

**SUBMISSION TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
AUGUST 2009
MANITOBA ORGANIZATION OF FACULTY ASSOCIATIONS**

The Manitoba Organization of Faculty Associations (MOFA) represents approximately 1,600 teachers and researchers employed by Manitoba's primary public universities. MOFA's central concern is the quality of university teaching and research in the province. To a considerable degree, the achievement of high quality teaching and research in Manitoba, and their numerous ancillary benefits, depend on Federal financial support through a combination of transfer payments and targeted funding for post-secondary education.

MOFA believes that these two avenues for Federal funding of universities are vital to the well-being of our institutions and Canadian society as a whole. Investment in the teaching and research functions of universities has demonstrable benefits for society, including a well-educated and employable populace, the generation of new knowledge that benefits individuals and organizations, and an overall enriched quality of life for Canadians. This type of investment is particularly important to address goals related to economic and social development in what is likely to be a period of slow and protracted economic recovery from the recession of 2008-09. We trust that the next Federal budget will acknowledge these and other benefits and will include appropriate increases in support of university teaching and scholarship.

More specifically, MOFA encourages the Federal government to fund universities in ways that benefit all Canadians, no matter what their geographic location. Evidence indicates that Federal funds for universities distributed through a variety of targeted programs (e.g., granting councils, research chairs, undergraduate and graduate scholarships and loans, infrastructure programs) do not serve provinces like Manitoba well, and indeed are likely to exacerbate existing regional disparities in university and research funding. That is, rich institutions gain disproportionately from these programs at the expense of less well-endowed institutions. Here we concentrate on disparities involving Manitoba.

The central issue for MOFA is that Manitoba receives a much lower percentage of funds from these funding sources than warranted by the province's proportion of the Canadian population, undergraduate students, and faculty. The attached tables document the shortfall. Despite having about 3.7% of Canada's population, Manitoba institutions historically have received less than 3% of funds from the three main granting councils (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and Canadian Institutes for Health Research) and from the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (slides 1, 2, 3, and 4). In the case of CFI funds, Manitoba has received only 1.5% of its disbursements, far less than half of what its allocation would be if based on population. Our examination of specific programs within the granting councils (e.g., individual and group grants, scholarships and fellowships) demonstrates the general nature of the under-funding, with very few exceptions.

This shortfall across major sources of Federal support for university teaching and research makes it challenging to provide high quality teaching for students in Manitoba, and to conduct the quality of scholarship upon which contemporary society and business are so dependent. Given that much research and even teaching activity provides services to the region in which they are carried out (e.g., evaluations of the effectiveness of medical treatment, research relevant to industry, practicum courses, arts-based scholarly work), the shortfall means diminished support for Manitoba citizens, organizations, and businesses in diverse domains. Manitoba residents, relative to other Canadians, are likely to have fewer opportunities to participate in research-based programs for the treatment of physical and mental health difficulties, Manitoba businesses would have reduced access to industry-related scholarship, and Manitoba citizens would receive fewer cultural benefits from scholarly work in the arts and humanities.

Despite the complex nature of funding for university teaching and research in Canada, the Federal government is clearly in the best position to ensure that all Canadian citizens and businesses have equal access to quality university resources, and that the badly-needed but scarce resources represented by university students and researchers are not squandered by inadequate and uneven support. Certainly it seems inappropriate for the Federal government to allocate funds to universities in ways that worsen regional disparities. This is particularly clear in provinces like Manitoba where levels of industry-funded research also tend to be extremely low. A recent Statistics Canada report covering Industrial Research and Development for 2007 reported that only 1.2% of the dollar value of such research was conducted in Manitoba. Such inequitable funding, both public and private, at the very least demonstrates a less than optimal use of large numbers of university students and faculty who happen to be located in geographic regions not currently well served by Federal funding programs or by private investment.

In addition to an overall increase in funding for universities, therefore, MOFA would like to see policies and procedures that ensure adequate and equitable funding for students and researchers in all parts of Canada. We see at least two ways that the current situation can be improved.

One approach to ensuring equitable funding of Canadian universities in all parts of the country would be to strengthen transfer payments for post-secondary education, in terms of both the amount of money available and the manner in which funds are distributed. With respect to the latter, funds for post-secondary education and various social programs are currently co-mingled in the Canada Social Transfer (CST), which complicates accountability by various levels of government and in particular makes it difficult for the Federal government to ensure funds go where they are intended and needed (e.g., universities and other post-secondary institutions). We strongly encourage a separation of post-secondary and social program funding, building perhaps on a Post-Secondary Education Act like that proposed by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (see <http://www.caut.ca/uploads/pseact-2007.pdf>).

A second approach to equitable funding is to adopt mechanisms to correct regional inequities in

targeted Federal programs. A first step could be to examine Federal programs to identify funding criteria or other elements that bias distribution in favour of certain institutions or regions of the country. Historical funding records may provide some insights; for example, over 63% of the \$281M in CIHR funds used for clinical trials has been allocated to Ontario, versus a mere 1% to Manitoba. A second step would be to develop programs like those of the National Science Foundation in the USA designed to deal with geographic and other disparities in scholarly funding. In essence NSF allocates funds specifically for programs that strive to ameliorate and reduce regional disparities observed in NSF's primary programs (e.g., competition funds specific to under-served regions and institutions).

MOFA also suggests that Members of Parliament avoid tying increased funding to narrow research agendas. Last year, supplementary SSHRC funding was made available only to business-related projects, although Canadians and the economy would have benefitted as much or more from increased funding in other domains. To illustrate, research on changing people's attitudes about commercial products would have been funded but not research on health-related attitudes that have serious economic consequences or, more importantly, basic research on understanding the nature of attitudes and their modification. Such basic research tends to be far more dependent on government programs than applied research; Statistics Canada recently reported that only 4.5% of all Industrial Research and Development funds spent by business in 2007 was for activities classified as basic research. And yet basic research promises the greatest returns to society from a long-term perspective due to its implications for diverse areas of concern.

In conclusion, MOFA strongly encourages the Federal government to increase support for our universities, students, and faculty through unfettered increases both to transfer payments for post-secondary education and to diverse Federal programs that fund university teaching and scholarship. Moreover, the Federal budget should strive to improve parity in the allocation of funds to different parts of the country and to different institutions. Parity serves to make optimal use of university students and scholars throughout the country and to ensure that the benefits of university teaching and research are enjoyed equally by all Canadians.

James M. Clark
President, MOFA
j.clark@uwinnipeg.ca

SSHRC – All Programs (1998-2008)

1

Province	Number*		Amount		Average Award (\$)
	N	%	\$	%	
Atlantic					
Newfoundland and Labrador	348	1.06%	10,896,190.49	1.17%	31,316.84
Prince Edward Island	44	0.13%	1,171,339.00	0.13%	26,621.34
Nova Scotia	962	2.93%	25,444,305.64	2.73%	26,449.38
New Brunswick	508	1.55%	12,951,883.43	1.39%	25,495.44
Sub-total: Atlantic	1,862	5.67%	50,465,618.56	5.42%	27,102.86
Quebec					
Québec	8,245	25.10%	237,409,497.71	25.50%	28,794.38
Sub-total: Quebec	8,245	25.10%	237,409,497.71	25.50%	28,794.38
Ontario					
Ontario	13,226	40.26%	377,703,903.98	40.57%	28,557.68
Sub-total: Ontario	13,226	40.26%	377,703,903.98	40.57%	28,557.68
Prairies					
Manitoba	695	2.12%	19,804,056.40	2.13%	28,495.05
Saskatchewan	581	1.77%	17,437,212.14	1.87%	30,012.41
Alberta	2,379	7.24%	66,083,422.67	7.10%	27,777.82
Sub-total: Prairies	3,655	11.13%	103,324,691.21	11.10%	28,268.41
British Columbia					
British Columbia	4,221	12.85%	128,709,906.26	13.82%	30,492.75
Sub-total: British Columbia	4,221	12.85%	128,709,906.26	13.82%	30,492.75
North					
Yukon	6	0.02%	333,831.00	0.04%	55,638.50
Northwest Territories	5	0.02%	75,000.00	0.01%	15,000.00
Sub-total: North	11	0.03%	408,831.00	0.04%	37,166.45
Other in Canada					
Other in Canada	702	2.14%	15,543,876.00	1.67%	22,142.27
Sub-total: Other in Canada	702	2.14%	15,543,876.00	1.67%	22,142.27
Outside Canada					
Outside Canada	926	2.82%	17,506,542.77	1.88%	18,905.55
Sub-total: Outside Canada	926	2.82%	17,506,542.77	1.88%	18,905.55
Total	32,848	100.00%	931,072,767.49	100.00%	28,344.88

NSERC – All Programs (1991-2008)

2

Province	Number		Amount		Average Award (\$)
	N	%	\$	%	
British Columbia	18,604	11.65%	532,361,438	13.53%	28,615
Alberta	14,691	9.20%	361,657,570	9.19%	24,618
Saskatchewan	4,345	2.72%	108,992,961	2.77%	25,085
Manitoba	4,451	2.79%	96,274,280	2.45%	21,630
Ontario	55,798	34.93%	1,407,957,558	35.78%	25,233
Quebec	32,862	20.57%	865,739,554	22.00%	26,345
New Brunswick	3,136	1.96%	58,392,199	1.48%	18,620
Nova Scotia	6,322	3.96%	128,562,748	3.27%	20,336
Prince Edward Island	420	0.26%	5,260,818	0.13%	12,526
Newfoundland and Labrador	2,267	1.42%	51,725,615	1.31%	22,817
Other	16,852	10.55%	318,604,348	8.10%	18,906
Total	159,748	100.00%	3,935,529,089	100.00%	24,636

CIHR – All Programs (up to 2009-2010)

3

Country	Region	Number	%	Amount	%	Average Amount
Unknown	Unknown	314	1.2%	\$46,032,918	0.6%	\$146,602
Canada	N/A	215	0.8%	\$59,188,473	0.8%	\$275,295
Canada	Ontario	9895	37.6%	\$2,895,506,938	40.0%	\$292,623
Canada	New Brunswick	93	0.4%	\$10,336,266	0.1%	\$111,143
Canada	Newfoundland and Labrador	249	0.9%	\$43,426,447	0.6%	\$174,403
Canada	Québec	7652	29.1%	\$2,092,984,362	28.9%	\$273,521
Canada	Nova Scotia	756	2.9%	\$169,084,929	2.3%	\$223,657
Canada	Manitoba	821	3.1%	\$199,924,071	2.8%	\$243,513
Canada	Alberta	2662	10.1%	\$760,653,346	10.5%	\$285,745
Canada	Saskatchewan	477	1.8%	\$96,703,872	1.3%	\$202,733
Canada	British Columbia	3119	11.9%	\$852,523,329	11.8%	\$273,332
Canada	Prince Edward Island	56	0.2%	\$6,808,038	0.1%	\$121,572
Total		26309	100%	\$7,233,172,989	100%	\$274,932

CFI – up to 2009

4

	# Awards	\$
Canada	6308	\$4,248,073,863
Manitoba	218	\$65,583,941
% MB	3.5%	1.5%