STRATEGIC MANDATE AGREEMENT

'X' University

2017-20

Draft Submission Template between the
Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development and 'X University'

Institution
logo here

Ontario

Ontario's Vision for Postsecondary Education

Ontario's colleges and universities will drive creativity, innovation, knowledge, skills development and community engagement through teaching and learning, research, and service.

Ontario's colleges and universities will put students first by providing the best possible learning experience for all qualified learners in an affordable and financially sustainable way, ensuring high quality and globally competitive outcomes for students and Ontario's economy.

[Name of University] Vision, Mission and Mandate

Institutional mandate, mission, and vision statements describe where an institution currently is and where it sees itself in the future. [Name of University] submitted the following during the 2014-17 Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) process:

- **To be pre-populated by MAESD**

If your institutional mandate, mission and vision have changed, or will be changing, since SMA 2014-17, please provide the following:

- *Institutional mandate statement – identifies an institution's current role within Ontario's postsecondary education system, as it relates to establishing legislation (as applicable) and current strategic plan;*
- *Institutional mission statement – describes how priority activities undertaken at an institution help to further its mandate; and,*
- *Institutional vision statement – indicates how an institution's future aspirations align with the government's vision for higher education, skills development and differentiation priorities.*

Preamble

This Strategic Mandate Agreement between the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development and [Name of University] outlines the role the University currently performs in Ontario's postsecondary education system and how it will build on its current strengths to achieve its vision and help drive system-wide objectives and government priorities.

The Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA):

- Identifies and explains the shared objectives and priorities between the Ontario government and the University;
- Outlines current and future areas of program strength;
- Supports the current vision, mission, and mandate of the University and established areas of strength within the context of the University's governing legislation;
- Describes the agreed-upon elements of the new university funding model , including:
  o a University's enrolment plans as well as their projections of their enrolments relative to their corridor midpoint and any desired changes to their corridor during the period of this SMA; and
  o differentiation areas of focus including metrics, targets and differentiation grant allocation.
- Provides information on the financial sustainability of the institution; and
- Informs Ministry decision-making and enables Ministry to align its policies and processes to further support the University's areas of strength.

The term of the SMA is from April 1, 2017 to March 31, 2020.

The agreement may be amended in the event of substantive policy or program changes that would significantly affect joint commitments made in the SMA (e.g. Major Capacity Expansion, Highly Skilled Workforce, etc.). Any such amendment would be mutually agreed to in writing, dated, and signed by both signatories.

Aspirations

The Ministry recognizes the importance of supporting institutions to evolve and acknowledges the strategic aspirations of its postsecondary education institutions. The SMA is not intended to capture all decisions and issues in the postsecondary education system, as many will be addressed through the Ministry's policies and standard processes. The Ministry will not be approving any requests for capital funding or new program approvals, for example, through the SMA process.

Institutional Aspirations

[*Placeholder section for institutional aspirations.*]

Shared Objectives and Priorities for Differentiation

In the next section, universities are requested to indicate how recent and planned initiatives and/or investments help to further focus on areas of differentiated strength, including:

- *Student Experience;*
- *Innovation in Teaching and Learning Excellence;*
- *Access and Equity;*
- *Research Excellence and Impact; and*
- *Innovation, Economic Development & Community Engagement.*

1.0 Student Experience

This section captures institutional strengths in improving student experience, outcomes and success. This section recognizes institutions for measuring the broader learning environment, such as continuity of learning pathways; retention; student satisfaction; co-curricular activities and records; career preparedness; and student services and supports.

1.1 Institutional Approach to Improving Student Experience

Universities are asked to comment on existing or planned initiatives aimed at improving student the experience, including the uniqueness of your approach, target groups and partners involved. Quantitative and qualitative evidence will be used to reflect progress and achievements over time.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

1.2 Examples of Institutional Initiatives

Universities are asked to include a list of key relevant initiatives, including a brief description to further explain your institution's approach:

- *Example 1*
- *Example 2*
- *Example 3*

1.3   Metrics and Targets

Institutional Metrics	Institutional Targets	System-Wide Metrics	Institutional Targets for System-Wide Metrics
• Metric 1 • Metric 2 • Metric 3	• Target 1 • Target 2 • Target 3	• Proportion of fourth year students with two High-Impact Practices (HIPs) or average number of HIPs per student (from the National Survey of Student Engagement) • Year 1 to Year 2 retention (from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange) • Proportion of operating expenditures on student services, net of student assistance (as reported in the Council of University Finance Officers data)	• Target 1 • Target 2 • Target 3

Notes for filling out Section 1.3

Universities could consider the following examples among their preferred institutional metrics:

- *Student experience as it relates to graduate students*
- *Student Satisfaction Survey Results (NSSE Score)*
- *Composite score on NSSE questions related to enriching experiences and extra-curricular activities (e.g., estimated hours in co-curricular activities)*

2.0 Innovation in Teaching and Learning Excellence

This section focusses on innovative efforts including pedagogical approaches, program delivery and student services that contribute to a highly skilled workforce and ensure positive student outcomes.

This section captures institutional strengths in delivering high-quality learning experiences, such as experiential, entrepreneurial, personalized and digital learning, to prepare students for rewarding careers. It includes recognition of student competencies that improve employability.

It begins to identify indicators of quality that are currently available and within an institution's control.

2.1   Institutional Approach to Innovation in Teaching and Learning Excellence

Universities are asked to comment on existing or planned initiatives related to innovation in teaching and learning (e.g., co-op education, placements, simulations, digital modules and other high-impact practices), including target groups (e.g., part-time students, adult learners, etc.). Quantitative and qualitative evidence will be used to reflect progress and achievements over time.

Note: There is a particular interest in learning more about the activities/initiatives that Universities are pursuing in the area of experiential learning. A system-wide definition for experiential learning is currently under development and will be finalized in the near future. In the meantime, SMA Advisors are interested in learning about activities that Universities are pursuing that might fall into this category.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

2.2   Examples of Institutional Initiatives

Institutions are asked to include a list of key relevant initiatives, including a brief description to further explain your institution's approach:

- *Example 1*
- *Example 2*
- *Example 3*

2.3　Metrics and Targets

Institutional Metrics	Institutional Targets	System-Wide Metrics	Institutional Targets for System-Wide Metrics
• Metric 1 • Metric 2 • Metric 3	• Target 1 • Target 2 • Target 3	• Composite score on NSSE questions related to students' perceived gains in higher order learning outcomes • Proportion of programs with explicit curriculum maps and articulation of learning outcomes • Graduation rate (from the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange)	• Target 1 • Target 2 • Target 3

Notes for filling out Section 2.3

Universities could consider the following examples among their preferred institutional metrics:

- *Range of delivery modes used to promote deep and/or collaborative learning*
- *Measures of teaching quality (for example, proportion of faculty or courses assessed as "good" or above on student satisfaction evaluations and/or performance reviews)*
- *Measures related to effective teaching practices*
- *Methodologies and/or practices used to promote student/faculty interactions*
- *Number of students enrolled in an experiential learning program at an institution*

3.0 Access and Equity

This section recognizes institutions for their efforts in improving postsecondary education equity and access. Institutions play an important role in providing equitable and inclusive environments that make it possible for students from diverse communities to thrive and succeed.

Institutions will also be recognized for creating equitable access opportunities that can include multiple entrance pathways and flexible policies and programming, with the focus on students who, without interventions and support, would not otherwise participate in postsecondary education. Examples include outreach to marginalized youth, transition, bridging and access programs for adults with atypical education histories and who do not meet admission requirements.

3.1 Institutional Approach to Improving Access and Equity

Universities are asked to comment on the characteristics of the students for whom access is being provided, as well as the programming; policies and practices that are uniquely supportive of access for diverse groups of students. Universities are also asked to comment on the involvement of community partners and expectations and definitions of success.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

3.2 Examples of Institutional Initiatives

Institutions are asked to include a list of key relevant initiatives, including a brief description to further explain your institution's approach:

- *Example 1*
- *Example 2*
- *Example 3*

3.3 Metrics and Targets

Institutional Metrics	Institutional Targets	System-Wide Metrics	Institutional Targets for System-Wide Metrics

• Metric 1
• Metric 2
• Metric 3
	• Target 1
	• Target 2
	• Target 3
		• Number and proportion of the following groups at an institution:
		  A. Indigenous students,
		  B. First generation students
		  C. Students with disabilities, and
		  D. Francophone students
		• Share of OSAP recipients at an institution relative to its total number of eligible students
		• Number of transfer applicants and registrations, as captured by the Ontario University Application Centre
			• Target 1
			• Target 2
			• Target 3

Notes for filling out Section 3.3

Universities could consider the following examples among their preferred institutional metrics:

- *Number/percentage of students from diverse demographic/socio-economic groups successfully completing their program in some number of years, and subsequent labour market participation*
- *Number/percentage taking advantage of flexible program options*
- *Number of students in access pathway(s) and number/percentage successfully completing the pathway(s)*
- *Number/percentage of students entering a regular degree/diploma/certificate program after completing an access pathway*
- *Number/percentage of students from access pathways completing the regular degree/diploma/certificate program*
- *Number of College graduates enrolled in University programs*

4.0 Research Excellence and Impact

This section captures institutional strengths in producing high-quality research on the continuum of fundamental and applied research through activity that further raises Ontario's profile as a globally-recognized research and innovation hub. It also acknowledges that research capacity is strongly linked with graduate education.

4.1 Institutional Approach to Research Excellence and Impact

Universities are asked to comment on existing and planned contributions to research and scholarly endeavours, areas of research strength, partners involved and key research funding sources (e.g., federal, provincial, private, etc.). Quantitative and qualitative evidence will be used to reflect progress and achievements.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

4.2 Examples of Institutional Initiatives

Institutions are asked to include a list of key relevant initiatives, including a brief description to further explain your institution's approach:

- *Example 1*
- *Example 2*
- *Example 3*

4.3   Metrics and Targets

Institutional Metrics	Institutional Targets	System-Wide Metrics	Institutional Targets for System-Wide Metrics
• Metric 1 • Metric 2 • Metric 3	• Target 1 • Target 2 • Target 3	• Tri-council funding (total and share by council) • Number of papers (total and per full-time faculty) • Number of citations (total and per paper)	• Target 1 • Target 2 • Target 3

Notes for filling out section 4.3

Universities could consider the following examples among their preferred institutional metrics:

- *Tri-council funding per university faculty (eligible for tri-council funding)*
- *Total sponsored research from industry and other sources*
- *Number of research chairs*
- *Number of graduate degrees awarded (Highly Qualified Personnel)*
- *Graduate to undergraduate ratio*
- *PhD degrees awarded to undergraduate degrees awarded*
- *Graduate degrees awarded to undergraduate degrees awarded*
- *Citation impact (normalized citation per paper)*
- *Ration of international to domestic graduates*
- *Percentage of a university's collaborative publications that include an international co-author*

5.0 Innovation, Economic Development and Community Engagement

This section recognizes the unique role institutions play in contributing to their communities and to economic development, as well as to building dynamic partnerships with business, industry, community members and other colleges and universities. It focusses on regional clusters, customized training, entrepreneurial activities, jobs, community revitalization efforts, international collaborations, students, partnerships with Aboriginal Institutes and a program mix that meets needs locally, regionally and beyond.

5.1 Institutional Approach to Innovation, Economic Development and Community Engagement

Universities are asked to comment on the impact they have on community, economic development and innovation, commercialization of research, uniqueness of institutional approach, target groups (e.g., international students, community stakeholders, domestic and international business partners, etc.). Quantitative and qualitative evidence will be used to reflect progress and achievements. Institutions are also invited to share an economic impact statement, if they have one.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

5.2 Examples of Institutional Initiatives

Institutions are asked to include a list of key relevant initiatives, including a brief description to further explain the institutional approach:

- *Example 1*
- *Example 2*
- *Example 3*

5.3   Metrics and Targets

Institutional Metrics	Institutional Targets	System-Wide Metrics	Institutional Targets for System-Wide Metrics
• Metric 1 • Metric 2 • Metric 3	• Target 1 • Target 2 • Target 3	• Graduate employment rates • Number of graduates employed full time in a related job	• Target 1 • Target 2 • Target 3

Notes for filling out section 5.3

Universities could consider the following examples among their preferred institutional metrics:

- *Number of patents, licenses, invention disclosures and new products*
- *Number of new start-up companies*
- *Number of new start-up social innovation enterprises*
- *Number of students involved in building a start-up*
- *Number of students involved in entrepreneurship courses and/or activities*
- *Community economic revitalization and impact*
- *Community social and/or health development initiatives and collaborations*
- *Community-based learning/research initiatives and student participation*

6.0 Differentiation Areas of Focus

In the previous sections of the SMA template, the Ministry has asked institutions to comment on current and planned activities and initiatives in five priority areas: Student Experience; Innovation in Teaching and Learning; Access and Equity; Research Excellence and Impact; and Innovation, Economic Development and Community Engagement.

In addition to commenting on activities in these areas, institutions have been asked to indicate preferred institutional metrics and targets, as well as to establish institutional targets for system-wide metrics. This is part of the path from SMA2 to SMA3 and the ongoing work between the Ministry and institutions in developing and using metrics that support greater accountability and transparency for the use of differentiation funding.

Building upon the previous sections, the Ministry is asking institutions to set out a differentiation narrative. If each of the five priorities corresponded to a funding envelope, taking into account your institutional visions and mandates – and your strengths – how would you weight your priorities against those envelopes and how would you measure your progress?

In this section, the Ministry is interested in learning more about each institution's overall differentiation vision.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

7.0 Enrolment Strategy and Program Direction

7.1 Proposed Enrolment Plan and Corridor Midpoints

*The purpose of this section is to identify institutional enrolment plans and aspirations and the key assumptions for those plans. Institutions are also asked to identify their expected corridor midpoints in the new university funding model and how their corridor enrolments will change relative to that midpoint. (**Note**: For details on the corridor model and, midpoint establishment, please consult the University Funding Formula Technical Manual).*

*(**Note:** Graduate allocation issues will be addressed in Appendix 1. There are ongoing discussions about where this will be reflected in the SMA template.)*

7.1.1 Projected Funding-Eligible Enrolments

					These years are for planning purposes and will not be included in the final SMA2	
	Projected 2017-18	Projected 2018-19	Projected 2019-20		Projected 2020-21	Projected 2021-22
Undergraduate						
• Full-time Headcounts						
• FFTEs						
• First-year Intake						
• BIUs						
Masters						
• Full-time Headcounts						
• FTEs						
• BIUs						
• New registrants						
Doctoral						
• Full-time Headcounts						
• FTEs						

• BIUs					
• New registrants					
Total Enrolment					
• Full-time Headcounts					
• BIUs					

Note – for this table, please see the definitions below:

- *Full-time Headcount should be reported for Fall term only.*
- *FFTE (Fiscal Full-Time Equivalent) for undergraduate enrolments and FTE (Full-Time Equivalent) for graduate enrolments – as defined in the Ontario Operating Funds Distribution Manual.*
- *First-year Intake – Fall Term full-time headcount for the first year of all undergraduate programs.*
- *New Registrants – The sum of the number of students in terms of FTE enrolled in a graduate program for the first time in each term.*
- *BIUs – for all enrolments. For graduate enrolments, adjust for graduate minima/maxima.*

7.1.2 Projected Weighted Enrolments and Corridor Midpoints

Institutions should enter their estimated final 2016-17 BIUs, which will normally form the basis of an institution's corridor midpoint when it enters the corridor system in 2017-18 and continue through the 2018-19 to 2019-20 period. The BIUs projected should be those which will be counted towards each institution's corridor midpoint in the new university funding model, consistent with the institution's projected enrolments as noted in Table 6.1.1. BIUs will be converted into Weighted Grant Units as described in the University Funding Model Technical Design Manual and WGUs will be used in the final SMA.

					These years are for planning purposes and will not be included in the final SMA2	
	Projected 2016-17	Projected 2017-18	Projected 2018-19	Projected 2019-20	Projected 2020-21	Projected 2021-22
Estimated BIUs at corridor midpoint	N/A					
Estimated number of BIUs above or below corridor midpoint BIUs [1]	N/A					
Comments/ Notes: [2]						

1. The estimated BIUs over or under the midpoint should be estimated using the *Growing Moving Average* formula described in the draft University Funding Model Technical Design paper.

2. Please note any issues on the data provided, whether any technical adjustments are sought to the corridor midpoint, etc.

7.1.3   Projected International Enrolment

	Projected 2017-18	Projected 2018-19	Projected 2019-20		These years are for planning purposes and will not be included in the final SMA2	
					Projected 2020-21	Projected 2021-22
Undergraduate						
• Full-time Headcounts						
• FFTEs						
• First-year Intake						
• BIUs						
Masters						
• Full-time Headcounts						
• FTEs						
• BIUs						
• New registrants						
Doctoral						
• Full-time Headcounts						
• FTEs						
• BIUs						
• New registrants						
Total Enrolment						
• Full-time Headcounts						
• BIUs						

Note: International enrolments include all funding ineligible international students.

7.2   International Enrolment Strategy and Collaboration

Universities are requested to outline their international enrolment strategy and collaboration activities, specifically how international partnerships, activities and enrolment fit within the overall strategic plan for their institution. The description should include these elements:

- *International goals;*
- *Risk factors considered in managing international enrolment; and*
- *International strategy approval process within your institution.*

7.3   Strategic Areas of Program Strength and Expansion

Program Areas of Strength

To provide context for this section, in your 2014-17 SMA, you indicated your institutional program areas of strength to be:

- ***To be pre-populated by MAESD***

In Appendix 2, Tab 2, please use the first table to list a maximum of 5-10 program areas of strength for your institution for 2017-20. Your program areas of strength can be carried over from your 2014-17 SMA or a new area can be identified. Institutions are asked to substantiate new areas (new to the 2017-20 SMA) with a rationale, such as KPIs for related programs and projected enrolment.

The proposed areas of program strength are intended to inform program approval processes.

Program Areas of Expansion

To provide context for this section, in your 2014-17 SMA, you indicated the following areas as program areas of growth:

- ***To be pre-populated by MAESD***

In the second table on Tab 2 of Appendix 2, list up to 5 program areas in which your institution would like to expand offerings in the next years. Institutions are expected to provide supporting information, including expected labour market outcomes, projected enrolment relevant KPIs (if applicable) and connection to existing areas of strength proposed above, where possible. For clarity, these program expansions are those that will be managed within the negotiated corridor.

In Tab 3 of Appendix 2, institutions are asked to indicate, as best as they are able to at this time, specific programs that they anticipate introducing over the course of this SMA. This is in place of the University's annual program development plan for 2016. Programs listed here will not preclude an institution from submitting additional program submissions through the period of this SMA.

7.4   Financial Sustainability

The Ministry and the University recognize that financial sustainability and accountability are critical to achieving institutional mandates and realizing Ontario's vision for the postsecondary education system. To this end, it is agreed that:

It is the responsibility of the governing board and senior administrators of the University to identify, track, and address financial pressures and sustainability issues. At the same time, the Ministry has a financial stewardship role. The Ministry and the University agree to work collaboratively to achieve the common goal of financial sustainability and to ensure that Ontarians have access to a full range of affordable, high-quality postsecondary education options, now and in the future.

The University remains accountable to the Ministry with respect to effective and efficient use of provincial government resources and student resources covered by policy directives of the Ministry, or decisions impacting upon these, to maximize the value and impact of investments made in the postsecondary education system.

System-wide Metrics*	2015-16 Actuals**	Comments
• Net Income / (Loss) Ratio		•
• Net Operating Revenues Ratio		•
• Primary Reserve Ratio		•
• Interest Burden Ratio		•
• Viability Ratio		•

*These were the metrics agreed upon through the COU/MAESD Working group during fall 2016.
**2015-16 actuals under development - pending confirmation with the COU/MAESD Working group.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

[Note for section 6.4: When considering institutional financial sustainability, Universities could consider adding their own institutional metrics in the "Comments" section of the table above.   For example, universities that have credit reports from rating agencies can add information from these reports in the reporting to the ministry.]

7.5   Other Sustainability Issues

Institutions are encouraged to state their perspectives on other sustainability issues and opportunities to address them.

[Placeholder for institutional input. Examples of input could include environmental sustainability issues, program sustainability issues, and capital sustainability issues.]

8.0 Institutional Collaborations and Partnerships

[*Note: This section should include information that is new and not listed earlier in the SMA template.*]

Institutions are asked to profile key partnerships with other institutions that ensure students have access to a range of learning opportunities in a coordinated system. This may include, but is not limited to, credit transfer pathways, collaborative or joint programs between or within sectors supporting student mobility and supporting research excellence and innovation. This section should also outline partnerships that support efficiency, shared services and financial sustainability.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

Institutions with federates or affiliates may wish to outline the role that they play related to achieving SMA objectives and institutional differentiation.

[Placeholder for institutional input.]

9.0 Ministry/Government Commitments

Over time, the Ministry commits to aligning many of its policy, process, and funding levers with the differentiation priorities and SMAs in order to support the strengths of institutions and implement differentiation. To this end, the Ministry will:

- *Placeholder*
- *Placeholder*
- *Placeholder*

The Ministry and the University are committed to continuing to work together to:

- *Placeholder*
- *Placeholder*
- *Placeholder*

SIGNED for and on behalf of the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development by:

SIGNED for and on behalf of [LEGAL NAME OF INSTITUTION] by:

_____

Sheldon Levy
Deputy Minister

_____

(NAME)
President

_____

Date

_____

Date

Appendix

Appendix 1: Graduate Enrolment (template to be provided by MAESD)

Appendix 2. Program Areas of Strength (template to be provided by MAESD) [Note: Information provided in this appendix is confidential. The Appendix is not for publication.]

Technical Addendum – Metrics

- System-wide metrics (to be completed by MAESD)
- Institution-specific metrics (to be completed by each institution; to include definition of metrics; methodology/formula and how and when data is collected)

Appendix 3: Institutional Areas of Strength from 2014-17 SMAs (to be pre-populated by MAESD)