

Submitted by: Allan Manson

In reviewing the Budget Report 2014/15, I noticed that the Expense Budget on p. 32 shows that the amount of \$722, 607 was allocated in 2013/14 for “Faculty Renewal” but that this has been reduced to zero in 2014/15.

Can you please advise the Senate on the impact of this change on the general issue of faculty renewal since many units expressed to me concern that their faculty complements have not been adequately supported to meet the demands of increased enrolments?

The Faculty Renewal Program began when retirement was still mandatory and provided for a three-year bridge between a new appointment and a known retirement. A total of 24 positions were funded to a maximum of \$80,000 annually, for three years.

The last position under this program was awarded in 2011. The expense recorded for this program in its final year, 2013–2014, was \$15,000. The expenses fluctuated from year to year, sometimes putting the fund in deficit or surplus in any particular year because the funding, which was through equalized payments year by year, did not always match the expense in that year. The final expense in 2013-2014 actually paid off the program’s outstanding deficit.

Under the new budget model, “the general issue of faculty renewal” is now addressed primarily at the Faculty level. If the faculty renewal program was still in existence, it would be funded by a charge against Faculties’ attributed revenue, thereby reducing the capacity of the Faculties to engage in faculty renewal. To this degree, eliminating the program had no effect on faculty renewal. As to the issue of whether “faculty complements have [or have] not been adequately supported to meet the demands of increased enrolments”, this is in the hands of the Faculty Deans, who must weigh faculty renewal against other uses for increased revenue, including increasing salary and benefit costs of existing faculty members.