

SENATE LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday June 3, 2024

10:00 – 11:00 A.M. EST

NH 3318 / Zoom

TIMING	AGENDA ITEM	PAGE	ACTION
10:00 a.m. 10:05 a.m. (10 min) 10:15 a.m. (40 min)	OPEN SESSION		
	1. Declarations of Conflict of Interest a. Excerpt from Bylaw 1, section 8	Oral 3	Information
	2. Minutes of April 10, 2024* and Business Arising To approve the minutes as distributed/amended.	5	Decision
	3. Chair’s Remarks (Rush)		Information
	4. Annual 2023-24 Institutional Performance and Priorities for 2024-25* (Goel) 5. Other Business	7	Discussion
10:55 a.m. (5 min)	CONFIDENTIAL SESSION Committee members, Secretariat and Technical Staff as required		
	6. Senate Self-Evaluation Survey Results *	17	Oral/Discussion
	7. Other Business 8. Next Meeting: Wednesday September 11, 2024 from 1:30-3:00 p.m.		

May 29, 2024

 Mike Grivicic
 Associate University Secretary

This page intentionally left blank.

Excerpt from Senate Bylaw 1

8. Declarations of conflict of interest

8.01	At the beginning of each meeting of Senate or any of Senate’s committees or councils, the chair will call for members to declare any conflicts of interest with regard to any agenda item. For agenda items to be discussed in closed session, the chair will call for declarations of conflict of interest at the beginning of the closed portion of the meeting. Members may nonetheless declare conflicts at any time during a meeting.
8.02	A member shall be considered to have an actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest, when the opportunity exists for the member to use confidential information gained as a member of Senate, or any of Senate’s committees or councils, for the personal profit or advantage of any person, or use the authority, knowledge or influence of the Senate, or a committee or council thereof, to further her/his personal, familial or corporate interests or the interests of an employee of the university with whom the member has a marital, familial or sexual relationship.
8.03	Members who declare conflicts of interest shall not enter into debate nor vote upon the specified item upon which they have declared a conflict of interest. The chair will determine whether it is appropriate for said member to remove themselves from the meeting for the duration of debate on the specified item(s).
8.04	Where Senate or a committee or council of Senate is of the opinion that a conflict of interest exists that has not been declared, the body may declare by a resolution carried by two-thirds of its members present at the meeting that a conflict of interest exists and a member thus found to be in conflict shall not enter into debate on the specified item upon which they have declared a conflict of interest. The chair will determine whether it is appropriate for said member to remove themselves from the meeting for the duration of debate on the specified item(s).

This page intentionally left blank.

University of Waterloo
SENATE LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
Minutes of the meeting held April 10, 2024
[in agenda order]

Present: Nasser Abukhdeir, Jeff Casello, Paul Fieguth, Bruce Frayne, Vivek Goel, Rob Gorbet, Mike Grivicic (secretary), Kevin Hare, Narveen Jandu, Shana McDonald, Jacinda Reitsma, James Rush (chair), Diana Vangelisti

Absent: Sheila Ager*, Judy Castaneda, Trevor Charles, Charmaine Dean*, Mark Giesbrecht*, Chris Houser*, Lili Liu*, Kristiina Montero, Siva Sivoththaman*, Mary Wells*, Annie Yang
*regrets

Resources/Guests: Michael Dorr, Jenny Flagler-George, Beth Namachchivaya

Organization of Meeting: James Rush took the chair, and Mike Grivicic acted as secretary. The secretary advised that due notice of the meeting had been given, a quorum was present, and the meeting was properly constituted.

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were declared.

2. MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2024 MEETING AND BUSINESS ARISING

A motion was heard to approve the minutes as distributed. Abukhdeir and Gorbet. Carried.

3. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Rush indicated that future agenda items for this committee will include an item on annual performance reporting in June 2024, as well as the campus master plan.

4. WATERLOO VALUES – REVIEW OF DRAFT VALUES STATEMENT

Goel spoke to the process of developing the draft values statement, with the need for such a statement coming to the fore in the President's Anti-Racism Taskforce (PART) Report, Waterloo at 100, and the report from the Provost's Advisory Committee on Building a Resilient University of Waterloo. It is anticipated that the values statement will be brought to the May Senate meeting and thereafter to the Board of Governors in June.

Dorr provided an overview of the report and the draft values statement: consultations of the working group over the past year; development of the values statement was an iterative process; key feedback was to keep the statement simple and utilize plain language; the values statement intends to display what makes Waterloo unique and different from other institutions, with a bias toward action and orientation to positive impacts; acknowledgement of co-operative education and experiential education, which are comparative advantages of Waterloo. Members discussed: setting values is just the beginning, acting on values and making decisions with values in mind are key; metrics follow values, we need to first decide what is important to us; key performance indicators will be forthcoming; useful example of implementation from Imperial College London; several other initiatives on campus will dovetail with this and allow integration into those initiatives; people looking to join our community will look at our values; add language for ensure gender inclusivity; for implementation and integration of values to take hold, it will be important for members of the community to have time dedicated in the work day to learn about the values and become oriented to them; these values will send an important message to co-op employers, research partners, community partners, prospective students, and alumni.

5. INTEGRATIVE LIBRARY SPACE AND UTILIZATION STRATEGY

Rush introduced the report and presenters, emphasizing that the strategy is less a space plan and more towards supporting the academic and research mission via collaborations, technology, utilization of space, services and support.

Namachchivaya and Fieguth provided a presentation on the strategy: work to date is supported by the provost's commission; range of stakeholders are involved and this exercise is one of integrated planning; broad representation on steering committee; trends and changes to Library usage provoke the question of how to

reimagine the space and the services that will be needed going forward; Western provides a good example of a reimagined Library spaces, which was informed by campus consultation and supported by an external design firm to identify short-term and long-term actions. Members discussed: this committee can be a regular sounding board for this project over time; the approach taken here departs from the usual process where building plans are prepared first, in this case we are securing input earlier to inform planning; with funds required to be spent on deferred maintenance in any event, these are opportunities to think ahead on space usage/renovation and to replicate the process for other spaces over time; able to delineate the built environment from the Library's services, towards new uses or simply to retain flexibility in space usage; steering committee is able to liaise with Faculties at the appropriate times; useful case studies for reimagination and reinvention exist in the University of Toronto Mississauga Library as well as in public libraries; space for study and congregation is particularly valuable to students who may not otherwise have access to high quality space; unanticipated outcomes of the Western example included impacts on staffing; this would be a strong candidate project for philanthropic support. A copy of the provost's commission will be distributed to members following the meeting.

6. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

7. NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting is Monday June 3, 2024 from 10:00 – 11:00 a.m.

May 24, 2024

Mike Grivicic
Associate University Secretary



To: Senate Long Range Planning
From: Vivek Goel, President and Vice-Chancellor
Date: May 29, 2024
Subject: 2023-24 KPI Report - SLRP

Each year, the Senate Long Range Planning Committee reviews the institution's annual performance through a Report on Institutional Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Please find enclosed the 2023-24 KPI Report for our meeting next week.

This Report is comprised of a KPI dashboard that includes key institutional metrics over time. Starting this year, measures are organized under goals from our long-term vision for [Waterloo at 100](#). These include our mission-oriented goals for (1) Community, Campus, and Culture; (2) Knowledge, Graduates, and Co-op; (3) Fundamental and Applied Research; and (4) Innovation and Entrepreneurship. A final set of KPIs falls under Operational Indicators, tracking indices relating to staff, alumni, and our environmental and financial performance.

Many of our KPIs allow for peer comparison across Canada and Ontario. As many national and provincial surveys are held every three years, additional indicators are relied upon from our own surveys and data sources available annually, which may not have comparators. In these cases, we review progress against our own performance over previous years.

The KPI Report also includes an Insights Report on a specific area. This year's Insights Report focuses on the results of our most recent Employee Engagement Survey. These results are helping to inform current and planned initiatives to enhance the employee experience including in areas such as wellness, engagement, and talent development.

During our meeting, I will highlight a range of KPIs from the dashboard and Insights Report, as well as speak to the institution's top priorities for the year ahead. At the next meeting of Senate on June 10, the 2023-24 KPI Report will be presented under the report of the Senate Long Range Planning Committee. The Board of Governors then receives the Report at its meeting on June 18.

2023-2024 Key Performance Indicators Report

Notes: A variety of data sources are used for the KPIs. Sources for each indicator are conveyed in square brackets. Data sources have differing years and reporting frequencies (i.e., not all align to shared time periods such as 2020-2021, 2021-2022, and 2022-2023). To account for this variability, the specific period for each indicator is noted below each data point from older to the most recent. The trend column shows Waterloo’s performance in the most recent period compared to the oldest with either a positive (green), undesirable (red), or a dash (static). The trend column offers an “at a glance” view and does not indicate significance of change. Comparator data is not available for indicators that use internal data sources (e.g. Waterloo’s student experience survey (SES)). Values presented for the peer groups are the average of the group unless otherwise noted. This report, now completed in May for reporting in June, reflects our transition from fall to spring reporting. As a result, several indicators that were provided in fall 2023 do not yet have new data available and have the same data as reported in fall 2023.

Key performance indicator			Waterloo				Comparator			
			Older	→	Most recent	Trend	Peer group	Older	→	Most recent
Community, campus, and culture (C)										
Student experience	1. Students feel like they are part of the Waterloo community [NSSE]	First year	N/A	74.6% 2020	73.6% 2023	↓	U15	N/A	70.7% 2020	70.4% 2023
		Graduating year	N/A	63.9% 2020	68.5% 2023	↑	U15	N/A	63.1% 2020	64.7% 2023
	2. Students feel that they belong at Waterloo [SES]	64.0% Fall 2022	64.0% Fall 2023	64.2% Winter 2024	↑	No peer comparison				
	3. Students feel that their instructors care about their wellbeing [SES]	55.0% Fall 2022	54.8% Fall 2023	52.8% Winter 2024	↓	No peer comparison				
Knowledge, graduates, and co-op (K)										
Academics	4. Percentage of students with entering average >90% [OUAC]		69.5% 2020	75.7% 2021	72.0% 2022	↑	U6	60.1% 2020	69.8% 2021	65.9% 2022
	5. First to second year student retention [CSRDE]		93.2% 2021	92.5% 2022	93.6% 2023	↑	U6	91.8% Returned Fall 2021	91.1% Returned Fall 2022	92.1% Returned Fall 2023
	6. Graduation rates [UW and U15]	Undergraduate (six years after start)	84.3% 2021	85.2% 2022	85.1% 2023	↑	U6	79.9% 2021	80.6% 2022	81.6% 2023
		Masters (four years after start)	88.2% 2019	90.4% 2020	90.7% 2021	↑	U6	91.4% 2019	92.2% 2020	92.7% 2021
Doctoral (six years after start)		60.5% 2020	63.3% 2021	65.4% 2022	↑	U6	54.8% 2020	54.4% 2021	55.5% 2022	

2023-2024 Key Performance Indicators Report

Key performance indicator	Waterloo				Comparator				
	Older	→	Most recent	Trend	Peer group	Older	→	Most recent	
7. Graduate employment rate two years after graduation by survey year [OUGS]	94.9% 2020	95.5% 2021	96.3% 2022	↑	ON	92.7% 2020	94.3% 2021	95.1% 2022	
8. Graduates' employment related to skills developed at university two year after graduation by survey year [OUGS]	92.7% 2020	92.6% 2021	95.2% 2022	↑	ON	87.4% 2020	87.5% 2021	87.9% 2022	
9. Graduates earning above \$60K two years after graduation by survey year [OUGS]	55.9% 2020	63.8% 2021	68.3% 2022	↑	U6	41.2% 2020	46.5% 2021	52.6% 2022	
10. Percentage of full-time co-op enrolment [UW and U15]	Undergraduate	73.8% 2021-2022	75.8% 2022-2023	76.2% 2023-2024	↑	U15	12.3% 2021-2022	12.6% 2022-2023	12.9% 2023-2024
	Graduate	5.8% 2021-2022	7.9% 2022-2023	8.3% 2023-2024	↑	U15	1.1% 2021-2022	0.9% 2022-2023	0.9% 2023-2024
11. Participation in two or more engaging learning practices – excluding WIL [SES]	88.5% Fall 2022	N/A	92.5% Winter 2024	↑	No peer comparison				
Fundamental and applied research (R)									
Research	12. Annual research revenue (\$M) [CAUBO]	\$211.2 2019-2020	\$221.0 2020-2021	\$196.3 2021-2022	↓	U15	\$420.9 2019-2020	\$479.5 2020-2021	\$461.9 2021-2022
		CND comprehensive ¹		\$94.2 2019-2020		\$100.4 2020-2021	\$96.4 2021-2022		
	13. Research revenue from industry / non-governmental sources (\$M) [CAUBO]	\$48.2 2019-2020	\$45.8 2020-2021	\$39.9 2021-2022	↓	U15	\$149.0 2019-2020	\$154.5 2020-2021	\$156.6 2021-2022
		CND comprehensive ¹		\$21.6 2019-2020		\$21.4 2020-2021	\$22.3 2021-2022		

¹ Canadian comprehensive comparators (based on Maclean's ranking, see page 7)

2023-2024 Key Performance Indicators Report

Key performance indicator	Waterloo				Comparator			
	Older	→	Most recent	Trend	Peer group	Older	→	Most recent
14. Publications among top 10% most interdisciplinary indexed [Elsevier]	10.4%		10.4%	—	U15	3 rd		3 rd
	2017-2021	10.3%	2019-2023		Intl comparators ² (n=22)	2017-2021	3 rd	2018-2022
15. Publications with international collaborators [Leiden]	57.6%		60.3%	↑	U15	56.5%		58.4%
	2016-2019	59.4%	2018-2021			2016-2019	57.7%	2017-2020
Innovation and entrepreneurship (E)								
16. Universities globally producing investment-backed undergraduate entrepreneurs [PitchBook]	22 nd		21 st	↑	U15	1 st		1 st
	2021	21 st	2023		Intl comparators ² (n=38)	20 th		21 st
17. Universities globally producing investment-backed undergraduate female entrepreneurs [PitchBook]	N/A		33 rd	↑	U15	N/A		3 rd
		37 th	2023		Intl comparators ² (n=38)	N/A		19 th
18. Universities globally producing investment-backed graduate entrepreneurs - [PitchBook]	N/A		64 th	↑	U15	N/A		4 th
		96 th	2023		Intl comparators ² (n=38)	N/A		19 th
19. Research-backed startup intensity: number of startups / \$100M in annual research funding (ten-year average) [AUTM]	6.2		6.2	—	U15 (median)	1.1		1.0
	2011-2020	6.5	2013-2022			2011-2020	1.0	2012-2021
								2013-2022

² International comparators (see page 7)

2023-2024 Key Performance Indicators Report

Key performance indicator	Waterloo				Comparator					
	Older	→	Most recent	Trend	Peer group	Older	→	Most recent		
20. Academic-corporate collaboration: number and percentage of outputs that have been co-authored by researchers from both academic and corporate affiliations. [SciVal]	4.6% 2017-2021	→	4.8% 2018-2022	4.6% 2019-2023	—	U15	8 th 2017-2021	7 th 2018-2022	6 th 2019-2023	
						CND comprehensive ¹ (n=14)	1 st 2017-2021	1 st 2018-2022	1 st 2019-2023	
						Intl comparators ² (n=22)	20 th 2017-2021	20 th 2018-2022	20 th 2019-2023	
21. Policy cited scholarly output (e.g., publications), normalized ³ ; world average expected value = 1 [SciVal and Overton]	1.8 2021	→	1.9 2022	2.0 2023	↑	U15	15 th 2021	15 th 2022	12 th 2023	
						Intl comparators ² (n=26)	12 th 2021	15 th 2022	14 th 2023	
Operational indicators										
Staff	22. Staff ⁴ turnover rate [UW]	7.8% 2021	→	10.0% 2022	7.6% 2023	↓	No peer comparison			
Alumni	23. New funds raised (\$M) ⁵ [CASE]	\$30.2 2020-2021	→	\$36.9 2021-2022	\$39.3 2022-2023	↑	Participating comprehensive institutions ⁶	\$18.6 2020-2021	\$19.9 2021-2022	\$14.4 2022-2023
	24. Engaged alumni as a percentage of contactable alumni [CASE]	32.3% 2020-2021	→	22.5% 2021-2022	21.1% 2022-2023	↓	Participating CDN institutions	24.8% 2020-2021	7.4% 2021-2022	15.0% 2022-2023
	25. Alumni donors as a percentage of contactable alumni [CASE]	2.5% 2020-2021	→	2.7% 2021-2022	2.2% 2022-2023	↓	Participating comprehensive institutions	1.0% 2020-2021	1.1% 2021-2022	1.7% 2022-2023

³ This indicator is calculated by taking the percentage of Waterloo's policy cited scholarly output and dividing it by the average global policy cited scholarly output. The global average is the expected value of 1.0. Values greater than 1.0 are higher than expected and less than 1.0 are lower than expected.

⁴ More specific results to questions addressing staff engagement available in the Insights report

⁵ Advancement funds raised includes pledges, stock / property, cash, recurring gift (five-year value), gift-in-kind, private sector research grants, and other funds.

⁶ Maclean's University Rankings: Canada's comprehensive universities – participation in CASE is not mandatory and therefore peer group may change each year

2023-2024 Key Performance Indicators Report

Key performance indicator		Waterloo				Comparator			
		Older	→	Most recent	Trend	Peer group	Older	→	Most recent
Environmental Sustainability	26. Greenhouse gas emissions percentage change from 2015 base year [UW]	-5.8% 2020	-2.1% 2021	-8.8% 2022	↓	No peer comparison			
Financial	27. Net operating revenues ratio [COU] ⁷ (Cash flow from operating activities as a proportion of revenues)	18.8% 2020-2021	10.8% 2021-2022	7.7% 2022-2023	↓	ON universities with full-time enrolment >30K	19.6% 2020-2021	9.2% 2021-2022	8.3% 2022-2023
	28. Net income / loss ratio [COU] (Total revenues - total expenses / total revenues)	9.8% 2020-2021	4.8% 2021-2022	4.2% 2022-2023	↓		10.5% 2020-2021	3.9% 2021-2022	5.0% 2022-2023
	29. Primary reserve ratio (days) [COU] (Expendable net assets / total expenses * 365)	214 2020-2021	234 2021-2022	236 2022-2023	↑		236 2020-2021	234 2021-2022	227 2022-2023
	30. Viability ratio [COU] (Expendable net assets / long-term debt)	No external long-term debt					219.8% 2020-2021	212.0% 2021-2022	227.0% 2022-2023

⁷ Compiled by COU from institutional audited financial statements based on the Ministry of Colleges and Universities (MCU) financial indicator definitions

2023-2024 Key Performance Indicators Report

Definitions of acronyms (alphabetically)

AUTM Association of University Technology Managers
CASE Council for Advancement and Support of Education
CAUBO Canadian Association of University Business Officers
COFO Council of Ontario Finance Officers
COU Council of Ontario Universities
CSRDE Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange

NSSE National Survey of Student Engagement
OUAC Ontario University Application Centre
OUGS Ontario University Graduate Survey
SES Student Experience Survey
UW Waterloo data (internal)

Peer group references

ON All Ontario universities (Algoma, Brock, Carleton, Guelph, Lakehead, Laurentian, Laurier, McMaster, Nipissing, OCAD, Ontario Tech University, Ottawa, Queen's, Toronto, Metropolitan (formerly Ryerson), Trent, Waterloo, Western)
U15 U15 Canada is an association of fifteen leading research universities across Canada (UBC, Calgary, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Waterloo, Western, McMaster, Toronto, Queens, Ottawa, McGill, Laval, Montreal, Dalhousie)
U6 U15 members who are in Ontario (Waterloo, Western, McMaster, Toronto, Queens, Ottawa)
Comprehensive Universities classified as comprehensive in Maclean's university ranking (Concordia, Carleton, Regina, Guelph, Memorial, New Brunswick, Windsor, Université du Québec à Montréal, Toronto Metropolitan University, Laurier, Brock, Simon Fraser University, Victoria, York, Waterloo)
ON universities with full-time enrolment >30K McMaster, Ottawa, Toronto Metropolitan, Toronto, Waterloo, Western, York
Core international comparators: Carnegie Mellon University, Chalmers University of Technology, Delft University of Technology, Georgia Institute of Technology, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, KAIST, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Leiden (has a University Medical Centre) University, MIT, Princeton, Purdue University, Stockholm University, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology at Zurich, Technical University of Berlin, University of California at Berkeley, University of California at Santa Barbara, University of Colorado Boulder, University of Strathclyde, University of Technology Sydney, University of Twente, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (**Relevant indicators:** Publications among top 10% most interdisciplinary indexed, Academic-Corporate Collaboration)

Additional international comparators:

- **Universities globally producing investment-backed undergraduate, female, and grad entrepreneurs:** Core international comparators (see above) plus Stanford University, Harvard University, University of Pennsylvania, Cornell University, Tel Aviv University, University of Michigan, University of Texas, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Yale University, University of Southern California (USC), Columbia University, University of Illinois, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay, New York University, Duke University, Brown University
- **Policy cited scholarly output:** Core international comparators (see above) plus Technical University of Denmark, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Polytechnic University of Milan, Hong Kong Polytechnic University

2023-2024 Key Performance Indicators Report

Insight Report: Employee engagement survey

Employee Engagement Survey question		% favorable responses (agree, strongly agree)		
		2019	2023	Relative to previous year
Engagement	1. Overall employee engagement	75	70	↓
	2. The university motivates me to do more than is required.	57	50	↓
	3. I would recommend the university as a good place to work.	82	77	↓
	4. I feel proud to work for the university.	83	77	↓
	5. I feel motivated to do more than is required of me.	75	68	↓
	6. Given your choice, how long would you plan to continue working for the university? (favourable response indicates five years or more)	77	79	↑
Enablement	7. Overall enablement	69	71	↑
	8. My job makes good use of my skills and abilities.	84	84	—
	9. My job provides opportunities to do challenging and interesting work.	83	83	—
	10. Conditions in my job allow me to be about as productive as I can be.	59	62	↑
	11. There are no significant barriers at work to doing my job well.	51	54	↑

Effectiveness profile

2019	Low Engagement	High Engagement
High Enablement	11% Detached Not engaged but enabled	51% Most effective Both engaged and enabled
Low Enablement	22% Least effective Neither engaged nor enabled	17% Frustrated Engaged but not enabled

2023	Low Engagement	High Engagement
High Enablement	17% Detached Not engaged but enabled	46% Most effective Both engaged and enabled
Low Enablement	24% Least effective Neither engaged nor enabled	13% Frustrated Engaged but not enabled

2023-2024 Key Performance Indicators Report

Employee engagement survey dimensions

Dimensions are created by combining related survey questions. The score for each dimension is the average of the % favourable responses (agree, strongly agree) for the questions included. For example, the training dimension included questions 61, 62 and 63; the per cent favourable for each question was averaged to 48%.

2019 Employee engagement survey dimensions		% favourable responses (agree, strongly agree)
Lowest scoring	Training	48%
	Work, structure, and process	48%
	Communication and Collaboration	52%
Highest scoring	Authority and empowerment	77%
	Performance management	74%
	Development opportunities	73%

2023 Employee engagement survey dimensions		% favourable responses (agree, strongly agree)
Lowest scoring	Work, structure, and process	46%
	Pay and benefits	47%
	Training	48%
Highest scoring	Performance management	74%
	Authority and empowerment	73%
	Development opportunities	71%