SPECIAL EDITION

UBC REPORTS

SPECIAL EDITION

Volume 28, Number 2

January 13, 1982

Budget reductions, fee increase proposed

An advisory committee on retrenchment to President Douglas T. Kenny has proposed reductions of non-faculty and faculty budgets and an increase in student tuition fees to meet an annualized shortfall of $7.483 million in operating funds in the 1982-83 fiscal year and beyond.

This special edition of *UBC Reports* contains the full text of the report from the 13-member committee which was chaired by Prof. Michael Shaw, UBC vice-president, academic, and provost.

The committee proposes that almost half of the $7.483 million shortfall be made up from reductions in the budgets of non-faculty units, such as the library, research, and academic service units.

The balance of the shortfall would be made up from reductions of nearly $2 million in faculty budgets and student tuition fee increases of approximately 30 per cent.

The report of the advisory committee on retrenchment is in the hands of the deans of UBC's 12 faculties and three vice-presidents, who have been asked to:

- Identify specifically the affected areas and dollar amounts that would be removed to meet the total target for their faculty or administrative area;
- Indicate the academic impact that would result from the removal of funds; and
- Indicate, in the case of faculties, if consideration will have to be given to limiting course offerings or placing a ceiling on enrolments if the dollar figures proposed in the report have to be removed.

President Kenny said he would review these statements with deans and vice-presidents and with the Senate budget committee before making his own recommendations to the Board of Governors.

He said recommendations approved by the Board would have to be implemented on April 1, the start of the 1982-83 fiscal year.

In addition to Prof. Shaw, members of the advisory committee on fiscal retrenchment are: Prof. John Dennison, Education; Dr. J.R. Auman, Geophysics and Astronomy; Dr. D.H. Copp, Physiology; Dr. G.A. Feltham, Commerce and Business Administration; Dr. William M. Keenlyside, a member of UBC's Senate; Dr. R.W. Kennedy, Forestry; Dr. A.J. McClean, Law; Dr. V.J. Modi, Mechanical Engineering; Dr. G.G.E. Scudder, Zoology; R.A. Shearer, Economics; Dr. Olav Slaymaker, Geography; and Kenneth Young, UBC's Registrar.

Text of retrenchment report to president

I. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The committee's task was to consider the entire spectrum of the University's programs and operations and to advise the president how the University can meet an annualized shortfall of $7.483 million in operating funds for fiscal 1982-83 and beyond, with minimum damage to the scope and quality of education at UBC.

II. PREAMBLE

The budgetary shortfall of $7.483 million in 1982-83 should be seen against the background of four facts. First, while annual operating grants have increased in each of the seven years from 1975-76 to 1981-82, the increases have been substantially less than the amounts requested by the University (difference column, Table 1). These contained substantial amounts for the development of existing programs, including additional faculty and staff, which were not funded. Second, because the operating grants have not kept pace with inflation in salaries, wages, and non-salary expenditures, the University has had to effect reductions in continuing operating expenditures in order to balance its budget in each of the five preceding fiscal years (Table 2).

Third, these budgetary reductions have been forced on the University even though there has not been a corresponding reduction in enrolment. To complicate the problem, enrolments have shifted in favor of relatively costly programs. If enrolments are weighted by the cost-factors used in the Universities Council allocation formula, UBC has had to cut budgets in the face of a substantial increase in the number of cost-weighted, full-time equivalent students (from 45,494 in 1975-76 to 48,803 in 1981-82; i.e., an increase of 7.3%). Fourth, the internal re-allocations of operating funds have necessarily been accompanied by such adjustments as increased class and section sizes which have not been consistent with teaching effectiveness and academic excellence.

Although the University has had to make several budget cuts, this is the first time that it has been faced with the necessity of making such a massive readjustment — an annualized reduction of $7.483 million effective April 1, 1982 — in a single fiscal year. So far as we are aware, no other Canadian university has had to implement a budgetary reduction of this magnitude in one year. Since money has to be found quickly, the committee's decisions could not be made solely on the basis of academic considerations, because such decisions can often only be implemented over a long period of time. Thus, it became clear to the committee that the fiscal recommendations would inevitably be constrained by the "art of the possible."

There are several severe constraints on the adjustments that can be made in the short run.

1. The termination of academic programs is a matter of serious consequence which cannot be undertaken without careful deliberation, including the approval of Senate. Among the important considerations are the potential injustice to students already enrolled in such programs, the legitimate ambitions and aspirations of students and their parents, and the unique role of UBC in providing specialized programs which are not available at other provincial institutions.

2. The application of the allocation formula currently employed by the Universities Council to divide the operating grant from the province among the three provincial universities can create the paradoxical result that certain retrenchments could actually make the deficit worse. This could

Continued on page 2

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF OPERATING GRANTS REQUESTED AND RECEIVED

Fiscal Year	GRANT $ Requested	GRANT $ Received	DIFFERENCE $	DIFFERENCE %[a]
1975/76	$ 99,442,581	$ 91,988,957	$ 7,453,624	7.50
1976/77	$127,708,689	$103,920,766	$23,787,923	18.63
1977/78	$129,804,130	$111,315,322	$18,488,808	14.24
1978/79	$133,800,583	$122,286,000	$11,514,583	8.61
1979/80	$142,726,633	$131,831,768	$10,894,865	7.63
1980/81	$152,147,771	$143,323,783	$ 8,823,988	5.80
1981/82	$169,214,750	$161,781,475	$ 7,433,275	4.39
Mean	$136,406,448	$123,778,296	$12,628,152	9.54[b]

[a]% of $ requested.
[b]Column mean; total difference as proportion of total requested is 9.26%.

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF INTERNAL BUDGET REDUCTIONS

FISCAL YEAR	BUDGET REDUCTIONS
1976/77	$1,750,430
1977/78	$1,364,806
1978/79	$ 689,165
1979/80	$ 826,649
1980/81	$2,098,000
Subtotal 1976-80	$6,729,050*
1981/82	$7,483,000**
Total 1976-81	$14,212,050

*The sources of these funds were academic salaries 55%; support staff salaries 36%; non-salary items 9%.
**This is an annualized shortfall flowing out of fiscal 1981-82 into fiscal 1982-83.

occur if retrenchment involves a reduction in enrolment. A fall in enrolment may reduce the grant revenue to the University by more than the amount saved (e.g., immediate cancellation of the entire Guided Independent Study program might save approximately $240,000 in expenditures, but under the allocation formula, UBC would receive $630,000 less in grant revenue, not to mention fee revenue).

3. The University is bound by its contractual obligations with its faculty, staff and other employees.

4. Under the University Act, the University is not permitted to run an operating deficit. Section 28(1) of the Act states that "The Board shall not incur any liability or make any expenditure in a fiscal year beyond the amount unexpended of the grant made to the university by the universities council and the estimated revenue of the university from other sources up to the end of and including that fiscal year, unless an estimate of the increased liability or overexpenditure has been first submitted to the universities council and approved by the minister and Minister of Finance."

Because of these constraints, the committee's recommendations have to be considered as transitional. During its deliberations, it became clear to the committee that there is a number of potential adjustments that could not be studied adequately in the time available. These include constraints on curriculum expansion and a careful evaluation of the appropriate scope of programs offered by UBC, enrolment limitations, the level of operation of branch libraries and reading rooms, and the exploration of early retirement options. While these issues cannot be considered in this report, they should be studied by an appropriate body. Furthermore, in emphasizing that the recommended reductions in the budgets of the faculties and the units reporting to the vice-presidents and to the president are transitional, the committee recognizes that fundamental adjustments undoubtedly will be necessary. However, these cannot and should not be made without further study and consultation.

III. MEETINGS AND PROCEDURE

The committee met 35 times between late September, 1981 and the present for a total of approximately 90 hours. Several early meetings were spent in discussing the criteria which should be applied in effecting retrenchment. At an early stage in its deliberations, the committee recommended that the Board of Governors delay a decision on student fees for 1982-83 until the president had had the opportunity to study the committee's report. This recommendation was endorsed by the Senate Budget Committee and accepted by the president and the Board of Governors.

In the discussions with the deans and vice-presidents, the primary concern of the committee was to assess the impact of various levels of potential budgetary reductions on the scope and quality of academic and support programs. In order to provide a sharp focus for these discussions, each dean and vice-president was given a pessimistic working target and was asked to give priority rankings to the dollar amounts identified as potential reductions, and to document the impact of these on their programs and operations.

The committee received presentations from and interviewed the twelve deans of faculties, the co-ordinator of health sciences, the acting librarian, the directors of the Schools of Physical Education and Recreation, Architecture, and Nursing, the director of the Botanical Garden, the president of the Alma Mater Society, the president of the Alumni Association, the three vice-presidents, and the registrar and acting vice-provost. Deans of the faculties concerned were present when the directors of schools were interviewed. The Faculty Association was invited to make a presentation to the committee, but declined to do so.

IV. PRINCIPLES

The committee was guided by the following considerations which emerged during its deliberations:

1. Retrenchment must occur with as little damage as possible to the scope and quality of the academic programs of the University. The programs of the professional faculties have unique importance to the province, including the development of the professions, business, industry, health care and the management of renewable resources. The programs of the core Faculties of Arts and Science have a crucial role in providing fundamental education for students in the arts, humanities, social sciences, and science; they are also crucial to the cultural, social, and scientific vitality of the province and the nation. In addition, the core Faculties of Arts and Science contribute essential instructional support to the programs of the professional faculties. Excellence in this dual role of the two core faculties is the hallmark of a first class university.

2. Some faculties and administrative units, including the central administration, are by any reasonable measure already understaffed, underfunded, and therefore under severe pressure.

3. Thus, the option of an "across-the-board" reduction in the budgets of all major units is undesirable, indeed, indefensible.

4. Nevertheless, each major unit should contribute toward the shortfall target of $7.483 million.

5. However, no faculty should be permitted to effect savings by reducing its service to other faculties without appropriate consultation and agreement. If this were permitted unilaterally, it could damage academic programs in other faculties and would allow a faculty to isolate itself from the rest of the University.

6. It is essential to maintain academic and administrative support services and to maintain buildings and grounds at an acceptable level.

7. Student Services at UBC are funded at a level below prevailing norms elsewhere in the province and in the country and must therefore be protected to the greatest extent possible.

V. ASSESSMENT OF BUDGET REDUCTIONS

To simplify the presentation, the budget of the University is divided into two parts: i) the budgets of the twelve faculties; and ii) the budgets of the administrative units that report directly to the president and the vice-presidents. The former are referred to as the faculty budgets, and the latter as the non-faculty budgets.

Continued on page 3

TABLE 3
ASSESSMENTS — NON-FACULTY BUDGETS

FUNCTION AND UNIT	BUDGET REDUCTION	BALANCE
ACADEMIC SERVICES		
Animal Care	$ 2,000	
B.C. Studies	$ 2,000	
Berwick Centre	$ 88,000	
Botanical Garden	$ 100,000	
Canadian Literature	$ 2,000	
Computing Centre	$ 290,000	
Faculty Publications List	$ 3,000	
University Press	$ 20,000	
Centre for Continuing Education	$ 100,000	$ 607,000
CREDIT COURSE PROGRAMS		
Correspondence Courses	$ 113,000	
Extra-sessional Studies	$ 141,000	$ 254,000
LIBRARIES	$ 564,000	$ 564,000
STUDENT SERVICES		
Athletics	$ 7,500	
Canada Employment Centre	$ 800	
Student Health Service	$ 12,000	$ 20,300
RESEARCH		
Research Committee Grants	$1,000,000	
Overhead on Contracts	$ 80,000	$1,080,000
ADMINISTRATION		
Alumni Association	$ 76,000	
President's Office	$ 61,000	
University Resources Office	$ 35,000	
Registrar's Office	$ 6,000	
Institutional Analysis and Planning	$ 2,000	$ 180,000
GENERAL EXPENSES	$ 5,000	$ 5,000
PHYSICAL PLANT	$ 990,000	
Campus Mail	$ 20,000	$1,010,000
TOTAL REDUCTION — NON-FACULTY		$3,720,300

TABLE 4
ASSESSMENTS — FACULTY BUDGETS

FACULTY	BUDGET REDUCTION ($)
Agricultural Sciences	$ 80,200
Applied Science	$ 108,300
[Nursing	$ 52,150]
[Architecture	$ 16,050]
[Engineering	$ 40,100]
Arts	$ 541,400
Commerce & Business Admin.	$ 36,100
Dentistry	$ 36,100
Education	$ 361,000
Forestry	$ 24,100
Graduate Studies	$ 120,300
Health Sciences	$ 6,400
Law	$ 32,100
Medicine	$ 288,800
Pharmaceutical Sciences	$ 12,000
Science	$ 280,700
	$1,927,500

1. **Non-Faculty Budgets**

We *recommend* that the non-faculty budgets be reduced by a total amount of $3,720,300, and that the reduction be borne by the various units in the manner listed in Table 3. The proposed budget reductions will severely curtail aspects of the support provided for academic programs, the services provided by the University to the community and some of the broader educational activities of the University.

The major impact of the proposed reduction in academic services would be felt in the Berwick Centre ($88,000), the Botanical Garden ($100,000), the Computing Centre ($290,000), and the Centre for Continuing Education ($100,000). Responsibility for the funding of the Berwick Centre is to be assumed by the B.C. Mental Retardation Association. The committee notes that the responsibility of the Botanical Garden includes the maintenance of some parts of the University grounds and service to some other units of the University as well as the development of the Botanical Garden proper. It is the committee's view that a decision to retrench grounds maintenance and other services to the University should be co-ordinated through the President's Office. The reduction in funds for equipment rental in the Computing Centre will inevitably affect the level of service provided to users. The retrenchment in the Centre for Continuing Education will inhibit the ability of the centre to service its various constituencies and impair the University's responsibility under the University Act to "provide a program of Continuing Education in all academic and cultural fields throughout the province" (part 10, section 46, clause e).

The recommendations under Credit Course Programs recognize that the University's role in providing Guided Independent Study courses ought to be re-evaluated following establishment of the Open Learning Institute. Further, it was felt that adjustments must be made in the budget in the Department of Extra-Sessional Studies.

The proposed reduction in the Library will result in a reduced level of service. A reduction in hours of opening, in the range of bibliographic and other services, and possibly in the number of separate library units, is regrettable, but nevertheless unavoidable given the magnitude of the problem the University faces.

The proposal that the entire sum budgeted for Research Committee grants be deleted was arrived at reluctantly, especially because this will inevitably interfere with the ability of beginning faculty members to get research programs started. It is hoped that a way will be found to provide some assistance to such faculty members.

The Alumni Association provides valuable services to the University which are not widely known (such as maintenance of the Convocation list, and certain fund raising activities). However, the committee is confident that the Alumni Association will provide the funds necessary to continue these important services in the face of a reduction of $76,000 in the University's contribution to the Alumni office. This proposed reduction reflects the painful reality that the University can no longer continue to support the Alumni Association operations at past levels.

The committee is most concerned about how the reduction in the budget of Physical Plant is spread across this large unit. For example, the committee is not sure whether an appropriate balance is being maintained between the level of expenditures on the maintenance of grounds and of buildings. In the time available, the committee was not able to pursue these concerns as fully as it would like to have done.

2. **Faculty Budgets**

The assessment of $3,720,300 against the non-faculty budgets leaves a balance of $3,762,700 to be found to make up the shortfall target of $7,483,000. After careful and detailed consideration of the submissions of the deans and the health sciences co-ordinator, the committee was unanimous and emphatic in its conviction that an assessment of almost $3.8 million against the faculties would wreak permanent damage on the teaching and research programs which are the University's raison d'etre. In the committee's judgement, such an assessment cannot be contemplated.

We *recommend* that the faculty budgets be reduced by a total amount of $1,927,500 and that each faculty be assessed the amounts shown in Table 4. These assessments were arrived at after careful study of the submissions of the deans and the co-ordinator of health sciences and in light of the principles enunciated in Section IV above. The proposed assessments against some faculties are relatively light because the committee recognizes that some academic units are already operating on totally inadequate funding. Other faculties should be asked to bear a heavier share of the reduction, not necessarily because they are adequately funded, but because they are not in quite so perilous a financial state.

We wish to stress that a total reduction of almost $1.93 million in the combined budgets of the faculties in a single fiscal year must inflict major damage, coming as it does after the cumulative adjustments of the last five years (Table 2). In particular, it will make it very difficult to fill vitally important faculty and staff vacancies which have arisen because of retirements and resignations, and to appoint department heads and directors of schools from outside of UBC. Such appointments are sometimes essential in the normal evolution of an academic unit. Furthermore, it must impinge on the level of instructional support to students. In general terms, it will retard the development of existing programs which are already under severe pressure.

The assessments of $3,720,300 against the non-faculty budgets, and of $1,927,500 against the faculty budgets sum to $5,647,800. This leaves a balance of $1,835,200 to be found to meet the shortfall target of $7,483,000. Apart from an increase in the operating grant from the province, there is only one possible source of these additional funds, namely tuition fees. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase in tuition fees.

VI. ANALYSIS OF REVENUE FROM TUITION FEES

Table 5 shows the basic tuition fees for 1971 and 1981. Over the same period of time, the cost of all goods and services increased dramatically as indicated by the 170% increase in the Vancouver Consumer Price Index. Tuition fees have not kept pace with inflation. If tuition fees had been increased in accordance with the CPI, the level of fees would have been as indicated in Table 5, and the University's revenue from fees would have been 93% greater than it actually was in 1981-82. The Board of Governors of the University has already expressed serious concern about the declining share of the cost of education at UBC being provided by tuition fees, and has enunciated as a matter of University policy that "tuition fees be not less than 10% of the net budgeted general operating costs for the current year (i.e., fiscal year in which review is made)." Education at UBC is by any measure a bargain.

It is the committee's considered opinion that tuition fees must be increased substantially above the minimum increase required to meet the Board of Governors policy. The minimum increase involves a lift of 15.3% on the 1981-82 base of $15,716,000; this sum (i.e., $2,396,000) forms part of the budgeted revenue for 1982-83 which has been set against anticipated additional commitments (increases in salaries and wages, student aid, and in non-salary costs taking effect in 1982-83). It is not considered to be a contribution to the shortfall. Consequently, in the explanation of the two alternative proposals for increases in fee revenue presented below, the aggregate increase is divided into two components, (i) an increment to implement the current Board of Governors policy increase (contribution to 1982-83 University revenue); and (ii) a special increase (to meet the shortfall).

The committee is convinced that this substantial fee increase must not interfere with access to higher education at UBC. Accordingly, the committee proposes that the fee increase be accompanied by a more than proportionate increase in the funding for student aid.

The committee has considered two alternative levels of fee increase, both of which are substantially below the indexed increases shown in Table 5. These two levels are set out below as Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, which propose increases of 29.5% and 32.8% respectively.

VII. RECOMMENDED INCREASE IN TUITION FEES AND THE ALLOCATION OF FEE REVENUE

We *recommend* (i) that fees be increased by a minimum of 29.5% and that the additional revenue be

Continued on page 4

TABLE 5

UBC TUITION FEES — CURRENT DOLLARS

Degree Program	1971 Fees	1981 Fees	1971 Fees in 1982 $*
Agriculture	440	725	1188
Applied Science			
Architecture	522	850	1409
Engineering	522	850	1409
Nursing	380	695	1026
Arts			
Arts B.A./B.F.A.	428	670	1156
Home Economics	428	670	1156
Librarianship	474	770	1280
Music	544	850	1469
Social Work — 1st Year	474	670	1280
Social Work — 2nd Year	428	670	1156
Commerce			
1st Year	428	695	1156
Other Years	506	820	1366
Dentistry			
D.M.D.	644	1050	1739
Dental Hygiene	506	820	1366
Education			
B.Ed.	428	670	1156
Phys. Ed. & Rec. Ed.	428	695	1156
Forestry	506	820	1366
Law	506	820	1366
Medicine			
M.D.	644	1050	1739
Rehabilitation Medicine	380	695	1026
Pharmacy			
1st Year	428	695	1156
Other Years	506	820	1366
Science	428	670	1156
Ph.D./Ed.D. - 3 year total	1200	2105	3240
Masters - 2 year total	800	1405	2160

*1982 Average Vancouver CPI Index estimated at 270 (1971 = 100)

ALTERNATIVE 1

Current revenue from fees		$15,716,000[A]	
1.	Increment to implement minimum Board policy (15.3% of [A])	$ 2,396,000[B]	
2.	Special increment (14.2% of [A])	$ 2,246,000[C]	
	Total Increment (29.5% of [A])	$ 4,642,000	$4,642,000
Allocation of increased fee revenue			
1.	Additional provision for student aid (from [B] and [C]: 5.4% of [A])	$ 849,000	$ 849,000
2.	Provision for inflation on current operations in 1982/83 (from [B]: 12.5% of [A])	$ 1,957,800	$1,957,800
3.	Special provision to meet short-fall (from [C]: 11.7% of [A])	$ 1,835,200	$1,835,200
			$4,642,000

The provision for increased student aid was calculated using $2.0 million as the current base figure for student aid:

29.5% of $2,000,000	$590,000
10% of $2,590,000	$259,000
Total Increase in Student Aid	$849,000

It should be noted that (1) the current base for student aid has been increased by the same percentage (29.5%) as the proposed increase in student fee revenue; and (2) that a further lift in student aid of 10% has been added to cover new cases of hardship which may arise from the proposed increase in fees. The total new student aid under this alternative is $849,000, representing an increase of 42.5%. This would provide, for example, 1,132 bursaries of $750 each.

ALTERNATIVE 2

Current revenue from fees		$15,716,000[A]	
1.	Increment to implement minimum Board policy (15.3% of [A])	$ 2,396,000[B]	
2.	Special increment (17.5% of [A])	$ 2,764,000[C]	
	Total Increment (32.8% of [A])	$ 5,160,000	$5,160,000
Allocation of Increased Revenue			
1.	Additional provision for student aid (from [B] and [C]: 5.9% of [A])	$ 921,600	$ 921,600
2.	Provision for inflation on current operations in 1982/83 (from [B]: 12.5% of [A])	$ 1,968,100	$1,968,100
3.	Special provision to meet shortfall (from [C]: 14.4% of [A])	$ 2,270,300	$2,270,300
			$5,160,000

The provision for increased student aid of $921,600 was calculated as in Alternative 1. It represents an increase of 46.1% in student aid which would provide, for example, 1,228 bursaries at $750 each.

Alternative 2 is intended for comparison with Alternative 1. It should be noted that it would yield $435,100 ($2,270,337 -- $1,835,218) more than Alternative 1 to the provision for the shortfall.

allocated as in Alternative 1 in Section VI above.

We also *recommend* that, should it be decided that the increase in fee revenue be 32.8% in accordance with Alternative 2 in Section VI, the additional funds available ($435,100) be used to provide offsets (possibly as non-recurring funds) against the assessments against the non-faculty budgets in Table 3. We have in mind particularly, the Library, Research Committee grants and the Computing Centre. Other areas might also be considered.

Finally, the committee notes that implementation of either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 would mean that student fees at UBC would result in only a modest increase in the contribution of student fees to the financing of the operating costs of the University. Implementation of the minimum Board of Governors policy for 1982-83 would increase revenue from student fees as a percentage of the preceding year's operating budget from 9.84% in 1981-82 to 10.03% in 1982-83 (Table 6). Implementation of Alternative 1 would increase this figure to 11.27% and of Alternative 2 to 11.56%.

By the way of contrast, among the universities of Ontario fee revenue provides an average of 15.2% of annual operating costs. Moreover, as recently as 1970-71 fees provided 17% of annual operating costs at UBC (Table 6).

TABLE 6

BUDGETED FEES AND NET OPERATING BUDGET 1970-71 — 1981-82

Year	Budgeted* Fees	Net Operating Budget	Fees as a % of Budget	Fees as a % of Preced. Year's Budget
1970/71	$ 9,643,801	$ 56,467,511	17.08%	– %
1971/72	$ 9,897,892	$ 63,723,885	15.53	17.53
1972/73	$ 8,938,160	$ 67,872,060	13.17	14.03
1973/74	$ 8,564,369	$ 71,801,269	11.93	12.62
1974/75	$ 9,920,771	$ 84,898,215	11.69	13.82
1975/76	$10,612,079	$103,394,536	10.26	12.50
1976/77	$10,589,778	$116,431,494	9.10	10.24
1977/78	$12,998,413	$125,877,115	10.33	11.16
1978/79	$12,882,984	$136,853,015	9.41	10.23
1979/80	$13,394,888	$146,913,499	9.12	9.79
1980/81	$14,138,758	$159,795,884	8.85	9.62
1981/82	$15,715,952	$180,614,354	8.70	9.84
1982/83	$18,111,873(+15.3%)	$220,000,000(est.)	8.23	10.03
	$20,357,618(+29.5%)	$220,000,000(est.)	9.25	11.27
	$20,875,578(+32.8%)	$220,000,000(est.)	9.49	11.56

*All credit courses; includes incidental fee revenues such as Application Fees, Late Registrations, Transcripts, etc.

VIII. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

That non-faculty budgets be reduced by $3,720,300 as set out in Table 3.

Recommendation 2

That the budgets of the faculties be reduced by $1,927,500 as set out in Table 4.

Recommendation 3

That tuition fee revenue be increased by a minimum of 29.5% and that the resulting increase in revenue employed to provide

a) $849,000 for increased student aid (i.e. an increase of 42.5%)
b) $1,957,800 to meet new costs arising in 1982-83
c) $1,835,200 toward the shortfall of $7,483,000

Recommendation 4

If it is decided that tuition fee revenue be increased by 32.8%, then we recommend that the resulting increase in revenue be employed to provide

a) $921,600 for increased student aid (i.e. an increase of 46.1%)
b) $1,968,100 to meet new costs arising in 1982-83
c) $2,270,300 toward the shortfall of $7,483,000 and further that
d) the additional funds provided toward the shortfall of $435,100 (i.e. $2,270,300-$1,835,200) be employed to offset the assessments against the non-faculty budgets proposed in Recommendation 1.

Included as appendices to the Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Fiscal Retrenchment were the following documents:

A. 1981 University Program Inventory: British Columbia Institutions.
B. Summary of Criteria for the Evaluation of Academic Programs and Academic Units.
C. Letter from Dr. Shaw to President Kenny of Oct. 15, 1981: Resolution on the Board decision on student fees for 1982/83.
D. Board of Governors Policy on Tuition Fees (Dec. 4, 1979)

Interested members of the University community who wish copies of the appendices can obtain them from the UBC Department of Information Services, 228-3131.

UBC Reports is published every second Wednesday by Information Services, UBC, 6328 Memorial Road, Vancouver, B.C., V6T 1W5. Telephone 228-3131. Al Hunter, editor. Lorie Chortyk, calendar editor. Jim Banham, contributing editor.

Canada Post Postage paid / Postes Canada Port payé
Third class / Troisième classe
2027
Vancouver, B.C.