

# **OCUFA Funding Formula Review Handbook**

**A guide to the  
Ontario University Funding Formula Review**

**OCUFA**

Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations  
Union des Associations des Professeurs des Universités de l'Ontario

# CONTENTS

---

- 1. Introduction – What is the University Funding Formula Review?**
- 2. Funding formula principles**
- 3. Assessing the performance funding model**
- 4. The balance between tuition and public funding**
- 5. Making sense of the funding formula**
- 6. Strengths and weaknesses of the current funding regime**
- 7. Unpacking the misconceptions around Ontario’s university funding formula**
- 8. The University Funding Formula Review process – What we know**

# 1. Introduction – What is the University Funding Formula Review?

---

In 2014, the Government of Ontario signaled its intent to review the formula by which Ontario's universities are funded. In Premier Kathleen Wynne's Mandate letter to Reza Moridi, Minister of Training, Colleges, and Universities (MTCU), she asked him to:

*"[Work] with postsecondary institutions and the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario to improve the consistency and availability of institution-level and system-level outcome measures. These measures will help inform the allocation of graduate spaces, updated program approval processes and the implementation of a reformed funding model for universities."*

The funding formula review fits into the government's larger push for differentiation in the university sector. Strategic Mandate Agreements (SMAs) signed last year are the first part of the differentiation agenda. The desire to reform the funding formula can be seen as the second part of this agenda.

The government has signaled its interest in greater measurement of "outcomes" (as yet undefined), and there has been some suggestion that some portion of operating funding be allocated according to performance on these outcomes. OCUFA has serious concerns about these proposals (see Section 3), and will be expressing these concerns throughout the reform process.

OCUFA is also concerned that the funding formula review is geared to extending MTCU's ability to play a directive role in the sector. We recognize that the government is a critically important stakeholder in our institutions, and that they do have a role to play as sector stewards. However, it is important that the autonomy of our institutions be preserved to ensure academic freedom, excellent teaching, and world-class research.

The government has committed to an open consultation process around the funding formula review. They have appointed Sue Herbert as Executive Lead of the review process, and given her the authority to meet with stakeholders. An open briefing (April 27) and all-day symposium (May 6) have already been held. OCUFA expects to be consulted on a one-on-one basis over the coming months, and will be providing a written submission to the review by September 1, 2015.

OCUFA plans to engage with every part of the funding formula review to make sure the faculty perspective is given proper consideration. We take the government at its word that the process will be open, transparent, and meaningful, and we look forward to working with them over the coming months.

## 2. FUNDING FORMULA PRINCIPLES

---

In order to guide our work over the coming months, OCUFA has developed a set of principles for the funding formula review. Any changes to the existing formula, or new funding models, must be consistent with these principles.

Robust and adequate public funding for universities is crucial for a strong and thriving higher education sector. The formula that establishes the basis for allocating operating funding for Ontario universities is foundational and should be designed to foster excellence in research and teaching while ensuring that postsecondary education remains affordable and accessible. But universities in Ontario have been dealing with accumulated underfunding for years.

As such, any review or update of the funding formula must not be driven by a desire to constrain government funding, but rather must aim to improve the quality of postsecondary education.

OCUFA believes that the formula according to which Ontario's universities are funded should be guided by the following principles. Funding must be:

**Adequate:** Public funding for universities must provide adequate resources to support a high quality and affordable higher education sector.

**Committed to core activities:** A funding formula should protect and promote the two core activities of a university: excellent teaching and learning, and world-class research.

**Student-centred:** Funding must be responsive to the number of students in the system and the programs in which those students are enrolled.

**Supportive of good jobs:** Universities should receive adequate funding to support good jobs on their campuses. For faculty, this means ensuring fair terms and conditions of employment for contract faculty and hiring sufficient numbers of tenure stream faculty to maintain high academic standards and fair workloads.

**Stable and predictable:** Mechanisms should be put in place to ensure that funding is stable and predictable to facilitate long-term planning and to avoid extreme fluctuations in institutional revenue.

**Equitable:** Funding should be allocated among institutions on a fair and equitable basis to protect against wide variations in quality across the system and to support student success at all universities. Any system that allocates or withholds funding on the basis of institutional performance or output measures will result in the creation of "winners" and "losers" and will penalize students at institutions that fail to reach their targets.

**Transparent:** Any formula for allocating funding must be transparent, simple to administer and objective. It should not be arbitrary or open to manipulation or negotiations behind closed doors. Above all, university funding must not be subject to short-term political objectives.

**Respectful of university autonomy and academic freedom:** Universities and professors have rich practical knowledge of their institutional and pedagogical needs and strengths. Any funding formula must respect institutions' and professors' ability to pursue strategies that enable them to do what they do best.

### 3. ASSESSING THE PERFORMANCE FUNDING MODEL

---

When a policy is proposed, the burden of proof lies with the people making the proposal. They need to explain why the new policy is better, and they need to provide evidence to support their claim. This is how sensible policy gets made.

The Government of Ontario is interested in performance funding for universities. That much is clear. In the Premier's mandate letter to the Minister of Training, Colleges, and Universities, the Ministry was asked to improve the "consistency and availability of institution-level and system-level outcome measures" in order to help "the implementation of a reformed funding model for universities." With a review of Ontario's university funding formula on the horizon, it is likely that outcomes and performance funding will figure in the conversation.

So what is performance funding? The idea behind it is that a portion of the public funding received by universities should be determined by the ability of a given institution to meet certain performance targets. If targets are met, then funding is granted. If targets are not met, then a portion of funding will be withheld.

The argument made by its proponents is that tying funding to performance will incentivize institutions to be more productive, more efficient, and more in-tune with the labour market. There is [ample evidence](#) that Ontario's universities are extremely productive and very good at moving students into the world of work. We educate more students with less money than anywhere else in Canada. So, if there is little in the way of efficiency to be gained, the argument that performance funding improves universities needs to be very strong. We're left to ask: Does performance funding have anything to offer Ontario?

If we review the available research, there is little reason to accept the idea that performance funding will improve higher education in Ontario. There is virtually no evidence that demonstrates that performance funding improves the effectiveness of universities.

This lack of evidence is not for lack of examples. In the USA, [34 states](#) have implemented, or are in the process of implementing, some form of performance funding for higher education. The design of these funding regimes varies wildly. In Indiana, six per cent of state funding is allocated according to performance indicators. In Tennessee – the state often held up as an exemplar of performance funding – between 80 and 85 per cent of state funding is allocated through outcome-based metrics. Some states have had decades of experience with performance funding, while others are just getting started.

Given the widespread use of performance funding in the US, one would expect to see some research suggesting that this method of allocating funds actually improves the quality of higher education. But instead the literature suggests that performance funding has, at least so far, no real benefit at all.

[In a recent study](#) published in the journal *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, researchers found that performance funding had no discernible effects on retention or degree completions at Washington State's community colleges, when compared with jurisdictions without performance funding mechanisms. This follows a 2013 [policy brief](#) from the Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education (WISCAPE) that concluded, *"Results suggest the [performance funding] policy has not been significantly effective for increasing associate or baccalaureate degree completions in performance funding states, and it may even have had negative effects in some states."*

Closer to home, the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) [recently released](#) an "extensive review of outcomes-based funding models used in postsecondary education and their effectiveness." It found that, "research on outcomes-based funding of higher education has shown little evidence that these policies are associated with improved student outcomes." All of these studies are easy to find, and a simple Google search will return many more studies that outline the lack of evidence for – and the evidence against – performance funding.

Curiously, the President and CEO of HEQCO [put out a blog post](#) counselling that we not worry too much about the lack of evidence revealed by his own organization's research. According to what he describes as "human nature and basic laws of behavior," performance funding just works. Some readers may be surprised to learn that human nature and behavior is so rigid and immutable.

This laissez-faire attitude towards evidence in policy-making is risky. There is considerable evidence that performance funding produces [a variety of unintended consequences](#), some that could harm higher education in Ontario. For example, in the Washington study, the researchers found that one clear response to performance funding was the increased granting of short-term certificates. These credentials have limited labour market utility, but have the advantage of moving students through an institution quickly, thereby protecting student retention and graduation rates (often key metrics in performance funding regimes). Performance targets have been met by blasting students through the institution, but graduates are left with a questionable credential on the other end. That's not performance—that's the academic equivalent of cooking the books.

Evidence suggests that another unintended consequence may be [the raising of admission requirements](#), with negative implications for equity and access. More qualified – or at least better prepared – students are more likely to persist to degree completion, again boosting performance stats. But this might hurt prospective students from marginalized backgrounds, and harm institutions who work to serve these individuals (like historically black colleges in the USA). In this instance, performance funding cuts against broader societal access to higher education, while penalizing universities who seek to enroll under-represented students. In the end, "Trust us!" is a poor argument for policy change. Ontario's university funding formula is critical to the quality and accessibility of the sector. Changes to the formula cannot be justified on good intentions and fond hopes alone. The proponents of performance funding

have a responsibility to show us how their ideas will make Ontario's universities better. The burden of proof belongs to them. And so far, the proof they need to make their case is in short supply.

## 4. THE BALANCE BETWEEN TUITION AND PUBLIC FUNDING

---

For the first time ever, tuition fee revenue has exceeded public operating funding for Ontario's universities. Tuition fees now account for almost 51 per cent of the university operating budgets across the province.

"Our universities are meant to be public – that is, supported by public dollars," said Kate Lawson, President of OCUFA. "The fact that students and their families are now shouldering the majority of the cost of higher education should be cause for concern and reflection."

The funding figures were published in the latest data release from the Council of Ontario Financial Officers – Universities of Ontario (COFO-UO) as part of their [Financial Report of Ontario Universities 2013-14](#). The COFO-UO data demonstrates that even when scholarships and other forms of institutional financial aid are subtracted from student fees, tuition revenue is still higher than public funding.

Ontario has the highest tuition fees in Canada, and the lowest level of per-student public funding. Given these facts, the eclipsing of public funding by tuition fees had become inevitable in recent years. However, it need not be a permanent state of affairs.

OCUFA has been advocating for renewed public investment in our universities, most recently in its [2015 Ontario Pre-Budget Submission](#). Not only does public investment in universities improve learning quality and support accessibility, it also has significant economic returns. A recent Conference Board of Canada report found that for every dollar invested in universities, \$1.36 is returned to the local community and to the province.

"Ontario's professors and academic librarians recognize the government is facing financial constraints," said Lawson. "But we simply can't afford to not invest in our universities. They are pillars of our communities and essential treasuries of our shared public wealth. We must ensure that they remain that way."

## 5. MAKING SENSE OF THE FUNDING FORMULA

---

For most people, even those who work in the university sector, the funding formula for Ontario universities is a bit of a mystery. It has been reformed and tweaked so many times in recent decades that it has become complicated and opaque. Its complexity makes it difficult to grasp how government funding is actually allocated among Ontario's universities. This short piece will attempt to pull back the curtain and leave the reader with a clearer sense of how the current funding formula works.

To begin with, it is important to understand that the funding formula does not determine *how much funding* is available to support universities' operating budgets, but rather *how funds are distributed* among institutions. The level of funding made available for universities is a political decision that is laid out in the Ontario Budget each year. The role of the funding formula is to provide an objective method for distributing those funds among Ontario's universities.\*

This was not always the case. When the first iteration of the current formula was established in the late 1960s, it was designed to determine the level of funding needed to deliver quality education at each institution. The formula estimated the actual cost of educating each student according to their level of study and program. Each university was then provided with an operating grant that reflected the number of students they enrolled and the estimated cost of delivering quality education to those students. This arrangement only lasted a few years. By 1973, the formula had become purely a mechanism for distribution, no longer playing a role in determining the total amount of operating support provided.

Many of the key features of the funding formula, however, are still drawn from the original model. The existing funding formula remains "student-centred" in the sense that the mechanism used to distribute operating grants reflects enrolment numbers. Enrolment is weighted by level of study and program by assigning basic income units (BIUs) that reflect the relative costs of teaching and research. By level of study, for example, more funding is needed to support the smaller class sizes and one-to-one mentoring of graduate students in their education as scholars than introductory course lectures for more junior undergraduates. By program, the cost of maintaining a lab for teaching and research in the physical sciences is more expensive than the parallel activities in the social sciences. More expensive programs are therefore assigned higher BIU weights.

In the current formula, the dollar value of the BIU is determined by the total amount of funding available (determined by the Ontario Budget) divided by the number of BIUs distributed each year. Operating grants are then allocated to each institution based on their share of these eligible BIUs. All of this is pretty straightforward, but the next step is where the formula gets a bit counter-intuitive. A university's share of BIUs is not simply calculated on a year-to-year basis. Instead, it is based on their historical share of funding as of the 1986-87 school year (an

arbitrary date that reflects the introduction of the current policy). This reference date can be changed over time, but has not been updated for many years.

Beginning from this reference date, each institution's share of available funding remains the same unless their number of BIUs changes substantially (the current threshold is whether a university's five-year 'moving-average' of BIUs has increased or decreased by 3 per cent). This is known as the "corridor model" and was put in place to ensure continuity and stability in funding for the sector. It also protects against institutions taking advantage of the funding regime by expanding enrolments to receive additional funds at the expense of other institutions.

The result is a method for allocating funding that at its core reflects the number of students in the system, but the level of funding is not directly dependent on the actual enrolment in any given year. This model supports a certain degree of consistency and predictability in funding, but in its current iteration provides no mechanism for ensuring that the amount of funding each institution receives is adequate to deliver high-quality education. Stay tuned for the next part in this series, which will explore the strengths and weaknesses of the current funding formula for Ontario universities in more depth.

*\*Government funding for universities is made up of two components: funding envelopes that have been put in place to provide mission-specific funding (e.g. to support bilingual or northern institutions) and basic operating grants that account for most public funding. It is the basic operating grants that are distributed according to the funding formula at issue here.*

## 6. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE CURRENT FUNDING REGIME

---

Now that we have a handle on [the origins of the funding formula and how it actually works](#), it is clear that as it currently exists, the funding formula for Ontario's universities has some important strengths that ought to be preserved as well as some problematic weaknesses that must be addressed. This installment of OCUFA Report's funding formula series will highlight the aspects of the current funding formula that aren't working and need to be corrected as well as those aspects that are working well and should be protected or enhanced in the upcoming funding formula review.

### **Weaknesses**

There are two key weaknesses of the current funding formula that should be addressed in the funding formula review. First, the formula no longer estimates the true cost of educating a student. Second, the current formula is overly complex and opaque.

The funding formula, as originally conceived, provided an estimate of the actual cost of educating a student in a given program or at a given level of study, and then multiplied this number by the number of students enrolled. In the current model, the government determines the overall amount of funding available for universities, and uses the number of students enrolled in a given year to divide that predetermined amount of funding among institutions. It is a distribution mechanism only, with little relationship to the true cost of education. When the real cost of educating a student ceases to be a factor that determines the levels of funding that government provides to our universities, then the funding formula is no longer responsive to the financial realities faced by universities and faculty. This shift away from a funding model that is based on real costs contributes significantly to the biggest challenge currently facing the university sector: underfunding. The lack of financial resources underpins a variety of problems, from high tuition fees to the rise of contract faculty employment to billions of dollars of deferred maintenance on Ontario's campuses.

In a previous column, OCUFA attempted to [demystify the logic of the current funding formula](#). This is not a simple task, as decades of tweaks and add-ons have modified the original core formula in such a way as to make the overall funding regime complicated and difficult to understand – even to those in the sector. For example, in addition to the core logic of distributing funding on the basis of enrolment, the formula also uses the 1986-87 year as a baseline for funding. This was originally done to ensure some stability for institutions, a “floor” below which funding could not fall. Now, this provision strikes many as arbitrary and increasingly irrelevant. There are also additional calculations/allocations for a variety of special purpose funding envelopes, for everything from accessibility to supporting Northern institutions. These are obviously important areas of investment, but the continual layering of

new envelope funds makes the formula even more complex. It would be much simpler to include these priorities in base operating fund calculations.

Thus despite a clear and logical foundation, the complexity of the funding formula works against transparency, accountability and comprehension. The funding formula review is an opportunity to simplify the formula, and restore its ability to account for the true cost of a high-quality university education.

### **Strengths**

There are three key strengths of the current formula that are worthy of being protected even as changes to the funding formula are being considered. First, the funding formula is student-centred. Second, it ensures relatively stable levels of funding. And third, it ensures equity across universities throughout the province.

While the current funding formula doesn't reflect the actual cost of educating students and conducting research, it is nonetheless student-centred, insofar as the calculation for distributing funding is responsive to enrolment and provides funding to institutions on a per-student basis. Ensuring that funding for universities is tied to both the number of students in the system and the programs in which those students are enrolled is central to ensuring that universities are able to provide a high quality education to every student and is one of OCUFA's key funding formula principles.

Another key principle seeks to ensure that funding is stable and predictable through mechanisms that guard against extreme fluctuations in institutional revenue, which allows universities to make well-informed long-term plans. The stability of funding is currently protected through the corridor model, whereby the variation in an institution's allocation of funding is limited to a predetermined range based on a five-year moving average of an institution's enrolment level. To the extent that it ensures stable levels of funding over time, the corridor model – or something similar to it – should be preserved in the upcoming funding formula review.

Finally, the current funding formula distributes funding equitably across institutions – that is to say that the same rules for how funding is distributed apply equally to every institution in the province. This model prevents wide variations in quality across the province and ensures that students can access a comprehensive range of university programs relatively close to home. While some funding is allocated on the basis of institutional performance on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), as a proportion of total funding, this amount is relatively limited and should not be increased. As the funding formula is reviewed, the equitable distribution of operating funding across universities must be preserved in order to support student success throughout Ontario.

Within the current formula there are strengths that are aligned with [OCUFA's funding formula principles](#). These aspects – funding tied to students, stability, and equity – should be preserved, while the weaknesses must be addressed and corrected.

## 7. UNPACKING THE MISCONCEPTIONS AROUND ONTARIO'S UNIVERSITY FUNDING FORMULA

---

*This article looks at the two most common misconceptions about the current funding formula: that enrolment-based funding formulas encourage unsustainable growth in the university sector; and that the current funding formula does not promote educational quality.*

### **The current funding formula – on its own – does not encourage unsustainable university growth**

Ontario's university funding formula is sensitive to enrolment. That is, it distributes a certain amount of funding based on the number of students attending a particular institution, and the programs in which those students are enrolled. Some have suggested that this enrolment sensitivity creates an incentive for institutions to ramp up enrolment in order to generate more revenue. The more students through the door, the more money received by the university.

If no checks were imposed on enrolment increases, this might well be true. However, the current formula also contains a "corridor model" which prevents against institutions taking advantage of the funding regime by expanding enrolments to receive additional funds at the expense of other institutions. Any increase beyond three per cent of the university's five-year moving enrolment average will not be automatically funded, so there is little reason for an institution to admit huge numbers of new students.

Nevertheless, enrolment has increased substantially over the past decade. Since 2005, the number of students enrolled at Ontario universities has increased by 24 per cent, or nearly 100,000 students. So what's the reason for the increase, if not incentives created by the funding formula?

Simple: enrolment increased because **it was explicit government policy to increase enrolment**. In 2011, the Liberal government committed to adding 60,000 new spaces at Ontario's colleges and universities, on top of the growth permitted by the funding formula. This had the effect of removing the brakes on enrolment, which was already trending up due to the need to accommodate the Double Cohort (the large bubble of applicants created by the elimination of the OAC year), the "echo boom" increase in university-aged individuals, and rising participation rates. There was money to increase enrolment, so universities dutifully enrolled more students. After years of under-funding (Ontario currently has the lowest level of per-student public funding for universities in Canada), universities have become very good at chasing revenue.

What this demonstrates is that the current funding formula, on its own, does not encourage unsustainable or unwise enrolment growth. Growth has occurred because of government policies that encourage growth, often created for largely political reasons. This is not to say that expanding enrolment is a bad idea; quite the contrary, increasing access to higher education is a desirable thing.

But governments that complain about growth in the university sector should examine the effect of their own policies, and then work with universities and university stakeholders to develop a multi-year enrolment plan free from short-term political considerations.

In OCUFA's [principles for the funding formula](#), we highlight the need for funding to remain student centred. That is, it should be responsive to the number of students in the system and the true cost of educating those students. Enrolment sensitivity should be preserved and improved in any new formula, alongside increases to the per-student funding amount.

### **Resources, not funding formulae, determine educational quality**

Some observers have suggested that the current funding formula does not promote educational quality. For these critics, the lack of systematic performance measurement and reporting in the formula means that money is not spent effectively.

While it is true that quality is strained at Ontario's universities, blaming it on the funding formula is somewhat of a red herring. The quality of education provided by Ontario's universities is, first and foremost, a function of the resources that are put in to support teaching and learning. By this measure, Ontario is not doing well. We currently have the lowest level of per-student funding in Canada, lagging 34 per cent behind the national average. This has predictable results: class sizes go up (Ontario has the worst student-to-faculty ratio in Canada); tuition fees rise (we also have the highest fees in Canada); and infrastructure crumbles (the Council of Ontario Universities estimates [deferred maintenance at Ontario's universities now amounts to \\$2.49 billion](#)).

The university funding formula is a mechanism for distributing financial resources. If the amount of money to be distributed is inadequate, then quality will suffer. This is not a question of inadequate oversight or performance measurement. There are already a variety of accountability and reporting systems in place. Ontario universities are not, for the most part, spending money in an ineffective way. They simply do not have the resources they need to improve quality.

It is true that the Government of Ontario made significant investments in higher education as part of the *Reaching Higher* plan, which ran from 2005 to 2010. However, these investments were not large enough to fill the funding gap created by deep cuts in the mid-1990s, and creeping underfunding throughout the late 1990s and early 2000s. Much of the new funding was also eaten up by rising enrolment driven by changing demographics, an increasing university participation rate, and government policies. The lack of clear quality dividends from *Reaching Higher* was not the fault of the funding formula. It occurred because of a variety of longstanding financial, political, and social factors.

Some observers claim that a move to outcomes or performance-based funding – where a portion of funding is distributed according to how universities perform against particular targets – will help improve quality. There is virtually [no evidence to support this claim](#). Moreover, any system that allocates or withholds funding on the basis of institutional performance or output measures will result in the creation of “winners” and “losers” and will penalize students at institutions that fail to reach their

targets. OCUFA believes that university funding should be equitable and aimed at improving educational quality, not punishing institutions that under-perform on simplistic metrics.

As we enter the funding formula review, it is important that government and all stakeholders recognize that policies do not exist in a vacuum. They interact with other policies in often unforeseen ways, sometimes producing undesirable or negative consequences. The funding formula alone did not promote rapid growth in university sector, nor did it undermine quality improvements. As we examine new options for distributing funding to universities, we must recognize the role government policy plays in driving university behavior, often in unpredictable ways. We must also recognize that even a perfect funding formula cannot make a positive impact on educational quality if the overall level of resources remains inadequate.

## 8. The University Funding Formula Review process – What we know (May 9, 2015)

---

### Online Resources

At the outset of the review, MTCU released a discussion paper outlining the process, their principles, and some key discussion questions. The paper can be accessed at:

[http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/audiences/universities/uff/uff\\_ConsultationPaper.pdf](http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/audiences/universities/uff/uff_ConsultationPaper.pdf)

The review also has a dedicated website at: [www.ontario.ca/fundinguniversities](http://www.ontario.ca/fundinguniversities)

### Structure of the Review

#### *Open briefings*

MTCU will host a series of open briefings on topics relevant to the review process. The first briefing was held on April 27, 2015 on the current structure of the funding formula. The next briefing will be on May 27, 2015. OCUFA will attend all briefing sessions where appropriate.

#### *Symposia*

On May 6, 2015, MTCU hosted a day-long symposium in order to consult stakeholders on the funding formula review. OCUFA attended this event, and President Kate Lawson participated in a stakeholder panel discussion. At this point, it is not clear if future symposia are planned. If they are scheduled, they will likely be regionally based.

#### *One-on-one meetings*

Executive Lead Sue Herbert has indicated that she will meet with OCUFA several times over the coming months to discuss our principles, ideas, and concerns.

#### *Written submission*

All stakeholders have been asked to provide a written submission to the funding formula review. The submissions are due on September 1, 2015, and OCUFA plans to take full advantage of this opportunity.

**Key personnel:***Sue Herbert, Executive Lead*

Sue is a senior civil servant, with significant experience in post-secondary education. In 2013–14, she led the negotiations of Strategic Mandate Agreements with Ontario's 24 community colleges on behalf of the government.

Sue was a Deputy Minister in the Ontario Government from 1997–2008, retiring after serving as Deputy Minister of the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines, the Ministry of Education, where she represented Canada for several years at the OECD Education Directorate, and the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Prior to becoming a Deputy Minister she was the CEO of the Ontario Housing Corporation and held various Assistant Deputy Minister positions.

*Bill Praamsma, Project Director*

Bill is a MTCU Manager (Funding Policy and System Planning Unit) who has accepted a secondment to the University Funding Formula Review

*Reference Panel*

Sue Herbert has set up a reference panel which she plans to consult during the review. The terms of reference for the panel are not available, and OCUFA is seeking more clarity on what role the panel will play in the process.

We do not have a complete list of the members of the panel, but it includes:

Tony Chambers, Professor, OISE/UofT  
Glen Craney, Executive Director, ONCAT  
Harvey Weingarten, President and CEO, HEQCO\*  
Alex Usher, Higher Education Strategy Associates\*  
David Trick, David Trick & Associates

\*OCUFA does not view these individuals as neutral, as they have either attacked faculty publicly or pursued evident agendas contrary to the interest of OCUFA's members.