance and Administration, although financial plans are developed through detailed discussions with all senior administrators and ultimately approved by the University Board of Governors. Financial strategy is an important component of the University Budget and Academic Plan – which integrates the University’s core academic, research, enrolment, student services, technology, and financial management objectives. The core financial management objectives are:

- ensure financial plans reflect and support academic objectives;
- maintain balanced operating budgets and manage the outstanding deficit;
- prudently manage the investment of pension, endowment and other funds;
- plan appropriately for compensation and benefit costs; and
- maintain financially sound ancillary operations.

The primary process for review, discussion, and if necessary, revisions to financial strategy is through the annual long-term budgeting process. The University has a well-established multi-year rolling budget process that involves review and approval by the board of multi-year budget plans on an annual basis. This approach provides flexibility in the annual budgeting process and ensures a longer-term perspective is considered in making immediate fiscal year budget decisions.

The process commences with an environmental scan and review of current and emerging institutional issues that have financial implications for the University. Key planning assumptions are agreed upon in consultation with relevant stakeholders, and various planning scenarios are generated using the University’s planning models. The results of the planning scenarios are reviewed with the University Executive Committee in arriving at the updated plans to be recommended to the board for approval. Input and advice is received from the deans of the various Faculties during the process through review and discussion of planning scenarios with the President’s Priorities Committee. This group is chaired by the president, and is comprised of the vice-presidents, the deans, the university librarian, and the chief financial officer.

The first year of the final approved multi-year budget effectively forms the basis for the upcoming fiscal year’s annual budget allocations to the academic and administrative units which form the basis for the most detailed budgets against which units are measured on a monthly basis throughout the fiscal year.

Planning Context – Multi-Year Budget Plans

A consolidated summary of the past five Budget Plans covering the period 2006-2007 to 2012-2013 is provided in Figure 4; this represents a significant planning period for the University. The key factors that influenced the budget plan included the end of the significant growth in undergraduate enrolments and the double cohort students which commenced in 2003; the adoption of a strategic plan to significantly increase graduate enrolments; the release by the Provincial Government in May 2005 of the new “Reaching Higher” plan that identified an investment of $6.2 billion in postsecondary education over the four-year period ending in 2008-2009; the Government announcement in March 2006 of a new tuition fee framework which provided the University with an opportunity to increase tuition fees following a two-year period of government imposed tuition freezes and an extended labour disruption that occurred during 2008-2009; and a period of significant capital market volatility which has resulted in a significant unfunded position in the University’s Pension Plan.

The results shown in Figure 4 reflect a total of $691.8 million in additional revenue over the six-year period. A total of $260.6 million is budgeted to be generated from annual tuition fee increases, $214.5 million from grants and tuition related to the growth in undergraduate and graduate enrolments, $100.5 million from additional grants from the Province.

During this planning period the University Budget plan has identified a total of $704.2 million in additional budget allocations. These allocations include $348 million to fund compensation and benefit pressures, $190.4 million to support the costs of the growth in enrolments, $94.8 million to address inflationary and other cost pressures and $148.9 million for Strategic Investments.

The University’s approach to financial planning is multi-year and an essential element of this plan is a sound financial position. Guided by this principle, the University implemented plans for multi-year budget cuts of 0 per cent in 2008-2009, a 3.5 per cent cut in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, a 2.25 per cent budget cut in 2011-2012 and no cut in 2012-2013. These budget cuts will generate a total of $188.4 million to enable the University to arrive at a substantially balanced budget position at the end of the planning cycle.
These allocations are identified in detail in Figure 4 and the corresponding allocations by division are presented in Figure 5.

The key planning assumptions that form the basis of this budget plan are described in detail below.

**Key Planning Assumptions/Changes**

**ENROLMENT GROWTH**

A key planning assumption which drives revenue and cost changes is the enrolment plan. The overall enrolment plan is provided in Figure 1 below, with individual breakdowns for undergraduate and graduate shown in the charts that follow. The undergraduate enrolment chart (Figure 2) shows that the actual 2009-2010 domestic undergraduate enrolment results exceeded the plan. The University had recognized that, as a result of the 2008-2009 labour disruption, the achievement of its plan may not be possible and had built into its budget plan the financial impacts of lower enrolment applications for a period of three years, after which it was anticipated that enrolments would return to more normal levels. The actual 2009-2010 enrolment levels surpassed the previous enrolment targets by about 1200 FFTE’s. The University has now approved a new enrolment plan which will maintain the undergraduate enrolment levels at the current level as its steady state for the foreseeable future.

The University also updated its graduate enrolment plan (Figure 3) to maintain the current enrolment level for the foreseeable future. The demand for graduate enrolment had been expected to continue to increase as a result of the graduation of the undergraduate double-cohort class and increased participation rates in graduate programs. However, the overall level of graduate growth across the Province has not materialized at the level originally projected by the Government in its Reaching Higher Plan targets, and competition among universities for graduate students has proven to be intense.
REVENUE ASSUMPTIONS

Domestic and International Tuition Fee Increases
A significant planning assumption affecting projected revenues is the rate for future tuition fee increases. In March 2006, the Government announced a multi-year tuition fee framework which provided for increases to tuition fees, with a number of constraints.

The tuition fee framework provides for a total average tuition increase across all programs of up to 5 per cent in any year. The fee framework places further constraints on fee increases tied to specific categories of programs and year of study, as well as compliance with the Government’s student access guarantee.

The Board of Governors approved tuition rates for most of York’s programs through 2011-2012 at essentially the maximum annual increases allowable under the guidelines. For budget planning purposes, this plan incorporates an assumption of a 5 per cent annual increase in tuition revenue for domestic and international tuition fees. The tuition fee framework for 2012-2013 has yet to be announced by the Government, hence this budget planning assumption will have to be reviewed when the actual tuition fee guidelines are announced.

Tuition revenue is projected to increase by $11.1 million in 2012-2013, based on the allowable tuition increase assumption.

Government Grant Increases
In the May 2005 budget the Provincial Government announced the new “Reaching Higher” plan that would invest $6.2 billion in postsecondary education over the four-year period ending in 2008-2009. The additional revenue allocated by the Government has been used to fund the anticipated growth in undergraduate enrolment as well as some additional funding for General Quality and Targeted Quality Initiatives. In 2009-2010, the Government allocated $35 million in additional funding to be used for General Quality.

Quality Funding
York University represents approximately 11 per cent of the total Ontario system and that figure reflects what York’s share of the General Quality and Targeted Quality Funding should be.

The University’s share of this quality funding resulted in $18.5 million in continuing quality funding with some additional one-time-only funding in 2006-2007, $5.7 million in 2007-2008 and $5.8 million in 2008-2009.

As part of its Reaching Higher plan, the Ontario Government allocated about $300M in 2007-2008 to improve quality at Ontario universities. Allocations were spread over 5 different “quality funds” (including the General Quality Fund, Targeted Quality Fund, Per Student Quality Fund, Minister’s Fund and the Quality Access Contingency Fund) and are tied to the submission of a Multi-Year Accountability Agreement each year.

It has been difficult to plan in this environment as the amounts in each fund have fluctuated from year to year with little or no advanced notice. For example, the Government announced a $30M planned decrease in the General Quality Fund for 2007-2008 at the beginning of the fiscal year but provided a $55M increase at year end.

The University’s share of this quality funding resulted in $18.5 million in continuing quality funding over the period to 2009-2010. This represents less than its traditional 11 per cent share of system funding. While York does receive its traditional share of the General Quality Fund and Targeted Quality Fund, it receives only a negligible share of the Per Student Quality Fund. This particular fund provides full funding for so-called “unfunded students”, enrolments that were above its negotiated enrolment funding corridor mid-point level. However, York did not have many “unfunded students” in the baseline year.

Accessibility Funding – Undergraduate and Graduate
The University received additional funding on a per student basis for its growth in graduate and undergraduate enrolments. Over this planning period the University is expecting to receive increased funding until it reaches the level of $17.0 million in 2010-2011. This revenue is subject to the attainment of enrolment targets.

Grant funding continues to be allocated based on in-year enrolment changes with no enrolment corridor protection for enrolment increases since 2004. In recent years the Government funding has not been sufficient to fully fund in all years, the results of the system growth at the undergraduate level. In 2006-2007, the University experienced a discounting of its total undergraduate accessibility grant of approximately $3 million due to higher system growth than anticipated in the Ministry’s budget. In March 2010, the Provincial Government announced additional funding for undergraduate growth to fund an additional 11,000 spaces across the system.

The planning assumption for this budget plan assumes full undergraduate funding over the budget plan period.

Miscellaneous Revenues
Government Grants – The University receives non-enrolment related grants from the Federal and Provincial governments as contributions to the indirect cost of research and other related funding. The budget plan reflects the increases in the funding received of $1 million beginning in 2008-2009.

Interest Income – The University has implemented a structured fixed income strategy to improve the returns on its working capital. The significant decline in short-term market rates has resulted in an expected reduction of interest income based on the significant reduction in short-term interest income and has been reflected in the plan.

EXPENDITURE ASSUMPTIONS

Enrolment Growth Related
The major factors contributing to growth in expenses over the planning period are the costs associated with the planned enrolment for domestic and international students at the graduate and
undergraduate levels. The University has developed a comprehensive framework to provide a sound basis for budgeting to meet enrolment growth related to graduate and undergraduate needs.

The single largest expense is the salary and benefit costs associated with the additional tenure stream faculty, part-time faculty, and administrative support staff that will be needed across the University to meet the demands of the additional students. The plan allocations provide for a total faculty complement increase of 48 FTEs in 2006-2007 that grows to 65 FTEs by 2008-2009 and 70 by 2009-2010.

The plan also assumes that the number of administrative support staff will grow at the rate of 1 staff for every 1.5 faculty members. The plan provides for the funding of 32 additional staff by 2008-2009.

The second largest expense is the student support required for graduate students. The budget framework provides funding for four years for non-professional doctoral students and two years for non-professional masters students at competitive rates.

The fixed costs associated with capital expansion, to support the enrolment growth, will also be covered from the revenues generated from enrolment growth. These costs include the borrowing costs directly attributable to new construction, as well as funds needed to operate buildings in an ongoing basis such as utility and cleaning costs. The budget plan provides for debt servicing costs for a total cost of $30 million in debt. Since a matching capital contribution from the Government is anticipated, the budget plan provides for the operating costs associated with $60 million of capital projects. The plan also provides for an annual amount to be set aside to cover ongoing maintenance/renewal of these buildings to avoid exacerbating the University’s deferred maintenance backlog.

The plan also identifies funds to cover the other anticipated costs of enrolment growth, including faculty start-up, graduate student benefit costs, faculty supervision release, and the requirement to increase the number of university librarians.

Total expenses from enrolment growth are $39.0 million in 2009-2010 that will increase to $41.2 million in 2010-2011.

Compensation/Benefit Costs
a) Salary and Benefit Costs

Collective agreements for most employee groups were negotiated in 2008 and 2009 for a three year period expiring in 2011 and 2012. The estimated compensation/benefit cost increases to the end of 2010-2011 had been incorporated into the budget plan based on a reasonable assumption of the outcome of the contracts negotiated. The current plan reflects the projected impact of the Compensation Restraint Act on University employee groups announced by the Government in March 2010. The updated Budget Plan assumes a two-year freeze upon expiration of existing collective agreements.

Similar to most Ontario employers, the University continues to experience increased utilization of benefits by employees (reflective of the increasing age of the workforce) as well as increases in premiums and actual claim costs. The plan reflects the costs for salary/benefit increases for the period of $15 million in 2010-2011, $11 million in 2011-2012 and in 2012-2013, an increase of only $3 million as most employee groups will experience the impact of the Compensation Restraint Act.

b) Pension Costs

Pension cost pressures have emerged as a result of changes in actuarial assumptions and unfavourable investment returns in 2008. These assumption changes reflect required increases in the non-reduction reserve assumptions from 1.5 per cent to 3.5 per cent of the going concern liability, as well as a series of changes to the mortality tables to reflect actual experience. In addition, the unfavourable investment returns have created a sizable unfunded pension deficit which requires additional special payments.

The increase in pension expenses is $4.5 million, starting in 2009-2010 growing to $9.5 million in 2011-2012 and $19.5 million in 2012-2013.

Inflationary Cost Pressures

a) Energy Inflation and the Energy Management Program

The University experiences cost pressures due to inflation and other factors. The budget plan recognizes the significant cost pressures that are anticipated in future years from the impact of deregulation of hydro rates, resulting in an estimated 15 per cent increase in rates in 2006-2007, as well as the rising cost of natural gas. The University has two co-generation plants that help to offset the rising cost of energy.

The University commenced an energy performance management project requiring estimated capital expenditures in the range of $40 million. These capital expenditures are expected to mitigate considerably the future rising energy costs beyond 2008-2009. The University budget plan recognizes an amount of $2.5 million annually over 16 years to amortize the cost of the required capital improvements. The total cost increase related to energy and energy management is projected to be $5.0 million in 2008-2009, including the $2.5 million annual capital investment funding noted above. Beyond 2009-2010, energy costs are projected to remain flat for the next several years as a result of the energy savings achieved by the investments in conservation.

b) Insurance

Similar to most businesses, the University is experiencing increased capital costs related to its property and liability coverage. The premium increases related to property are reflective of the increase in the University investment in capital property as well as an increase in insurance rates. In recent years higher premiums are being experienced due to industry claims for natural disasters as well as lower investment returns. The University insures property through CURIE, a University reciprocal which provides more competitive rates than are available through external markets.
The University liability coverage is calculated based on student enrolments and claims experience. The cost of University coverage is being impacted by our significant increase in student enrolment as well as higher levels of litigation within the University sector.

To address this cost escalation, the budget plan has allocated $1.8 million in 2008-2009 with no additional funding beyond that date.

c) Library inflation

The University library collection is a critical element for the success of our faculty researchers and students. The cost of journals and books is continuously under significant cost pressures.

The budget plan anticipates an increase of $1.4 million in 2008-2009 rising by $400 thousand per year thereafter for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011.

Other Cost Pressures

There are a number of other cost pressures that have arisen due to the need to support operating costs related to the new buildings.

In fiscal 2008-2009 the University experienced an extended labour disruption that had a significant impact on the students and the operations of the University. As a result of this labour disruption the University experienced a number of one-time costs which included a $10 million cost for a tuition fee credit program to assist students who were impacted by the strike and $5 million in miscellaneous additional operating costs.

The Provincial Government has introduced legislation that will require the University to meet a series of five different standards to accommodate individuals with disabilities. The AODA (Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities) Office has been created to identify requirements, coordinate actions, and provide oversight as these standards come into effect. The University has identified the need to provide a higher level of due diligence to assist with compliance with University policies in the areas of procurement, expense reimbursements, conflict of interest, etc. The updated plan reflects an investment of $0.6 million annually to fund these costs.

Strategic Investments

The University administration has identified the need to make a number of strategic investments to position itself to meet the objectives of the University Academic Plan. The investments identified are as follows:

a. Investment in Academic /Research Quality – the University has experienced almost a decade of budget cuts that have resulted in pressure on maintaining faculty complement ratios. A strategic investment in faculty complement would allow the hiring of approximately 15 additional faculty in 2006-2007 rising to 35 by 2009-2010. In addition, a Strategic Re-investment Fund growing to $5 million by the end of the planning period was budgeted in 2008-2009. The strategic Re-investment Fund will be directed towards strategic hiring in faculty complement. This additional fund should generate an additional 30 to 35 new faculty positions. The hiring related to these funds was deferred in 2008-2009 as a budgetary measure to assist with budget pressures within Faculties.

b. Faculty allocations in higher fee programs – under the Government approved tuition fee framework, certain programs are permitted to increase tuition fees at higher rates. The University proposes to allocate this higher fee revenue differential to the Faculties with the higher cost programs. It is expected that the Faculties will develop plans for these additional funds, focused on improving academic quality and providing increased student support.

c. Research Support – the University Academic Plan recognizes a strategic focus on research. The budget plan recognizes the need to increase direct funding for research initiatives in support of the University Academic Plan.

d. Student Financial Assistance – the University has directed approximately 10 per cent of the incremental tuition fees generated to provide additional financial assistance to graduate and undergraduate students. The University continuously analyzes the effectiveness of its graduate and undergraduate student financial support frameworks.

e. Faculty of Health – the Senate and Board of Governors approved the creation of a new Faculty of Health effective July 1, 2006. The incremental costs of creating this new Faculty are estimated at $900 thousand, and are provided for in this Budget Plan.

f. Capital Investments – to help offset the impacts of a growing deferred maintenance deficit at the University. The most recent estimate of deferred maintenance for the University is over $90 million.

g. Master Planning/Subway Planning Support – the University is engaged in a number of projects associated with developing an updated Master Plan, driven in part by the extension of the Toronto subway, and the prospect of further capital development on the campus. A strategic investment of $1 million has been recognized to accommodate the significant costs that will be required to support these projects.

h. Strategic Re-Investment Funds – the University is committed to investing in academic quality through faculty appointments and has identified an allocation of $1.0 million in 2008-2009 rising to $3 million to $5 million in 2010-2011.

i. Endowment Support (Awards and Chairs) – during 2008 the University experienced significant capital market volatility and was required to reduce its annual distribution in order to protect the endowed capital. The University allocated a total of $3 million in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 in order to mitigate the impact of the reduced distribution on students and Faculties.

j. System/Process Investments – The University is consistently focusing on process improvements to increase efficiency and to ensure effective use of scarce resources. The updated plan reflects investments of $0.9 million annually to maintain a new Time & Attendance System that is currently being implemented and to create a dedicated resource team to assist the Faculties and departments to ensure efficient and effective processes and use of resources across the University.

k. Campus Safety – The University introduced an enhanced campus safety program two years ago to increase security in the University residences. These costs had not been base funded. The budget plan reflects the required annual costs of $1.5 million to permanently maintain this service.
### Figure 4: Approved Multi-Year Budget Plan 2007-2013

#### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment Growth (Graduate/Undergraduate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic &amp; International Tuition Fee Increases</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>260.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Grants</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Adjustments</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Revenue Increase

- 47.6
- 63.9
- 87.9
- 105.0
- 117.7
- 129.0
- 140.7
- 691.8

#### Operating Base Revenue

- 631.8
- 648.1
- 672.1
- 689.2
- 701.9
- 713.2
- 724.9

#### Compensation/Benefit Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Benefit Increases</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>307.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Costs</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inflationary Cost Pressures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Inflation</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Management</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Inflation</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategic Investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investments in Academic/Research Quality</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Investments</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Planning/Subway Planning Support</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Re-Investment Funds</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Support (Awards and Chairs)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Safety</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Allocations</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Budget Cuts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.75%)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(31.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(7.0)</td>
<td>(35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(58.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(44.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.25%)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(9.5)</td>
<td>(19.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Budget Cuts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(13.3)</td>
<td>(28.0)</td>
<td>(42.7)</td>
<td>(52.2)</td>
<td>(52.2)</td>
<td>(188.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Net Allocation Increases

- 42.7
- 67.8
- 102.9
- 111.0
- 118.8
- 123.4
- 137.6
- 704.2

#### Operating Base Allocations

- 627.8
- 652.9
- 688.0
- 696.1
- 703.9
- 708.5
- 722.7

#### Annual Surplus/(Deficit)

- 4.0
- (4.8)
- (15.9)
- (6.9)
- (2.0)
- 4.7
- 2.2
- (18.7)

#### CFWD Balance from Prior Year-End

- 8.4

#### Year End Adjustment (Budget vs. Actual)

- 7.0
- 11.0
- 14.6
- (1.3)
- (8.2)
- (10.2)
- (5.5)
- (3.3)

#### Cumulative Surplus/(Deficit)

- 11.0
- 14.6
- (1.3)
- (8.2)
- (10.2)
- (5.5)
- (3.3)
- (3.3)

Source: Vice President Finance and Administration
KEY PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS AND UNCERTAINTIES

The budget plan outlines a framework that will result in the University achieving its key financial and academic objectives, while maintaining a substantially balanced budget position at the end of the budget planning period in 2012-2013.

There are a number of key planning assumptions and uncertainties that may impact the plan, and they include:

- the variability of investment returns and the potential impact on pension costs and future endowment distributions;
- the increasing pressures on salary and benefit costs;
- the implications of potential changes in government grant funding allocations;
- the uncertainty associated with the tuition fee framework beyond 2011-2012; and
- the achievement of planned budget cuts across the institution.

Other Budget Measures

In order to bring the overall cumulative surplus/deficit to a balanced position over the planning period, base budget cuts of 3.5 per cent will be required in 2010-2011 and a 2.25 per cent cut in 2011-2012. No budget cut is anticipated for 2012-2013 at this time.

Figure 5: Summary of Net Allocation Increases by Division 2006-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>(1.0)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President Academic &amp; Provost</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>391.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President Students</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(1.4)</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President Research &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Institutional</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>130.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support (Graduate &amp; Undergraduate)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>108.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocation Increases</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>118.8</td>
<td>123.4</td>
<td>137.6</td>
<td>704.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vice-President Finance and Administration

Figure 6: York University Expenditure Analysis - Expenditures Based on 2009-2010 Organizational Structure and are Adjusted for Carryovers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(in millions of dollars)</th>
<th>2006-2007 Actuals</th>
<th>% of Univ*</th>
<th>2007-2008 Actuals</th>
<th>% of Univ*</th>
<th>2008-2009 Actuals</th>
<th>% of Univ*</th>
<th>2009-2010 Actuals</th>
<th>% of Univ*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP Academic</td>
<td>$399.5</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>$435.4</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>$439.8</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>$485.2</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Research &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Subtotal</td>
<td>409.0</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>447.4</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>450.8</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>499.9</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Degree Programs</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Total</td>
<td>441.0</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>482.1</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>488.4</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>534.2</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Bursaries</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Students</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP University Relations</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Institutional</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Servicing - New Buildings</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University Net of Non Degree Programs</td>
<td>642.9</td>
<td>696.6</td>
<td>710.4</td>
<td>746.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University</td>
<td>674.9</td>
<td>731.3</td>
<td>748.0</td>
<td>780.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Carryover Adjustment</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td>(15.1)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University Net of Carryovers</td>
<td>$677.5</td>
<td>$746.4</td>
<td>$744.0</td>
<td>$780.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To Determine % of University Expenditures, Non Degree Program Expenditures were excluded from the denominator because they are full cost recovery programs and do not receive central funding.

Source: Office of the Assistant Vice-President Finance & CFO
Year-over-Year Budget Comparisons

The PBA reports actual expenditures and planned budgets for each fiscal year based on the organizational structure of the University in effect at the time of the report. The comparability of the information from year to year has been constrained by factors such as organizational restructuring, strategic investments, impact of budget carry forwards and unspent allocations, decisions to alter the timing of budget cuts and delay of implementation of Faculty cuts for one year, and changes in the reporting of non-credit courses.

To assist readers of this document to compare actual expenditures by major funding envelope (President, Academic, Finance and Administration, etc.), Figure 6 takes the University’s organizational structure in 2009-2010, restates each previous year, and adjusts for the impact of any allocated but unspent budget carry forwards.

A major impact was the decision to use debt financing to accommodate the significant capital investments required to accommodate double cohort enrolment levels. The cost of servicing the debt of the second debenture has been reflected in the categories of Debt Servicing – New Buildings. As well, the annualized impact of the operating and maintenance costs for the capital expansion program is reflected under Vice-President Finance and Administration.

General Institutional costs include those a Division is not responsible for, such as legal fees and insurance premiums.

To improve the reporting of allocations to the Divisions, the University adopted a reporting format that attributes the employee pension and benefit costs to the divisions for those costs that can be directly linked or proportionately based on salary costs. The remaining costs, which cannot logically be attributed to a specific division, remained in the General Institutional category.