



UTFA Information Report

University of Toronto Faculty Association January 5, 2010

Information Report #11

How Undergraduates Subsidize Professional Faculties

A Look at UofT's New Budget Model

“Program delivery costs may not be fully recognized in the government’s funding formula or in tuition fee levels¹”

Uof T budget document

This information report examines the correlation between revenue (from the government funding formula, student tuition fees, etc.) and the expense budget allocations for each of the nineteen academic divisions at UofT. We use the ‘New Budget Model’ data in the UofT ‘blue book’ budget documents, from 2006-07 to 2009-10 to examine University Fund inputs and outputs.

Conclusion

The unavoidable conclusion of this report is that there is a very substantial cross subsidy of funds from academic divisions that have large undergraduate enrolments to those that do not.²

Specifically, large undergraduate student enrolment units, like Arts and Science, UTSC, UTM, and Engineering provide a cross subsidy, through the new University Fund, to most of the health science and professional divisions, like Medicine, Dentistry, OISE, Management, Law, Music, Architecture, Nursing, etc.

The new budget model data suggests that in 2006-07 this cross subsidy totaled about \$50 million, when the total expense budget mass for all 19 academic divisions at UofT was \$712 million. Three years later, in 2009-10, the cross subsidy total is \$3 million less, or about \$47 million, while the corresponding expense budget total is \$733 million. Assuming this rate of change, it will take 47 years before the current \$47 million is eliminated.

In 2006-07 the six divisions that contributed the \$50 million subsidy had a total expense budget mass of \$454 million. Thus the \$50 million loss to the six divisions represented about 11% of their budget total.

The thirteen divisions that received the \$50 million subsidy had a total expense budget mass of \$265 million. Thus the \$50 million gain to the thirteen divisions represented about 19% of their budget total.

The variation in the cross subsidy gain or loss, in 2006-07, from one academic division to another is summarized in Table 1 on page 3. Further discussion as to why the 2006-07 budget year is important and pivotal will follow after some brief comments about the New Budget Model.

¹ Uof T ‘blue book’ budget document for 2009-10, page 134 in the pdf file – or page 6 in the Long Range Budget Guidelines section (February 17, 2009). The 2009-10 budget ‘blue book’ has 259 pages.

² This observation was briefly discussed at the last UTFA Annual General Meeting, April 19, 2009, as posted at <http://utfa.org/images/file/2009-April%20AGM%20memo%20GJL-final.pdf>

Background for the New Budget Model:

The New Budget Model.³ Starting with the 2007-08 budget year, the university introduced a new format for budgetary allocations in our university. The revenue generated per student, primarily from the government funding formula and directly from student tuition, is well defined and acts as the starting point in the new model for each academic division. After the attributed operating revenue⁴ is determined for each division, funds are deducted for shared university expenses (utilities, maintenance, library, and the like), for student aid and for the University Fund. There may be additional deductions, such as “Share of Deficit”, etc. This is illustrated in the tables in Appendix A and Appendix B.

The University Fund (UF). How does one transition from the old budget model allocations (used prior to 2007-08) to the new budget model allocations – and provide for budget continuity and for fiscal flexibility that reflects academic priorities and is non-formulaic? The bridge is a new central fund, called the University Fund, which provides the transition from the old to the new. Each division is ‘taxed’ annually about 9% of its gross revenue (the attributed operating revenue) to establish the University Fund. Subsequently each division may or may not receive an allocation back from the UF. The overall UF output equals the overall input – it is a zero sum arrangement. But division by division the input contributed and the output received will not be the same. This is key to understanding the divisional cross subsidy statements in this report.

The 2006-07 Shadow Budget. The transitional fiscal year was 2006-07. In that year, while the old budget model was still in effect, a second or shadow budget reflecting the new budget model was introduced. In the shadow budget each academic division received a notional allocation from the University Fund such that the ‘Expense Budget’ for each division would stay unchanged from the old budget model to the new budget model. This UF allocation defines a ‘baseline’ for future allocations. The 2006-07 shadow budget, also referred to as the ‘A2 table’ in budget documents is reproduced here in Appendix A.

The good, the bad and the ugly. The New Budget Model is much clearer on how the budget of a division is determined. It connects the divisional revenue to the divisional budget allocation. It introduces divisional incentives to increase revenue and to reduce waste. So far so good.

But what is not so positive about the new budget model is that it practically locks in the 2006-07 budget allocations – be they good, bad or ugly. It does so via a specific recommendation in the Task Force Report⁵:

9. *As an additional provision to maintain stability, the University Fund allocation to each division during the transition year should be regarded as a baseline. Barring exceptional circumstances that would be identified in the University’s multi-year budget plans, allocations in future years should not drop below that baseline. (emphasis added)*

In Appendix A, table A2, the University Fund Allocation column, also shown as (G=K-F), is the 2006-07 baseline for the University Fund. This recommendation thus tends to perpetuate any existing cross-divisional subsidy, inherent in this baseline, into the future. There is a very gradual corrective mechanism via a growth in the gross operating revenue and the resulting growth in the University Fund tax on a growing base. Any new increase in the University Fund total can be reallocated – while the 2006-07 baseline is preserved.

³ New Budget Reports at the Provost’s website at <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/public/reports/budgetmodel.htm>
The UofT Planning and Budget website at <http://www.planningandbudget.utoronto.ca/>

⁴ The “Attributed Operating Revenue” heading is used for column (A) in both the budget table A2, (the 2006-07 Shadow Budget or Reference Budget) in Appendix A and the Appendix B, Schedule 5 table.

⁵ Page 9, item #9, in the “Task Force to Review Approach to Budgeting, Final Report, January, 2006” – on the web at <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/Assets/Provost+Digital+Assets/Provost/publication/Budget/finbudrev.pdf>

The Baseline Year for the University Fund:

2006-07 Baseline: Table A2 (in Appendix A) recast to show - the gains and losses via the University Fund					
DIVISION	10% Contribution to Univ Fund (B)	University Fund Allocation (G=K-F)	2006-07 University Fund Net (I=G-B)	Expense Budget (H)	U-F Net as % of Expense Budget (J=I/H)
GAINING DIVISIONS			\$ GAIN		
Medicine	12,541,031	21,816,900	9,275,869	95,103,347	10%
OISE/UT	5,300,059	14,496,842	9,196,783	47,316,581	19%
Dentistry	1,935,664	11,064,884	9,129,220	22,955,145	40%
Law	1,635,694	6,856,910	5,221,216	17,833,749	29%
Music	957,278	4,499,382	3,542,104	9,319,706	38%
Graduate Institutes & Centres	336,702	3,487,035	3,150,333	5,195,690	61%
Forestry	183,443	2,730,357	2,546,914	3,356,230	76%
Architecture	475,499	2,644,653	2,169,154	5,059,353	43%
Management	3,983,637	6,147,788	2,164,151	36,125,954	6%
Information Studies	654,152	2,319,805	1,665,653	6,050,901	28%
Transitional Year Program	42,512	1,459,038	1,416,526	1,430,060	99%
Social Work	738,176	1,090,076	351,900	5,915,387	6%
Nursing	1,284,212	1,539,175	254,963	9,439,444	3%
Above SubTotal	30,068,059	80,152,845	50,084,786	265,101,547	19%
LOSING DIVISIONS			\$ LOSS		
UTM	11,052,557	-3,450,348	-14,502,905	75,798,257	-19%
UTSC	11,259,217	-3,050,469	-14,309,686	78,765,190	-18%
Arts & Science (incl. Colleges)	33,622,269	21,854,767	-11,767,502	220,077,360	-5%
Applied Science & Engineering	10,066,369	4,091,457	-5,974,912	64,903,104	-9%
Pharmacy	2,036,120	-970,949	-3,007,069	10,594,222	-28%
Physical Education & Health	700,379	177,664	-522,715	3,899,172	-13%
Above SubTotal	68,736,911	18,652,122	-50,084,789	454,037,305	-11%

Table 1

Table 1 shows the inputs and outputs for the University Fund, division by division in 2006-07. There are two groupings: the thirteen divisions that gain the \$50 million (in blue) and the six that lose the \$50 million (in red). The table illustrates that the four largest undergraduate divisions, namely A&S, UTSC, UTM and Engineering contribute substantial income revenue to the University Fund and at best receive part of it back. In fact in 2006-07, UTM and UTSC would have received no allocation and the negative entry shows they would have had to contribute extra millions in addition. The four top beneficiaries are Medicine, OISE, Dentistry, and Law as illustrated by the dollars in column (I=G-B). The last column, (J=I/H), shows the percentage of the net UF gain/loss to the expense budget.

The data in Table 1 is drawn from the UofT budget table 'A2' for 2006-07, as presented in the 2009-10 'blue book' and reproduced here in full for the interested reader, in Appendix A.

Observations and comments on the 2006-07 Shadow Budget⁶:

- (i) **Column (A) in table A2, Appendix A.** About 90% of the \$1.1 billion total in the attributed operating revenue in column (A) derives from provincial operating grants and tuition. The remaining 10% comes from investment and endowment income, CRC and scholarship grants, and indirect cost recovery on research grants and contracts. Divisional Income is not shown in table A2

⁶ These observations are made with reference to the two tables in Appendix A. The UofT 'blue book' budget document refers to this table as 'table A2' and we shall do the same.

as it is not included in the determination of the contributions to the University Fund, nor to the Shared Expense fund or the Student Aid fund. The reasons for this exclusion are not apparent and need to be considered further. In fiscal year, 2009-10, Divisional Income represented an additional total revenue of \$187 million.

- (ii) The two smallest academic divisions in Table A2, namely Forestry and the Transitional Year Program, have some anomalous attributes and shall be excluded in the general comments that follow. Together they represent about 0.2% of the total \$1.1 billion in revenue.
- (iii) **Column (B).** Appendix A, lower table, shows that the average contribution to the University Fund in 2006-07 was a fairly uniform 9% of the revenue in column (A). It was a shade lower, at 8%, for Medicine and Engineering and higher, at 10%, for UTSC and UTM.
- (iv) **Column (C).** Appendix A, lower table, shows that the average divisional contribution to ‘University Wide Expense’⁷, shown in column (C), was 30% of attributed operating revenue. It was less for UTM and UTSC since a number of general expenses at their campuses, such as utilities, cleaning, etc., are paid from their expense budgets, i.e. from column (H). Management was also less at 21% while Medicine was higher at 41%. Reasons for these variations are not given.
- (v) **Column (D).** Appendix A, lower table, shows that the average divisional contribution to the ‘Student Aid Set-Aside’ shown in column (D), was 6% of attributed operating revenue. The lowest contribution was from Management at 3% and the highest was from Music at 10%.
- (vi) **Column (G)** – Appendix A, column G shows how much of the University Fund was allocated back to each division so that the expense budget for that division in the old budget model would agree exactly with that in the new budget model.

Further background. What are the numbers for the current fiscal year? How have revenues and expenses changed over the three years?

Appendix B shows the same revenue and expense information as Appendix A and in almost the same format, except that it is for the 2009-10 budget year. The table in Appendix B has a new column, (F), which is labeled “less: Revenue in Restricted Funds and Div Income.” At this time the significance of this addition to the table is not clear to us and it needs to be studied further.

Rather than engage in a discussion of specific increases or decreases from 2006-07 to 2009-10, we provide a table in Appendix C, to show the percentage increases in the various dollar amounts over the three years. We leave it to the reader to interpret the details therein.

The last line in the Appendix C table prompts a particularly discouraging observation. Given the 2006-07 baseline minimum allocation back to divisions out of the UF, it may well take decades for the system to correct itself to ensure a more equitable correlation of divisional revenue with expenses across the university. The numbers bear this out. Revenue increased by about 4% in each of the three years. This means that the UF increased by about 0.4% of revenue each year (10% of 4%). If this is the maximum flexibility available to correct the current imbalance, it could take many years to rebalance expenses with revenue, even with maximum adjustment each year. However, even with the baseline restriction, we are not observing a maximum readjustment.

⁷ There are a total of 12 cost bins in this expense bucket. They are: occupancy, information technology, university management, financial management, human resources, pension amortization, university advancement, central library, research administration, student, university-wide academic and university-wide general.

What is the University Fund allocation today, in 2009-10?

2009-10 Fiscal Year					
Recast to show the gains and losses via the University Fund					
DIVISION	Divisional Contribution to the Univ Fund (B)	2009-10 University Fund Allocation (G)	2009-10 University Fund Net (I=G-B)	Expense Budget (H)	U-F Net as % of Expense Budget (J=I/H)
GAINING DIVISIONS			\$ GAIN		
Medicine	14,155,959	22,360,024	8,204,065	78,732,043	10%
OISE/UT	6,206,987	14,897,684	8,690,697	50,154,885	17%
Dentistry	2,224,997	11,445,350	9,220,353	22,011,472	42%
Law	1,925,896	7,028,595	5,102,699	15,371,199	33%
Music	1,184,503	4,795,639	3,611,136	9,850,248	37%
Graduate Institutes & Centres	157,672	1,946,365	1,788,693	2,819,737	63%
Forestry	190,439	2,926,383	2,735,944	2,700,593	101%
Architecture	678,703	2,912,652	2,233,949	6,093,579	37%
Management	5,277,423	6,926,565	1,649,142	41,640,282	4%
Information Studies	925,683	2,433,965	1,508,282	7,245,729	21%
Transitional Year Program	41,620	1,461,135	1,419,515	1,241,104	114%
Social Work	912,123	1,186,622	274,499	6,252,059	4%
Nursing	1,494,186	2,000,428	506,242	9,772,135	5%
Above SubTotal	35,376,191	82,321,407	46,945,216	253,885,065	18%
LOSING DIVISIONS			\$ LOSS		
UTM	13,878,789	186,501	-13,692,288	97,217,882	-14%
UTSC	13,228,364	259,420	-12,968,944	93,002,980	-14%
Arts & Science (incl. Colleges)	37,291,126	26,229,427	-11,061,699	212,506,810	-5%
Applied Science & Engineering	11,460,270	5,376,867	-6,083,403	58,890,337	-10%
Pharmacy	2,503,064	-161,576	-2,664,640	13,136,613	-20%
Physical Education & Health	777,742	303,498	-474,244	4,212,137	-11%
Above SubTotal	79,139,355	32,194,137	-46,945,218	478,966,759	-10%

Table 2

Table 2 is the 2009-10 version of the earlier Table 1 for 2006-07. It shows that the same thirteen academic divisions still have a substantial net benefit from the University Fund of about \$47 million and the same six divisions again give up \$47 million, with some variation from division to division over the three years.

There is slight indication of a corrective trend. This will be examined further in the next section.

How have *contributions to the University Fund and allocations from it* changed over the last three years? What is the trend? Which divisions gained and who lost?

Table 3 is similar to the previous two tables. It shows how both the *contributions to* and the *allocations from* the University Fund changed over the three years, from 2006-07 to 2009-10. It then looks at the difference in the two amounts to show who is losing or gaining relative to the increased contributions to the University Fund.

Disclaimer. To draw comparative conclusions the author must assume the makeup of the nineteen academic divisions has been static over the three years and that we are comparing the ‘same apples’ to the ‘same apples’ three years later. To the extent that this is not true for a division, any conclusion made or implied for that division may need to be revised or corrected.

University Fund - Changes in Contributions to and Allocations from 2006-07 (Baseline) to 2009-10							
DIVISION	Contribution To			Allocation From			Gain or Loss (X=R-N)
	2006-07 Divisional Contribution to the Univ Fund (L)	2009-10 Divisional Contribution to the Univ Fund (M)	2006-07 to 2009-10 Contribution Increase (N=M-L)	(Baseline) 2006-07 University Fund Allocation (P)	2009-10 University Fund Allocation (Q)	2006-07 to 2009-10 Allocation Increase (R=Q-P)	
GAINING DIVISIONS							
Medicine	12,541,031	14,155,959	1,614,928	21,816,900	22,360,024	543,124	-1,071,804
OISE/UT	5,300,059	6,206,987	906,928	14,496,842	14,897,684	400,842	-506,086
Dentistry	1,935,664	2,224,997	289,333	11,064,884	11,445,350	380,466	91,133
Law	1,635,694	1,925,896	290,202	6,856,910	7,028,595	171,685	-118,517
Music	957,278	1,184,503	227,225	4,499,382	4,795,639	296,257	69,032
Graduate Institutes & Centres	336,702	157,672	-179,030	3,487,035	1,946,365	-1,540,670	-1,361,640
Forestry	183,443	190,439	6,996	2,730,357	2,926,383	196,026	189,030
Architecture	475,499	678,703	203,204	2,644,653	2,912,652	267,999	64,795
Management	3,983,637	5,277,423	1,293,786	6,147,788	6,926,565	778,777	-515,009
Information Studies	654,152	925,683	271,531	2,319,805	2,433,965	114,160	-157,371
Transitional Year Program	42,512	41,620	-892	1,459,038	1,461,135	2,097	2,989
Social Work	738,176	912,123	173,947	1,090,076	1,186,622	96,546	-77,401
Nursing	1,284,212	1,494,186	209,974	1,539,175	2,000,428	461,253	251,279
Above SubTotal	30,068,059	35,376,191	5,308,132	80,152,845	82,321,407	2,168,562	-3,139,570
LOSING DIVISIONS							
UTM	11,052,557	13,878,789	2,826,232	-3,450,348	186,501	3,636,849	810,617
UTSC	11,259,217	13,228,364	1,969,147	-3,050,469	259,420	3,309,889	1,340,742
Arts & Science (incl. Colleges)	33,622,269	37,291,126	3,668,857	21,854,767	26,229,427	4,374,660	705,803
Applied Science & Engineering	10,066,369	11,460,270	1,393,901	4,091,457	5,376,867	1,285,410	-108,491
Pharmacy	2,036,120	2,503,064	466,944	-970,949	-161,576	809,373	342,429
Physical Education & Health	700,379	777,742	77,363	177,664	303,498	125,834	48,471
Above SubTotal	68,736,911	79,139,355	10,402,444	18,652,122	32,194,137	13,542,015	3,139,571

Table 3

Table 3, column (N=M-L) shows that seventeen⁸ out of the nineteen divisions increased their *contribution to the University Fund* in 2009-10 relative to 2006-07. The total increase is on the order of \$16 million and reflects both enrolment increases and inflation increases for tuition and BIUs.

Table 3, column (R=Q-P) shows that eighteen out of the nineteen divisions saw an increase in the *allocation from the University Fund* in 2009-10 relative to 2006-07. That is all but one received more than the minimum allocation prescribed by the 2006-07 baseline number (shown in column (P)).

Table 3, column (X=R-N) records the difference between the increase in the contribution and the increase in the allocation. This shows which divisions **gained (in blue)** and which **lost (in red)** in the new budget model over the three years relative to their increased contribution. One does wonder why some of the divisions in the top half of the table are blue, as this indicates that their cross subsidy was increased, not decreased. At the other extreme, Engineering is red, and thus its subsidy to the system was increased. Again why?

The interpretation of Table 3 is illustrated with two academic divisions:

⁸ The two exceptions being the Graduate Institutes and Centres division and the Forestry division. As noted earlier, one must take care in basing any conclusions on our data for these two units and for the Transitional Year Program.

- (i) OISE increased its contribution to the University Fund by \$0.9 million over the three-year interval but only received an increase of \$0.4 million from the UF in 2009-10 relative to 2006-07. Thus it “lost” about \$0.5 million in this respect. But keep in mind that it still received \$8.7 million more from the UF than it put in for 2009-10 (as shown in Table 2)
- (ii) Pharmacy increased its contribution to the University Fund by \$466,944 over the three-year interval but also saw a larger allocation of \$809,373 from the UF in 2009-10. Thus it “gained” \$342,429 in this respect. But keep in mind that it still was a net contributor of \$2.7 million in 2009-10 (as shown in Table 2).

Concluding Comments

The University of Toronto is a highly complex institution with a correspondingly complex budgetary process. The new budget model is a welcome improvement to this process. It provides for greater clarity on incomes and expenses at the divisional level. This transparency encourages accountability both at the divisional and at the Simcoe Hall level. This is desirable and all to the good.

However, as this report has tried to show, there are serious legacy problems that need to be addressed if we are to strive for a more equitable distribution of resources and therefore the teaching workloads across our university. To effect this change in a non-destructive manner is a significant challenge for all.

There are two funding issues. The first is the equitable distribution of existing resources across the university. The second is the need to increase overall revenue, the issue of: “Program delivery costs may not be fully recognized in the government’s funding formula or in tuition fee levels.”

This analysis is a work in progress. It is not the final word and may have some unintended inaccuracies. It is an initial, modest and sincere effort to better understand the fiscal landscape of this complex institution. There is much to examine and absorb.

If the reader wishes to discuss any aspect of this report with me, I am more than happy to do so.

As always we welcome any and all comments.

George Luste

UTFA President,
luste@utfa.org

UTFA Information Report is published by:
The University of Toronto Faculty Association
720 Spadina Avenue, Suite 419 Toronto ON M5S 2T9
Phone 416-978-4596 Fax 416-978-7061
Email faculty@utfa.org Website www.utfa.org

Appendix A

The University of Toronto Budget book for 2009-10 ('blue book'), page 160 or page 25 of 61 in Appendix A.

DIVISION	Attributed Operating Revenue (A)	10% Contribution to Univ Fund (B)	Share of University Wide Expense (C)	Student Aid Set-Aside (D)	Share of Deficit (E)	Net Revenue (F=A-B-C-D+E)	University Fund Allocation (G=K-F)	Expense Budget (H)
Arts & Science (incl. Colleges)	366,500,419	33,622,269	115,531,032.70	22,091,752	2,967,227	198,222,593	21,854,767	220,077,360
UTSC	115,582,995	11,259,217	17,478,135.10	5,965,756	935,773	81,815,659	-3,050,469	78,765,190
UTM	113,972,985	11,052,557	18,920,292	5,674,270	922,738	79,248,604	-3,450,348	75,798,257
Dentistry	22,330,791	1,935,664	7,728,737	956,921	180,793	11,890,261	11,064,884	22,955,145
Medicine	156,987,625	12,541,031	65,068,947	7,362,189	1,270,989	73,286,447	21,816,900	95,103,347
Nursing	14,101,004	1,284,212	4,293,908	736,779	114,163	7,900,269	1,539,175	9,439,444
Pharmacy	22,379,392	2,036,120	7,133,332	1,825,956	181,186	11,565,171	-970,949	10,594,222
Physical Education & Health	7,123,863	700,379	2,397,354	362,298	57,676	3,721,508	177,664	3,899,172
Applied Science & Engineering	118,826,327	10,066,369	41,180,986	7,729,356	962,031	60,811,647	4,091,457	64,903,104
Architecture	5,012,941	475,499	1,797,796	365,531	40,585	2,414,700	2,644,653	5,059,353
OISE/UT	57,267,909	5,300,059	15,677,142	3,934,617	463,647	32,819,739	14,496,842	47,316,581
Forestry	2,555,326	183,443	1,651,342	115,356	20,688	625,873	2,730,357	3,356,230
Law	18,632,758	1,635,694	4,939,328	1,231,750	150,853	10,976,839	6,856,910	17,833,749
Information Studies	7,159,426	654,152	2,449,318	382,823	57,963	3,731,096	2,319,805	6,050,901
Music	10,237,106	957,278	3,541,051	1,001,333	82,881	4,820,325	4,499,382	9,319,706
Social Work	8,365,699	738,176	2,344,883	525,059	67,730	4,825,311	1,090,076	5,915,387
Management	44,026,248	3,983,637	9,110,695	1,310,192	356,441	29,978,166	6,147,788	36,125,954
Transitional Year Program	516,685	42,512	384,459	122,875	4,183	-28,978	1,459,038	1,430,060
Graduate Institutes & Centres	4,454,441	336,702	2,245,919	199,228	36,064	1,708,656	3,487,035	5,195,690
Total	1,096,033,940	98,804,968	323,874,656	61,894,042	8,873,610	620,333,885	98,804,969	719,138,853

DIVISION	Attributed Operating Revenue (A)	10% Contribution to Univ Fund (B)	Share of University Wide Expense (C)	Student Aid Set-Aside (D)	Share of Deficit (E)	Net Revenue (F=A-B-C-D+E)	University Fund Allocation (G=K-F)	Expense Budget (H)
Arts & Science (incl. Colleges)	100%	9%	32%	6%	1%	54%	6%	60%
UTSC	100%	10%	15%	5%	1%	71%	-3%	68%
UTM	100%	10%	17%	5%	1%	70%	-3%	67%
Dentistry	100%	9%	35%	4%	1%	53%	50%	103%
Medicine	100%	8%	41%	5%	1%	47%	14%	61%
Nursing	100%	9%	30%	5%	1%	56%	11%	67%
Pharmacy	100%	9%	32%	8%	1%	52%	-4%	47%
Physical Education & Health	100%	10%	34%	5%	1%	52%	2%	55%
Applied Science & Engineering	100%	8%	35%	7%	1%	51%	3%	55%
Architecture	100%	9%	36%	7%	1%	48%	53%	101%
OISE/UT	100%	9%	27%	7%	1%	57%	25%	83%
Forestry	100%	7%	65%	5%	1%	24%	107%	131%
Law	100%	9%	27%	7%	1%	59%	37%	96%
Information Studies	100%	9%	34%	5%	1%	52%	32%	85%
Music	100%	9%	35%	10%	1%	47%	44%	91%
Social Work	100%	9%	28%	6%	1%	58%	13%	71%
Management	100%	9%	21%	3%	1%	68%	14%	82%
Transitional Year Program	100%	8%	74%	24%	1%	-6%	282%	277%
Graduate Institutes & Centres	100%	8%	50%	4%	1%	38%	78%	117%
Total	100%	9%	30%	6%	1%	57%	9%	66%

Appendix B

The University of Toronto Budget book for 2009-10 ('blue book'), page 166 or page 31 of 61 in Appendix B.

From Appendix B, Schedule 5

Summary of Projected Revenue and Expense Allocations for 2009-10

DIVISION	Attributed Operating Revenue (A)	10% Contribution to Univ Fund (B)	Share of University Wide Expense (C)	Student Aid Set-Aside (D)	Net Revenue (E = A-B-C-D)	less:		University Fund Allocation (H)	Expense Budget (I = G+H)
						Revenue in Restricted Funds and Div Income (F)	Adjusted Net Revenue (G=E-F)		
Arts & Science	397,988,706	37,291,126	132,939,810	27,653,192	200,104,578	13,827,195	186,277,383	26,229,427	212,506,810
UTSC	135,046,789	13,228,364	20,953,139	6,873,537	93,991,748	1,248,189	92,743,559	259,420	93,002,980
UTM	141,686,913	13,878,789	22,558,546	7,007,510	98,242,069	1,210,687	97,031,382	186,501	97,217,882
Dentistry	24,438,250	2,224,997	8,993,519	1,237,344	11,982,391	1,416,269	10,566,122	11,445,350	22,011,472
Medicine	168,035,895	14,155,959	70,904,570	14,844,218	68,131,147	11,759,127	56,372,019	22,360,024	78,732,043
Nursing	15,737,775	1,494,186	5,067,267	1,079,666	8,096,656	324,949	7,771,707	2,000,428	9,772,135
Pharmacy	26,349,199	2,503,064	7,715,786	2,166,271	13,964,079	665,889	13,298,189	-161,576	13,136,613
Physical Education & Health	7,907,794	777,742	2,567,598	600,952	3,961,502	52,863	3,908,639	303,498	4,212,137
Applied Science & Engineering	128,731,433	11,460,270	44,693,620	10,614,513	61,963,030	8,449,561	53,513,469	5,376,867	58,890,337
Architecture, Landscape & Design	7,067,714	678,703	2,592,816	474,242	3,321,952	141,026	3,180,927	2,912,652	6,093,579
OISE/UT	65,285,246	6,206,987	17,932,523	4,003,249	37,142,487	1,885,286	35,257,201	14,897,684	50,154,885
Forestry	2,601,066	190,439	1,821,817	367,581	221,230	447,021	-225,791	2,926,383	2,700,593
Law	20,017,868	1,925,896	5,562,625	3,570,968	8,958,380	615,775	8,342,605	7,028,595	15,371,199
Information	9,770,494	925,683	3,146,832	579,208	5,118,771	307,007	4,811,764	2,433,965	7,245,729
Music	12,125,519	1,184,503	4,403,448	1,379,856	5,157,712	103,104	5,054,608	4,795,639	9,850,248
Social Work	9,929,277	912,123	2,726,408	749,996	5,540,750	475,312	5,065,437	1,186,622	6,252,059
Management	54,526,079	5,277,423	11,644,103	1,370,820	36,233,733	1,520,015	34,713,718	6,926,565	41,640,282
Transitional Year Programme	417,368	41,620	384,093	211,686	-220,031	-	-220,031	1,461,135	1,241,104
Graduate Centres & Institutes	1,934,804	157,672	725,576	89,378	962,178	88,806	873,372	1,946,365	2,819,737
Subtotal (excl divisional inc)	1,229,598,189	114,515,545	367,334,096	84,874,187	662,874,360	44,538,081	618,336,279	114,515,545	732,851,824
Divisional Income	187,401,035				187,401,035				187,401,035
Subtotal (incl divisional inc)	1,416,999,224	114,515,545	367,334,096	84,874,187	850,275,395	44,538,081	618,336,279	114,515,545	920,252,859
Flow-through to Jt. Progr. and TST	6,851,559				6,851,559				6,851,559
Flow-through to hospitals for CRCs	13,700,000				13,700,000				13,700,000
Total	1,437,550,783	114,515,545	367,334,096	84,874,187	870,826,954	44,538,081	618,336,279	114,515,545	940,804,418

Above Table, Recast to show Percentage (%) of respective dollars (\$) in Column (A)

DIVISION	Attributed Operating Revenue (A)	10% Contribution to Univ Fund (B)	Share of University Wide Expense (C)	Student Aid Set-Aside (D)	Net Revenue (E = A-B-C-D)	less:		University Fund Allocation (H)	Expense Budget (I = G+H)
						Revenue in Restricted Funds and Div Income (F)	Adjusted Net Revenue (G=E-F)		
Arts & Science	100%	9%	33%	7%	50%	3%	47%	7%	53%
UTSC	100%	10%	16%	5%	70%	1%	69%	0%	69%
UTM	100%	10%	16%	5%	69%	1%	68%	0%	69%
Dentistry	100%	9%	37%	5%	49%	6%	43%	47%	90%
Medicine	100%	8%	42%	9%	41%	7%	34%	13%	47%
Nursing	100%	9%	32%	7%	51%	2%	49%	13%	62%
Pharmacy	100%	9%	29%	8%	53%	3%	50%	-1%	50%
Physical Education & Health	100%	10%	32%	8%	50%	1%	49%	4%	53%
Applied Science & Engineering	100%	9%	35%	8%	48%	7%	42%	4%	46%
Architecture, Landscape & Design	100%	10%	37%	7%	47%	2%	45%	41%	86%
OISE/UT	100%	10%	27%	6%	57%	3%	54%	23%	77%
Forestry	100%	7%	70%	14%	9%	17%	-9%	113%	104%
Law	100%	10%	28%	18%	45%	3%	42%	35%	77%
Information	100%	9%	32%	6%	52%	3%	49%	25%	74%
Music	100%	10%	36%	11%	43%	1%	42%	40%	81%
Social Work	100%	9%	27%	8%	56%	5%	51%	12%	63%
Management	100%	10%	21%	3%	66%	3%	64%	13%	76%
Transitional Year Programme	100%	10%	92%	51%	-53%	-	-53%	350%	297%
Graduate Centres & Institutes	100%	8%	38%	5%	50%	5%	45%	101%	146%
Subtotal (excl divisional inc)	100%	9%	30%	7%	54%	4%	50%	9%	60%

Appendix C

How have revenues and expenses changed

over the three years,

from 2006-07 to 2009-10?

[i.e. from the Appendix A table to the Appendix B table]

Percentage Change in \$ amounts, for revenues and expenses, from 2006-07 to 2009-10									
DIVISION	Attributed Operating Revenue (A)	10% Contribution to Univ Fund (B)	Share of University Wide Expense (C)	Student Aid Set-Aside (D)	Net Revenue (E = A-B-C-D)	less:		University Fund Allocation (H)	Expense Budget (I = G+H)
						Revenue in Restricted Funds and Div Income (F)	Adjusted Net Revenue (G=E-F)		
Arts & Science	9%	11%	15%	25%	1%		-6%	20%	-3%
UTSC	17%	17%	20%	15%	15%		13%	xx	18%
UTM	24%	26%	19%	23%	24%		22%	xx	28%
Dentistry	9%	15%	16%	29%	1%		-11%	3%	-4%
Medicine	7%	13%	9%	102%	-7%		-23%	2%	-17%
Nursing	12%	16%	18%	47%	2%		-2%	30%	4%
Pharmacy	18%	23%	8%	19%	21%		15%	xx	24%
Physical Education & Health	11%	11%	7%	66%	6%		5%	71%	8%
Applied Science & Engineering	8%	14%	9%	37%	2%		-12%	31%	-9%
Architecture, Landscape & Design	41%	43%	44%	30%	38%		32%	10%	20%
OISE/UT	14%	17%	14%	2%	13%		7%	3%	6%
Forestry	2%	4%	10%	219%	-65%		-136%	7%	-20%
Law	7%	18%	13%	190%	-18%		-24%	3%	-14%
Information	36%	42%	28%	51%	37%		29%	5%	20%
Music	18%	24%	24%	38%	7%		5%	7%	6%
Social Work	19%	24%	16%	43%	15%		5%	9%	6%
Management	24%	32%	28%	5%	21%		16%	13%	15%
Transitional Year Programme	-19%	-2%	0%	72%	659%		xx	0%	-13%
Graduate Centres & Institutes	-57%	-53%	-68%	-55%	-44%		-49%	-44%	-46%
Subtotal (excl divisional inc)	12%	16%	13%	37%	7%		0%	16%	2%

Notes:

- (i) The four boxes in columns G and H with xx denote that the starting numbers in 2006-07 were negative, therefore a percentage change number is not appropriate.
- (ii) Some of the more dramatic % changes may well be due to restructuring and budget transfers and therefore must be treated with suspicion. This is particularly true for 'Graduate Centres & Institutes', for the Transition Year Programme, and perhaps for Forestry.
- (iii) Please note that columns E and G use the same initial number in the Appendix A table, namely the Net Revenue in column A, Appendix A.
- (iv) The overall revenue (column A) has increased by 12% over the three years, but this increase varies considerably from division to division.
- (v) Column F requires further study.