



**BOARD OF GOVERNORS
Strategy & Planning Committee**

**Minutes for the Public Meeting of Wednesday, January 18, 2017
1:55 p.m. to 3:05 p.m., ERC 3023**

Attendees: John McKinley (Acting Chair), Don Duval (*via teleconference*), Miles Goacher (*non-voting guest*), Adele Imrie, Tim McTiernan, Glenna Raymond, Ololade Sanusi (*via teleconference*), Bonnie Schmidt (*via teleconference*), John Speers, Mary Steele, Shirley Van Nuland

Staff: Becky Dinwoodie, Craig Elliott, Cheryl Foy, Douglas Holdway, Brad MacIsaac, Susan McGovern, Michael Owen, Deborah Saucier

Regrets: Jay Lefton, Valarie Wafer

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:12 p.m.

2. Agenda

The Agenda was approved, as presented.

3. Conflict of Interest Declaration

There were none.

4. Chair's Remarks

J. McKinley served as Chair in V. Wafer's absence. He welcomed the Committee members and wished them Happy New Year. He kept his remarks brief in the interest of allowing more time for discussion.

5. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of November 9, 2016

Upon a motion duly made by A. Imrie and seconded by S. Van Nuland, the Minutes were approved, as presented.

6. President's Remarks

- COU/UC Strategic Initiatives

T. McTiernan provided a COU update to the Committee. He advised that the COU is in the early stages of conducting a yearlong conversation with Ontario residents regarding the value of a university education. They are trying to shift the topic of discussion away from “Which is better – college or university?” and instead focus on the knowledge and skills of university graduates and how they contribute to larger society.

T. McTiernan also reported on UC initiatives. UC is advocating for the support of student well-being, particularly in regards to student mental health issues. A member asked whether the UC has learned anything new regarding levels of federal support. T. McTiernan responded that they have seen strong policy support and the government is currently reviewing a series of reports that will help define priorities for the upcoming budget. M. Owen provided an update on the status of innovation reports to the government.

The Committee discussed the colleges’ approach to developing their executive compensation plans and how it differs from the approach taken by universities. T. McTiernan discussed the difference between the governing legislation of universities and colleges. He confirmed that the COU has an external firm conducting the benchmarking for salary comparators and the university will work together with the COU on this process.

7. Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA)

D. Saucier delivered a presentation on the SMA. She reviewed the SMA goals from 2014-2017. She expects that it will be a 3-year SMA, but has also heard that some aspects could be implemented for 5 years. She discussed the potential differences between the SMA versions. The SMA will be tied to the 2017-2022 Strategic Plan and she reminded the Committee of the 3 main pillars of the 2017 Strategic Plan: Challenge, Innovate, and Connect.

D. Saucier reviewed the key aspects of the current SMA (SMA 1.0) and then presented how the next SMA (SMA 2.0) might compare in respect of the following:

- Student Populations/Mobility
- Research/ Innovation
- Economic Development/Jobs
- Teaching & Learning/Programs

She explained the proposed corridor-funding model. She noted that there is no new money in the system. If an institution falls below its corridor for a period of time, the government will

reduce its funding accordingly. The purpose of shifting to a corridor model is to have a predictable amount of funding going to institutions on an annual basis. Corridor funding existed in the 90's and disappeared with the double cohort.

D. Saucier discussed the difference between a business income unit (BIU) and full-time equivalent (FTE). As long as an institution remains in the selected corridor, it will receive the same amount of funding. She reviewed the pros and cons of being at the bottom of a corridor. She also explained how funding could be transferred from the corridor to differentiation through key performance indicators (KPIs). There will be several standard KPIs, but the university will also have to develop some its own KPIs. The Ministry's chief negotiator will be Bonnie Paterson, who fully understands the corridor model. A member noted the similarity of the introduction of KPIs in the postsecondary sector to what was implemented in the health sector. There was an engaged discussion regarding how the corridor will be structured, as well as how the BIU will be set.

8. Retention

D. Saucier delivered a presentation entitled "Student Success". She reviewed the characteristics of the typical UOIT student. The 2012-2016 Strategic Plan set a goal of increasing retention by 3%, which was achieved (77% to 80%). We must consider what the right target is for the 2017 plan. She reviewed the UOIT and system retention and admission averages. There was a discussion regarding Algoma's ability to retain students. When comparing UOIT to similar institutions, it might be more reasonable to set a goal of 82% retention.

D. Saucier presented the recommendations/initiatives for improving retention, which include:

- introduction of diagnostic testing;
- 1st year courses taught by FT faculty & ensuring link with learning strategist in student life;
- enhancing transition programs;
- re-orienting students after receiving their first grade (approximately 3 weeks into a course) – used example of the Dean of Health Sciences speaking to classes after receiving their first grade to give students advice on how to improve performance;
- implementing an early warning system; and
- increased training for administrative & faculty advisors.

She explained that some students experiencing difficulties do not seek help because they are embarrassed. We must continue to work on providing students the support they need. There was a discussion as to what initiatives have been successful in increasing retention. D. Saucier informed the Committee that because the initiatives have not been introduced systematically, it has been difficult to identify which have been most effective. Concern was raised about the resources needed to implement the recommendations. B. MacIsaac advised that certain steps can be taken that are low cost and effective, such as online diagnostic testing for students. He also identified several successful initiatives, including:

- “I Begin” in Student Life;
- PASS – peer-assisted support sessions; and
- FEAS early warning system.

A member suggested that if the goal is to increase retention by 1%, perhaps we should consider increasing the target to 3%. D. Saucier responded that it might be difficult given our program mix.

9. Other Business

There was none.

10. Termination

There being no other business, upon a motion duly made by S. Van Nuland and seconded by D. Duval, the public session of the meeting terminated at 3:30 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary