**University of Waterloo**  
**BOARD OF GOVERNORS**  
**Notice of Meeting**

**Date:** Tuesday, April 5, 2011  
**Time:** 2:30 p.m.  
**Place:** Needles Hall, Room 3001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPEN SESSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>1. Remarks from the Chair</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35</td>
<td>Consent Agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motion: That items 2-6 below be approved and/or received for information by consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Approval of the February 1, 2011 Minutes [enclosed]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.    | Report of the President  
|       | a. Recognition and Commendation | 1-2 | Information |
|       | b. Sabbatical/Administrative Leaves and Administrative Appointments | 3-7 | Decision/Information |
| 4.    | Report of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost  
|       | a. University Professor Designation | 8 | Information |
| 5.    | Report of the Vice-President, Administration & Finance  
|       | a. Incidental Fee Changes | 9 | Decision |
| 6.    | Report from the Executive Committee | 10 | Information |

**Regular Agenda**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>7. Business Arising from the Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2:45  | 8. Presentations  
|       | a. Co-op Education & Centre for Career Action | 11-14 | Information |
| 3:10  | b. Virtual Tours of Waterloo Summit Centre, Huntsville and Waterloo Stratford Campus | Oral | Information |
| 3:15  | 9. Report of the President  
|       | a. Environmental Scan | 15 | Information |
|       | a. Clinical Professoriate – Changes to Policies 76 and 77 | 16-38 | Decision |
|       | b. Composition of Nominating Committees for Dean of Engineering and Dean of Science | 39-40 | Decision |
|       | c. MOA – Additions to Performance Ratings Scale | 41 | Decision |
|       | d. 2011-12 Operating Budget | 42-46 | Decision |
| 4:15  | Break |       |              |
| 4:30  | 11. Report of the Vice-President, External Relations | 47-48 | Information |
| 4:40  | 12. Report of the Vice-President, University Research | 49 | Information |
CONFIDENTIAL SESSION

13. Reports from Committees
   a. Building & Properties
   b. Finance & Investment

14. Other Business

15. Approval of the February 1, 2011 Minutes [enclosed]

16. Report of the President
   a. New Appointment with Tenure
   b. Tenure Recommendations

17. Report from the Governance Committee

18. Business Arising from the Minutes

19. Report from the Finance & Investment Committee

20. Other Business

21. Next Meeting
    Tuesday, June 14, 2011

22. Adjournment
    Reception in Needles Hall, Room 3004

Information items enclosed: April University Affairs; Waterloo Newswatch

Note: To allow the board to complete a number of matters quickly and to devote more of its attention to major items of business, the agenda has been divided between items that are to be approved and/or received for information by consent and those that are to be presented individually for discussion and decision and/or information.

A consent agenda is not intended to prevent discussion of any matter by the board, but items listed under the consent sections will not be discussed at the meeting unless a governor so requests. Governors are supplied with the appropriate documentation for each item and all items will be approved by means of one omnibus motion. The board will then move immediately to consideration of the items on the regular agenda.

MRA:tad
March 25, 2011

Marie Armstrong
Associate University Secretary

Parking available in Lot D (underneath Needles Hall)
Please convey regrets to Tracy Dietrich at (519) 888-4567, x36125 or tdietrich@uwaterloo.ca
For Information

Recognition and Commendation

Three Waterloo faculty members and one student are among the “young leaders in our community” who have been honoured this year as the “Top 40 Under 40” by the Waterloo Region Record newspaper: kinesiology student Emma Glofcheski, who also volunteers with the Special Olympics and other groups; philosophy professor and human rights author Brian Orend; Slim Boumaiza, wireless networks researcher in the electrical & computer engineering department; and Joseph Emerson of the applied mathematics department and the Institute for Quantum Computing. [Daily Bulletin, Feb. 28/11]

A Waterloo student team is the grand prize winner in this year’s Hydrogen Student Design Contest, sponsored by the US Department of Energy, Praxair, Honda, and Proton Energy Systems. Winners were announced at the 2011 Fuel Cell and Hydrogen Energy conference, held at the Gaylord National Convention Center outside Washington, DC. The Waterloo team included Kirby Skinn, Lisa Tong, and Nicholas Hartmann of chemical engineering, and Anna Beznogova of architecture. “This Grand Prize marks the fifth award for the University of Waterloo in the six-year history of the contest,” a news release says. “Contest newcomers Imperial College London and University of California Riverside were awarded honorable mentions.” For the 2011 contest, students were challenged to plan and design a residential hydrogen fueling system. “Universities from all around the world submitted entries for the 2011 Contest,” said Kyle Gibeault, contest manager. [Daily Bulletin, Feb. 28/11]

Teams of students from Waterloo’s Master of Business, Entrepreneurship & Technology program cleaned up at this year’s Next Great Innovator Challenge, sponsored by the Royal Bank of Canada. Each year RBC asks graduate-level business students to answer a real-world business challenge. This year’s challenge: “suggest an innovation that will be critical to Canadian financial services in 2015.” Submissions came from 22 schools across Canada and the top three winners all came from the MBET cohort. Coming home with the $20,000 first prize were Krishna Nuthi, Michelle Berelowitz and Wei Wei, who call themselves Team ROKUR ALL. Their proposal was “the We Care portal.” They explain: “This video-based technology will address the link between the aging Canadian population and their caregivers with a novel mix of strategy and technology to create real value in banking interactions.” Coming in second was Team Mighty Moguls, consisting of Pierre-Marc Pepin, Catherine Carroll, Hui Zhang and Prashal Nagendran. This quartet “looked ahead to how the banking needs of Canadians will change in 2015. They introduced a three-phased program to transform banking for the new Canadians of today, and in the future.” And in third place were David Saint-Onge, Gerrit Ellerwald, Carla Tafich Salim, Kehinde Odumosu and Rahim Kanji, making up Tycoons of Tomorrow. This team “demonstrated what the financial services industry could do today to help children become financially literate. The team introduced an interactive educational account that links financial knowledge, education, and play to address the impact in reducing the many problems faced by today’s adults.” [Daily Bulletin, Mar. 10/11]

The Institutional Identity program that has brought Waterloo new designs for souvenirs, letterhead, recruitment publications, posters, and — soon — web pages has earned the university a gold medal in the Institutional Identity category from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). When the award, which is given to a university program “that maintains a consistent identity for the institution as a whole across all media,” was presented in Baltimore, as District II of CASE held its
annual conference, Waterloo also received three honours for its alumni student referral program “Can You Spot Potential?”: silver in the category of Best Practices in Alumni Relations, silver in Best Practices in Communications, and honourable mention in Advertising. CASE is an international organization for university staff who work in fundraising, recruitment, communications, government relations, and related disciplines. District II represents higher education institutions from around the world. It covers Ontario, Québec, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. [Feb. 8/11 Daily Bulletin]

The Graduate Admissions project has been selected as the winner of the Ontario University Registrars’ Association Innovation Award for 2011. The award program is designed to recognize, reward and share university achievements in improving the quality and reducing the cost of academic administration. The award is valued at $5,000 to be given in the form of an endowment to fund a student scholarship at the winning institution. [GSO email, Mar. 11/11]
FOR APPROVAL

1. Sabbatical and Administrative Leaves

UW Policy 3, Sabbatical and Other Leaves for Faculty Members [excerpts below, full text available at: http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy3htm], sets out the purpose of leaves for faculty members as well as the requirements/responsibilities of faculty who are granted such leave.

The granting of a leave . . . depends on the University's assessment of the value of such leave to the institution as well as to the individual, and on whether teaching and other responsibilities of the applicant can be adequately provided for in her/his absence. A faculty member who is granted a sabbatical or other leave is expected to return to duties in the University for at least one year and upon return will be expected to submit a brief report to the Department Chair regarding scholarly activities while on leave.

The purpose of a sabbatical leave is to contribute to professional development, enabling members to keep abreast of emerging developments in their particular fields and enhancing their effectiveness as teachers, researchers and scholars. Such leaves also help to prevent the development of closed or parochial environments by making it possible for faculty members to travel to differing locales where special research equipment may be available or specific discipline advances have been accomplished. Sabbaticals provide an opportunity for intellectual growth and enrichment as well as for scholarly renewal and reassessment.

. . . the granting of sabbatical leave is contingent upon the faculty member's department being able to make the necessary arrangements to accommodate such an absence, and also upon the financial resources of the University in any given year. Should problems arise in any of the above, it may be necessary to postpone individual requests until such time as all the conditions can be satisfied.

• Sabbatical Leaves

Robert Ballard, Drama and Speech Communication, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 100% salary
Completing three major research publications on intercountry adoption and interpersonal communication as well as creating a book proposal/series of articles based on my dissertation work in communication ethics and ethnographic methods

Jonathan Baugh, Chemistry, September 1, 2011 to February 29, 2012 at 100% salary
I'm requesting the sabbatical leave in order to carry out research that will establish an excellence in the field of solid-state quantum computing at UW. This experimental research, carried out in my lab, would otherwise be difficult or impossible to complete in the same time frame. Given the competitive nature of international research, it is critical that we make rapid progress in this field.

John Burbidge, Economics, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 100% salary
Every social science needs some model of human behaviour. Economic models begin by describing the constraints that restrict what the person can do and then, given these restrictions, the model determines what choice the person makes. Fifty years research in economics on how people behave over the life cycle have focused primarily on financial constraints and have paid too little attention to time constraints. Statistics Canada has good data on how time is used by Canadian Households. I intend to use these data to resolve some puzzles left unexplained by current research.
Roy Cameron, Health Studies and Gerontology, September 1, 2011 to August 31, 2012 at 94.7% salary
Publish papers related to population based chronic disease prevention; support transition of the Propel Centre I lead as a new leader takes over, in the context of the UW School of Public Health.

Cora Cluett, Fine Arts, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 85% salary
I am requesting a sabbatical leave for the purpose of developing a substantial body of abstract paintings for exhibition at Wynick Tuck Gallery in Toronto (spring 2012) as well as Harbinger Gallery in Waterloo. I will also use this time to continue to develop a body of photographs that document WWII pillboxes that line the coasts of Scotland and Eastern Canada. I have applied for funding to support the painting – results will be announced in April 2011.

Lori Curtis, Economics, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 85% salary
The Canadian and UK governments made commitments and implemented policies to eliminate child poverty. Although neither country hit its target, Canada's child poverty rate increased by 2.25% between mid 1990 and mid 2000 while the UK's decreased by 3.55%. My sabbatical research will undertake cross-country comparisons in policies implemented to fight child poverty and the changes in poverty rates for Canada and the UK from the late 1990s onward using multiple data sources (e.g., cross-sections of the Canadian Survey of Household Spending and the British Household Panel Survey and comparable time-use studies). The study will follow methodologies introduced in Crossley and Curtis, 2006 and Bonke and Curtis, 2009 to poverty trends (income, expenditure and time).

Sherry Dupuis, Recreation and Leisure Studies, July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 at 100% salary
This one year sabbatical will be focused primarily (75%) on the CURA research being conducted in three different research settings. The remainder of time will be spent developing a new research based drama focused on relationships in dementia care with playwright Julie Gray and researchers Gail Mitchell, Christine Jonas-Simpson and Pia Kontas.

Yulia Gel, Statistics and Actuarial Science, September 1, 2011 to February 29, 2012 at 85% salary
I plan to devote my sabbatical leave mainly to investigation of nonparametric and semiparametric methods in time series analysis, which will include a number of visits to University of California, Berkeley, and University of Goettingen, Germany.

Carl Haas, Civil and Environmental Engineering, May 1, 2011 to October 31, 2011 at 100% salary
Development in research, teaching and service, include for example, deepening current collaborative research relationships with Canadian industrial partners such as Aecon and Coreworx, and with academic colleagues at Les Ecoles Centrale in France, TU Munchen, Carnegie-Mellon University, Laval, Concordia, and the University of Texas at Austin. The outcome will be a strategic plan that may include a centre proposal.

Mark Havitz, Recreation and Leisure Studies, July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 at 100% salary
The bulk of my sabbatical leave will be devoted to moving forward my SSHRC project Lifelong Longitudinal Retrospectives on Ego Involvement and Commitment with Running. Products will include multiple academic papers, a book, and several workshops targeted to professional constituency groups. I will also advance and complete a variety of unrelated academic papers during this time.

Eric Helleiner, Political Science, July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 at 85% salary
I will be working on two research projects. The first analyzes the political economy of the global financial crisis of 2007-09, with a special focus on post-crisis initiatives to regulate global derivatives markets. The second examines North-South financial relations during the Bretton Woods era in order to better understand the origins of the post 1945 international financial order.
Jan Huissoon, Mechanical and Mechatronics Engineering, May 1, 2011 to April 30, 2012 at 100% salary
I intend to write a text on Mechatronic Design based on lecture notes for the Electromechanical Machine Design course (MTE322) that I developed for the Mechatronics Engineering program, and have taught for the past three years.

Jingjing Huo, Political Science, January 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 at 100% salary
This leave is in preparation, as a junior faculty member, for tenure application.

David John, Germanic and Slavic Studies, January 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 at 100% salary
I wish to spend my final year at the university concentrating on my research. I will be researching and writing the chapter on "Faust in India" for the upcoming "Oxford Encyclopedia of Faust" (Oxford UP, by invitation). I will be writing the first draft of a new book tentatively entitled "Fritz Bennewitz in India: An Intercultural Partnership" (expected: UToronto Press). It will deal with stage productions of German plays (Goethe, Brecht) in India and their intercultural significance. I will continue to direct graduate students as my department wishes.

Veronica Kitchen, Political Science, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 100% salary
I will use my sabbatical to complete analysis of data gathered on Integrated Counter-Terrorism Units, to complete field work, and to draft conference papers and book outline.

Patrick Lam, Electrical and Computer Engineering, November 1, 2011 to April 30, 2012 at 100% salary
The primary purpose of this sabbatical is to give me time to write up research results gathered in the past three years for publication. I also plan to collaborate with colleagues at the University of California, Berkley and to increase my visibility in the research community by presenting invited talks at various universities.

Michael MacDonald, English, July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 at 85% salary
My sabbatical will be devoted to editing the Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies, which involves editing sixty-one chapters and writing an introduction, glossary, and timeline of the history of rhetoric. In addition, I will be writing a chapter on Shakespeare and rhetoric for the Blackwell Companion to British Literature (Volume 2); finishing an essay on rhetoric and information warfare for the Quarterly Journal of Speech; and using my UW 4A Award to write a SSHRC application on the work of Harold Innis and Marshall McLuhan.

Patricia Marino, Philosophy, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 85% salary
I request a sabbatical leave to complete a book project on "Moral Reasoning in a Pluralistic World."

Daniel McCarthy, Environment and Resource Studies, January 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 at 100% salary
For my proposed sabbatical I will be writing manuscripts on several interrelated projects in my two case study research areas: the Oak Ridges Moraine in Southern Ontario; and, Fort Albany First Nation in Northern Ontario. The work will build off existing work on environmental policy and planning in both areas and explore these cases through a social innovation lens.

Daniel Miller, Electrical and Computer Engineering, September 1, 2011 to August 31, 2012 at 85% salary
I plan to use my sabbatical to work on some new research ideas that I'm developing. I will spend the majority of my time at the University of Waterloo, with a three month visit to the University of Newcastle in Australia as well as several short trips to visit collaborators in Ireland and Hong Kong.

Anne Marie Miraglia, French Studies, January 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012 at 85% salary
This sabbatical leave is necessary in order to pursue research on a project (presented in my SSHRC
which will examine immigration novels written in French by Arab, Berber and Black African novelists who have left their country of birth in order to settle in France and in Quebec. My objective is to produce a book on the representation in their fiction of the realities, problems and solutions that characterize the African immigration experience in France and in Quebec.

Elizabeth Nilsen, Psychology, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 100% salary
My sabbatical will provide me with the opportunity to focus on writing manuscripts, developing research projects, and pursue research collaborations. My research focuses on children’s ability to tailor their communicative behaviour to the perspective of conversational partners. I examine the cognitive skills required for this process to emerge and the interpersonal consequences for populations of children who have cognitive deficits.

Richard Oakley, Chemistry, September 1, 2011 to August 31, 2012 at 85% salary
Research into multifunctional molecular magnetic and conductive materials is poised for major advances. Indeed, these easily processable, environmentally benign materials are likely to play a major role in the emerging field of molecular spintronics. I am seeking the time and opportunity to explore new synthetic methodologies for generating materials which will display metallic conductivity, perhaps even superconductivity.

Garry Rempel, Chemical Engineering, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 100% salary
Further development and exploitation of research carried out under NSERC Industrial Research Chair (IRC) during the period of January 2007-June 2011. Completion of final reports for IRC. Collaborative research with universities in Southeast Asia and China resulting from already established research undertaking including the co-supervision of graduate students. Invited lectures. Sustained intense research being carried out at the University of Waterloo.

Bryan Smale, Recreation and Leisure Studies, July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 at 100% salary
As the new Director of the Canadian Index of Wellbeing, a national initiative coming to UW beginning January 1, 2011, I will be responsible for planning and developing its administration, research program, and expansion. My remaining time will be devoted to completing several active research projects, as well as continuing my responsibilities as President of CALS and Editor of Leisure/Loisir.

Mark Smucker, Management Sciences, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 100% salary
I intend to stay at the University of Waterloo and continue working on my existing research program of utilizing user interaction to improve information retrieval. In particular, I plan to conduct several new user studies and work on the completion of projects currently in progress.

Marek Stastna, Applied Mathematics, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 85% salary
I will continue my research on the numerical simulation of lake dynamics with a focus on internal waves. The model developed by my recently graduated PhD student Christopher Subich will be used to look at the turbulent breakdown of internal waves, while work developed with my PhD student Derek Steinmoller will look at lake dynamics in boreal lakes with complex coastlines. I will visit M. Wells at the University of Toronto and M. Carr at St. Andrew’s, UK to collaborate on laboratory work.

Michael Stone, Geography and Environmental Management, July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 100% salary
A sabbatical leave is requested to conduct sediment-associated contaminant transport research. Field studies will be conducted on the Oldman watershed (Alberta) and supported by a series of laboratory annular flume studies at Canada Centre for Inland Waters, Burlington, Ontario. The flume studies are required to determine critical transport parameters for cohesive sediment which are necessary to model cohesive sediment and associated contaminant transport in Alberta rivers.
John Thistle, Electrical and Computer Engineering, September 1, 2011 to August 31, 2012 at 85% salary
The leave will be used for research on the analysis and design of large-scale automatic control systems. Current work in this field is largely based on fixed, finite-state system models. In contrast, the proposed research will extend to complex systems in which the number of subsystems is variable or unknown, or so large as to render explicit modelling impractical.

- **Sabbatical Leave Cancellation**
  Ali Ghodsi, Statistics and Actuarial Science, March 1, 2011 to August 31, 2011 at 100% salary.

- **Administrative Leave**
  David John, Germanic and Slavic Studies, September 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011 at 100% salary
  [See description above, sabbatical leave, January 1, 2012 to June 30, 2012.]

**FOR INFORMATION**

2. **Administrative Appointments**
   **Gerry Boychuk**, appointment as Department Chair, Political Science, Faculty of Arts, January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2015.

   **Lorne Dawson**, appointment as Department Chair, Sociology and Legal Studies, Faculty of Arts, July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2015.

   **Fraser Easton**, reappointment as Department Chair, English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2015.

   **Doris Jakobsh**, appointment as Director, Women’s Studies, Faculty of Arts, May 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

   **Monica Leoni**, appointment as Department Chair, Spanish and Latin American Studies, Faculty of Arts, May 1, 2011 to April 30, 2015.

   **Ian McKillop**, reappointment as Executive Director, University Health Research, Office of Research, January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011.

   **Rod McNaughton**, appointment as Director, Conrad Centre for Business, Entrepreneurship and Technology, Faculty of Engineering, January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2015.

   **Nancy Waite**, reappointment as Interim Director, School of Pharmacy, Interim Associate Dean of Science for Pharmacy, and Interim Director, Health Sciences Campus, Faculty of Science, January 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011.

   **Administrative Appointment Change**
   **Richard Nutbrown**, appointment as Department Chair, Political Science, Faculty of Arts, change from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011 to July 1, 2008 to December 31, 2011.
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FOR INFORMATION

University Professor Designation

The 2011 University Professor designation: Robert Le Roy (chemistry).

To date, Waterloo has awarded this distinction to fifteen individuals: Garry Rempel (chemical engineering), Mary Thompson (statistics & actuarial science) and Mark Zanna (psychology) in 2004; Terry McMahon (chemistry), Cam Stewart (pure mathematics) and Robert Jan van Pelt (architecture) in 2005; Phelim Boyle (accountancy) and Ian Munro (computer science) in 2006; Ken Davidson (pure mathematics), Keith Hipel (systems design engineering) and Jake Sivak (optometry) in 2007; Roy Cameron (health studies & gerontology) and Flora Ng (chemical engineering) in 2008; Ellsworth LeDrew (geography & environmental management) and Ming Li (computer science) in 2009; Stuart McGill (kinesiology) and Janusz Pawliszyn (chemistry) in 2010.

University Professor

The University of Waterloo owes much of its reputation and stature to the quality of its professors. Waterloo recognizes exceptional scholarly achievement and international pre-eminence through the designation “University Professor.” Once appointed, a faculty member retains the designation for life.

Not counting retirees, it is anticipated there will be 14 University Professorships at steady state, with at most two appointments each year. Such appointments are reported to Senate and to the Board of Governors in March and April respectively, and are recognized at convocation.

Selection Process

1. Annually, nominations will be sought from deans, directors and chairs, as well as from the university community generally. A nominee shall have demonstrated exceptional scholarly achievement and international pre-eminence in a particular field or fields of knowledge. The individual who nominates a colleague is responsible for gathering the documentation and submitting it to the vice-president, academic & provost before the December break. The University Tenure and Promotion Committee will act as the selection committee; its decisions are final.

2. A nomination must be supported by at least six signatures from at least two Waterloo departments/schools and must be accompanied by a curriculum vitae and a short, non-technical description of the nominee’s contributions.

3. A nomination must also be accompanied by letters from the nominee’s dean, and from at least two and no more than five scholars of international standing in the nominee’s field from outside the university. The scholars are to be chosen by the nominee’s chair/director in consultation with the dean and the nominator. The letter of nomination should explain why these particular scholars were chosen.

4. Letters soliciting comments from scholars shall be sent by the chair/director. Scholars shall be asked to comment on the impact and specific nature of the nominee’s most influential contributions, addressing their responses directly to the vice-president, academic & provost.

5. The dossiers of unsuccessful nominees remain in the pool for two additional years. The appropriate dean should provide updated information each year.

Geoff McBoyle  
Vice-President, Academic & Provost
FOR APPROVAL

Incidental Fee Changes

Student Services Fee
It is recommended that the compulsory Student Services Fee, assessed and collected each term from all full-time and part-time undergraduate and graduate students, be changed effective Spring Term (May) 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current 2010/11</th>
<th>Proposed 2011/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate full time</td>
<td>$126.00</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate part time (on campus)</td>
<td>37.80</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate full time</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate part time (on campus)</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>33.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- the fee is developed in accordance with the Student Services Protocol approved by the Board of Governors in April 1994
- services include Athletics & Recreational Services, Health Services, Centre for Career Action, Counselling, Student Life Office, Writing Clinic, Turnkey Operation, Student Resource Office, Student Security Service, Gallery, Organizational & Human Development, OPD – Accessible Transportation
- the majority of members on the Student Services Advisory Committee are students; the committee unanimously recommends the fee change

Dennis Huber
Vice President,
Administration & Finance
FOR INFORMATION

1. APPOINTMENT OF THE DEAN OF ARTS
   The committee, acting on the delegated authority of the board, unanimously approved, on behalf of the board, the appointment of Professor Douglas Peers as dean of the Faculty of Arts for an initial five-year term ending June 30, 2016 and as professor, with tenure, in the Department of History; both appointments commencing July 1, 2011.

Bob Harding
Chair
Co-operative Education and Centre for Career Action

This report covers the following areas:
1. Trends in enrolment, employment rates and student/employer quality rankings
2. Key accomplishments
3. Priorities for next two years

Trends in enrolment, employment rates and student/employer quality rankings

The student employment rates have remained above 95% through the last 14 consecutive terms. Since the calendar year 2006, the number of students scheduled for co-op work terms has increased from 12,500 to an anticipated 16,250 for the calendar year 2011. This represents a compound growth rate of over 6%. During this period, more than 20 new programs which include co-op have been created in various faculties. Both trends are expected to continue.

CECS continues to obtain high employment rates by absorbing the increase in number of students through more employment by focusing on job development with current and new employers. This is being accomplished in an economy that has been only slowly recovering as well as being exposed to increased competition from co-op programs at other institutions. The employment rate is consistently higher than the national and provincial average employment rates and moved upward in 2010.

Scheduled Co-op Students and Employment Rate by Year

The number of co-op visa students has grown to an all-time high of 350 in winter term 2011. The employment rate of visa students is slightly above the overall average.

Increased employer demands and inherent job market challenges did not impair Waterloo co-op students' ability to perform extremely well on their work terms. Since winter 2006, over 90% of all students, regardless of level, received rankings of very good to outstanding. Visa students' rankings are approximately the same as the overall student averages.

As important as the employers' evaluations are the positive experiences of the students while on work terms. On a scale of 1-10, with 10 being the highest, Waterloo co-op students continue to enjoy meaningful and relevant employment and reap the positive benefits of the co-op program. At all three student levels, rankings of 7 and above comprised over 90% of all student rankings. Visa students' ratings are consistent with the overall student population.

Note: Students are classified as junior, intermediate and senior depending on the number of work terms in their program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>4 Work Terms</th>
<th>5 Work Terms</th>
<th>6 Work Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3 and 4</td>
<td>4 and 5</td>
<td>5 and 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key accomplishments

- Centre for Career Action
  Working toward our Sixth Decade goal to be "a more highly visible Career Services unit", and based on research conducted over the past two years, we launched our new brand in fall 2010. The new name emphasizes our goal to have students take a more active role in their career development. Results to date are encouraging. Fall 2010 brand tallies show our top three descriptors with

Prepared March 2011 by P. Jarvie and G.C. O'Neill
students as “professional,” “relevant” and “motivating”. Based on anecdotal evidence, the campus community has improved understanding of what we do and whom we work with (all students at all levels, all types of career needs). Student use of the centre has been strong.

Numbers of students who sought individual advising appointments remained steady while attendance at regularly offered student workshops rose by 45%. Job listings for graduating students increased dramatically (up 44% for this recruitment season compared to last). Student use of the job posting service also increased.

• Co-op renewal
A key initiative in the overall renewal strategy is a department-wide reorganization. Design is almost complete, and implementation will begin in Spring term 2011. Major changes include focus on new employer development, employer retention and expansion, rationalizing student advising roles, and reducing the number of onsite work term visits to students. The process has involved extensive staff consultation, opportunities for student input, and regular communication on process and progress.

In 2010 a new technology platform to support renewal was piloted with architecture students and employers. Concerns about sustainability and scalability led to the cancellation of that project in February 2011. Plans are underway for an upgrade to the existing JobMine system as an interim solution.

A third initiative in the renewal strategy is the introduction of an integrated accounts approach to our larger employers. This initiative is in its pilot phase with four employers, two each in financial services and technology. Employers who were invited to participate consistently hire relatively large numbers of Waterloo co-op students, and have centralized recruiting resources with whom we can partner. Employers will benefit from integrated support for their campus co-op and graduate recruiting, an opportunity to share best practices and provide input to the department, and assistance liaising with other parts of the University. The department will benefit from focused input and a willing incubator for new approaches and services. We anticipate expanded co-op hiring in these partner companies; hiring has already increased with one of the companies.

• Co-op learning outcomes
Regular reviews of undergraduate programs must provide evidence of the attainment of University Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) as set out by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-presidents (OCAV). We have begun one approach to measuring UDLEs. Co-op employers evaluate student job performance every work term. The evaluation form is standardized and includes competency measures that map to many of the UDLEs as well as the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) learning outcome attributes. Employers are independent, third-party assessors of student achievement on these competencies over several successive work terms, providing trend data that relates to outcome attainment. Preliminary analysis is very promising, with data showing increasing attainment of learning outcomes coinciding with student progress in academic programs. In collaboration with engineering and other faculties, we are working to improve the rigour and reliability of job performance evaluations for assessing UDLEs and CEAB attribute attainment.

• International initiatives
The first group of engineering students from the UAE campus achieved successful work terms in

Spring 2010. Seventeen second-year students and 57 first-year students are scheduled out to work in the UAE in Spring 2011. Job development continues to be considerably challenging in the face of the mid-East business culture and economy. An experienced CECS staff member was recently seconded to Waterloo International to manage the co-op program, emphasizing new employer relations and job development. Engineering and mathematics stakeholders are actively supporting CECS efforts to drive a mix of traditional and innovative co-op employment strategies.

The Faculty of Environment partnership with Nanjing University of Finance and Economics (NUFE) has had challenges with NUFE students participating in co-op in Waterloo. The majority of the first group returned to China for their co-op work terms after arriving in Canada, notwithstanding additional preparation and support from CECS and the faculty. Beginning with the 2013 class, co-op will be optional in the program and international students will be screened to ensure their employability in Canada in order for them to enter the co-op option.

- **Small Business Internship Program**
  Waterloo’s success as a delivery agent for this Industry Canada program was recognized by renewal of the funding for 2011, the third year of the program. The program supports businesses hiring students to increase their e-commerce capabilities. For 2011, CECS received almost one quarter of the Ontario funding with the mandate of addressing needs in the GTA, and has contributed several best practices to the administration of the program.

**Priorities for the next two years**

CECS priorities have been consistent for the past few years: student employment, and moving the renewal agenda forward to reaffirm the university’s leadership in co-operative education. Our priority areas through 2011 are student employment, implementing the employment relations strategy, determining a new technology direction, building capability within CECS, and responding effectively to university-driven initiatives. Specific initiatives include:

- Assessing the integrated accounts pilot and determining its viability going forward.
- Continuing to increase job development and retention capacity.
- Implementing and stabilizing the department reorganization.
- Completing the seven-year review of co-operative education.
- Supporting university-driven initiatives, such as:
  - Completing a four-year planning cycle.
  - Feasibility studies for proposed academic programs and programs under review.
  - Co-op at the Waterloo campus in Dubai including student support, administration, and employment relations.
  - Building understanding of learning outcomes involved with co-op work terms, and contributing the to the articulation and evaluation of (C)UDLES as they relate to co-op.
FOR INFORMATION

Environmental Scan

• Local Overview. Our Co-operative Education and Career Services department set a record this winter with the most students ever employed during a work term – 5,517, including 2,389 from engineering.

Dr. Stephen Hawking will be returning to Waterloo in September to help officially open the expansion of the Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics that bears his name, the 55,000 square foot Stephen Hawking Centre. We are eager to welcome him back to our community.

• Provincial Overview. Ontario’s Ministry of Education reports that 81 per cent of high school students in the province are now graduating high school, compared with 68 per cent in 2003-2004. This is definitely a good news story and an important achievement in public education.

According to the Council of Ontario Universities, university applications are up in Ontario this year, with 88,626 high school students applying, a 2.4 per cent increase over last year. University applications are up 49 per cent overall since the year 2000.

I will also discuss the provincial government’s 2011 budget, scheduled for release on March 29, and its impact on the post-secondary education sector at our meeting.

• National Overview. According to budget documents tabled in early February, the Canada Student Loans Program needs an infusion of $149.5 million to deal with 60,000 unanticipated defaults going back seven years. The delinquency rate for student borrowers rose to about 13 per cent in 2010-2011, compared with 10 per cent in 2009-2010. The number of students borrowing money has increased 6.5 per cent in the last year, while the amount borrowed has increased 8 per cent.

I will also discuss the federal government’s 2011 budget, scheduled for release on March 22, and its impact on the post-secondary education sector at our meeting.

• International Overview. Statistics out of Citizenship and Immigration Canada reveal that 2010 was a banner year for international students in Canada. 96,147 foreign students were studying in Canada in 2010, an increase of almost 29,000 over 2005. Foreign students contribute $6.5 billion to the Canadian economy every year, but we value them for their incalculable contribution to campus life and their important role in our mission to educate global citizens.

An interesting report from the Centre for the Study of Living Standards compares Canada to the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia in terms of business and university research collaboration. The study found that Canada, while rising in the ranks of countries that collaborate, and spending more on a per capita basis for higher-education based business research and development, is not getting its money’s worth. The report’s authors suggest that policy developments in the United States, UK, and Australia may be instructive for Canadian policymakers in encouraging more efficient and productive results.
FOR APPROVAL

Changes to Policy 76 – Faculty Appointments

Motion: To approve the proposed amendments to Policy 76 [see attached].

Changes to Policy 77 – Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members

Motion: To approve the proposed amendments to Policy 77 [see attached].

Summary:

The changes are needed to provide for clinical professoriate. Clinical faculty appointments will be governed by Policy 76; the tenure and promotion process by Policy 77.

The revisions are the result of consultations undertaken by the faculty association and discussions by the Faculty Relations Committee. In accordance with Policy 1 – Initiation and Review of University Policies, the amendments were approved by the Faculty Relations Committee (unanimous), the university president and Senate (March 28, 2011).
Policy 76 -- Faculty Appointments

Established:

June 6, 2000
Last Updated: October 27, 2009

Class:

F

1. INTRODUCTION

This policy defines appointment categories (regular, research, visiting, adjunct, special), appointment types (tenured or continuing, probationary-term, definite-term) and appointment intensities (full-time, part-time, fractional load) for faculty appointments at the University of Waterloo. Hiring procedures for regular faculty appointments are described in Section 5.

Faculty appointments are normally made in four ranks: Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. These titles, without additional qualifiers or with the qualifier “clinical”, are reserved for regular faculty appointments (see 2.A). Titles for other faculty appointments (see 2.B) which incorporate these ranks must include an additional descriptive qualifier other than “clinical”.

Professorial rank is intended to reflect a faculty member’s stature and record of accomplishment as a teacher and scholar. An Assistant Professor normally has a doctorate or terminal professional degree, as well as experience or strong potential in teaching and scholarship. An Associate Professor has demonstrated ongoing competence, maturity and independence in teaching and scholarship. A Professor has demonstrated a clear commitment to teaching and has shown substantial achievement in research as evidenced by the production of a body of scholarly work that is widely known and respected.

Faculty appointments can be made in departments, schools, Faculties, or other academic units approved by the Board of Governors. The approval route is: department Chair, Faculty Dean, Vice-President Academic & Provost (VPA&P); new appointments with tenure also require approval of the Board of Governors. Faculty appointments are reported to Senate for information.

2. FACULTY APPOINTMENT CATEGORIES

A. Regular Faculty Appointments
These appointments may be made on a full-time or fractional-load basis in the ranks of Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Clinical faculty appointments can be made at all these ranks. Reference to faculty ranks in this policy include all regular faculty appointments, including clinical appointments, except where explicitly noted otherwise.

Lecturer appointments are of two types: definite-term or continuing (see 3.D). Regular appointments in the professorial ranks are of three types: definite-term, probationary-term or tenured. Effective January 1, 2002, tenure will be awarded only at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

Regular full-time faculty in the professorial ranks are normally assigned formal teaching duties in two of the three terms in which the University operates, but are expected to engage in scholarship, supervise students as required, and contribute to University service throughout the year. However, due to the close relationship between clinical practice and scholarly activity for clinical faculty, it is typical and appropriate for the clinical teaching duties for clinical faculty in the professorial ranks to be spread over all three terms. During a term for which formal teaching duties are not assigned, faculty members are expected to increase their scholarly activity. In special circumstances, a faculty member and the department Chair may arrange a different assignment of responsibilities. Any such arrangement must be documented and must have the formal approval of the Faculty Dean.

For full-time Lecturers (including Clinical Lecturers in the School of Optometry), duties are primarily limited to teaching and service, and are normally assigned in all three terms, though Lecturers shall have the option to have at least one term in six be a non-teaching term. Assignment of duties must take into account the distinctive feature of university teaching (i.e., that instruction is provided by scholars who are expected to remain current in their field and maintain their scholarly competence) regardless of whether a separate rating for scholarship is part of the Lecturer's performance review. Prospective Assistant Professors may be appointed as Lecturers for a definite term pending completion of academic requirements (normally the PhD), and in such cases, duties will be as described for Assistant Professors in the preceding paragraph.

Procedures for tenure consideration for faculty members who hold probationary-term appointments and promotion procedures for faculty members who hold tenured appointments are set out in Policy 77. For those holding definite-term appointments, a recommendation to reappoint at a higher rank shall be considered by the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee (FTPC), and requires the approval of the Dean and the VPA&P.

The results of annual performance reviews carried out for each faculty member must be taken into account in considerations for reappointment, tenure or promotion.

B. Other Faculty Appointments

All faculty appointments, other than regular appointments as described in the preceding section, are definite-term appointments (see 3.A). They may be full-time or part-time, as specified in the letter of appointment.
Research Appointments. These appointments carry the titles Research Professor, Research Associate Professor or Research Assistant Professor, with rank determined according to the same scholarship criteria that apply to regular faculty appointments. A recommendation to reappoint at a higher rank shall be considered by the FTPC, and requires the approval of the Dean and of the VPA&P.

Research faculty members are normally appointed to an academic department or school, and their duties are as specified in their appointment letters. Duties will be primarily research-oriented, but in some cases may include some service, teaching and/or student supervision. Research faculty members should be encouraged to take part in the normal life of the department and Faculty, as permitted by their research duties. The performance of research faculty members should be reviewed annually, in accord with the nature of the appointment as specified in the letter of appointment, by the research director (supervisor, principal investigator) and the department Chair. Where the appointment includes components of service, teaching or student supervision, the department Chair shall review the performance of the research faculty member in these specific areas annually. The results of all such reviews shall be communicated to the research faculty member as soon as possible upon completion.

Research appointments are definite-term, and may be conditional on the availability of external research funding, as specified in the letter of appointment. A conditional appointment may be terminated should the external research funding for this purpose be discontinued; otherwise the usual considerations for definite-term appointments apply (see 3.A). If a research appointment is terminated prior to the contract end-date because external research funding is discontinued, any salary component promised from department operating funds and the associated teaching or other duties may, at the option of the appointee, be continued until the end of the definite-term contract period.

Visiting Appointments. These appointments are definite-term, normally of duration one year or less, and carry the titles Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor or Visiting Lecturer.

Adjunct Appointments. These appointments carry the titles Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor or Adjunct Lecturer. They are made to individuals, external or internal to the University, who are qualified to undertake certain specific responsibilities within an academic unit for teaching, scholarship or the co-supervision of students. Where appropriate, adjunct faculty members should be encouraged to take part in the normal life of the department and Faculty.

Special Appointments. The titles given (e.g., Visiting Critic, Writer-in-Residence, Resource Person) are expressive of the functions performed; the normal ranks are not used.

C. Miscellaneous Appointments

Overload Appointments. An individual who already has a faculty appointment in one of the other categories and who is asked to take on specific duties additional to her/his normal responsibilities may be given an overload appointment with additional remuneration. An
overload appointment is for a definite term, and requires approval of the Chair of the individual's home department.

Cross and Joint Appointments. The terms 'cross' and 'joint' applied to appointments denote administrative arrangements, not different appointment categories. A faculty member with a joint appointment has responsibilities in two or more academic units to such an extent that these units share salary and other expenses. A cross appointment does not involve cost sharing, but does identify a faculty member who is formally associated with the work of more than one academic unit.

Administrative Appointments. Faculty may hold administrative appointments as department Chairs, Deans, Vice-Presidents and so on. These appointments are covered by separate policies, and are not categories of faculty appointment under this policy.

Honorary Titles. The titles Professor Emeritus/a and Distinguished Professor Emeritus/a are honorary designations, and do not indicate categories of faculty appointment under this policy.

3. TYPES OF FACULTY APPOINTMENT

A. Definite-Term Appointments

A definite-term appointment is an appointment for a contractually limited period of time. Although reappointment is not precluded, a faculty member on a definite-term appointment is not entitled to consideration for reappointment upon the expiration of the term.

A definite-term appointment is for any period up to five years. There is no limit on the number of definite-term appointments for Lecturers or for faculty members who are not on regular appointments. Normally, for those with regular appointments in the professorial ranks, no further definite-term appointments can be made beyond the fifth year; however, they may be considered for probationary-term appointments.

A faculty member with a definite-term appointment of one year or more shall be notified by the Dean no less than six months before the end of the contract with regard to reappointment. Faculty members with definite-term appointments of less than one year may request, in writing, notification concerning reappointment on or after the mid-point of their contracts, and the Dean shall respond within one week.

For regular faculty members, a recommendation to terminate a definite-term appointment before the contractual completion date is handled in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement between the Faculty Association and the University of Waterloo. For non-regular faculty members, a termination before the contractual completion date is handled in accordance with the Employment Standards Act of Ontario.

B. Probationary-Term Appointments
A probationary-term appointment is a regular faculty appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor for a contractually limited period of time. A faculty member holding a first probationary-term appointment is entitled to formal consideration for reappointment to a second probationary term. A faculty member holding a second probationary-term appointment is entitled to formal consideration for tenure; see Policy 77. Faculty members with probationary-term appointments are not eligible for promotion prior to the granting of tenure.

A first probationary-term appointment shall have an end-date of June 30th, and its duration shall be at least two years and ten months, but less than three years and ten months. A second probationary-term appointment shall be for three years. If an appointment is at fractional-load, the duration of each probationary-term appointment may be extended by one year. Pregnancy, adoption or parental leaves reduce the time available to prepare for tenure consideration. Therefore, the probationary period and the time to tenure decision will be extended by one year on request to the Dean. The maximum extension is one year for each such leave during the probationary period.

An extended period of illness that prevents the fulfillment of duties can reduce the time available to prepare for tenure consideration. A period longer than 180 days may result in a Long Term Disability leave, in which case an extension to the probationary term and the time to tenure decision shall be made. A continuous period of debilitating illness which prevents the fulfillment of duties, but does not result in Long Term Disability, may also be eligible for an extension to the tenure clock upon application to the Dean. Normally such extensions will be for one year; renewable depending on the severity and continuation of the illness as determined by the University Physician. The applicant shall provide relevant medical information to the University Physician, who will provide detailed written advice to the Dean. The University has the right to request a second medical opinion, at the University's expense. Any medical information provided shall be kept in a separate confidential file, accessible only by the University Physician. If the Dean denies the request, he/she shall provide written reasons to the applicant, who may appeal the decision to the Vice-President, Academic & Provost. The decision of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost is final.

Consideration for reappointment to a second probationary term shall occur during the final year of the first probationary-term appointment; see below. If reappointment is not approved, the candidate's appointment shall be extended as necessary to provide twelve months' notice from the date he/she is informed of the Dean's negative decision.

Termination of a probationary-term appointment prior to the contractual end-date constitutes dismissal and is subject to the terms set out in the Memorandum of Agreement between the Faculty Association and the University of Waterloo.

Probationary-term Reappointment. The Chair shall give the candidate written notification of consideration for reappointment at least 13 months before the end-date of the first probationary term. The candidate shall meet with the Chair to discuss the process to be followed and the materials to be submitted. Except in unusual circumstances, external reference letters are not required for reappointment; however, if the candidate and/or the Department Tenure and
Promotion Committee (DTPC) decide that external referees should be contacted, the procedures in Section 6. of Policy 77 shall apply. The Department (DTPC), Faculty (FTPC) and University Tenure and Promotion Advisory (UTPAC) Committees are described in Section 5. of Policy 77.

For reappointment, the candidate is expected to present a record as a good teacher and evidence of scholarly or creative work as described in sections 2. and 3. of Policy 77. The DTPC shall assess whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure, recognizing that at this stage it may be necessary to make judgments in some areas based on potential. The DTPC Chair shall forward the DTPC recommendation to the Dean and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the recommendation is negative.

Upon receipt of the DTPC recommendation, the Dean shall decide whether to reappoint, and shall inform the candidate in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative.

The candidate may appeal a negative decision in writing to the FTPC within ten working days of being notified. For purposes of the appeal, the FTPC shall be chaired by its non-voting UTPAC member; the Dean and the DTPC Chair shall be available to present evidence and to answer questions, but shall not otherwise participate in the proceedings. The candidate may choose to appear before the FTPC and may choose to be accompanied by a UW academic colleague. The FTPC shall decide whether to reappoint and shall inform the candidate and the Dean in writing, including reasons if the decision is negative. The FTPC shall conduct its proceedings in accordance with the principles of natural justice and its decision shall be final and binding, except that an alleged failure of the FTPC to comply with the above procedures may be grieved under the grievance and arbitration provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Faculty Association and the University.

The Dean and/or Chair shall write to candidates who are to be reappointed to summarize any concerns that may have been identified, and to provide advice on preparing for future tenure consideration.

C. Tenured Appointments

Tenure is a form of continuing appointment granted only to regular faculty members, full or fractional load, in the professorial ranks. For clinical faculty, the term "clinical tenure" is sometimes used, for instance in advertising open positions. This alternative terminology does not reflect any difference in the status of the appointment; it is in place because it is sometimes useful to indicate that suitable candidates for the position can have scholarly activities that differ from those typical of non-clinical faculty. In particular, they may focus on activities described in Policy 76, sec. 2 as "new applications of knowledge to the problems of society." Assistant Professors who are granted tenure on or after January 1, 2002 will automatically be appointed at the rank of Associate Professor.

Normally, faculty members are considered for tenure during their fifth or sixth year of probationary appointment at the University of Waterloo. The criteria and procedures for the granting of tenure are set out in Policy 77.
An initial appointment with tenure is unusual and can be made only at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor. An appointment with tenure must be recommended by the FTPC, and requires approval by the Dean, the VPA&P and the Board of Governors.

A tenured appointment can be terminated prior to retirement only for adequate cause or for reasons of financial exigency. Dismissal of a tenured faculty member is handled in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement between the Faculty Association and the University of Waterloo.

D. Continuing Lecturer Appointments

A Continuing Lecturer position is an ongoing faculty position at the rank of Lecturer. Duties are primarily in teaching and service, and are assigned in all three terms, though lecturers shall have the option to have at least one term in six be a non-teaching term. Faculty members with Continuing Lecturer appointments are not eligible for tenure or promotion consideration or for sabbatical leave. These positions are understood to be unusual and offered only in special circumstances.

The recommendation to appoint a Continuing Lecturer originates with the Chair and Dean, and must be approved by the VPA&P. The candidate shall have a record of strong teaching and service at UW, and normally shall have served for at least three years in definite-term appointments. The Chair and Dean, in consultation with the DTPC and FTPC, shall determine whether the candidate is suitable for a Continuing Lecturer position. The Dean shall forward the recommendation and all supporting documentation to the VPA&P, whose decision shall be final and binding.

Dismissal of a Continuing Lecturer is handled in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Memorandum of Agreement between the Faculty Association and the University of Waterloo.

4. FACULTY APPOINTMENT INTENSITIES

Full-time faculty appointments are 12-month appointments which carry an obligation for some combination of teaching, scholarship and University service throughout the full year, excepting annual paid vacation.

Part-time appointments may be made in any of the non-regular faculty appointment categories (Section 2.B). A part-time appointment carries a lower time commitment than does a full-time appointment, and may also have a more limited range of duties and responsibilities, as specified in the letter of appointment.

A fractional-load appointment is a regular faculty appointment that carries the same distribution of duties in teaching, scholarship and service as does a regular full-time appointment, but the total commitment of time to the University is not as great. Fractional-load appointments can be made at any fraction of total load (normally at least 50%) that corresponds to a practical
assignment of University duties. A faculty member who holds a probationary-term appointment on a fractional-load basis is entitled to formal consideration for reappointment or tenure at the same fractional load.

Regular faculty members may apply to change their appointments from full-time to fractional-load (or vice versa). Such changes require the written mutual agreement of the faculty member and department Chair, and must be formally approved by the Faculty Dean and the VPA&P.

Temporary Reduction in Workload. Faculty members who desire a temporary reduction in workload should apply for a partial leave of absence; see Policy 3.

A reduced load to retirement is a special fractional-load appointment with respect to participation in UW pension and benefit plans; see Policy 59.

5. HIRING PROCEDURES FOR REGULAR FACULTY MEMBERS

This section describes the procedures to be followed in hiring probationary and tenured faculty members, as well as those regular faculty members on definite-term appointments of at least three years duration.

Academic excellence, the cornerstone of UW's mission, is achieved by the commitment of the University community to the highest quality teaching, scholarship and services that support the academic enterprise. That commitment underlies admission and examination standards, hiring and promotion decisions, criteria for performance evaluation and academic goals.

Consistent with the mission of achieving academic excellence, UW is committed to recruit the best faculty possible, within the context of its budgetary considerations and academic programs, as well as priorities such as faculty renewal and employment equity. Faculty recruitment will be carried out through the application of the highest standards and best practices. Recruitment of faculty of the highest quality is a very competitive process and as such requires prompt actions on the part of all involved with the recruitment process. The VPA&P, Faculty Deans and Department Chairs will take appropriate administrative measures to realize this goal.

The need for a new or replacement appointment is identified by a Department Chair in consultation with the department. Authorization to advertise a position must be obtained from the Dean and the VPA&P to ensure that the appointment is consistent with Faculty/University priorities and budgetary considerations. Care should be taken that the position is not defined so narrowly as to limit unreasonably the pool of qualified candidates.

Procedures are to be adopted to ensure that an adequate list of possible candidates of the highest quality is obtained through proactive national and international searches and that selection from this list has been effectively carried out. The search process will continue until an adequate list of possible candidates of the highest quality is obtained.

Positions are advertised in University Affairs and/or the CAUT Bulletin, and normally in relevant professional journals and e-lists. Also, the Chair shall send advertisements to appropriate contact persons at other Canadian universities. Advertisements should specify the
desired areas of specialization, the anticipated rank and starting date, the deadline for applications, and immigration requirements. They must include UW’s employment equity statement. It is recognized that in a highly competitive environment, advertisement is a necessary tool for recruitment but is not a substitute for other forms of proactive recruitment such as identifying potential candidates through professional colleagues.

In addition, the Chair and other department members should strive to identify qualified candidates and encourage them to apply. This is particularly important when one gender is seriously underrepresented in the department. In some cases, it may be necessary to exercise flexibility with respect to starting date and/or non-traditional career paths.

A. Department / School Advisory Committee on Appointments (DACA)
For each regular faculty appointment of duration two years or more, a search committee (DACA or equivalent for inter-departmental and joint appointments) shall be established. The DACA is normally chaired by the Department Chair or equivalent, and normally consists of from three to five tenured faculty members chosen in a manner acceptable to the department(s) or equivalent. In the case of smaller units where there may not be a sufficient number of tenured faculty members or when a particular disciplinary expertise is needed, senior probationary-term faculty members may be chosen to serve on the DACA.

It is highly desirable for the DACA to include both women and men. Where this is not possible, a department, in consultation with the Dean, should consider inviting a faculty member from a related discipline to join the DACA.

The DACA shall participate in short-listing and interviewing candidates for the position, and shall provide advice to the department Chair concerning the selection procedure and suitability of the various candidates. In determining suitability, the DACA shall take into account UW’s commitment to the highest quality teaching, scholarship and services which support the academic enterprise. Selected candidates must have demonstrated records or at least the potential to meet the above standards. The DACA will determine appropriate processes to evaluate candidate suitability based on these measures. These measures should include a research seminar, and some form of teaching evaluation. If there is significant disagreement between the advice of the DACA and the Chair’s recommendation, it shall be noted, and become part of the record.

Candidates should be asked only questions relating to bona fide position or occupational requirements. Enquiries as to an applicant’s birthplace, ancestry, marital status, family status, age, sex, religion, record of offenses or handicap are contrary to Human Rights legislation and could form the basis for a discrimination claim.

B. Role of the Department Chair
The Department Chair plays a critical role in the hiring process. It is the Chair’s responsibility to ensure that candidates being interviewed and the selected candidate meet UW’s expectation of the highest quality teaching, scholarship and services which support the academic enterprise. In addition, it is the Chair’s responsibility to provide each candidate interviewed with information
about salary levels, teaching loads, performance expectations, procedures for reappointment and/or the granting of tenure, and other terms and conditions of employment.

The Chair is expected to consult widely and generally to involve other department members in the hiring process (e.g., by making CVs of short-listed candidates available). Before making a hiring recommendation, the Chair must review with the Faculty Dean the list of candidates considered, ranked according to desirability for the position and department needs. If a man and a woman are judged to be equally suitable for the position, preference will be given to the underrepresented gender.

C. University Appointments Review Committee (UARC)
This Committee, appointed by the VPA&P in consultation with Deans’ Council and the President of the Faculty Association, shall advise on regular faculty appointments of duration two years or more. UARC shall consist of one or more members from each Faculty, and shall include at least two women and two men. The term of office is three years, staggered to provide continuity. The Chair of UARC is chosen from among its members by the VPA&P.

UARC shall review the hiring process and provide advice to the Dean before a hiring recommendation is sent to the VPA&P for approval. The Chair (through the Dean) shall provide UARC with a brief summary of the recruiting process including efforts to solicit candidates from the underrepresented gender. Documentation (such as CVs, letters of reference) will be provided for the top three candidates. If all three are of the same gender, documentation will also be provided for the top candidate of the opposite gender.

Special arrangements may be required to permit continuous recruitment for multiple vacancies when the hiring environment is highly competitive. The department Chair and Faculty Dean shall seek the advice of the UARC Chair on the proposed recruitment strategy, and shall obtain the written approval of the VPA&P.

Because faculty hiring is often highly competitive, UARC will respond expeditiously, usually within a week of receiving documentation. Normally, the UARC Chair will review cases in consultation with the UARC member from the relevant Faculty, and will act on behalf of the Committee. The UARC Chair should meet with the Committee, or a subset of it, if there appear to be problems with the hiring process.

In exceptional circumstances, and with the approval of the VPA&P, the UARC review process may be bypassed. When this occurs, the Dean shall provide reasons in writing to the UARC Chair for information.

More generally, UARC monitors the hiring process to ensure that positions were properly advertised, that both the letter and the spirit of the hiring procedure were followed and that there was a thorough search for candidates, especially candidates of the underrepresented gender. It provides advice to Chairs, Deans and the VPA&P with respect to faculty hiring, and reports to Senate annually, via the VPA&P, on its activities and operation.

D. Exceptional Candidates
The opportunity to recruit uniquely qualified, internationally recognized scholars may necessitate prompt hiring decisions to attract such individuals to become UW faculty members. In such cases, with the recommendation of the DACA(s) involved in the proposed hiring and in consultation with the VPA&P, the Dean(s) may waive normal hiring requirements. The following process will then ensue. After a departmental presentation by the candidate and upon a positive recommendation from the DACA(s) with the approval of the Dean(s) and VPA&P, the candidate may be offered a position. The VPA&P will provide an annual statistical report on such cases to Senate, with special attention to equity.

6. PROCEDURES FOR SPOUSAL APPOINTMENTS

In accordance with its academic mission, UW is committed to the principle of recruiting the best available faculty in its pursuit of excellence. Increasingly, recruiting involves couples who are both academics. In such cases, it is desirable for UW to benefit from the combined excellence of both the recruit and the recruit's spouse. Spousal appointments are intended as positions from which the spouse may find a more permanent position.

Spousal appointments are governed by the following criteria:

• The spousal appointee should be of such calibre that were a vacancy to arise in the spousal's hire area in the department/school, he/she would be a credible candidate for that position.

• The spousal appointment normally is a Definite-Term Appointment [see Section 3], and normally is for a term of up to three years.

• The sponsoring unit must provide justification in support of the sponsoring unit recruit. The host unit through its appointments committee must also make a strong case in support of the spousal recruit.

• Due to the special nature of the spousal appointment, there is no requirement for advertising and competition, but all other requirements set out in section 5 must be met.

• UARC will review the two hire files concurrently.

• Department/School and Faculty approval processes (apart from advertising and competition for the spousal appointment) must be satisfied.
Policy 77 -- Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members

Established:

June 6, 2000

Class:

F

1. INTRODUCTION

Universities exist to develop society's intellectual resources and to preserve its intellectual traditions. Their primary functions are to preserve, evaluate, develop and transmit knowledge, intellectual skills and culture. The modern university is expected to provide intellectual leadership to society, to contribute in a major way to the coordination of knowledge and the development of artistic, philosophical, scientific and technological ideas, and to provide a fertile intellectual environment in which new knowledge and ideas can evolve. To achieve these goals, faculty members must be effective and committed teachers and scholars, constantly striving to expand and communicate their knowledge, ideas and understanding for the benefit of society.

Tenure. Tenure is meant to provide institutional support for academic freedom (see the Article on Academic Freedom in the Memorandum of Agreement between the University and the Faculty Association). The pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and the attainment of understanding through scholarship and teaching, which are essential functions of a university, occur best in an atmosphere in which free inquiry and discussion are fostered. Free inquiry may at times bring a faculty member into conflict with society, governments or the University itself. Tenure provides security of employment against pressures that might arise from such conflicts, in the belief that the University and society at large benefit from honest judgments and independent criticisms rendered by scholars who are free from fear of possible consequences that might arise from giving offense to powerful individuals or groups.

Tenure provides stability for both individual faculty members and the University. Tenure provides a faculty member with an environment conducive to long-term scholarly work. The University, for its part, is assured of a continuing group of teachers and scholars committed to the University, around which it can plan and from whom it can draw its academic leadership.

Professional Conduct. All faculty members are expected to conduct themselves in relations with colleagues, staff and students across the University in such a way as to promote the academic well-being of all concerned. Faculty members should avoid denigrating the character and professional competence of others, and should pass judgment on the work of colleagues only in
the proper academic forums. Further, they should refrain from actions that prevent others from pursuing their legitimate activities and should strive to be helpful, readily contributing their time and expertise for the overall benefit of the academic community.

2. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

The standards outlined here guide all decisions made at each stage of a regular faculty appointment, beginning with the original decision to hire. Because these standards are intended to apply university-wide to faculty members engaged in complex intellectual endeavours, they cannot be expressed in absolute quantitative terms. Nonetheless, they do provide a framework around which qualitative judgments can be made by academic administrators and by those serving on tenure and promotion committees.

The University expects all faculty members to maintain high standards in all aspects of their university work. To this end, the University exercises judgments on performance in the basic areas of a faculty member's academic responsibilities: teaching, scholarship and service. Such judgments must be made with the greatest possible care and fairness as they are reflected in decisions regarding salary, reappointment, tenure and promotion.

It is the responsibility of department Chairs to assess the performance of each regular faculty member annually, to provide a written performance review and to be available to discuss it upon request. Performance reviews are especially important in helping new faculty members gauge their progress towards meeting the standards for reappointment and tenure. Annual performance reviews form part of the evidence in tenure and promotion considerations, together with reports from external referees and more extensive career reviews carried out by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC).

Teaching. The purpose of teaching is to facilitate learning. Thus, effective teaching draws the strands of a field together in a way that provides coherence and meaning, places what is known in context, lays the groundwork for future learning, and opens the way for connections between the known and the unknown. High-quality teaching is an important goal of the University. All regular faculty members are expected to contribute to undergraduate teaching and, where possible, to contribute to graduate teaching and to participate in project/thesis supervision.

University teaching encompasses a wide range of activities. It takes many different forms (e.g., undergraduate and graduate courses, graduate seminars, distance education, project and thesis supervision), has many different components (e.g., lectures, tutorials, setting and grading of assignments and examinations, interaction with students outside the classroom, curriculum development), and can occur in many different environments (e.g., large lecture theatres, small seminar rooms, off-campus short courses and workshops, clinics, laboratories, one-on-one supervision).

In all of their teaching activities, faculty members are expected to be fair in the evaluation of student work and constructive in their comments. They are expected to be available to students for interviews and consultations outside the classroom at reasonable times. They must always respect the integrity of their students and carefully avoid any exploitation of them for private
advantage. They must maintain strict confidentiality with regard to students' personal lives and political and religious views. They must comment on academic progress and provide judgments on character only to appropriate persons and in appropriate circumstances, and must always be as fair and as objective as possible when making assessments and providing letters of reference.

Scholarship. University teaching is informed and enriched by the research and scholarship of the professoriate. The University expects its regular faculty members to be active participants in the evolution of their disciplines and professions, to keep academic programs and courses current with developments in their fields, and to communicate both their discoveries and their commitment to scholarship and research. Where feasible, faculty members are expected to seek external funding to support their scholarly work.

Scholarship may take several equally valuable forms. One is the discovery of new knowledge, which may differ from discipline to discipline, and includes the generation of new concepts, ideas, principles and theories. A second form involves the innovative coordination, synthesis or integration of knowledge. This type of scholarship seeks and promotes understanding in a broader context by organizing knowledge in a new and useful way, by illustrating new relationships between the parts and the whole, by relating the past in a new way to the present and future, or by demonstrating new and significant patterns of meaning. Scholarship may also be observed in new and useful applications. Indeed, significant new applications of knowledge to the problems of society represent important scholarly contributions. Novel applications may take many forms, such as creative writing, design, fine and performing arts, innovative clinical or professional practice, and the discovery, development and transfer of technology for societal benefit. Peer-reviewed research with respect to pedagogy and peer-reviewed research with respect to innovative teaching also constitute scholarly activity.

Although any of these scholarly activities may be carried out on a confidential basis, the expectation of the University is for communicated scholarship. In general, only work that is accessible for peer review or professional adjudication can be considered in assessing scholarship for performance reviews, tenure or promotion. Regardless of the discipline and type of scholarship, the key ingredients are the originality, quality and impact of the scholarly work.

Faculty members are expected to meet the ethical standards for scholarship in their particular fields of endeavour; to observe the University's guidelines and policies with respect to ethical conduct in research; and more generally, to act with integrity, truthfulness and honesty in the conduct and communication of their scholarly work.

Service. In addition to their primary duties of teaching and scholarship, regular faculty members have a responsibility to participate in the effective functioning of the University through service on committees, student advising, coordination of activities and in administrative positions. It is important that all faculty members be willing to assist with administrative duties when their help is needed. Many faculty members also provide valuable service to groups outside the University, such as disciplinary or professional organizations, conferences, journals and granting councils. Community service related to a faculty member's scholarly activities is normally considered as service to the University.
3. PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

Peer assessment of teaching, scholarship and service forms the basis for determining the suitability of a faculty member for the granting of tenure or for promotion to Professor. Insofar as possible, tenure and promotion committees shall base their assessments on evidence that is first-hand and direct.

Assessment of Teaching. Teaching quality should be assessed broadly using evidence gathered from as many sources as practicable. Responsibility for providing documentary evidence on teaching rests with the candidate and, to a lesser degree, with the department Chair. A teaching dossier developed by the candidate may be the most effective way of assembling this information.

Classroom performance may be judged in terms of preparation, organization of subject matter, currency of course material, presentation skills, ability to stimulate student interest and scholarship, suitability of assignments and examinations, and willingness to provide individual feedback and help outside the classroom. Student course evaluations are an important source of information, but they should be supplemented with peer evaluation of teaching skills, course content and course materials.

University teaching involves much more than classroom performance and, hence, it is important to develop a fair assessment of competence and effectiveness across the candidate's full spectrum of teaching activities. Contributions to project and thesis supervision, clinical supervision and instruction, graduate seminars, oral and thesis examinations, and curriculum development are all relevant in assessing overall teaching activity. The opinions of current and former students can be of value if solicited on a systematic basis.

Assessment of Scholarship. The University relies primarily on external referees and members of the DTPC to judge a candidate's scholarly record. Although the University looks for evidence of active continuing scholarship, the volume of scholarly output is less important than its quality, originality and impact.

A candidate for tenure or promotion must provide examples of her/his scholarly work for examination by referees and the DTPC. The candidate is responsible for documenting contributions made to team research and jointly authored work. Joint work with students supervised by the candidate should be identified. The candidate must also provide an overview of her/his scholarly work to date, information about work in progress and a general indication of future plans.

High quality contributions to the synthesis of knowledge (e.g., books, monographs, review articles) and to non-traditional forms of scholarship (e.g., artistic exhibitions and performances, innovative design) can provide direct evidence of effective scholarship. Consulting reports and planning documents that are accessible for peer review and evidence of having produced improvements in clinical or professional practice may also be submitted as evidence of a candidate's scholarly contributions.
Other evidence of activity and standing as a scholar includes supervision of student research, invitations to present "keynote" addresses, election to and awards received from professional and disciplinary societies, service as a referee for journals and granting councils, and membership on government or professional committees.

The primary assessment of quality, originality and impact is made by referees and DTPC members on the basis of examining examples of the candidate's work. Other less direct indicators include the rigor of the review processes for journals and conferences in which the candidate has published, the standards of publishing houses for books, and the extent to which other scholars have made reference to the work. In areas such as the fine and performing arts, similar information may be derived from the prestige of exhibitions and performances to which the candidate has contributed, professional reviews and the receipt of awards or prizes.

Assessment of service. Candidates for tenure or promotion shall provide information on their service activities in sufficient detail to allow the DTPC to assess its quantity and quality. Where necessary, the DTPC should obtain statements from those who have personally observed the candidate's service contributions both internal and external to the University. Some service activities, such as chairing a curriculum committee or editing a professional society journal, may also provide indirect evidence for scholarship and teaching.

4. TIMING AND CRITERIA

Candidates for tenure and promotion must apply to the department Chair not later than June 1st in order that their applications can be considered by the DTPC and FTPC during the fall term.

Consideration for tenure. A faculty member holding a second probationary-term appointment is entitled to formal consideration for tenure, which normally occurs during the second year of the second probationary term. However, the candidate may choose to postpone consideration until the third year. Service beyond the second probationary term is possible only if tenure has been granted.

In exceptional circumstances, for instance where extensive experience was acquired prior to the probationary appointment at UW, an individual may be considered for tenure earlier than the second year of the second probationary appointment. Such early consideration requires the agreement in advance of the candidate and the DTPC plus the written agreement of the Dean. If either the DTPC or the FTPC recommends against tenure, early tenure consideration shall cease and the candidate must wait for tenure consideration until the final year of the second probationary-term appointment.

As of January 1, 2002 the granting of tenure to a probationary-term Assistant Professor carries with it appointment at the rank of Associate Professor. Assistant Professors tenured prior to January 1, 2002 may apply for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The relevant criteria and procedures are those for the granting of tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, as described below.
The expectations for the granting of tenure are: a record as a good teacher committed to academic and pedagogical excellence; a record of high-quality and peer-assessed scholarly or creative work (normally demonstrated by publication or presentation in suitable academic or artistic forums); and a record of professional, university or community service. See sections II. and III. The granting of tenure normally will require a record of strong performance in both scholarship and teaching, with satisfactory performance in service. However, a candidate may also qualify for appointment as a tenured Associate Professor by virtue of very strong performance in scholarship or teaching with at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas.

Tenure is not a right; it must be earned by a record of good performance. By the time candidates are considered for tenure they will have had ample opportunity to develop their teaching skills and to make original contributions to their fields of endeavour. These original contributions must be of sufficient magnitude to give witness to a candidate's depth of understanding and scholarly and professional competence. Committees and external referees will be concerned not so much with the volume of scholarly output as with the depth of understanding and degree of scholarly competence it demonstrates. Particular attention will be paid to assessing the likelihood that candidates will continue their scholarly activities once tenure has been awarded.

Candidates for tenure should have demonstrated their willingness to participate in service activities as described in Section II. However, service expectations are lower for probationary faculty than for tenured faculty, and service is not weighted as heavily as scholarship or teaching in tenure considerations.

Consideration for promotion to Professor. In principle, a tenured Associate Professor may apply in any year for promotion; however, it is unusual for such a promotion to occur prior to five years of full-time service in the rank of Associate Professor. If an application for promotion is unsuccessful, the candidate becomes eligible to reapply two years thereafter.

Promotion to the rank of Professor recognizes a high order of achievement in both scholarship and teaching by tenured Associate Professors, together with satisfactory performance in service. Although evidence of strong teaching performance is required, normally the greatest emphasis is placed on scholarship and achievement within an individual's discipline. However, in exceptional cases, a tenured Associate Professor may be promoted on the basis of an outstanding teaching record accompanied by a continuing and long-standing record of satisfactory or better scholarship and service.

A continuous program of scholarship with positive peer review by nationally and internationally recognized scholars is essential for promotion to Professor. For clinical faculty, the relevant scholars will often be nationally and internationally recognized practitioners in the relevant fields, and may not have academic appointments. The candidate's record is to be judged in comparison with the records of faculty members recently promoted at UW and other universities of comparable standing. Promotion to Professor is not an assured step in the career of a faculty member, and some will not attain this rank.

5. TENURE AND PROMOTION COMMITTEES
Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (DTPC). The DTPC shall be chaired by the department Chair and shall include four to six tenured faculty members elected by the tenured and probationary faculty of the department. The Chair and elected members shall be voting members of the DTPC. Normally, a majority of the DTPC's voting members should be full professors; it is desirable that each DTPC include both men and women. In addition, the Dean may appoint a non-voting advisor to the DTPC.

In small departments or where there are too few full professors to constitute a majority on the committee, the Dean, after consultation with the department and with the written approval of the Vice-President, Academic & Provost (VPA&P), may make other arrangements respecting the size and composition of the DTPC.

In departments that include clinical faculty, when such faculty are likely to be evaluated for tenure or promotion the DTPC should include members with the requisite expertise to evaluate the scholarly contributions of the clinical faculty.

By May 1 each year the Chair shall report the DTPC membership to the Dean and to the department's tenured and probationary faculty, and shall invite those who wish to be considered for tenure or promotion to apply by June 1.

Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee (FTPC). The FTPC shall be chaired by the Faculty Dean and shall include at least five tenured faculty members broadly representative of Faculty program areas and elected by the tenured and probationary members of the Faculty. FTPC members may not serve simultaneously on a DTPC in the same Faculty. A majority of the FTPC's elected members shall be full professors; it is desirable that each FTPC include both men and women. The Dean and elected members shall be voting members of the FTPC, and the VPA&P shall appoint an additional voting member who shall be a tenured faculty member from outside the Faculty. The University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (UTPAC) shall appoint a non-voting advisor from amongst its members. The Dean shall report the membership of the FTPC to the VPA&P and to the Faculty's tenured and probationary faculty.

University Tenure and Promotion Committee (UTPC). The UTPC shall be chaired by the VPA&P and shall include the Faculty Deans, the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies and the Vice-President, University Research. In addition, the UTPC shall include two non-voting student members, one undergraduate and one graduate, appointed by the VPA&P in consultation with the President of the Federation of Students and the President of the Graduate Student Association. The UTPC shall be advisory to the President on individual tenure and promotion cases, and on the comparability of standards across the University.

University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee (UTPAC). The UTPAC shall consist of the Chair plus six additional tenured faculty members jointly appointed by the VPA&P and the FAUW President for three-year terms; at least five shall be full professors. The Committee shall include both men and women. The UTPAC Chair shall appoint a member of UTPAC to each FTPC, with no member serving on the FTPC in her/his own Faculty. Otherwise, members of UTPAC may not serve on any DTPC or FTPC.
The UTPAC is advisory to Senate through the VPA&P concerning tenure and promotion standards, policies and procedures, and may recommend changes to the VPA&P. UTPAC shall report to Senate annually on its activities.

6. TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

Application for tenure or promotion to Professor. The candidate shall inform the department Chair in writing by June 1, and shall meet with the Chair to discuss the procedures to be followed.

Candidate's brief. By July 1, the candidate shall submit a brief supporting the application for tenure or promotion. This brief must include a curriculum vitae, copies of relevant scholarly work, a summary of the candidate's contributions in scholarship, teaching and service, and any other relevant information the candidate feels may be useful to the DTPC and FTPC. The candidate must also submit, by July 1, the names of at least three arms-length external referees who can assess her/his published work.

Annual Performance Reviews. The Chair shall provide the DTPC with copies of all written assessments made of the candidate within the department.

External referees. External opinions of a candidate's scholarly contributions are sought in all tenure and promotion cases; normally at least three external reviews are obtained. External referees shall be both external to UW and at arms-length from the candidate.

The DTPC shall consider the candidate's list of referees and normally will suggest additional names. After consulting with the Dean, the Chair shall inform the candidate of the pool of potential referees. The candidate may challenge, in writing to the DTPC, a potential referee for bias, apprehension of bias, perceived conflict of interest or unsuitability. If the DTPC and the candidate do not agree on the pool of potential referees, at least half of the referees contacted must be from those approved by the candidate.

Letters soliciting comments from referees shall be sent by the Dean. Referees shall be sent copies of this policy, and shall be asked to assess the candidate's scholarly work and, if possible, to compare it with the scholarly achievements of others recently tenured at their own institutions or others of similar standing. Informal contacts with potential external referees by the department Chair, DTPC or FTPC members, or the candidate are inappropriate.

Tenure or promotion file. The tenure or promotion file for a candidate consists of: all evidence considered by the DTPC, the FTPC or the President; the DTPC assessment of the candidate's performance in teaching, scholarship and service; the outcome of deliberations by the DTPC, the FTPC and the President. The file shall also include the numerical record of votes taken, plus any written statements, including reasons, by DTPC or FTPC members who do not agree with the majority recommendation. If the file is provided to the candidate, it shall include all internal or external letters of assessment with the names of the authors and other identifying references deleted, unless the authors have expressly consented to being identified.
Conflict of interest. A member of a tenure and promotion committee who has a conflict of interest in a particular case shall declare the conflict and shall be absent from the portion of committee meetings dealing with that case. In particular, no DTPC or FTPC member may attend those portions of meetings at which her/his own case is being considered (except when appearing as a candidate). If the Committee Chair has a conflict of interest, the committee shall elect another of its members to serve as Chair pro tem during the absence of the Chair.

Challenges. Prior to consideration of a case, a candidate may challenge in writing any member or members of a DTPC or FTPC for bias, apprehension of bias or perceived conflict of interest. The committee, excluding the member challenged, shall decide whether the challenge is well-founded. If so, the challenged member shall not attend those portions of committee meetings dealing with the specific case. If the committee decides that a challenge is not well-founded, the challenged member shall participate, but the challenge becomes part of the record for any subsequent consideration or appeal.

Procedures at the Department Level. The DTPC shall meet to consider all applications from the department for tenure or promotion, shall prepare an assessment of each candidate’s performance in teaching, scholarship and service, and shall decide whether to recommend tenure or promotion. The assessment should state clearly, and in detail, the evidence considered, the criteria applied to the evidence, the evaluation of the candidate in each of the three areas and the emphasis placed on each area.

If a candidate’s work intersects significantly with work in another academic unit, the Chair will normally ask an appropriate member or members of that unit for comment. The Chair shall forward to the DTPC any written submissions assessing the candidate’s qualifications for tenure or promotion.

If members of the DTPC express significant reservations that could result in a negative recommendation, the Chair shall provide the candidate with a complete copy of the tenure or promotion file, together with a written explanation of the nature of the reservations in sufficient detail to allow the candidate to respond. Within ten working days the candidate shall provide her/his written response (including any relevant new evidence) to the Chair for distribution to the DTPC. The candidate may also choose to appear before the DTPC and may choose to be accompanied by a UW academic colleague. The DTPC shall not finalize its recommendation until the candidate has been given the opportunity to respond, as described above.

When the DTPC has completed its deliberations, the Chair shall inform the candidate in writing of the outcome (including the basis for it, if negative), and shall forward the tenure or promotion file to the Dean for consideration by the FTPC. When a negative recommendation has gone forward, the Chair shall inform the candidate that the FTPC will review the case unless the candidate chooses to withdraw it.

Procedures at the Faculty Level. The FTPC shall consider all positive tenure and promotion recommendations from a DTPC to ensure that the DTPC has acted carefully and appropriately in its deliberations, that its recommendations are sound and that comparable standards are being
applied from department to department. Negative DTPC recommendations will also be reviewed unless the candidate has chosen to withdraw her/his case.

The FTPC shall base its deliberations primarily on the report forwarded by the DTPC. The DTPC Chair (or delegate) normally will present the DTPC recommendations to the FTPC and will be available to answer questions, but shall not otherwise participate in the proceedings. In exceptional circumstances, the FTPC may decide to contact additional arms-length, external referees; if such additional referees were not in the original pool of potential referees developed by the DTPC, the candidate's right to challenge must be respected, as specified above.

If members of the FTPC express significant reservations that could result in a negative recommendation, the Dean shall provide the candidate with a complete copy of the tenure or promotion file, together with a written explanation of the nature of the reservations in sufficient detail to allow the candidate to respond. Within ten working days the candidate shall provide her/his written response (including any relevant new evidence) to the Dean for distribution to the FTPC. The candidate may also choose to appear before the FTPC and may choose to be accompanied by a UW academic colleague. The FTPC shall not finalize its recommendation until the candidate has been given the opportunity to respond, as described above.

When the FTPC has completed its deliberations, the Dean shall inform the candidate in writing of the outcome (including the basis for it, if negative). For positive recommendations, the Dean shall forward the tenure or promotion file to the President. Negative promotion recommendations by both the DTPC and FTPC shall result in the promotion file being closed for that particular year. Otherwise, negative FTPC recommendations will be forwarded to the President unless the candidate chooses to withdraw the case.

The President. The President shall consider all tenure or promotion recommendations forwarded by the FTPC, together with the advice of the UTPC.

If the President decides in favour of promotion, he/she shall inform the candidate and report the promotion to Senate and the Board of Governors for information. If the President supports the granting of tenure, he/she shall inform the candidate, recommend approval to the Board of Governors, and subsequently report the granting of tenure to Senate for information.

If the President decides against tenure or promotion, he/she shall inform the candidate in writing with reasons. In the event of a negative tenure decision, the candidate's appointment shall be extended as necessary to provide 12 months' notice from the date the candidate is informed.

7. TENURE AND PROMOTION APPEALS

A negative tenure or promotion decision by the President may be appealed. Within ten working days of being informed of the negative decision, the candidate must submit written notice of intent to appeal to the UTPAC Chair, who shall establish a three-person Tribunal to hear the appeal.
Members of the Tribunal normally shall be or shall have been tenured Associate Professors or Professors at the University of Waterloo in the candidate's discipline or a related discipline. They shall not have had any prior connection with the particular tenure or promotion consideration nor have had a close professional or personal relationship with the candidate.

The candidate and the President shall each propose at least three possible Tribunal members in accordance with the above criteria, and shall be given the opportunity to challenge in writing the names proposed by the other party with respect to the criteria or for bias, apprehension of bias or perceived conflict of interest. The UTPAC Chair normally shall appoint the three Tribunal members from the names proposed, including at least one member proposed by each of the parties, and shall name one of the members as the Tribunal Chair.

If the UTPAC Chair judges that it is not possible to establish an internal Tribunal meeting the above requirements, one or more of the three Tribunal members may be external to the University of Waterloo. External members shall be or shall have been tenured Associate Professors or Professors at another Canadian university in the candidate's discipline or a closely related discipline. They shall not have had any prior connection with the particular tenure or promotion consideration nor have had a close professional or personal relationship with the candidate. The candidate and the President shall be given the opportunity to propose external Tribunal members and to challenge in writing external members proposed by the other party or by the UTPAC Chair.

The Tribunal shall conduct its proceedings in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The Tribunal shall be provided with the complete tenure or promotion file, and shall schedule a hearing at which the parties may present arguments and submissions, and may call, examine and question witnesses. The candidate is entitled to be accompanied by a UW colleague. The burden of proof shall be on the candidate to demonstrate that the criteria for tenure or promotion have been met.

The Tribunal shall decide by majority vote on the basis of the evidence submitted to it whether the criteria for tenure or promotion have been met. The Tribunal Chair shall forward a written decision, with reasons, to the candidate and the President, with copies to the UTPAC Chair and the FAUW President. The decision of the Tribunal is final and binding on the candidate and the University, except that an alleged failure of the Tribunal to comply with the above procedures may be grieved under the grievance and arbitration provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Faculty Association and the University.
To: Board of Governors  
From: Geoff McBoyle, Vice-President, Academic & Provost  
Date: March 28, 2011  
Subject: Composition of Nominating Committees for Dean of Engineering and Dean of Science

1. **Motion:** That the Board of Governors approve increasing membership of the 2011 Nominating Committee for the Dean of Engineering by one to include eight regular faculty members.

**Rationale:** Section 4.A of policy 45 (reproduced below) sets out the composition of decanal search committees. In the Faculty of Engineering, it specifies that there are to be seven regular faculty members, including at least one elected at-large. With the School of Architecture's move to engineering, there are now seven constituencies to be represented on the committee that is about to be constituted. The recommended change would allow for one representative of each constituency plus one member elected from the faculty at-large. This change was considered and supported by the Faculty Relations Committee on March 3, 2011. Senate approved the change at its March 28, 2011 meeting.

2. **Motion:** That the Board of Governors approve increasing membership of the 2011 Nominating Committee for the Dean of Science by one to include seven regular faculty members.

**Rationale:** Section 4.A of policy 45 (reproduced below) sets out the composition of decanal search committees. In the Faculty of Science, it specifies that there are to be six regular faculty members, including at least one elected at-large. With the creation of the School of Pharmacy, there are six constituencies to be represented on the committee that is about to be constituted. The recommended change would allow for one representative of each constituency plus one member elected from the faculty at-large. This change was considered and supported by the Faculty Relations Committee on March 17, 2011. Senate approved the change at its March 28, 2011 meeting.

**Background:** Various aspects of policy 45 have been discussed by the Faculty Relations Committee in recent years. The committee has now decided to begin a complete review of policy 45. In discussion of the situations in science and engineering, members thought it preferable not to propose changes to policy 45 in piecemeal fashion; instead, they felt that Senate and the Board of Governors should be asked to approve exceptions to the policy.

*Excerpt from Policy 45 – The Dean of a Faculty: 4.A Appointment of a Nominating Committee*

When nominations for the Dean of a Faculty are required, as through notice of resignation, death, or the approaching end of a term, a nominating committee shall be formed by the Vice-President, Academic & Provost. The nominating committee shall normally be formed no earlier than 18 months and no later than one full calendar year prior to the end of the term of office of the incumbent.

The Committee Chair shall vote only to break a tie. The majority of the other voting members of the Committee shall be elected by and from the regular faculty members of the Faculty. The nominating committee shall consist of:
- The Vice-President, Academic & Provost, who shall chair the committee.
- Seven regular faculty members in Arts and Engineering, and six in the other Faculties. At least one committee member shall be elected at-large; the others are to be selected by a procedure approved by the Faculty Council and distributed to each regular faculty member. Where some of the members are to be elected by Department by and from the regular faculty members in the Department, those elections shall be conducted prior to the at-large Faculty-wide election. If both genders are not represented on the Committee
Memorandum to Board of Governors
Composition of Nominating Committees for Dean of Engineering and Dean of Science

as a result of departmental elections, then the at-large election shall be conducted so as to ensure that both genders are represented. [1]

- In the Faculty of Arts, one faculty member from and appointed by the Federated & Affiliated Colleges.
- One senior regular faculty member from outside the Faculty concerned, selected by the VicePresident, Academic & Provost in consultation with the President.
- One staff member elected by and from the regular staff of the Faculty, and one appointed by the Staff Association, normally from the Faculty concerned.
- One undergraduate student from the Faculty concerned, appointed by the Federation of Students, in consultation with the appropriate student society.
- One graduate student from the Faculty concerned, appointed by the Graduate Student Association, in consultation with the appropriate student society.

A reasonable gender balance should be maintained on nominating committees, whenever feasible.

Membership on nominating committees shall be conditional on each person agreeing to maintain in confidence the information discussed by the committee, except on points where -the committee subsequently agrees otherwise, and to exercise authority and responsibility as an individual in order that decisions may be taken at the time and place of committee meetings.

If any member of the nominating committee becomes, or seeks to become a candidate for the Office of Dean of a Faculty, the member shall resign from the committee.

In the event of a perceived conflict of interest that could compromise or be seen to compromise the member's judgment of the candidates, he/she shall disclose the nature of that conflict to the committee in sufficient detail to enable the committee to determine whether the member must resign from the committee.

If the association of any member of the nominating committee with the University is terminated or in any way significantly altered, or if for any reason, including resignation, any member is unable to carry out responsibilities on the committee, the nominating committee will request a replacement member, unless the committee has reached a stage in its deliberations where it deems such a replacement inadvisable.

[1] In the unlikely event that no candidate from the unrepresented gender is willing to stand for election as an at-large member, the Vice-President, Academic & Provost shall appoint a candidate from the unrepresented gender in that Faculty.
Memorandum

To: Members of the Board of Governors

From: Geoff McBoyle, Vice-President, Academic & Provost

re: Memorandum of Agreement – Additions to Performance Ratings Scale

Motion: That the Board of Governors approve the addition of the ratings “0.25 Needs Major Improvement” and “0.75 Needs Some Improvement” to the scale of performance ratings in article 13.5.3 of the memorandum of agreement between the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo and the University of Waterloo.

Article 13.5.3 [reproduced below] sets out the numerical performance ratings that are to be used during annual performance evaluations. One of the recommendations of the Review of the Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation Process conducted by a working group jointly appointed by the faculty association and the university was to “increase the dynamic range of evaluations in all areas (scholarship, teaching and service) by adding .25 and .75 to the scale of possible scores.”

The Faculty Relations Committee drafted descriptors to accompany the scores. In December 2010, the members of the faculty association approved the addition of the ratings and descriptors.

Current version
13.5.3 Each Member shall receive one of the following nine numerical performance ratings in each of teaching, scholarship and service:
2.0 Outstanding
1.75 Excellent
1.5 Very Good
1.25 Good
1.0 Satisfactory
0.5 Needs Significant Improvement
0.0 Unsatisfactory

Proposed version
13.5.3 Each Member shall receive one of the following nine numerical performance ratings in each of teaching, scholarship and service:
2.0 Outstanding
1.75 Excellent
1.5 Very Good
1.25 Good
1.0 Satisfactory
0.75 Needs Some Improvement
0.5 Needs Significant Improvement
0.25 Needs Major Improvement
0.0 Unsatisfactory
## UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

### 2011/12 Operating Income Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010/11 Base</th>
<th>Estimated 11/12 % Increase</th>
<th>Estimated 11/12 $ Increase</th>
<th>2011/12 Base</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Grant</td>
<td>172,788</td>
<td>26,672</td>
<td>199,460</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Growth</td>
<td>35,533</td>
<td>(25,973)</td>
<td>9,560</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Growth</td>
<td>5,509</td>
<td>3,796</td>
<td>9,305</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement Fund</td>
<td>8,772</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>9,303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Colleges</td>
<td>(10,244)</td>
<td>(291)</td>
<td>(10,535)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Fund</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Infrastructure</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Programs</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access for Disabled</td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>217,677</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>222,621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>200,693</td>
<td>16,688</td>
<td>217,381</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Colleges</td>
<td>(11,475)</td>
<td>(958)</td>
<td>(12,433)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>37,907</td>
<td>4,853</td>
<td>42,760</td>
<td>[4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>227,125</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20,583</td>
<td>247,708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Recovery</td>
<td>12,374</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>12,984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Fee</td>
<td>7,302</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>7,947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Overhead</td>
<td>7,008</td>
<td>(567)</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to Colleges</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant in lieu of Taxes</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>9,987</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,987</td>
<td>[6]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45,276</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>47,628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>490,078</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>27,879</td>
<td>517,957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES TO 2011/12 OPERATING INCOME

[1] The net decrease of $26M in undergraduate growth funding is due to the following: a) $26.6M of growth funding up to 2009/10 has been rolled into the basic grant; b) an increase of $7M based on Waterloo receiving full funding for growth in 2010/11. No growth funding is projected for 2011/12.

[2] The allocation is based on projected Fall 2011 FTE growth over the Fall 2007 FTE base. The projection shows Waterloo meeting the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) growth targets in Fall 2011.

[3] The $16.7M increase in undergraduate tuition is a result of continued international growth and modest domestic growth. Tuition increases for new domestic students are 4.5% in regulated programs, 6.5% in deregulated programs, and 3% for international students.

[4] The $4.9M increase in graduate tuition reflects a 3% rate increase for all students and continued enrolment growth to meet MTCU grant targets and the sixth decade goals.

[5] Interest estimate is based on projected cash available to invest and interest rates.

[6] Miscellaneous income includes: Health Services and Optometry OHIP and professional services income, application processing fees, non credit tuition, other student related fees, rental income, parking income, and other general revenues. Many of these items have offsetting expenses.
## UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
### 2011/12 Operating Expense Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010/11 Base</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>% of Income</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-02-01</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current salaries and wages</td>
<td>280,780</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>282,580</td>
<td>282,580</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondments</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary savings from faculty retirements/terminations</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>(800)</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion costs</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary increases</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total salary and wages</td>
<td>281,123</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>288,696</td>
<td>288,696</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current benefits</td>
<td>57,641</td>
<td>57,641</td>
<td>57,641</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit cost increase</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty professional expense reimbursement plan</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental leave supplement</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>861</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total benefits</td>
<td>60,139</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>62,672</td>
<td>62,672</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total salaries and benefits</td>
<td>341,262</td>
<td>10,106</td>
<td>351,368</td>
<td>351,368</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student support</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate incentive fund</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for international graduate students</td>
<td>4,517</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate matching scholarships</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition set aside</td>
<td>16,131</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>17,008</td>
<td>17,008</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate scholarships/bursaries</td>
<td>6,536</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>7,073</td>
<td>7,073</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total student support</td>
<td>33,531</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>35,405</td>
<td>35,405</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential tuition</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate growth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate international growth</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate enrolment expansion</td>
<td>4,903</td>
<td>4,903</td>
<td>4,903</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International tuition</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate course based masters</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>703</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income sharing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,556</td>
<td>10,556</td>
<td>12,860</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>374,793</td>
<td>22,536</td>
<td>397,329</td>
<td>399,633</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board, April 5/11
### UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

#### 2011/12 Operating Expense Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010/11 Base</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2011/12 One-Time</th>
<th>2011/12 Total</th>
<th>% of Income</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td>$000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic fund</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access for disabled</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base budget adjustment to reflect overhead costs</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency reserve</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment investment shortfall</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty recruitment and retention</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate programs holdback</td>
<td>5,428</td>
<td>3,203</td>
<td>8,631</td>
<td>8,631</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International fund</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library acquisitions</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal taxes</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement fund</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate programs holdback</td>
<td>18,248</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>21,107</td>
<td>21,107</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>15,450</td>
<td>15,450</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>[6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>66,455</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>8,379</td>
<td>74,834</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and expenses</td>
<td>52,731</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>55,828</td>
<td>55,828</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance to off-set future expenditure reductions</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure reduction at 2%</strong></td>
<td>(4,305)</td>
<td>(4,305)</td>
<td>(4,305)</td>
<td>(4,305)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross expenses</td>
<td>496,979</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>29,707</td>
<td>526,686</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>528,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost recoveries and chargeouts</td>
<td>(10,709)</td>
<td>(10,709)</td>
<td>(10,709)</td>
<td>(10,709)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageable allowance</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated net expenses</strong></td>
<td>485,770</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>29,707</td>
<td>515,477</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>517,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>517,957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess income over expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES TO THE 2011/12 OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET

[1] The increase to salary and wages includes $1.8M of funding for new positions, estimated salary increase costs based on salary settlements in place for 2011/12 and ongoing clawback savings on faculty terminations/retirements, net of estimated over F costs.

[2] Benefit cost increases include estimated increases in employer contributions for extended health, dental coverage, life insurance, CPP, employment insurance, costs for new faculty and staff, and costs associated with salary increases.

[3] The ongoing income sharing balances represent additional amounts available in 2011/12 for distribution. Income sharing for existing programs is allocated to the faculties on a slip-year basis. Funding for new programs is allocated on a calendar-year basis. New graduate growth allocations were introduced in 2006/07 to recognize growth in intake and overall FTEs. The ongoing cumulative income sharing amounts, including additional amounts for 2011/12, from inception to date, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differential tuition</td>
<td>13,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate expansion (ended 2004/05)</td>
<td>2,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate growth (started 2005/06)</td>
<td>8,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate international growth</td>
<td>1,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate enrolment expansion</td>
<td>31,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International tuition</td>
<td>21,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate course based masters</td>
<td>2,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>82,343</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To accommodate growth, academic support units receive supplemental budget increases.

[4] Graduate programs holdback is a portion of the grant and tuition related to growth and held at the centre to support graduate expansion.

[5] Undergraduate programs holdback relates to emerging programs which are considered to be incremental to the current activity of the institution/faculty. Grant and tuition generated from the program during the start-up period is held at the centre and managed by the Provost. Funds are released as required to support the start-up costs. Once the program is determined to have reached steady-state, budget for the program will be transferred to the home faculty through the current income sharing mechanisms in place. In 2011/2012 the emerging programs are Nanotechnology Engineering, Management Engineering, Pharmacy, International Development, Knowledge Integration and WatPD.
NOTES TO THE 2011/12 OPERATING EXPENSE BUDGET

[6] The utilities increase is due to new buildings and higher unit prices for electricity and water.

[7] Supplies and expenses is the total of non-salary budgets in faculties and academic support units that are not specifically identified elsewhere in the budget. Based on 2010/11 actual expenses, included in this number are the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, maintenance and rentals</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and entertainment</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted services</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing, including software</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases for resale</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase to supplies and expenses for 2011/12 includes $1.7M for new building maintenance and other known increases to non-salary budgets.

[8] A 2% expenditure reduction is allocated across all academic units resulting in a savings of $4.3M.
FOR INFORMATION

‘Delivering a Great Giving Experience’
Stewardship at University of Waterloo
Recently, our Faculty of Mathematics made a stewardship call to The General Dominion Insurance Company of Canada, to introduce the new Dean of Mathematics and deliver a stewardship report. The Manager of Corporate Communications observed that Waterloo was the only “fundee” that has been reporting to them on the impact of its investment and ensuring a strong personal relationship. She noted that due to the economy, Dominion has scaled back its giving and Waterloo was one of only three organizations they have continued to support.

“Thank you” is not enough – the difference between donor recognition & stewardship
Historically, a description of stewardship might have included activities such as gift acknowledgement and receipting, donor recognition levels and events, naming opportunities and the publication of annual donor lists. However, we now define these activities as ‘donor recognition’, which is complementary to, but distinct from, stewardship.

To deliver true stewardship, an organization needs to convey the impact of a gift and create opportunities for the donor to become engaged and connected to the work that they are supporting. When done well, not only are donors more likely to give again, and give larger gifts, they are also more likely to encourage others to give.

Where organizations used to think about stewardship only for their largest donors, more sophisticated organizations are now broadening programs and activities in an effort to deliver true stewardship to all of their donors in a meaningful and cost-effective manner. Waterloo is one of these organizations.

The focus on advancing the role of stewardship underlies the message that stewardship is the beginning of the fundraising cycle, not the end.

Waterloo’s best prospects are our current donors
With as many as 16,000 donors each year at varying levels of giving and a diverse demographic located around the world, how do we make donors feel genuinely appreciated on a personal level, and aware that they have a real and continuing impact on Waterloo’s mission?
Defining Gold Standard Stewardship
By definition, gold standard stewardship meets the needs of a wide range of donors.

- Characteristically, it inspires donors with stories and events that are personal and builds donor confidence through proof of performance.
- It requires outstanding customer service, attentive listening, and the ability to put oneself in the donor’s shoes.
- It nurtures affinity and makes supporters feel proud and confident that their participation is critical to the university’s success and is valued by all.
- As new strategies and technologies emerge, gold standard stewardship will embrace ideas that promote transparency, accountability, and meaningful donor engagement.

The goal of our dynamic stewardship program is to build long-term relationships with donors by fostering a sense of ownership in Waterloo’s accomplishments and a deep affinity for its future. We want donors to understand, and truly believe, that by supporting the university, they play a significant role in solving Canada’s and the world’s most pressing challenges, regardless of the size of the gift they give.

At Waterloo, we are striving to evolve our existing activities and strategies for our top donors into meaningful and realistic strategies for all of our donors.

Examples:
Targeting communication pieces through use of variable data
Personal correspondence adjusted to connect with larger groups
Smaller, ad hoc events that leverage travel for other purposes
Strategic use of technology
Opportunities to connect with Waterloo leaders and students
Expanding volunteer opportunities
Build stronger business systems and relationships
Support faculty advancement in their efforts to steward donors of $25,000+

Measuring Success
The following are some of the key results that are monitored and assessed in determining the effectiveness of our stewardship efforts:

- Overall donor retention rates and targeted donor retention rates (Circle donors, major gift donors, geographic groups)
- Upgraded giving from loyal donors (pipeline development)
- Anecdotal donor feedback
- Open, click-through rates
- Survey results
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Report of the Vice-President, University Research

Board of Governors

University of Waterloo
FOR APPROVAL

1. Conceptual Design for the Health Services Building Addition [see Attachment 1]

Motion: That the Board of Governors approve the conceptual design for the Health Services Building Addition.

Congruence with 6th Decade Plan: attract excellent students; student engagement through health/wellness

Risk: 20-year compulsory student fee is insufficient to cover capital costs plus interest (low probability)

Background: The approved architects for this $7.75 million project are Kearns Mancini Architects Inc. with John MacDonald Architect Inc. With a total floor area of approximately 18,500 square feet, the siting of the building addition meets the requirements of the floodway established by the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA).

The original Health Services Building was designed by Raymond Moriyama in 1967 and built as a doctor’s clinic and small hospital. Raymond Moriyama is recipient of many awards including the Governor General Award and is a member of the Order of Canada.

The design for the addition is respectful of the original building by the extensive use of glass which creates a backdrop and reflects the landscape. The south wall consists of a solid structure that acts as a retaining wall due to the change in grades and helps anchor the building on the site.

The first floor of the building includes 21 new examination rooms together with the required infrastructure to operate a modern team based medical clinic. The second floor provides the facilities necessary for the university’s mental health and health promotion activities.

The President’s Advisory Committee on Design (PACOD) met on March 8 to review the conceptual design and recommended its approval subject to finalizing some minor fenestration details. The President has accepted PACOD’s recommendation.

2. Renovations to the Douglas Wright Engineering (DWE) Building

Motion: That the Board of Governors approve a $15 million project budget for the renovation of the Douglas Wright Engineering Building “C” Wing and that Walter Fedy Partnership be retained as architects/engineers/construction managers for the project.

Congruence with 6th Decade Plan: strive for excellence in everything; upgrade teaching and learning space.

Risk: The project has $2.1 million of funding on hand; the balance will be funded through the Faculty of Engineering’s operating budget and fundraising efforts.

Background: With the completion of the new Engineering 6 building planned for the summer of 2011, the Chemical Engineering Department will be vacating the “C” Wing of the DWE building.
This 46,000 gross square foot area will then be renovated (with a potential 2,650 square foot addition) to accommodate the Civil Engineering Department.

Budget (including net HST):
- Construction: $11,775,000
- Construction Management Fee: 350,000
- Professional Fees & Disbursements: 1,700,000
- Contingency: 1,000,000
- Network Connectivity: 125,000
- Building Permit & Development Charges: 50,000
- Total: $15,000,000

(Cost per square foot = $326)

3. **Siting of Potential Student Services Building** [see Attachment 2]
   - **Motion:** That the Board of Governors approve in principle the site west of the RCH lecture hall for a potential student services building.
   - **Congruence with 6th Decade Plan:** attract excellent students; foster student engagement
   - **Risk:** Execution of the project is dependent on students’ support of a referendum.

   **Background:** The undergraduate students are considering the possibility of conducting a second referendum to financially support the construction of a student services building. Based on feedback from the prior referendum, the students are requesting that the university commit to a revised site central to the south campus for a building with a floor plate of approximately 15,000 square feet.

   To ensure consistency with the Campus Master Plan, the GSP Group Inc. (part of the original master plan consulting team) was retained to undertake a siting concept exercise which is reflected in the attached conceptual site design.

**FOR INFORMATION**

4. **Psychology, Anthropology and Sociology (PAS) – Animal Care Facilities Fit-Out**
   The committee approved the award of a stipulated sum contract to Nith Valley Construction for $3,309,425 plus HST for the fit out of the animal care facility in the PAS building. (Cost per square foot = $321)

5. **Science Expansion Building**
   The committee approved the design/build procurement method for the planned $45 million science expansion building.

6. **General Oversight**
   The committee reviewed and accepted for information:
   - the capital financing commitments associated with the capital projects and advises that these commitments fall within Waterloo’s board-approved debt policy; and
   - 2010 committee assessment results and advises that the results indicate that members are satisfied with the operation of this committee.

Catherine Booth
Chair
Kearns Mancini Architects Inc. | John MacDonald Architect Inc.
University of Waterloo Health Services Clinic Building Addition
Scheme 'D' Perspective View 'E'
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GSP Group Inc | January 2011
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FOR INFORMATION

1. 2011-12 OPERATING BUDGET
   Following the provost's review of the context in which the budget would be developed, the measures
Waterloo is taking to mitigate budgetary pressures, the committee advised the provost that it was
prepared to support the proposed budget in principle.

2. VALUE FOR MONEY/EFFICIENCY MEASURES [Attachment 1]
   The committee received this report from the provost and notes the 30 percent increase in days lost due
to work related injuries (2009: 301 to 2010: 391). Other than the foregoing, there were no significant
year-over-year changes.

Bruce Gordon
Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Desired Trend</th>
<th>Performance Over Previous 5 Years</th>
<th>Year over Year</th>
<th>Institutional Target</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>quality of education / student experience</td>
<td>decrease ratio</td>
<td>ratio increased</td>
<td>2007-08 = 27.1</td>
<td>ratio 20:1</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008-09 = 27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Student Expenditure</td>
<td>compare expenditure levels to North American competitors</td>
<td>increase from $11,000/student</td>
<td>improving vs. Canada, deteriorating vs. U.S.A.</td>
<td>2008-09 = $177,789 2009-10 = $17,041</td>
<td>North American average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Students</td>
<td>increase share of 90% plus students</td>
<td>increase share</td>
<td>recovering from decline due to double cohort</td>
<td>2009 = 29.6%</td>
<td>top 3 in Canada</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Research Funding</td>
<td>increase external research support</td>
<td>growth above national avg. rate</td>
<td>30% increase over 5 years</td>
<td>2008-09 = $144,089,000 2009-10 = $169,506,642</td>
<td>50% of operating budget</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Enrolment</td>
<td>increase graduate enrolment</td>
<td>10% growth per year</td>
<td>40% increase over 5 years</td>
<td>Total % of student body 2008-09 = 3,350, 12.8% 2009-10 = 3,561, 12.6%</td>
<td>double enrolment</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>diversify income through fundraising</td>
<td>continued growth</td>
<td>increase 40% / yr over 5 years</td>
<td>2008-09 = $53.4M 2009-10 = $53.8M</td>
<td>annual fund raised 25% of operating budget</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Placements / Employment</td>
<td>students employed throughout the last three terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008-09 = 97.4% 2009-10 = 96.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity/Cost Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Revenue per Staff Position</td>
<td>relative measure of staff productivity</td>
<td>maintain - 2006/2005 = 5.4%</td>
<td>average 5% increase per annum</td>
<td>previous average = 4.0% fiscal 2010 over 2009 = 6.4%</td>
<td>gains of 3% to 5% per year</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption</td>
<td>gigajoules per square metre of building area</td>
<td>maintain/improve</td>
<td>1.41 GJ/m2</td>
<td>2008-09 actual = 1.41 GJ/m2 2009-10 actual = 1.36 GJ/m2</td>
<td>~30% lower than Ontario university system average (^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Costs as a % Operating Budget</td>
<td>% of operating budget expended on central administration</td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td>3rd lowest in province</td>
<td>previously = 2.43% (3rd lowest in province) 2009-10 = 1.17% (lowest in province)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Consortiums</td>
<td>savings through local, provincial &amp; national consortiums</td>
<td>add two commodities per year</td>
<td>&gt;31 commodities purchased through consortiums</td>
<td>0 new commodities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Condition Index</td>
<td>deferred maintenance vs replacement value of buildings</td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td>FCI = 0.03</td>
<td>2009 FCI = 0.03 2010 FCI = 0.04</td>
<td>FCI &lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Related (WSIB) Injuries</td>
<td>a) number of lost time (LT) injuries</td>
<td>decrease</td>
<td>a) averaged 35 LT injuries/year</td>
<td>a) 2009:33 to 2010:35 = 6% increase b) 2009:301 to 2010:391 = 30% increase</td>
<td>7% annual reductions WSIB target</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) days lost during same calendar year as injury</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) averaged 369 lost days/year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>$ raised / $ expended</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008-09 = $53.4M / $7.0M</td>
<td>2009-10 = $53.8M / $7.0M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) and ~40% lower than the average commercial / institutional energy use as reported by Natural Resources Canada (former target was: 1-3 lowest of Ontario universities, however data is unavailable for comparison)