

Following is an analysis of one-time only funding done by OCUFA staff:

This has been a vexing question.

There is warrant for the universities to say that some operating funding is OTO. I just found a reference in one of the MTC memos to the universities re. undergraduate accessibility funding.

The memo is dated March 20, 2008 and accompanies the final instalment of the funding for that year. It states that the funding is OTO, but really this is a misnomer. To quote: "allocations for 2007-08 are provided on a one-time (OTO) basis and are not incremental to the 2006-07 Undergraduate Accessibility grants."

That they are not incremental simply means that the amount is calculated on an annual basis. 2006-07 funding also would have been "OTO". As would be the funding for 2008-09.

The grant is based on:

- the current year net additional undergraduate enrolment above 2004-05 (excluding certain programs like nursing which receive funding from other envelopes)
- Base Operating Income (BOI) per BIU of \$5,113.27 less formula fees (net of tuition set-aside)

The Minister's 2006 memo indicated the fund would exist through 2008-09.

With respect to the "year-end" characteristics of this fund, the Minister's memo indicated the total fund for 2007-08 was planned to be \$100 million. The preliminary allocations memo indicated the fund would be \$101 million. The March 2008 memo indicated the final allocation for the fund would be \$116 million. The only possible surprise or "year-end" funding would be the \$15 million difference, which is only ONE-HALF of ONE per cent of the 2007-08 operating allocation to universities (excluding MTCU funding for scholarships, etc. to students).

In any case, if the additional \$15 million is distributed at year-end, it is in part because there were unallocated funds:

- a) provided for already, in the preliminary allocations and/or
- b) from other envelopes (e.g., graduate expansion) that were transferred to the Undergraduate Accessibility grants.

The total amount of operating allocations did not decrease. The only uncertainty was the name of the fund under which the funds would be delivered. Which fund might also affect the distribution, but that is still only some fraction of one-half per cent.