



University of Toronto

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, GOVERNMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS

TO: Committee on Academic Policy and Planning

SPONSOR: Carolyn Tuohy
CONTACT INFO: 416-978-2181; c.tuohy@utoronto.ca

DATE: May 28, 2004 for June 4, 2004

AGENDA ITEM: 1

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

The Committee is the point of entry into governance for reports on the results of academic reviews commissioned by academic administrators. The role of the Committee is to ensure that the reviews are done, that an appropriate process is being used, that adequate documentation is provided and consultations are undertaken, and that issues identified in the review are addressed by the administration.

The compendium of review summaries will be forwarded, together with the record of the Committee's discussion, to the Agenda Planning committee of the Academic Board, which will determine whether there are any issues of general academic import warranting discussion at the Board level. The same documentation will be sent to the Executive Committee of the Governing Council for information.

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

HIGHLIGHTS:

Academic leaders commission regular reviews of academic divisions when deans or chairs reach the end of their terms. These reviews usually inform the search for a new dean or chair and are an integral part of the academic planning process.

The current report includes summaries of reviews of five units within the Faculty of Arts and Science, two units in the School of Graduate Studies, twelve departments in the Faculty of Medicine, one department at OISE/UT, and three Provostial reviews. In the Faculties of Applied Science and Engineering, Arts and Science, OISE/UT, and UTSC, a

number of chair searches were conducted without reviews because of recent accreditation and OCGS reviews. For the Committee's information, the Faculty Deans have provided summaries and explanations for the waiving of reviews.

The University of Toronto at Mississauga had completed an evaluation of its disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs and faculty cohorts, the outcome of which was the decision to establish distinct academic departments with their own appointing authority and budgets. A description of the process undertaken to establish these units is included in this compendium.

The full review reports are available in the Office of the Governing Council should members wish to consult them.

FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS:

There are no new/additional financial resources required.

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information.

REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS

Table of Contents

	Page No.
Introduction	2
<u>Faculty of Arts and Science</u>	
Department of Anthropology - Undergraduate	5
Drama Program (University College) - Undergraduate	7
Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology	9
Department of Religion	11
Department of Sociology	13
<u>School of Graduate Studies</u>	
Institute for Policy Analysis	17
<u>Faculty of Medicine</u>	
Department of Anaesthesia	21
Department of Biochemistry	25
Department of Family and Community Medicine	28
Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology	32
Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology	37
Banting and Best Department of Medical Research	41
Department of Medicine	44
Department of Nutritional Sciences	49
Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology	53
Department of Otolaryngology	58
Department of Public Health Sciences	62
Department of Surgery	66
<u>OISE/UT</u>	
Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning	70
<u>University of Toronto at Mississauga</u>	
Establishment of UTM Departments	75
<u>Provostial Reviews</u>	
Faculty of Information Sciences	78
OISE/UT	81
University of Toronto at Scarborough	85

INTRODUCTION

In the wake of the comprehensive wave of external reviews conducted as part of the *Raising Our Sights* planning process in 1999-2000, the University and its academic divisions have been re-establishing cycles of regular periodic reviews of academic programs and units. Previously, the review cycle had been tied in most cases to the term of the head of the unit. Given the comprehensive reviews in the last planning cycle and the anticipation of another round of reviews in the next planning cycle, however, end-of-term reviews have been waived in a number of cases. The Interim Vice-President and Provost, in consultation with Principals and Deans, is developing a set of revisions to the Provost's Guidelines on Reviews of Academic Programs and Units that will include a provision that each multi-departmental division will maintain a multi-year schedule of reviews, to be annually assessed and up-dated.

During the period covered by the current report, the multi-departmental faculty conducting the largest number of reviews was the Faculty of Medicine. The Faculty of Medicine did not commission separate departmental reviews as part of *Raising Our Sights*, opting instead for a comprehensive "Review of Reviews" process as previously reported to the Committee, and has therefore continued on its normal review cycle. During the past three academic years the Faculty has conducted reviews of twelve units. Seven of the reviews are for clinical departments (Anaesthesia, Family and Community Medicine, Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Medicine, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Otolaryngology and Surgery), four are for basic science departments (Banting & Best Department of Medical Research, Biochemistry, Medical Genetics and Microbiology and Nutritional Sciences) and one for a community health department (Public Health Sciences). In all cases the overall assessment of the department was very positive, with research excellence of particular note. In several cases the reviewers elaborate by providing an assessment of the ranking of the department in respect to national and international peers. Common issues highlighted include those identified in some reviews of departments in the Faculty previously reported to the Committee – space and budgetary concerns, the desirability of increased student mentoring and student involvement in departmental governance, the administrative complexities arising from the multi-site dispersion of departments, and the program design and inter-faculty management issues associated with the undergraduate arts and science programs offered by faculty in the basic science departments. The Dean has provided a detailed and considered response to each of these reviews.

In the Faculty of Arts and Science regular reviews were conducted for the Departments of Sociology and the Study of Religion. In addition, the undergraduate programs of the Department of Anthropology and the Drama Program at University College were reviewed as part of augmented OCGS reviews of Anthropology and Drama. These were the first instances of augmented reviews under changes to OCGS procedures allowing for this option. As this option is further developed and exercised in the future, care must be taken to ensure that sufficient attention is paid by reviewers to the undergraduate program. Each of these four reviews identified a number of key strengths, and also pointed out the need to accommodate internal diversity of outlook and approach within the unit and/or to pursue great coordination with related units, especially across the three campuses. These will be key issues for the Faculty in its *Stepping Up* planning.

Three graduate units were transferred from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Arts and Science during this period, and one (the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology) has undergone a regular review.

In the School of Graduate Studies five-year reviews were conducted for the Institute for Policy Analysis (IPA) and the Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama. The review of Centre for the Study of Drama incorporated the augmented OCGS review of the Centre conducted in 2002. A theme common to each of these reviews, and to the review of the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology in the Faculty of Arts and Science, was the importance for these centres and institutes of establishing broader linkages across the University. It should also be noted that in the case of two units included in this year's report which do not have explicit teaching mandates – IPA and the Bnating and Best Department of Medical Research in the Faculty of Medicine, reviewers have encouraged the units to develop more formalized means to facilitate the involvement of their members in teaching.

In OISE/UT, a review was conducted for the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL). The reviewers noted the strong record of research funding in the Department, as well as the perceived high quality of teaching. They remarked upon the diverse span of the Department, which is the largest in OISE/UT, and also addressed the tension between pre-service teacher and graduate education – a tension also noted in the review of OISE/UT, also included in this summary.

In each multi-departmental division, a number of reviews were waived at the end of the chair's term, largely due to the recent nature of the *Raising Our Sights* planning process. These instances of waived reviews are outlined in a separate section of this report.

At the level of the Provost, reviews of the Faculty of Information Studies and of OISE/UT were commissioned as part of the searches for new deans. Each of these reviews noted key strengths, but commented on the need for greater clarity and coherence of the intellectual vision and mission. At UTM and UTSC, the re-structuring brought about by the new *Framework for Academic Administration for the Three Campuses* intersected with the search for the new Vice-President and Principal at each campus. In the case of UTSC, an external review was commissioned by the Provost and is reported here. In the case of UTM, it was determined that the development of an entirely new departmental structure warranted deferring external reviews until the departments had become established. A description of the process and criteria used to establish the fourteen new departments and one institute is included herein.

Faculty of Arts and Science

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Anthropology - Undergraduate
DATE:	November 2002
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean of the School of Graduate Studies – OCGS review; augmented to consider undergraduate programs at the request of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Science.
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate:	B.A.: Specialist, Major and Minor Programs in Anthropology; Major program in Linguistic & Semiotic Anthropology; Specialist program in Social/Cultural Anthropology; Minor program in Environmental Anthropology. B.Sc.: Specialist program in Anthropological Sciences; Major program in Biological Anthropology.
Graduate:	n/a
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	Three external reviewers submitting one augmented report.
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International:	Prof. Jane Hill, University of Arizona Prof. Sydel Silverman, Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropology. Prof. Alan Swedlund, University of Massachusetts at Amherst
Canadian:	--
DATES OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS:	Cluster review, 1999.
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	Graduate Anthropology, Fall 2002.
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Self-Study Department's Undergraduate Handbook 2002-03
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	The reviewers, besides doing the necessary consultations for the OCGS review, looked briefly also at the undergraduate Anthropology programs on all 3 campuses.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:	
Normal review process requires the School of Graduate Studies to summarize and to respond to the regular OCGS review. The Faculty of Arts & Science therefore here summarizes (and below responds to) only the reviewers' comments on the undergraduate programs.	
The reviewers judged the undergraduate programs on all 3 campuses to be solid, and meeting very high student demand. More resources, in terms of faculty and of TA'ships, were felt to be needed for the Department to manage the level of demand. Specific fields of appointment were suggested for new faculty at both UTM and UTSC (socio-cultural and linguist fields, respectively).	

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Dean of Arts & Science is pleased with the reviewers' recognition of the solidarity and popularity of the Faculty's undergraduate programs in Anthropology. Resources – especially faculty positions – are always an ongoing concern, and will be a part, for all Faculty departments, of the Stepping UP academic planning processes currently taking place. New and replacement faculty positions will be allocated as a result of this planning exercise.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Drama Program (University College) - Undergraduate

DATE: Spring 2001

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean of the School of Graduate Studies –
OCGS review augmented in consultation with
the Principal of University College.

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate: B.A.: Specialist, Major and Minor Programs in
Drama; Specialist program in Drama and
English.

Graduate: n/a

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION: Three external reviewers submitting separate
augmented reports.

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:

International: Dr. Dennis Kennedy, Trinity College (Dublin)

Canadian: Dr. Susan Bennett, University of Calgary
Dr. Ted McGee, University of Waterloo

DATES OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS: Cluster review, 1999.

DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW: Undergraduate programs do not receive OCGS
reviews; but in this case an augmented OCGS
review (2001) of the Graduate Centre for the
Study of Drama dealt with relationship between
the Graduate Drama Centre and the separate
undergraduate program at University College.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

Self-Study
University College Drama Program review report
Program brochure
Academic calendar material

CONSULTATION PROCESS: The reviewers met with the faculty, staff, and
students of the Program and with the Principal of
University College. They also toured the
Program's facilities.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The reviewers agreed on the high quality of the UC Drama Program, which unites
academic/theoretical work in drama with the practical training (above all in acting). There is a
good balance between academic and practical courses. The reviewers recommend that a goal of
the Graduate Drama Centre be to work closely with the University's 3 undergraduate programs
(on 3 campuses): through, for example, seminars, TA'ships, informal exchanges, and joint
workshops.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The augmentation of the OCGS review was requested not by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Science but by the Principal of University College. The School of Graduate Studies responded to the OCGS review in January 2002, and included comments, in its response, on the relationship between the Graduate Drama Centre and the UC Drama Program. It concurred with the OCGS reviewers' conclusion that the graduate and undergraduate programs should not be merged within one administrative structure but that growing cooperation between the undergraduate and graduate programs should be a goal.

The UC Drama Program has been independently reviewed in the past, and will be so again in the future. The Dean and Vice Deans of Arts & Science will be developing, once the current Stepping UP planning process has been completed, a cyclical review process for all non-departmental undergraduate teaching programs, in which they will be considered fully as undergraduate programs, some with graduate unit connections, rather than largely in terms of their relationship to one or more graduate units.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Institute for the History & Philosophy of Science and Technology

DATE: 2002-03

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Science

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate: B.A.: Specialist, Major and Minor Programs in History and Philosophy of Science; Specialist, Major and Minor programs in History of Science and Technology.

Graduate: M.A., Ph.D.

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION: Two external reviewers submitting joint report.

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:

International: Professor George Smith
The Dibner Institute for the History of Science and Technology, Tufts University

Canadian: Professor Margaret J. Osler, University of Calgary

DATES OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS: The Institute was transferred from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Arts and Science in 2000. No previous Arts & Science reviews have been conducted.

DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW: 2001

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

Self-Study
OCGS review (2001)
Director's report
CVs of core Institute and affiliated faculty.

CONSULTATION PROCESS: Over the two days of the joint site visit, the external reviewers met with the Dean and Vice Dean Academic of the Faculty, the Associate Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, all but one member of the Institute faculty, 3 affiliated faculty members, some members of the Philosophy Department, and more than a dozen graduate students. The meetings with individual faculty members were largely taken up by questions put by the reviewers to the faculty.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The reviewers described the Institute as "one of the top programs in the field in North America," with a primary emphasis on the content of science and technology. The Institute has been "remarkably stable" over the last 3 decades, with faculty who are "almost all major scholars." Upcoming retirements now create an opportunity to bring in excellent younger faculty to serve as role models and younger mentors for graduate students.

Specific issues:

1. Faculty profile: The reviewers note that senior faculty nearing retirement will need to be replaced by energetic junior faculty members nearer in age to, and therefore more immediate role models for, graduate students. The philosophy of science and the history of medicine are two fields especially requiring new appointees.

2. Insularity: The reviewers felt that the Institute too often looks inward, in its teaching and research, rather than taking full advantage of the connections and opportunities offered by the University of Toronto as a whole.

3. Leadership and Renewal: The reviewers note that the Institute is going through a period for major change, during which it will require self-examination and exceptional leadership. The new Director will need energy, commitment, and political astuteness.

4. Graduate Program: The reviewers applauded the Institute's language requirements. They were unsure about, and so made no recommendations about, a one-year versus a two-year Master's degree, and a direct-entry Ph.D. admission option.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Dean of Arts & Science is pleased at the highly positive response of the reviewers to the quality reputation of the Institute. Two new junior faculty appointments have already been made, both in the philosophy of science, and another, in the history of science, will be made in 2004-05. The history of medicine is being staffed temporarily through a contractually limited term appointment. The new Director is a philosopher of biology with extensive administrative experience and a high level of energy and commitment; and connections both across the Faculty and with other areas of the University will be developed. Graduate program matters will be addressed in the Institute's Stepping UP plan.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department for the Study of Religion
DATE:	January 2002
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate:	B.A.: Specialist, Major and Minor Programs in Religion; also Specialist Programs in Religion: Christian Origins and in Religion and Philosophy
Graduate:	M.A., Ph.D
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	Two external reviewers, submitting joint report
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International:	None
Canadian:	Professor Katherine Young, McGill University Professor Pamela Dickey Young, Queen's University
DATES OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS:	1999 (ROS cluster review), 1984
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	1998-99
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Self-Study Chair's Report (15 August, 2001) Last external review (1999 cluster review) OCGS periodic appraisal (1998/99) Departmental brochures and CVs.
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	Over the two days of the joint site visit, the external reviewers met with the Dean and Vice-Dean of the Faculty, the administrative officers of the Department/Centre for the Study of Religion, core faculty members of the Department, some of the cross-appointed faculty with graduate teaching and supervision responsibilities in the Study of Religion, the administrative staff and a group of graduate students. They met no undergraduates. They examined detailed data on faculty complement and current undergraduate and graduate teaching activities, as well as the CV's of all faculty members.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall assessment:

The reviewers described the Department for the Study of Religion as "a good unit that could be great" if it developed more focus and infrastructure. They found considerable optimism, particularly among the recently hired faculty, regarding the potential to "do exciting things". At the same time, they signalled a number of challenges arising from the organizational complexity of a unit which functions simultaneously as a department with a small core faculty and as a graduate centre with a large and diffuse range of cross-appointments and linkages into other units. Foremost among such challenges is the need to strengthen the sense of an intellectual

community anchored to the department through academic and social events designed to bring faculty (both core and cross-listed) and students together in common cause.

Specific issues:

1. **Curriculum:** Given the university's extensive library holdings in several of the world's religions and the complementary expertise across other units in the university, the reviewers suggested that the department be encouraged to develop some specialized fields. They also recommended that it continue its excellent networking to bring graduate students together with scholars in other units, and that it enhance efforts at coordinated planning with other units in order to develop a rational plan for future collaboration.

They also proposed that the undergraduate programs be revised so that introductory and subsequent course offerings could be reconfigured in ways which would not only attract students to the field but also facilitate reasonable progression from undergraduate to graduate studies.

2. **Language training:** The reviewers recommended creation of a committee to explore language training for scholarly needs, and to recommend ways to facilitate access to such training by students, either within the university or through relevant language programs available elsewhere.
3. **Departmental administration:** The reviewers recommended that the next Chair be drawn from within the department rather than one of its cognate contributing units, and that the department adopt a more formal and democratic administrative structure, one that would include student representation on a wider range of departmental committees.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The deans of the Faculty of Arts and Science were pleased to learn of the great potential of the Department and the optimism among younger faculty which bodes well for the future. They note the reviewers' concerns that the Department needs to develop a sense of (intellectual) community and hope to follow the recommendation that the next chair be someone from within the Department. They will encourage the next chair to submit a revised undergraduate curriculum and to look into the issue of language training.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Sociology
DATE:	December 2002
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate:	B.A.: Specialist, Major and Minor Programs in Sociology; also Specialist Programs in Economics and Sociology, Philosophy and Sociology, Political Science and Sociology and Sociology and Urban Studies
Graduate:	M.A., Ph.D.
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	Three external reviewers, submitting joint report
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International:	Professor Wendell Bell Senior Research Scientist and Professor Emeritus Yale University
	Professor Teresa Sullivan Executive Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs University of Texas System
Canadian:	Professor Axel van den Berg Department of Sociology, McGill University
DATES OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS:	1999 (ROS Cluster Review)
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	2000-01
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Self-study Chair's Report (1 August 2002) Last OCGS Periodic Appraisal (GOOD)
QUALITY	WITH REPORT due 1 March 2003 OCGS appraisers' reports Previous external review (1999 Cluster Review) CVs of all faculty members
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	Over the first two days of their joint visit in December 2002, the external reviewers met with the Dean and the Vice Dean Undergraduate Education and Teaching of the Faculty, the Dean and Associate Dean for Social Sciences of the School of Graduate Studies, the Chair, Associate Chairs and many faculty members of the Department, including several from the University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough campuses, one administrative staff person and a few graduate and undergraduate students. The Department

staff helpfully provided additional information and data requested. On their third day the reviewers worked together to plan their report.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall assessment:

The reviewers have no doubt of the strengths of the Department in both research and teaching: 'Individual members of the UofT sociology faculty are generally of high quality and include **some top-ranked, internationally known sociologists**, people who would be a credit to the most respected and highly rated sociology departments in the best universities in the world. ... The quality of research being carried out in the Department is **generally excellent**, a fact that is reflected in the Department's success in obtaining external research grants, its research productivity, and in its scholarly reputation'; 'The quality of teaching, especially **undergraduate teaching, is exceptional for a major research university**. There are relatively few major Departments of Sociology that teach so many students per faculty member and do it as well as does the UofT Department.'

At the same time, however, the reviewers paint a disturbing picture of a department driven by disagreements between faculty members, disagreements which also affect graduate students, over, to use the reviewers' words, 'what good, high quality sociological work is and how the integrity of the discipline of sociology is best served by Departmental policies and decisions.' The disagreement is partly over the relative merits of quantitative and qualitative work in sociology and also over the worth of 'pure' versus applied sociology. It has caused some senior scholars to withdraw in various ways and to varying degrees from the life of the Department and other, younger faculty members to feel their own work is under-appreciated and/or impeded by administrative duties.

The reviewers' overall impression was one 'of a faculty that has made considerable rapid progress under the leadership of its current Chair ... [and] one of a faculty working energetically towards its goals, notably developing new strengths in the sociology of health and policy analysis, but **a faculty in which not everyone is happy with such an image of the future and which disagrees, sometimes disagreeably, with each other**' over important issues.

Specific issues:

1. The doctoral program: The reviewers thought the five fields in the new, shortened list of OCGS-approved fields in the Ph.D. program are each too broad and too vague to provide an accurate indication of the Department's strengths. The reviewers did not, however, share the concerns expressed by some faculty and some graduate students that there were too many required courses in methodology and/or too much emphasis on quantitative methodology; on the contrary, they 'unanimously felt that the present course requirements are not out of line with current practice in the leading sociology departments in North America' (though they did think the present field methods course was capable of improvement in order to make it clear that quantitative and qualitative methods are fundamentally complementary). They were divided in their views on the need to retain the second language requirement.

2. Graduate student funding: The reviewers noted the confusion in the Department over the requirements of the new guaranteed funding commitment and are also concerned that this may be leading to the admission of too small a number of doctoral students for the health of the program (and the Department). This issue 'needs to be addressed immediately by the Department and the Faculty of Arts and Science, in a cooperative and constructive manner.' The Department should also, in the reviewers' opinion, improve the graduate admissions process so as to match student interest more closely with the research interests of faculty members, especially (but not only) when the faculty members can provide research funds for the incoming students.

3. Faculty recruitment and retention: The external reviewers report the view of some senior faculty members that tenure has been too easily granted in the past; they themselves believe that the Department will have to raise its standards for recommending tenure 'well above what they currently appear to be'. They also point to the problem for junior faculty seeking to achieve high

standards in research of being overburdened by committee assignments and other administrative duties.

4. Administration: The reviewers' concern about the effect of the disagreements among the faculty over the proper approach to sociology has already been noted. They also note that although the current Chair has tried to create a more open and inclusive environment by the appointment of committees including junior faculty, and has succeeded insofar as department meetings are better attended and committee membership is more diverse, there is still 'a sense that the department's decision making is not yet sufficiently transparent' or democratic.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Dean is pleased with the recognition of the high standards of research and teaching achieved in the Sociology Department. He is understandably worried to learn that these high standards may be compromised by the differing views of the appropriate goals and methods for the Department to pursue in the next few years and the fact these differences are not being resolved within the Department.

On the specific issues, the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Department of Sociology are already working together to resolve the matter of graduate student enrolment and funding. The Dean notes the concern with respect to tenure standards and will alert the next Chair of the Department to this concern. The Dean will also endeavour to ensure that the next Chair has the full confidence and trust of the faculty and graduate students of the Department and has as her/his first duty to improve the governance structure of the Department.

REVIEW SUMMARY

- DIVISION/UNIT:** School of Graduate Studies,
Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama
- REVIEW COMPLETION:** May 7, 2002 – Decanal Response
April 22, 2002 – SGS Five Year Review
January 2002 – Decanal Response to OCGS
Augmented Review of the Graduate
Centre for the Study of Drama
April 2001 – OCGS periodic appraisal
augmentation
April 2001 – OCGS review, external appraisers
reports
- COMMISSIONING OFFICER:** Acting Dean Donald Cormack, SGS
- PROGRAMS OFFERED:** The Centre has an M.A. program and a Ph.D.
program with three OCGS-approved fields making
the core of its academic program: theatre history,
theory of drama and dramaturgy.
- Other:** “The Drama Centre currently has a complement of
2.67 FTE core teaching faculty and 4 FTE theatre
staff and administrative personnel; in addition, 41
faculty are cross-appointed to the Centre from other
graduate units. There are 87 students enrolled in the
Centre’s graduate programs, 13 full-time and 11 part-
time in the Master’s program and 63 in the doctoral
program.” (Report of the Committee, p. 2).
- INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:**
Professor Bernard Katz, SGS Associate Dean, Division I (Chair)
Professor Brian Corman, Centre for the Study of Drama and Chair, Department of English
Professor Stephen Johnson, Graduate Coordinator, Centre for the Study of Drama

Professor Leslie Katz, Centre for the Study of Drama

Mr. Robert Moses, Administrative Assistant, Centre for the Study of Drama

Professor Mariel O'Neill-Karch, Centre for the Study of Drama and Principal, Woodsworth College

Professor Paul Perron, Department of French and Principal, University College

Professor Wendy Rolph, Department of Spanish and Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science

Ms Kim Solga, Ph.D. Candidate, Centre for the Study of Drama

EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:

OCGS External Appraisers:

Dr. Susan Bennett, University of Calgary

Dr. Dennis Kennedy, Trinity College, University of Dublin

Dr. Ted McGee, University of Waterloo

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: 1995-1996, School of Graduate Studies

CONSULTATION PROCESS:

A notice in the Bulletin and e-mail message to faculty, staff and students resulted in responses from 9 faculty and staff and 10 students.

The Committee reviewed the following written material:

1. The Centre's 'Brief for the Periodic Appraisal of the M.A. and Ph.D. in Drama', submitted to OCGS in October 1999
2. Reports submitted in April 2001 by external appraisers for the OCGS review
3. The Centre's response to the OCGS appraisers' reports
4. The 'SGS Decanal Response to the Augmented Review of the Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama', prepared in January 2002.

Since external appraisers had reviewed the Centre so recently, as part of the OCGS review, the Committee did not seek additional outside appraisals.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall Assessment:

The Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama...has developed an M.A. program and a Ph.D. program that are without equivalent elsewhere in Canada". (Report of the Committee, p.1).

The Committee explored three main issues in its report, namely the Centre's faculty complement, the role of the practicum, and relations with the undergraduate drama programs at the University.

Faculty Complement

The OCGS appraisers had reported that the number of core faculty is too small. The Committee agreed and recommended further that any new faculty appointments be made jointly with one of the undergraduate programs or with a department. They emphasized the need for a new appointment in performance theory.

French language Canadian theatre and drama is not adequately supported in the Centre, which should be capable of supporting all areas of Canadian theatre and drama studies. A faculty appointment in francophone Canadian theatre and drama would forge links with the broader field of francophone studies. The Committee thus recommended exploring such an appointment together with the Department of French.

Role of the Practicum

The Centre tries to provide its students with concrete experience in production and performance within various contexts. The practicum was designed to allow students to integrate their practical and academic work, and develop technical skills. Students do not feel, however, that it is achieving its goals, and they do not feel supported by the faculty during their practical work. The Committee recommends that the Centre review the practicum at both the M.A. and Ph.D. levels.

Relations with the Undergraduate Drama Programs

It should be a goal of the Centre to continue to work closely with the University of Toronto's three undergraduate drama programs, and particularly with the University College Drama Program, and to expose its graduate students to their different aspects. The Centre should explore various points of pedagogical contact through, for example, seminars, teaching assistantships, informal exchanges, and joint workshops.

"The Drama Centre is the leading institution for the study of drama and theatre in the country. It fills an important academic role in the University and intellectual role in the country. With some investment of resources from the University and some rethinking of curriculum and structure, it can continue as a leader in its field." (p. 2)

Specific Recommendations:

1. That the Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama continue in operation for the next five years, 2002/03 to 2006/07;
2. That in the next complement plan, the Drama Centre make its priority a faculty appointment in the area of performance theory;
3. That the Drama Centre explore with the Department of French the possibility of a faculty appointment, or of a cross-appointment, in the area of francophone Canadian theatre;
4. That the Drama Centre review the structure and administration of its practical theatre requirement both at the M.A. and Ph.D. levels;
5. That the next Director of the Drama Centre undertake to find ways of working more closely with the University College Drama Program as well as the drama programs at UTM and UTSC.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Deans have read the Report of the Review Committee and are pleased at the progress that the Centre has made under the administrative and academic leadership of its Director, during the past five years. They note that the Report confirms both that the Drama Centre is the leading institution for the study of drama and theatre in the country and that it fills an important academic role in the University and intellectual role in the country. Accordingly, the Deans enthusiastically support the Committee's recommendation that the Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama continue in operation for the next five years, 2002/03 to 2006/07.

The Deans note, in addition, that the Centre's continued leadership will require some investment of resources. In the next complement plan, the School will take into account the Report's recommendation concerning a faculty appointment in the area of performance theory as well as one in the area of francophone Canadian theatre.

The Deans were also interested in the Report's comments on the relationship between the Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama and the various undergraduate drama programs at the University. They will encourage the next Director of the Drama Centre to find ways of working more closely with the University College Drama Program as well as the drama programs at UTM and UTSC so as to promote excellence in drama in the University as a whole.

School of Graduate Studies
University of Toronto
August 2002

School of Graduate Studies

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Institute for Policy Analysis

DATE OF REVIEW: October 2001 – SGS Dean's Response
October 17, 2001 – Student Assessment of the Five Year Review of the Institute for Policy Analysis
August 21, 2001 – Report of the Internal Advisory Committee (SGS)
March 2001 – Report of the External Review Panel

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean Michael Marrus, SGS

PROGRAMS OFFERED: None.

Other: "The Institute for Policy Analysis is an SGS institute established in 1967 to encourage quantitative social and economic policy research at the University of Toronto. Initially, its major undertaking has been research in macroeconomic forecasting and policy. Over the years, it has expanded into other fields, such as financial economics, industrial organization, law and economics, international trade, labour economics, and public economics. In most of these new areas, economic policy has been the major focus of research. The most important multidisciplinary effort has been in the areas of law and economics, and workplace practices." - Report of the External Review Panel, *March 2001*

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:

INTERNAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:
Professor Donald E. Cormack, Vice-Dean SGS (Chair)
Professor Jack Carr, Department of Economics
Professor Peter H. Pauly, Rotman School of Management
Professor Michael Smart, Department of Economics
Professor Nadia Soboleva, Department of Economics
Professor Michael Trebilcock, Faculty of Law

STUDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE FIVE-YEAR REVIEW, COMPOSITION:

Ms. Catherine Deri, Ph.D. Student, Dept. of Economics
Ms. Marie Rekkas, Ph.D. Student, Dept. of Economics
Mr. Moriko Ozawa, Ph.D. Student, Dept. of Economics
Mr. Andrew Tepperman, Ph.D. Candidate Dept. of Economics

EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE, COMPOSITION:

Professor Randall Kroszner, University of Chicago
Professor Pierre Fortin, University of Quebec at Montreal

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: 1995 – 1996 School of Graduate Studies

DATE OF OTHER REVIEWS: 1989 - 1990 School of Graduate Studies

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:
Self-study

IPA Director's Report (August 2000) – Professor Franklin Mathewson

IPA Director's Report (August 1995) – Professor James Pesando

CONSULTATION PROCESS:

The External Review Panel conducting the Five-Year Review received the 1995 Director's report and the IPA Director's Report 2000 detailing the activities and accomplishments of IPA during the period 1995-2000. The reviewers assessed the Institute in the two general areas of microeconomic and macroeconomic activities. They visited the campus, met privately with graduate students, Institute Associates, as well as the Chair and Acting Chair of the Department of Economics and the Dean of SGS. The Vice-Dean of SGS attended all meetings.

The Internal Advisory body reviewed and deliberated on the Report of the External Review Panel. The Student Assessment group reviewed the External and Internal Review Reports.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall assessment:

"To summarize, we have been presented convincing evidence that the IPA has done a superb job of supporting policy-focused microeconomic research, and that the research and training output has been of good to very strong international calibre. More could be done, however, to expand the role of the IPA in being a primary vehicle for supporting policy-relevant research throughout the University." (p. 3)

"The connection between the two macroeconomic projects and the IPA is fundamental. LINK and PEAP cannot survive and make progress at the University of Toronto without a specific institutional vehicle to support them. Recall that, despite its key importance for the professional practice of macroeconomic analysis and policy, macroeconometric modelling as a field is currently covered neither by the Department of Economics nor by the Rotman School." (p. 4)

Specific Issues:

The committee made the following recommendations:

1. That the Institute for Policy Analysis be continued for a further term of five years.
2. That the next Director, with the assistance of fund-raising resources at the School of Graduate Studies, seek to secure funding to support (a) programs in microeconomics, particularly in the areas of competition policy and international trade, (b) programs in macroeconomics, particularly in the nurturing of research by young academics on macroeconomic forecasting, (c) apply policy analysis by graduate students, and (d) the Institute's physical expansion plans.
3. That the next Director seek to involve members of the external advisory board in the fund-raising efforts.
4. That the next Director seek to increase the involvement in the IPA of relevant faculty in the Rotman School, the Faculties of Law and Medicine, as well as any other relevant units within the University of Toronto.
5. That the next Director seek to make resources of the Institute available to assist in faculty recruiting of policy-oriented economists in relevant departments and faculties of the University of Toronto.
6. That the next Director seek to reinforce and develop research participation in the activities of PEAP and LINK on the part of relevant junior supervisors.

INTERNAL REVIEW

The internal advisory committee supported the recommendation of the External Review Panel and concluded that the external reviewers had "identified the most important issues at the IPA". The Committee argued adamantly that IPA should continue to exist. Taking into consideration the high profile of IPA's policy analysis activity and its long history of nurturing academic activity

through conferences, workshops and seminars, the internal advisory body concluded there would be significant merit in formalizing these activities into a collaborative program. The internal advisory body noted that the apparent absence of junior faculty in the major macroeconomic modeling activity at IPA is a matter for concern.

Recommendations of the Internal Committee:

1. The Institute for Policy Analysis should continue for a further term of five years.
2. The Director should continue to seek the expanded involvement of faculty in the Rotman School of Management, Faculties of Law and Medicine, and other units.
3. The Director should seek to involve junior faculty members in the activities of LINK and PEAP. To this end, it should ensure that those participating in these activities are able to achieve a balance of academic research in addition to the service element for which these units have become so well known.
4. The Director should establish an advisory body to give guidance about the nature of a graduate collaborative program in public policy analysis through which the activities of the Institute can be promoted and focused in the best interest of a broad range of Ph.D.-stream graduate students.

Recommendations of the Student Assessors - Summary:

1. The group enthusiastically supports the development of a collaborative program in policy analysis.
2. This group recommends that, in addition to the seminar series that the Institute sponsors in cooperation with the Economics Department, the Institute should have an independent series of seminars/workshops that would deal with well-defined policy analysis questions.
3. The group feels that it is very uninformed about, but interested in, the macromodelling work and forecasting carried out by the LINK and PEAP researchers. This group encourages the development of some mechanism to promote information transfer and interaction between the students and these research groups. A representative of LINK and/or PEAP might annually present a seminar in the Institute's seminar series.
4. The students in residence at the Institute would like to have more students able to reside at the Institute. The Director should endeavour to make more efficient use of space if possible and work to increase the space allocated to the Institute for student offices.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Committee of Deans of the School of Graduate Studies greatly appreciated the work of the review committees. The SGS Deans agree that IPA should continue for a further five years. The search for the next director is already underway.

As recommended by the review committees, the Director should immediately proceed with the development of a collaborative program in Public Policy Analysis that would involve the graduate departments of Economics, Management and Law. The students' desire for a policy based seminar series (student recommendation #2) might be addressed in the context of this collaborative program.

To enhance student involvement in Institute activities, the Director should seek to provide more graduate student office space inside the Institute.

The Director should examine the relationship of the research enterprises LINK and PEAP with the other activities of the Institute and to expand the awareness and involvement of new faculty and graduate students in these activities (recommendation #3 from the faculty and students).

Faculty of Medicine

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Anaesthesia Faculty of Medicine
DATE:	November 2002
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean, Faculty of Medicine
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	Faculty teach in undergraduate medical program, including a 2-week Anaesthesia block
Graduate	M.Sc. / Ph.D. Clinician Scientist Program offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	Postgraduate medical training Fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	Continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. Bruce Cullen Dept of Anesthesiology, University of Washington Chief of Service, Harborview Medical Center
Canadian	Dr. Donald Miller Department of Anaesthesia, University of Ottawa The Ottawa Hospital - General Campus
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1997
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	N/A
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Member's Report Undergraduate Medical Education Report Postgraduate Medical Education Report Student Reports Continuing Education Report Critical Care Report Research Report Previous External Review Report Departmental Budget Departmental Communications Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

The reviewers consider the Department of Anaesthesia to occupy a pre-eminent position among Canadian departments of Anaesthesia and characterize this Department as the most research-intensive and academically productive in Canada and within the top third of U.S. programs.

Undergraduate Medical Education: The reviewers view the size, quality, and priority assigned to undergraduate medical education in the Department as very appropriate. They note that the Department has introduced innovations with respect to undergraduate education and that it provides a major contribution to the Faculty's medical student teaching.

- **Timing of Anaesthesia clerkship rotation:** The reviewers report that both students and departmental faculty would prefer to see the Anaesthesia clerkship rotation situated in the third year of the MD program (rather than fourth year) - to enhance the students' educational experience and to expose students to the specialty before the CaRMS match.

Other departments and disciplines have also sought changes in the timing of their rotations, thus no commitment about a change in the position of the Anaesthesia rotation can be made until a more general evaluation is undertaken. In the latter respect, the Faculty's Director of Curriculum and the Associate Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education will be re-evaluating the position and length of all clerkship rotations in the near future.

- **Mentoring Program:** The reviewers note that the students would like to have a faculty mentoring system for the clerkship rotation and suggested that the students might spend three or four days of the ten-day cycle with their mentors.

I am glad to see that the Undergraduate Education Committee will establish a faculty mentoring system for students during the Anaesthesia rotation.

- **Standardization of the evaluation process:** The reviewers report that students would like to have a standardized evaluation process across all hospitals.

There appears to be a difference in perception between students and faculty on this issue, since the Undergraduate Education Committee considers a standardized evaluation process to already be in place. The issue should be resolved through communication between the Department's undergraduate educators and the MD students.

- **Community Hospital Exposure:** The reviewers note that some students would appreciate select rotations in community hospital settings, although they also note that transportation issues present a challenge. The reviewers suggest that links with North York General and Toronto East General Hospitals should be considered.

The Undergraduate Education Committee will endeavour to meet the students' request for an anaesthesia rotation at peripheral community hospitals.

Postgraduate Medical Education

- **Regional Anaesthesia:** The reviewers note that the residents view their exposure to regional anaesthesia as somewhat limited.

Response to this concern rests now with the Department's Postgraduate Medical Education Committee.

- **Policies:** The reviewers urge the Department to set uniform policies across hospital locations for various issues – e.g. OR supervisory ratios; attendance at scientific meetings.

The Department Chair comments in his response to the review report that this would be difficult to accomplish for some policies – e.g. coverage policies - as they are determined locally, although monitored by the Postgraduate Education Committee. I understand these limitations, but would urge the next Chair to forge a consensus on these types of multi-institutional issues wherever possible.

- **Mentoring Program:** The reviewers suggest that a mentoring program would be beneficial for residents. *Agreed.*
- **Fellowship Director:** The reviewers suggest the establishment of a Fellowship Director position.

The Department Chair supports this concept, but notes that supplemental funding would be necessary to do so. Given financial pressures, I believe this can only be achieved by combining the Fellowship Director position with another role.

Research

- **Productivity:** The reviewers applaud the Department's growth in research productivity and view its unique clinician-scientist program as a particular achievement. They also note the essential support of the Chiefs of Anaesthesia for the clinician-scientist stream.

I hope all the leaders in the Department, not least the outgoing Chair, will share my pride in reading the reviewers' comment that "great vision, leadership, ingenuity, and co-operation have been demonstrated during the past decade".

- **Protected time:** The reviewers stress the importance for the Department's academic future of a protected research environment that includes guaranteed non-clinical time for young faculty scientists.

Both the Department Chair and I strongly agree.

- **Collaborative links:** The reviewers recommend that new collaborative research opportunities between institutions should be explored.

I agree. More and more multi-institutional collaboration is taking place, and the University has a special role as an 'honest broker' in this regard.

Continuing Education

- **CME Events:** The reviewers note that CME events should be a self-sufficient enterprise.

I encourage the Department CE Committee to explore this further. As the CE program keeps profits from their events, increasing their profit margins would be clearly beneficial.

- **Strategic Planning:** The reviewers suggest that a strategic planning exercise to address CE issues would be beneficial to the Department. *Agreed.*

Budget

- **"Under-Funding":** The reviewers consider that the Department is significantly under-funded and recommend that the Department's base budget be addressed/increased in light of its increased academic productivity and teaching commitments.

In light of the current UofT budgetary constraints, it is highly unlikely that there will be an increase in the Department's university-based budget for a few years to come. It is hoped that AFP agreements will offer new financial support for the Department's clinical faculty, with positive knock-on effects for the entire academic enterprise. It would also be useful for the Department to consider revenue-generating educational programs, such as a training stream for anesthesia technicians/extenders.

Organizational Structure

- **Executive Committee:** Although the reviewers consider that the Departmental Council functions well, they suggest that a smaller Executive Committee be created.

I leave it to the outgoing and incoming Chairs to appraise this concept with the Council. In response to the reviewers' suggestion, the Department Chair will consider holding regular departmental general meetings.

Faculty Issues

- **Recognition:** Several times in their report, the reviewers note that faculty would like increased recognition of their contributions to all types of teaching.

This sentiment is not unique to this department. I agree with the reviewers that additional methods should be identified to recognize teaching contributions. The Education Deans are committed to working with all departments to this end.

- **Promotion:** The reviewers reported that faculty commented on the need for academic promotion to be achievable on the basis of teaching activities.

Promotion based upon sustained excellence in teaching already exists as a viable path to promotion. Last year, the Promotions Task Force addressed these and similar issues, with the result that the promotions criteria are clearer and better-documented in the Faculty's Promotions Manual.

Vision and Future Challenges

- **Anaesthetist Supply:** The reviewers are concerned that the current under-supply of anaesthetists could become a major impediment to the Department's academic growth, particularly as the shortage is likely to continue. They consider that it is crucial that protected time continue to be in place for academic endeavours, despite the shortage of anaesthetists. *Agreed.*

- **Professional Educator:** The reviewers urge the Department to identify funds that will allow for continued funding of the Department's professional educator.

Since the review, the Department Chair has obtained clarification on continuance of the current salary support for the educator – this position is currently funded by St. Michael's Hospital and is considered support for Bob Byrick, while he is the Department Chair. With the end of his term as Chair, funding is not guaranteed. Once a new Chair is appointed, we shall have to revisit this issue.

- **Next Chair:** The reviewers note that it will be important for the next Chair to possess the necessary skills to maintain the "current excellent communications and mutual respect" that exist between the Chair and Chiefs. In addition, the next chair should have both good research credentials and excellent management skills. *Agreed.*

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

I congratulate all the Department members and the Chair, Dr. Robert Byrick, for this extremely positive review.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Department of Biochemistry

DATE: June 25-26, 2001

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean, Faculty of Medicine

PROGRAMS OFFERED:
Undergraduate B.Sc. (Biochemistry) - degree programs offered through Faculty of Arts and Science
Faculty teach in the undergraduate medical program
Graduate M.Sc., Ph.D.

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION: 1 Canadian, 1 American

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:
International Dr. Zena Werb
University of California, San Francisco
Canadian Dr. Brian Sykes
University of Alberta

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: 1995

DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW: 1996

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:
Dean's Review Guidelines
External Review Schedule
Chair's Report
Faculty Member's Report
Undergraduate Education Reports
Graduate Education Report
Student Reports
Research Report
PENCE Report
List of Faculty
Organization Chart and Committees
Previous External Reviews
Departmental Budget
Summary of Teaching Activities of Faculty
WGO/Seminar Program 2000/2001
Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty

CONSULTATION PROCESS: 2 day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, Department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:
The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

Chair's Legacy

One message that emerges very strongly from the reviewer's report is the extremely positive legacy of Peter Lewis' two terms as Department Chair. Peter has broadened the department's focus without diluting its excellence. He has maintained a high level of morale and drawn in the extended family of status-only faculty within the research institutes of the teaching hospitals. The budget is balanced and there is a reasonable carry-forward. The calibre of students is superb.

Certainly in my two and a half years as Dean, it has been a pleasure to work with Peter.

Issues

In addition to the many positive comments that the reviewers make about the Department, they flag a few potential issues:

1. **Undergraduate Teaching:** The teaching load is rising. Several changes have been made in the undergraduate curriculum, which are expected to encourage students to take Biochemistry as a major; however these changes will mean more teaching. Most of the teaching appears to be borne by a small number of dedicated teachers. The reviewers allude to “some feeling that more resources were going to be required from the Faculty of Medicine” to support this teaching.

In fact, in 2000 for the first time in decades, the basic science sector, including BCH, received APF funds to support its role in Arts and Science teaching. In 2001 we have taken the position that any further increases in teaching loads in A&S should be accompanied by funding transfers from the Central Administration/A&S to help our basic science departments carry this load. In his reply, Peter Lewis highlights the need for retirement positions to be returned to the Department. I confirm that this will occur unless there are unanticipated budget cuts that require all of us to eliminate positions.

2. **Graduate Education:** The reviewers note the general excellence of the graduate program and the very high quality of students and theses. Student esprit de corps is excellent. Students go on to first-rate postdoctoral positions in the USA, Europe and Canada. However, the reviewers note that the program has tended to recruit students largely from U of T, that the time to graduation is long and that the recruitment pool appears to have decreased in recent years. The reviewers note that more vigorous recruitment efforts are needed.

Professor Isenman, who will be Acting Chair as of January 1, 2002, and Professor Segall, the Graduate Coordinator, both identify factual errors in the comments on Graduate Education. For example, the program in fact recruits heavily from outside UofT.

There are different responses on time-to-completion from Professors Isenman and Segall and Professor Lewis. The former suggest that the completion times are not a major issue; Professor Lewis believes that progress has been made but that the 5.5 year time-to-completion is still longer than desirable. My view is perhaps a compromise. A time to PhD of 5.5 years is not sharply different than the average for science departments across the University, and that it should ideally be a little shorter not just in BCH but in general. This will be a minor issue for the next Chair.

On recruitment, again the Chair and the incoming Acting Chair and Graduate Coordinator have slightly different views. The Chair agrees that even more flexibility in prerequisites could be allowed, and thinks external recruitment could be more proactive. His colleagues demur, on the grounds that the current situation is satisfactory. In either case these are hardly fatal flaws in what is a very successful graduate program, and I shall leave it to the next year to ascertain the way forward.

3. **Research Activities:** The reviewers note the changing nature of research concentration in the Department, which is mainly due to the changing definitions of Biochemistry. They identify growing research strengths in protein structure and molecular cell biology. The areas of membrane and carbohydrate biochemistry will need new recruitment if they are to have critical mass in the future. They commend the faculty development plan established by the outgoing Chair, which has maximized the success of new faculty recruits. The reviewers also highlight the need to maintain a strong core department at the MSB.

I agree with this position. My view is that the Chair's laboratory must remain at the MSB (or CCBR in the future) for our larger basic science departments, such as Medical Genetics, Physiology, and Biochemistry. This will hold for the new Chair of Biochemistry as it did for Physiology. Return of retirements to complement in Biochemistry is planned

as above. I am also cautiously optimistic that space pressures will ease with the eventual opening of the CCBR.

4. **Vision for the Future:** The reviewers compliment Peter Lewis on building a department with a clear vision and for having initiated programs that will move the vision into the future. They note seven challenges for the next five years:
- i. Maintaining good communication with all the members of the larger city-wide department;
 - ii. Maintaining good communications with the other cognate academic departments;
 - iii. Supporting the young recruits;
 - iv. Continuing to promote the departmental vision, including continual attention to recruiting;
 - v. Enhancing the undergraduate teaching;
 - vi. Continue to maintain the outstanding graduate program by improving the situation for graduate students;
 - vii. Deal effectively with the new research building.

The reviewers nicely set out the future challenges. Peter Lewis' comments, however, struck a particular chord with me. He wrote that he agreed with the reviewers' perception of challenges ahead, but added: "...I believe the largest challenge facing the Biochemistry Department is not one of limiting resources but a state of mind that will accept that the discipline has broadened considerably over the past twenty years." This tension --- between the traditional disciplinary focus of biochemistry and other themes such as molecular biology, bioinformatics, and structural biology, is one that will animate the Department but also cause some debates about recruitment priorities in future, and indeed pose some interesting dilemmas for the next Chair.

I congratulate Peter Lewis on a first-class contribution to the Department, Faculty and University.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

See above for actions to be taken on specific issues by the Department of Biochemistry.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Family and Community Medicine
DATE:	September 13-14, 2000
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean, Faculty of Medicine
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	Undergraduate medical program
Graduate	MHSc graduate program offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	Postgraduate clinical training
Continuing	Fellowship subspecialty training Continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. Larry Green Center for Policy Studies in Family Practice and Primary Care, Washington, D.C.
Canadian	Dr. Ruth Wilson Queen's University
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1995
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Member's Report Student Reports Education Reports International Development Program Report Research Report Departmental Budget Previous External Reviews/Responses Departmental Communications Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:
The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

Overview

The reviewers consider the department "a contender for the preeminent department of Family Medicine in North America" by virtue of its academic and research profile.

1. Undergraduate Medical Education

The reviewers note a substantial increase in the teaching role of DFCM since curriculum reform and renewal in 1991. This has placed major pressures on departmental members who do not have the same ability to generate clinical revenue at the levels enjoyed by some in specialties. Furthermore, community-based practitioners are not eligible for hospital/institutional support.

While the reviewers recognize that a process is in place to reconsider the undergraduate teaching load of the department and reduce the number of hours taught, they state that this approach is “not well understood and/or accepted throughout the department”. Therefore, they recommend that the issue be revisited and that another solution be found that meets the interest of students and either gives more resources to the department or re-balances teaching modes on a basis that is better understood.

The departmental executive argues that the undergraduate medical education situation is evidence that the capacity and value students ascribe to DFCM teaching is not appropriately understood or regarded within the faculty. They also claim that other departments do not understand the challenges of teaching from a community or family medicine base.

The current chair’s view is that the solution is “not to reduce the amount of undergraduate teaching in the department of family and community medicine but to support it more fully than has been the case to date”.

At the outset, the record needs clarification. The Executive of the DFCM advised the Dean’s Office several months ago that, absent a base budget increase for DFCM, the various sites would effect a reduction in pre-clerkship teaching by fifty percent. I am gratified that many in the Department now want to see a reasoned compromise. The fact is that the Faculty and the University greatly value the special teaching role of DFCM in general and in the PBL curriculum specifically. We are aware that the Department was heavily loaded when small group learning was given greater emphasis in the early 1990s. Our intent is to retool the curriculum so as to enhance mid-sized group teaching by content experts, in keeping with the shifting frontier of post-genomic medicine, the vision of the McLaughlin Centre, the research-intensivity of the Faculty, and our vision of the Faculty as a training ground for academic leaders. This approach may also reduce some of the variability in content exposure that has been highlighted in other external reviews as a common side-effect of small-group PBL teaching.

As I explained to the departmental executive, we need time to get on with these changes in curriculum. I am in negotiations with Professor Rosser about what can be done to help the Department financially in the interim. As well, the Task Force on Clinician Teachers has emphasized the need to strengthen the role of clinical departments in delivery of the undergraduate curriculum. Therefore, there will be a greater opportunity for department chairs to compare and contrast their teaching loads as curriculum retooling occurs. For these reasons, I think that we will arrive at a fair compromise that meets the objectives of all concerned.

2. Postgraduate medical education

The reviewers consider that “(t)he situation of the department in the multicultural, vibrant metropolis of Toronto would seem to offer many opportunities for production of well-trained urban generalist family physicians who might also have additional skills in inner city issues.” They suggest that the Department define some core competencies for UofT postgraduate trainees and develop additional PGY3 positions to create a stronger specialization in family medicine for some trainees. The reviewers also suggest that some units might be consolidated.

The departmental executive rejected the concept of consolidating units. The departmental executive also expressed concern about focusing trainees on urban practice and suggested this would put the program in jeopardy with accreditors. The current percentage of residents focused on rural training was felt to be appropriate. The only issue on which there seemed to be agreement between the executive and the reviewers was that thirty to forty percent of second year positions should extend to R3 positions. However, from the executive’s perspective, the R3 years should be focused on enhancing skills of those “planning to work in more rural areas” rather than on producing a more specialized and differentiated stream of trainees.

The current chair suggests that adherence to accreditation standards and the PCCCAR basket of services vitiates any further need for a core curriculum. Chair Rosser rejected the concept that there should be any reduction in the number of rural trainees and suggested that, if anything, the number of rurally-oriented trainees might increase. Last, he highlighted the importance of R3 training programs.

I am not entirely comfortable with the position taken by either the departmental executive or the chair. I understand that DFCM residents are assigned to a particular site for more or less the entirety of their training. This contrasts with specialty programs in other departments where there is movement across institutions to ensure a breadth of exposure to various mentors and settings. While I do not think that an R3 program needs to focus primarily on urban health, I also question the wisdom of expanding our training of rural-oriented practitioners. We shall always play a major role in preparing Ontario physicians for rural and northern practice, but our comparative advantages rest elsewhere. I could readily envisage an R3 program with different streams, e.g. urban/inner city health, HIV/AIDS, maternity care, child health care, etc. If this Department is to achieve its potential of becoming the world leader in primary care research and education, some changes in the postgraduate training program seem to be indicated. Last, I should note that I have already indicated to the Ministry of Health that with enrollment expansion occurring in MD programs across the province, we are keen to see expansion of our postgraduate programs, including R3 slots for DFCM.

3. Research

The reviewers offer highly positive appraisals of the department's progress in research under Walter Rosser. They recommend continued support at higher levels.

I completely agree. No other department has the same number of patients flowing through its members' clinical practices. No other department is in the same position to do high volume clinical research of a nature that could fundamentally change decision making on the front lines of clinical service provision. I have articulated this view to the departmental executive and I hope to continue working with the Department to pursue this agenda. The requisites are info-structure as well as investments in training evaluative scientists who can be primary care research leaders for the world. PGY3 positions that permit clinical fellowships and graduate training would be valuable in this regard.

4. Fellowship programs

The reviewers recommend both that the third year clinical fellowships be expanded and that the current Master of Health Sciences in Family Medicine be enhanced by quantitative and qualitative methods courses. They urge that the research enterprise be more closely linked to the academic fellowship program.

I agree with both recommendations. I also wonder if the MHSc program is sufficiently research intensive for the Department to fully realize its research potential. Hence as the reviewers have rightly noted, there may well be a need to strengthen the research methods component of the current training program. An alternative is to look at switching from the MHSc to a standard MSc/PhD stream and swing the department more into alignment with other clinical departments as regards graduate training.

5. Continuing Education

The reviewers offer no specific recommendations on continuing education.

This is in any case an area of investment for the Faculty through the new knowledge transfer program funded through the Academic Priorities Fund and led by Professor Dave Davis, Associate Dean for Continuing Education.

6. Relations with the Dean's Office and Other Departments

The reviewers highlight the need for closer communication with the DFCM executive and the Dean's office. Even when relations with the Chair are sound (as they have been with Professor Rosser), the Department is large and diverse, and has, as the reviewers put it, a 'counter-culture' self-perception that lends itself to alienation from the rest of the Faculty.

I think the reviewers have correctly highlighted the need for closer communication with the DFCM executive and my office. I have met once with the DFCM executive, and I intend to do so again intermittently until the new Department Chair is settled in. I also urge the Department to work more closely with the Department of Paediatrics on child health issues and with other departments (such as obstetrics and gynaecology, psychiatry, medicine, and surgery) in defining a joint agenda for specialism within family medicine.

7. Organizational Structure

The reviewers recommend that the Department meet more often as a whole.

I think this will be difficult to organize. More frequent communications by e-mail and fax may help. But in fairness, I believe there will always be some centrifugal forces at work because of the difficulty in developing a common vision that will pull the Department together. DFCM combines community-based practitioners who are strongly dedicated to clinical teaching and preparing family physicians for small-city or rural practice, with downtown family physician-researchers who have subspecialized in particular research areas and may even have circumscribed their clinical practice.

On the other hand, I was struck by the reaction of the faculty at large who found the reviewers' relatively bland comments to be 'probably the most controversial in the entire report'. There are presumably some issues simmering in the departmental budgeting process, both as regards the structure and function of practice plans, and the allocation of University dollars. I am committed in principle to a policy of "open-book" practice plans, with explicit and transparent rewards for academic activity. I also would prefer to see greater transparency in general about the allocation of University dollars in clinical departments.

The reaction from a minority that the central Department is somehow overdeveloped strikes me as misplaced. I have already indicated my view that the assignment of residents exclusively to sites must be re-assessed. I also believe that the departmental executive structure needs more Faculty members with cross-cutting portfolios as a complement to the site chiefs. The latter will help diffuse some of the tensions that the reviewers note and that are reflected in the disparate faculty responses (some favouring an even more decentralized model, and others believing the sites function too much as separate silos).

8. Morale

A positive assessment with no recommendations.

9. Future Directions

The reviewers note that the Department is at a critical juncture in its development and is probably at a point where it can consolidate the impressive gains made during the chairmanship of Dr. Walt Rosser. They note that the diversity within the Department is a strength, and they believe it can co-exist with focused effort. They recommend that the Department's vision for the future embrace a "coherent pluralism", which will require identifying themes and strengths in the Department that fit into overall programs and structuring the Department around these areas, and strengthening management systems able to cope with several systems.

I indicated to the reviewers my belief that the Department requires "coherent pluralism" to succeed. There are many challenges articulated above. On the other hand, the progress that DFCM has made in the last decade under Walter Rosser's leadership is extraordinary. I agree with the reviewers that DFCM is already a major force in the University and nation, and has international profile as a result of its research activities. Now we must all work to position DFCM for even greater success in a rapidly-changing health care environment. I am confident that Professor Rosser's successor will be able to move the Department forward in the years ahead.

Administrative Response

The Dean's response to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations is contained above and appears in italicized font.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology
DATE:	December 10/11, 2001
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean, Faculty of Medicine
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	B.Sc. (Pathobiology) - specialist degree program offered through Faculty of Arts and Science Faculty teach in the undergraduate medical program
Graduate	M.H.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D.
Postgraduate Continuing	Postgraduate medical training Continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. David Kaufman University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Canadian	Dr. William Orr University of Manitoba
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	N/A (new department formed in 1997)
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	1996
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Member's Report Undergraduate Education Report Postgraduate Medical Education Report Diploma Program Report Graduate Education Report Student Reports Continuing Education Report Research Report Previous Review Reports Departmental Budget Departmental Communications\ Implementation Report Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:	
	<i>The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.</i>

Executive Summary

- **Strengths:** The reviewers consider the Department to be well-led, open to addressing its challenges, and striving for excellence.
- **Cohesion:** The cohesion of the teaching and residency programs is seen to be a serious challenge due to the distribution of clinical activities among multiple sites.
- **Faculty recruitment:** The Department has a chance to invigorate and add more molecular strength to the investigative program through recruitment into faculty retirement positions. Dr. Gottlieb is seen to have been very successful in recruiting faculty to meet this challenge.
- **Residency training:** The reviewers contend that the UofT should lead Canadian medical schools in training pathology residents - many of whom will move into academia.

Both Dr. Gottlieb and I fully support this goal, but unfortunately, it has become more challenging in recent times, due to organization of residency training and fewer residents entering the program. Interest in pathology on the part of postgraduate trainees has grown again recently, and we should be able to respond.

- **Bifid nature of faculty:** Differentiation of faculty into clinical and investigative streams is a continuing challenge, particularly in a department that is striving to achieve excellence in research endeavours.

To counteract these phenomena, Dr. Gottlieb is to be commended for seeking to recruit individuals with both clinical pathology training and strong research training.

Undergraduate Medical Education

- **Strengths:** The Department places value on education in general and medical student education in particular. The course director is seen by students to be highly receptive to their needs. Good teachers are recognized through teaching awards and there is a specific award for teaching that has a focus on principles of molecular biology.
- **Problem-based learning:** While students and educators both indicated that they enjoy small group learning sessions, students think that some of the problem-based learning sessions are repetitive, inefficient or inconsistent in quality.

I will leave it to the departmental Undergraduate Education Committee to deal with issues raised by the students. I agree with the authors of the faculty response to the report who suggest the use of teaching materials showing current technology and methods used by specialists in the field to convey the contemporary state of laboratory practice to students.

- **Value of teaching:** The reviewers note that several comments were made to them that could indicate stress in the system. They are concerned that this stress could eventually reduce the effectiveness of this program. In particular, the major issues were seen to be the tacit impression that faculty teaching and quality of performance are not highly valued, and the related low level reluctance of faculty to participate in teaching.

The faculty have suggested various means to recruit good teachers and I am confident that Dr. Gottlieb will continue to address this issue. He has already started rewarding good teachers with departmental teaching awards and is exploring how a professional educator could aid his faculty in achieving their educational objectives. The Faculty's task force on clinical faculty has recently tabled recommendations to address concerns of clinical teachers and establish closer links between hospital and university teaching. Support from the Faculty has come recently in the form of an award in the Dean's Excellence Fund competition to develop an e-based learning tool.

- **Exposure to laboratory medicine:** The Pathobiology course in the preclerkship has a strong departmental identity - one of the few courses to have this. Despite this, the reviewers found that students were unaware of the role of laboratory medicine specialists in medicine and recommend that the Department ensure that students are exposed to this in their program.

Undergraduate Arts and Science Education

- **Role of the Pathobiology program:** As a clinical department, the Department's involvement in undergraduate Arts and Science education is considered unique and highly innovative.

I agree with the reviewers that this new program in Pathobiology has great potential for attracting new students to the graduate or medical programs training future physician scientists. However, we must ensure that the program is supported by the University and/or the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Postgraduate Medical Education

- **Number of resident positions:** In recent years, both the number of residents enrolling in the program and the number of training positions available have dropped. The reviewers strongly urge the Dean's Office to support an initiative to increase the number of residency positions in lab medicine from the current three positions - noting that this is essential to the long-term ability of the Department to fulfill its academic and clinical mandate to replace retiring individuals and to reinstate its role of training leading pathologists.

Dr. Gottlieb's efforts at recruitment into secondary level entry routes are helping to alleviate the problem, but are not seen to be the solution. Over the next four years we shall graduate 21 additional MDs per year and have a further 25 postgraduate R1 slots, for a total of 46 new residency positions. Thus, I am committed to increasing the number of residency slots for LMP. The number is still to be determined as there is competition from other under-served specialties.

- **Training of Clinician-scientists vs. clinicians:** The reviewers endorse the Department's emphasis on training of clinician-scientists but recommend that good candidates with a primary interest in clinical practice also be encouraged to apply for residency positions.

Reviewing the faculty and Chair's response, it is clear that a sound balance can be struck here.

Graduate Education

- **Strengths:** The Department's graduate program is seen to be a distinct strength of its educational activity - with the size and breadth of departmental interests and the presence of excellent scientist mentors being a strong attraction for students enrolling in the program.
- **Communication:** The reviewers note that communication needs to be enhanced between students and between students and faculty. Problems in this area are partly due to the large and geographically dispersed nature of the Department.
- **Physical space:** Students and faculty identified the need for new and larger research space and the reviewers noted that the program would benefit by more centralization of the physical location of the faculty so that more opportunities for interactions between faculty and their students would be encouraged.

Dr. Gottlieb has been active in lobbying for expanding the MSB focus of the Department with the aim of creating a strong critical mass and increasing communication and opportunities for interactions through more centralization of the physical location of departmental faculty. The Faculty has already set aside the Best building in its long-term plan for LMP, although this may need to be reconsidered given the need for animal facilities for LMP.

- **Stipends:** The reviewers note that student stipends need to be made uniform within the Department and competitive with those of other departments.

Dr. Gottlieb comments in his response to the report that graduate student funding is looked at each year and that this year it increased to \$20,000 per annum - the recommended Faculty of Medicine rate.

- **Thesis guidelines:** Students stressed the need for the Faculty to establish uniform guidelines for thesis completion times and what constitutes adequate thesis work.
- **Teaching opportunities:** Graduate students expressed a desire for more teaching opportunities. In addressing this issue.

Dr. Gotlieb suggests that the number of teaching assistant positions may increase in the future with the Department's new undergraduate specialist program in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Currently, the Department does not have a large allotment of TA positions - and, hence, gets very little financial remuneration for teaching assistant positions. This underscores my earlier point about ensuring that the Department gets support from the Central Administration and the Faculty of Arts and Science when it expands its undergraduate teaching mandate.

Continuing Medical Education

- **Promotions process:** The only issue raised revolves around consideration of clinically-oriented CME activities in promotions.

I am confident that this can be resolved.

Research

- **Multi-disciplinarity:** The reviewers consider that the Department shows strong multi-disciplinarity in its research endeavours as a result of good collaboration between basic scientists and clinically-oriented faculty.
- **Clinician-scientists:** The reviewers stress that the Department must continue to recruit and develop clinician scientists in order to achieve its future goals.
- **Integration:** The reviewers remarked that the faculty consider one of the main challenges of the research community to be integrating the research activities and roles of the hospital research institutes and the UofT Department. This results in some fragmentation of research and competition between sites, and may reflect communication difficulties between sites. Faculty felt that improving communication would facilitate multidisciplinary group interactions.
- **Protected time:** Clinicians indicate that their opportunity for research is inhibited by their lack of protected time.

The authors of the faculty response suggest that the University pay a portion of the salary of the clinician scientists. The Faculty has a budget of \$60M and has been subject to multiple cuts and taxes by the University central administration, as have virtually all other faculties. I share the frustration of clinicians and see no prospect of adding base budget to the Department. I am cautiously optimistic that AFP negotiations may help out LMP, and also trust that the effective working relationships that Dr. Gotlieb has established with chiefs of service and research institute directors will help to resolve these issues.

Cognate Academic Departments

- **Residency positions:** Cognate chairs expressed a concern that the limited ability to recruit enough residents or clinical faculty could impair the Department's ability to provide adequate clinical service and interact effectively with other departments. Despite their support of the Department in its desire to acquire new residency training positions, none of the chairs appeared willing to give any of their slots to pathology. *See above re the question of allocating some of the new slots to LMP.*
-

Departmental Organizational Structure and Hospital Interface

- **Departmental organization:** The matrix organization for the Department was established to successfully effect the merger of three groups into one department. The reviewers recommend looking at ways to achieve greater cooperation between hospitals, research institutes, and the University, and recognize that the matrix system may be the best way to achieve this. However, they wondered if it might be useful to involve members of hospital boards or senior hospital administrators in the University Department's decision making process.

I agree with Dr. Gotlieb that the matrix system provides some autonomy to divisions while maximizing interactions in carrying out the academic mission - particularly the research and teaching programs.

- **Hospital / University functions:** The reviewers note a common 'disconnect' theme between hospital and University functions relative to organizational structure and recommend exploration of ways of achieving greater cooperation between hospitals, research institutes and the academic department of LMP.

This is assuredly not the case for the vast majority of departments in the Faculty, where there are seamless connections between the hospitals and the university functions. Thus, I agree with the reviewer's recommendation to explore ways of achieving greater cooperation, but see no generalizability of the concern. I suspect that LMP has been undervalued by hospitals - they are only now realizing how fundamental LMP is to the function of any clinical institution, in the same way that the importance of anesthesia has come to the fore in a situation of under-service.

Future

- **Shortages of personnel:** The reviewers note that the main challenge facing the Department is to continue to provide tertiary level clinical care in an academic setting in light of the significant shortages of clinicians and clinician-scientists.
- **Inclusivity:** The reviewers recommend that the Chair and the Faculty need to be more generally 'conscious of the concerns of (the Department's) current clinically-oriented faculty'.

The Faculty has already spent a considerable amount of effort in addressing some of the frustrations of clinical faculty and we intend to maintain that focus.

Stature of the Department

- **Strengths:** The reviewers note that the Department is the largest of its kind in Canada and has an immense human and economic resource base when compared to other departments in this country. Faculty are recognized internationally for their skills and academic productivity. Many are involved in the work of national and international societies. The Chair is to be commended for his creative efforts in taking this Department forward into the future.

The Department and its Chair are to be commended for their efforts in moving forward on the national and international scene, bringing the Department international recognition for its skills and academic productivity.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

See above for actions to be taken on specific issues by the Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology.

REVIEW

DIVISION/UNIT: Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology

DATE: May 2003

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean, Faculty of Medicine

PROGRAMS OFFERED / TEACHING COMMITMENTS:

Undergraduate

B.Sc. - Molecular Genetics and Molecular Biology - offered through Faculty of Arts and Science
B.Sc. – Microbiology - offered through Faculty of Arts and Science
Faculty teach in the undergraduate medical program, particularly over two weeks in the Pathobiology of Disease block in year 1.

Graduate

M.Sc., Ph.D. – Molecular and Medical Genetics Program
M.Sc. – Genetic Counselling Program

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION: 1 Canadian / 1 American

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:

Canadian

Dr. Gerry Johnston
Department of Microbiology and Immunology
Dalhousie University

International

Dr. Michael Snyder
Dept. Molecular, Cellular & Developmental Biol.
Yale University

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: 1998

DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW: 2003

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

Dean's Review Guidelines
External Review Schedule
Chair's Report
Faculty Members' Report
Undergraduate Education Reports
Undergraduate Student Reports
Graduate Education Reports
Graduate Student Report
Research Report
Departmental Budget
Previous External Review Reports / Responses
Departmental Communications
Program Information
Departmental org chart and committees
Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty

CONSULTATION PROCESS: 2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

Overall assessment and Specific Issues (Dean's Response to review report):

The reviewers consider this Department to have an outstanding record of research achievements that makes it the "best biomedical research department in the country" and "poised to be one of the best in the world". They consider Dr. Andrews' leadership and vision to be highly effective and instrumental in establishing the Department's current level of success. Medical Genetics and Microbiology is clearly a superb department, seamlessly uniting the campus and hospital-based faculty, with a stellar array of faculty, staff, and students.

I am grateful to the reviewers, Dr. Gerry Johnson (Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia) and Dr. Michael Snyder (Department of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut), for their helpful assessment of the Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology. I would also like to express my thanks to all the Department members who contributed so usefully to the documentation for the review, and who participated in interviews with the reviewers. I congratulate all the Department members and the Chair, Dr. Brenda Andrews, for this extremely insightful and comprehensive review. I shall restrict my responses to certain key comments and recommendations made by the reviewers.

Departmental Organizational Structure/Communication

- **Governance:** According to the reviewers, the Department's lack of a large bureaucratic structure and its paucity of departmental meetings appear to suit Department members. With easy access to the Chair, departmental communication and organization was considered by faculty to be effective and not requiring any change. Despite this, the reviewers suggest that the Executive Committee meet regularly, with pre-advertised agenda items that would allow for organized input from departmental faculty.

I leave it to the Department chair and her faculty to discuss membership on departmental committees and the feasibility of holding regular Executive Committee meetings.

Financial Issues

- **Overhead Funds:** The reviewers note that despite their increased research activity, departmental faculty do not perceive that they have received additional benefit from the flow of research overhead funds to the University.

I agree. The current division of overhead on a 75:25 basis, with 75% retained by the University's central administration, remains an affront to logic and fairness. The Department's share of the 25% was used to offset yet another budget cut last year. A more equitable flowing of research overhead monies associated with federal grants is needed.

- **Retirement Salary Savings:** The reviewers perceive the UofT policy of disallowing departments to retain a portion of the salary of retiring faculty as unfair and impacting on the Department's ability to attract new faculty with attractive starting salaries. It is the view of the reviewers that this policy should change.

The reviewers do not appear to understand that the scheme is associated with central funding of PTR. In other words, the PTR/ATB increases in salaries are covered by the central administration. Furthermore, the entry-level salary has risen over time.

- **Financial Recognition:** The reviewers recommend that the Faculty review its budgetary philosophy and set clear academic benchmarks to guide the budgetary process and enable departments that show increased research and teaching activity to reap some financial budgetary benefits.

Both the Department's Chair and I agree; however, in the absence of a fair model of activity-based funding University-wide, or negotiation of a block budget and college-type governance for the Faculty, this type of change will be very difficult to implement.

- **Increased Enrolment:** The reviewers consider that the funding transfer from the central administration needs to be supplemented to reflect the increased enrolment – i.e. increased teaching load.

Undergraduate Arts and Science Education

- The reviewers report that both the merger of the Department's two specialist programs – Microbiology and the Molecular Genetics and Biology – into one program with two distinct streams and the review of the Department's global program offerings are proceeding well. These programs are well received by undergraduate students in the senior years, but students in earlier years of undergraduate study expressed a feeling of remoteness from the Department. In general, undergraduate students expressed a desire to see more participation of faculty advisors in their orientation days when the students are faced with decisions concerning the choice of majors. The one issue that was raised a number of times involved the retirements of senior faculty who carry higher teaching loads than the more junior members of the Department.

I am please to see that the merger of the two programs is proceeding well. I am sure that the Department will explore issues raised concerning the sense of isolation felt by junior undergraduates, the participation of faculty advisors during orientation and up-coming faculty retirements.

Undergraduate Medical Education

- While undergraduate medical students felt that they had excellent exposure to high quality clinical teaching they felt somewhat disconnected from MGM. The reviewers note that the solution is not obvious, however, because students are involved in a demanding program, but they suggest that integration of students might be assisted through their inclusion in the social activities of the department.

Graduate Education

- **Student Issues:** While graduate students praised the Chair for being open and approachable, recognized the high-quality environment in which they were studying, and felt that the level of financial support was good, they raised two major issues of concern. The first issue concerned course offerings which student perceived to not be of sufficient quality and quantity, and the reviewers suggest that an interdepartmental “menu” of courses could be generated to provide increased course offerings and flexibility for graduate student programs. The second issue concerned students' feeling of lack of involvement in Departmental issues and the reviewers suggest that, at a minimum, students should be included in the graduate committee of the Department. A related issue that was raised is the lack of a clear appeals process when students find themselves in conflict with a member of their supervisory committee. In addition, some junior faculty feel that they do not have adequate access to students as compared to senior faculty. While the reviewers recognize that this is not a unique problem, they recommend that it should be addressed by the graduate committee to ensure equality of access.

A working group has already been established to examine issues around course offerings and the Department plans to increase student involvement in departmental affairs through appointing student representatives to sit on all working committees and to establish an appeals process. I am sure that the Graduate Committee will continue to work to clarify or solve the issues raised by the reviewers.

Research

- The reviewers note that the research activity of the Department places it as one of the best, if not the best, biomedical research departments in the country. The Department's already excellent ability to exploit cutting edge technologies will increase with the establishment of the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research. However, they consider the development of strong research training programs may lead to diminished departmental loyalties and recommend that issues of recruitment and program integrity be considered by the Department.

Challenges

- **CCBR:** The Faculty of Medicine is spearheading a novel experiment in conducting research within a common facility that will house investigators without regard for Department or Faculty affiliation. This tremendous opportunity also brings considerable uncertainty and anxiety within the existing research groups. The reviewers noted that there seems to be a widespread lack of information concerning almost every aspect of the CCBR planning process and there are feeling of concern among many faculty members about the effect of the CCBR on the research environment and teaching loads of faculty not moving to the CCBR. The reviewers recommend that the Faculty of Medicine undertake an aggressive communication strategy in order to ensure a widespread “buy in” from the scientific community and to address directly and openly the concerns raised. On the other hand, the reviewers note that movement of faculty from the existing Department location to the CCBR will provide a one-time opportunity to relocate members to lab space that maximizes interactions with colleagues as well as an opportunity to upgrade the remaining space in MSB.

I agree with the reviewers that an “aggressive” communication strategy needs to be undertaken to quell the current uncertainty and anxiety over the effect of the CCBR. This will begin with the recruitment of a director for CCBR. I strongly agree with the reviewers that the space in the MSB should be upgraded to prevent first class/second class perceptions from developing within the Department. That point has been on the agenda of the Dean's Executive for over a year.

- **Postdoctoral Fellows:** The reviewers note that postdoctoral fellows have little formal status within MGM and suggest that mechanisms be put in place to ensure that postdoctoral fellows become more involved in the Department. They see the creation of the CCBR as an unprecedented opportunity to establish a unique postdoctoral training program that would attract world-wide attention and increase the number and quality of postdoctoral applications to the Department. Recruitment of international postdoctoral fellows and students is one way to achieve the goal of becoming one of the best departments in the world.

I agree with the Department Chair that the Department's profile would be raised through implementation of some Department-based postdoctoral fellow recruitment and activities.

Administrative Response

See the Dean's Response to the review report above.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Banting and Best Department of Medical Research

DATE: March 26, 2002

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean, Faculty of Medicine

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate
Graduate

None
None (faculty are cross-appointed to departments with graduate programs and students are registered through those departments)

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION: 1 Canadian, 1 American

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:

International

Dr. Phillip Sharp
McGovern Institute for Brain Research, Cambridge,
MA

Canadian

Dr. James Smiley
University of Alberta

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: 1995

DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW: N/A

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

Dean's Review Guidelines
External Review Schedule
Chair's Report
Faculty Member's Report
Graduate Student Report
Research Assoc / Postdoc Fellow Report
Research Grant Holdings Journal Club
Research Seminar Series
Guest Speaker Program
Previous External Reviews
Departmental Budget
Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty

CONSULTATION PROCESS: 1-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, Department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

1995 External Review

- **Key Challenges:** The 1995 review identified two key challenges for the BBDMR: identify an overall research theme and upgrade physical infrastructure. The reviewers consider that the Chair has successfully met these challenges - developing the Department's genomics/proteomics focus, renovating space in the Best Institute, and identifying new funding sources for infrastructure.

Research, Faculty, and Future Direction

- **Departmental Strengths:** The reviewers consider the BBDMR to be a strong Department with 'highly distinguished faculty and an enviable record of research accomplishments'. They also recognize that the BBDMR plays a leading role in UofT genomics/proteomics endeavours, with departmental faculty strongly supporting this direction for the Department.

It is satisfying to see that such a positive review of the Department. The BBDMR Chair considers that the Department is uniquely positioned to respond to emerging scientific trends as it does not have to maintain a teaching program in a fixed subject area, and is therefore able to expeditiously pull together multidisciplinary teams. It is also considered that the broad diversity of research topics expands the outlook of its faculty and trainees, thereby providing a richer graduate student experience.

- **Faculty Demographics:** The reviewers recognize that the upcoming retirements within the BBDMR will significantly alter the Department's demographics.
- **Chair Search:** The reviewers comment that a search for a successor to Dr. Friesen should start as soon as possible.

Dr. Friesen's term has been extended to June 30, 2003, and could in fact be extended further were he to forego a terminal administrative leave. If he does not extend further, a search will be struck at once.

- **Teaching and Relationships with Other Departments:** The reviewers note that the degree of participation in teaching by BBDMR faculty varies substantially from individual to individual. They recommend that the Department become more equitably involved in teaching, adopting criteria used in other departments to determine teaching loads.

The cognate chairs value BBDMR's research accomplishments and teaching activities, but question the need for a Department that has no specific teaching or service mandate - i.e. BBDMR appears to be very much like a research institute. The departmental response notes that junior BBDMR faculty are encouraged to teach minimally in their first three years in order to establish their research programs. I should note that in this respect BBDMR is no different than other basic science departments where an effort is made to limit teaching loads while new faculty establish their research programs.

- **Building and Facilities:** The reviewers did not identify physical plant as a major issue.

The 1995 external review identified an inadequate physical plant as a major issue. I am glad to see that this issue was not a key one in this review - possibly due to extensive renovations that were carried out after the last review, with more to come, as well as the expectation of a move to the CCBR building.

- **BBDMR and the CCBR:** As the Chair and faculty in BBDMR have been instrumental in developing the CCBR concept and in raising CFI funding for it, the reviewers consider it logical to couple BBDMR's future development with that of the CCBR - with the BBDMR forming the nucleus of the CCBR with its multidisciplinary nature. One prominent issue that was tabled in the review process was that of who will move to the CCBR - all of the Department, part of it, or none of it. The reviewers stress the importance of resolving this issue to reduce uncertainty and anxiety in both faculty and students.

The Department is strongly in favor of moving as a whole to the CCBR - taking on a lead role through combining the positions of BBDMR Chair and CCBR Director into one position and using BBDMR recruitment to build CCBR faculty complement. I view this idea as unworkable unless the BBDMR were to be transformed into a special scientific group with designated BBDMR Scientists, rather than continuing as a formal department. The departmental response to the review report clearly states that the Department wants to 'remain as a line department of the Basic Medical Sciences'. Thus, we must face the prospect that BBDMR will be split like other departments, with some but not all colleagues in the CCBR. The reason that this is unsettling for BBDMR is because a large number of BBDMR members fit well with CCBR themes, and the BBDMR is a small department. Thus, the post-CCBR split in BBDMR will have a greater impact than in some other departments. One option that has been raised

is to redistribute appointments so that some of the BBDMR members in the CCBR move to other departments, with new slots from those departments being transferred back to BBDMR as 'compensation'. I suspect that other departments and the involved faculty alike will not be drawn to this option. However, similar options bear consideration to help address the looming problem of imbalance in the BBDMR faculty complement between the CCBR and the Best Institute.

- **Future Challenges and Opportunities:** Over the next five years, the BBDMR must recruit a new chair and faculty to replace retirees, as well as manage the transition to the CCBR. The reviewers feel strongly that the BBDMR should be nurtured and allowed to further evolve as a single unit - feeling that this small Department could not survive a split into two distinct entities. As such, the reviewers suggest that the issue of the integrity of the BBDMR be addressed along with the successor to the current chair.

I am sympathetic to their concerns for obvious reasons, and would be pleased if a long-term solution could be found that avoided a destabilizing split in the Department. However, I am not prepared to endorse an en bloc transfer of BBDMR into CCBR – a move that would strike at the heart of our programmatic planning around CCBR to date.

Graduate Students and Postdoctoral Fellows

- **Research Environment:** The reviewers note that Graduate students and postdoctoral fellows were very positive about the Department's genomics/proteomics focus. As well, they value the multidisciplinary nature of BBDMR and the benefits this brings - feeling that they receive a broader scientific experience than they would have if only in their home graduate departments. The reviewers consider the quality of the graduate research experience to be excellent, with well-funded and well-published labs.
- **Student Representation on Committees:** Although graduate students feel that their concerns are being heard, the reviewers note that there are no student representatives on departmental committees, and suggest that this change.

The departmental response notes that there is one regular departmental committee - with students being represented by the president of the Institute's student association.

- **Graduate Enrolment:** The reviewers note that graduate enrolment has significantly declined since 1995 and is below the norm for the faculty complement. The reviewers recommend that the BBDMR be more proactive in graduate recruitment, as well as look closely at other possible factors for the enrolment decline.

According to the Department, the decline in enrolment is due to the current departmental demographics in which some faculty are reaching retirement and others are new recruits. I support the Department's commitment to improve its recruitment process in cooperation with its cross-appointment departments.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Department of Medicine

DATE: September 30 / Oct 1, 2003

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean, Faculty of Medicine

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate	Undergraduate medical program
Graduate	Graduate programs offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	Postgraduate medical training
	Fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	Continuing medical education

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION: 1 Canadian, 1 American

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:

Canadian	Dr. Lorne Tyrrell Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry University of Alberta
International	Dr. Lee Goldman Chair, Department of Medicine and Assoc. Dean, Clinical Affairs School of Medicine University of California, San Francisco

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: 1998

DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW: N/A

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

- Dean's Review Guidelines
- External Review Schedule
- Chair's Report
- Division Directors Report
- Undergraduate Medical Education Reports
- Postgraduate Medical Education Report
- Student Reports
- Graduate Education Report
- Continuing Education Report
- Research Report
- Previous review reports / responses
- Departmental budget
- Departmental communications
- Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty

CONSULTATION PROCESS: 2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:
The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

On a national level, the reviewers consider the UofT Department of Medicine's collective academic portfolio to rank at the top in Canada – having excellent training and research programs and an impressive array of outstanding research and extramural funding. On a North American scale, the Department was assessed as ranking within the top quintile of departments of medicine for research performance and among the top ten in public universities.

The benchmarking here was a helpful contrast with the usual generalities, but also illustrates the challenge of making comparisons.

Undergraduate Medical Education

- **Overall:** The reviewers consider the Department of Medicine's undergraduate medical education program to be "excellent to outstanding" and receiving appropriate emphasis in the Department's mission.

This is a credit to all the involved educators/teachers and the Chair.

- **Student Feedback:** While student feedback was generally very positive, three issues were raised:
 - i. for those students starting on Internal Medicine as their initial rotation, a more complete orientation and guidance at the beginning of the rotation would be very useful;
 - ii. students noted that there was some variability in evaluation on clinical rotations and it was felt that more guidance should be provided to the instructors to bring more uniformity to the grading system; and
 - iii. there was some concern with grade inflation when 40% of the class receive "honours".

I am grateful that the Department's Undergraduate Medical Education Committee has already started to explore the issues raised by medical students in their session with the reviewers. The Department of Medicine's Clerkship Committee has provided a Curriculum Outline and is planning for a special orientation for students new to ward medicine. Efforts are also being made to address student concerns about grade inflation and uniformity in the clinical grading system. I encourage continuation of this process.

Postgraduate Medical Education

- **Overall:** The reviewers rate the Department's general and subspecialty postgraduate programs as outstanding.
- **CRISP:** While this centrally delivered component of the curriculum was not viewed very positively in the written material submitted to the reviewers, they note that during interviews with residents there was consensus that it was being improved to become an important part of a master core curriculum.

I am sure the renewal of the centrally delivered component of the curriculum (CRISP) will continue and will be well-received by residents.

- **Previous University Affiliation:** The reviewers suggest that the high percentage of UofT graduates in the UofT postgraduate medicine program indicates a bias towards UofT graduates.

The Chair, Dr. Phillipson, refutes this in his response to the reviewers' report - stating that the percentage of UofT graduates in the UofT residency programs is lower than the stats for other Canadian universities. I heartily agree with the Department's policy of accepting the best students, regardless of their prior university affiliation.

- **Balance:** The residents consider that there is a good balance between education and service and between scholarship and 'apprenticeship' activities.
- **Mentoring and Research Exposure:** The residents expressed a desire to have the current informal mentoring program formalized and to have increased exposure to research.

The Department is exploring how it might meet this wish.

Graduate Programs

- **Educational Mission:** The reviewers consider the Department's three graduate programs (Clinician Scientist, Clinician Educator and Master Teachers Program) to be solid evidence for the Department's strong support of the educational mission. The reviewers compliment the department on its "innovative, successful and popular" programs.

I agree with the reviewers' that these programs are helping to develop the future academic faculty in Medicine for all of Canada.

- **Funding:** Although the residents view the Department's graduate programs very positively, they did express concern about stability of funding for the programs.

I view the funding as relatively stable and am less concerned.

Continuing Education

- **Overall:** The reviewers note that they consider the Department's CE program to be "excellent to outstanding".

Research

- **Research Productivity and Publication Records:** The reviewers consider that departmental research productivity compares well with that of highly regarded U.S. institutions.

I agree fully with Dr. Phillipson in his opinion that this success has been due to the collaborative efforts of many who have supported research – faculty, division directors, physicians-in-chief, and departmental practice plans.

- **Canada Research Chairs:** The reviewers are unclear as to who has control over the CRC Chairs in the clinical departments, and recommend that a transparent policy be developed.

While hospital-based CRCs are allocated through hospital research institute directors, all nominees require the approval of the Department Chair. Market share analyses of federal granting council funding with departmental allocations of CRCs show an excellent correlation. Clinical departments are not being shortchanged.

- **Basic/Research Scientists:** Some basic scientists and research scientists registered their insecurity about their lack of tenure and the recent CIHR suspension of senior salary awards.

We are all hoping that CIHR will reverse its unpopular decision on senior salary awards, and pressure to that end continues to be exerted by academic administrators across Canada.

- **Clinician Scientists and Research Institutes:** The Clinical Scientist program was seen as a real strength; however there were concerns expressed among the clinical scientists about their ability to garner research institute resources.

Department's strategic planning process should include a clear articulation of the relationship between clinician scientists and research institute directors.

Budget

- **University funding:** The reviewers note a "general under-appreciation of the true magnitude of the resources that the University puts into the Department".

I hope that the process initiated by the Department chair and the Departmental Budget Allocation Committee will clarify sources of funding and expectations. Among the points I would also emphasize is the nature of Phase I AFP funding. Phase I AFP monies are a supplement for clinical education.

Organizational Structure

- **Job Descriptions:** The reviewers applaud the fact that departmental job descriptions put education and research portfolios on an equal footing.
- **Governance - Power Balance:** The reviewers describe the Department's governance structure as "unique" and highlight the problems with sustainability of a situation where the Chair does not have direct access to practice plan resources.

I agree with the reviewers and Dr. Phillipson that the power balance between the Department chair and the physicians-in-chief is a delicate one that demands "moral suasion" on the part of the chair. As Dr. Phillipson notes in his response, despite the challenges posed by this structure, the Department has flourished in both its education and research programs. Dr. Phillipson outlines alternate governance models that could be considered – a committee of physicians-in-chief replacing the Department chair or the Department chair serving as physician-in-chief for all teaching hospitals. I agree with Dr. Phillipson that both of these models have serious drawbacks and that the status-quo model of the Department chair serving as physician-in-chief at one institution has the most credence. On the other hand, the evolution of AFPs raises more urgent questions about governance. I believe horizontal AFPs organized across institutions by department are clearly superior as the way forward for so-called Phase X, and that the next Chair should be integrally involved in governance of such a horizontal AFP.

- **Governance – Priority Setting:** The reviewers comment that the physicians-in-chief consider that they, not the Department chair, set departmental priorities.

In his response to the review report, Dr. Phillipson considers that the true reality in hospitals is that the chair and physicians-in-chief are aligned together with occasional tensions arising with hospital research institute directors. I suggest that the Department would be an even more powerful advocate for colleagues' interests in dealing with hospitals and research institutes if there were a horizontal economic umbrella and 'confederacy'.

Faculty Issues

- **Morale:** The reviewers found morale amongst faculty and students to be generally outstanding – with faculty being proud of the Department and its leadership and students pleased with their programs.
- **Funding:** The reviewers note that the faculty are concerned that the Department chair needs more control over sources of funding in order for the Department to continue to flourish.

Dr. Phillipson considers that the development of a horizontal Department-wide AFP would facilitate the Department playing a significant role in allocation of AFP dollars. I agree. My understanding is that hospital CEOs would support more horizontal AFPs, provided that local colleagues are on side and there is continued diligence to align clinical and academic activity with the mission and strategic plans of the host hospitals.

- **Recruitment to Community Hospitals:** Some members of the Department are concerned that the community hospitals are recruiting top faculty candidates away from the academic health centres.

I agree with Dr. Phillipson that this is a challenge, but not one that has seriously disadvantaged us. The institution of an academic AFP will address this issue to some extent.

Vision and Future Challenges

- **Next Chair:** The reviewers recommend that the formulation of a vision for the next five to ten years should be the top priority of the next Department chair.

Dr. Phillipson adds that this plan should include a mechanism to ensure ongoing support of the Department's clinician-scientists. I agree with both.

- **Governance Structure:** The reviewers consider that Dr. Phillipson's good management and vision have gone a long way to resulting in the successful maintenance of the delicate balance among the chair and the hospital-based groupings led by physicians-in-chief.

As this balance is precarious and personality dependent, the development of a clearly defined academic strategic plan that is endorsed by all key leaders could minimize the potential for future friction.

Stature of the Department

- **Canada:** As noted above, the reviewers consider that the academic achievements of the Department rank at the top of all Canadian medical schools.
- **North America:** The reviewers consider the Department to rank with the top 20 or so U.S. departments of medicine and among the top 8 to 10 departments of medicine at public institutions in North America.

It is tough to assess research internationally based on external funding without full allowance for publication productivity. Furthermore, as Dr Phillipson notes, the Department's ranking would also have been higher if medical education programs had been fully considered in the analysis.

Conclusion

The Department of Medicine is a large, complex, and highly successful enterprise. Its legacy of achievement is the result of the commitment and talents of a vast number of individuals, including all the current Departmental members, those in myriad leadership roles, and, not least, the outstanding Chair for the last ten years who will be retiring in a few months, Dr. Eliot Phillipson.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

I am grateful to the reviewers, Dr. Lee Goldman (University of California, San Francisco, California) and Dr. Lorne Tyrrell (University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta), for their helpful assessment of the Department of Medicine. I would also like to express my thanks to all the Department members who contributed so usefully to the documentation for the review, who participated in interviews with the reviewers, and who helped again by responding to the review. I congratulate all the Department members and the Chair, Dr. Eliot Phillipson, for this extremely positive review.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Department of Nutritional Sciences

DATE: September 2002

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean, Faculty of Medicine

PROGRAMS OFFERED / TEACHING COMMITMENTS:

Undergraduate B.Sc. (Nutritional Sciences) - offered through Faculty of Arts and Science
Faculty teach in the undergraduate medical program, particularly in the Metabolism and Nutrition 8-week block in year 1.

Graduate M.Sc., Ph.D.
Jointly administers M.H.Sc. (Community Nutrition) program with the program's home department of Public Health Sciences

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION: 1 Canadian / 1 American

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:

International Dr. Johanna Dwyer
Assistant Administrator, Human Nutrition
Agricultural Research Service
US Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC

Canadian Dr. Larry Milligan
Professor, Department of Animal and Poultry
Science, University of Guelph

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: 1996

DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW: February 2000

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

- Dean's Review Guidelines
- External Review Schedule
- Chair's Report
- Faculty Members' Report
- Undergraduate Education Reports
- Undergraduate Student Reports
- Graduate Education Reports
- Graduate Student Reports
- Research Report
- International Initiatives Report
- Program in Food Safety Report
- Departmental Budget
- Previous External Review Report
- Alumni and Departmental Newsletters
- Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty

CONSULTATION PROCESS: 2 day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENTATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

The reviewers consider the UofT Department of Nutritional Sciences to be a "signature" department for the University - one that has experienced extraordinary progress and considerable success over the past five years.

I congratulate all the department members and the Chair, Dr. Michael Archer, for this extremely positive review. I shall restrict my responses to certain key comments and recommendations made by the reviewers.

Undergraduate Education

- **Commitments and Priorities:** In light of budget and human resource constraints, the reviewers consider that it may now be necessary for the Department to "reconsider and narrow commitments and priorities ... to focus on the Department's core mission...". They suggest that this could result in eliminating or scaling back the Department's commitment to the undergraduate specialist program in order to concentrate on research and graduate education.

The Chair notes in his response that this possibility has been discussed on an ongoing basis within the Department, but with no resolution. See below for my comments.

- **Undergraduate Medical Education:** Through its teaching in the undergraduate medical program, the Department is seen to be strengthening the links among nutrition, health, and disease treatment and prevention. The reviewers recommend that succession planning take place to ensure that retiring physician faculty are replaced, thereby ensuring a continuation of existing clinical linkages and training.

I am glad to see that the Chair has already begun this process.

- **Undergraduate Arts and Science Specialist Program:** The curriculum of the Specialist Program is seen to be of excellent quality. The reviewers note that some students expressed a wish for options for more practical applications or more professional preparation for the RD credential rather than a "research" track oriented degree. Other students were concerned that the curriculum was onerous with many science and laboratory courses and that it was difficult to fit in all courses without spending more than four years or going to sum school.

The Department will have to work with students to resolve some of the concerns identified in the external review. I recognize that the Department has to think through the role and configuration of its Specialist Program. Given the Faculty's mission, the link between the Specialist Program and the Department's Graduate Program should be at the heart of the decision-making. As one other factor in the decision, colleagues should be aware that currently the Dean's Office is in negotiations with Arts and Science about how we might share in revenue from enrolment expansion in Arts and Science as it relates to our Arts and Science teaching load. However, the fact is that there has been limited enrolment growth in Specialist Programs. Unless courses in Specialist Programs are open to a wider range of Life Science/Human Biology students, it is understandable that Arts and Science will not want to move funds our way. I suggest that the Department consult carefully with Associate Dean Whiteside who, in her inter-faculty portfolio, has been spearheading the discussions with Arts and Science.

Graduate Education

- **Quality:** The Department's graduate programs are considered to be unique and outstanding - both nationally and internationally. *This is a real credit to all the colleagues involved.*
- **Student Issues - MSc/PhD:** Graduate students were positive about the faculty and opportunities for research, but voiced a desire for more interactions with other labs. *I am confident that the Department can readily address this issue.*

- **Student Issues - MHSc:** Students registered a number of needs - campus-based communal study space, equitable funding with other graduate student programs, and more explicit structure in the practica part of the program. The reviewers note that one area needing improvement is the integration of MHSc program students into the Department.

A recent task force report on funding of professional Master's students has given additional profile to the student aid issues for this group across the Faculty. The other changes are internal matters.

Research

- **Quality:** The reviewers compliment the Department on its excellent research record spanning a broad range of areas that are very relevant to the Department's mission.

Relationships with Cognate Departments

- **Scope of Relationships:** Despite the fact that relationships with cognate departments are limited by the small size of the Department, the Department has established several relevant collaborations with a very large portfolio of activities. The reviewers report that cognate chairs consider that the Department "bridges the core biological sciences ... through to clinical medical practice and out into the community". As this has been partially accomplished through cross-appointments to the Department, the reviewers suggest that joint appointments be considered to allow the Department to become involved in joint recruitment.

Suffice it to say that the Dean's Office is supportive of any configuration of appointments that promotes genuinely trans-disciplinary research and education, with the important proviso that there be clarity about lines of accountability.

Budget

- **Vision:** The reviewers suggest that the Department needs to consider its "optimal situation and location" in the Faculty and move towards that vision. With current budget constraints, it is necessary to hone in on top priorities.

While I agree with the reviewers' assessment, I would also point out the extraordinary turnaround from a few years ago, when there was debate as to whether the Department would even continue to exist!

- **Personnel:** The reviewers stress the need to increase numbers of cross- and joint-appointees to increase department faculty numbers. *The Chair has already committed to carrying through on this front.*
- **Funding:** To further increase departmental faculty's grant funding, it was suggested that the Department lobby the CIHR to address the government's lack of a clear research priority relative to diet, nutrition, and cancer.

Partnerships with External Groups

- **Teaching Hospitals:** The reviewers note that the Department has worked to strengthen collaborations with selected teaching hospitals through cross-appointments, a joint appointment, and through graduate students. The partnerships with St. Michael's Hospital and the Hospital for Sick Children are particularly strong.
- **Government:** Interactions with all levels of government have been a high priority and in line with the departmental mission.
- **Industry:** The Department's interactions with industry bring a real-world policy dimension to the benefit of both communities.

Organizational Structure

- **Stability and Continuity:** The Department's organizational stability and leadership continuity are seen to have allowed it to flourish.

Morale

- **Faculty:** The reviewers note that while faculty morale is high relative to academic issues, it is tempered by their concern about the budgetary situation.

Future Challenges

- **Budget and Space Constraints:** Without an increase in budget and physical space, the reviewers consider that the Department may have to limit its activities to core health mission areas in order to conserve already-stretched faculty resources.

Reviewing the Department's core mission at this time would be appropriate in order to agree on how best to utilize limited resources. Concentrating on core priorities may be necessary, especially if budget constraints continue. However, I am also keen to help the Department find more space. I am cautiously optimistic that with the reconfiguration of the Fitzgerald Building, as we develop the CCBR and the 155 College Street site, there may be more space for the Department. Longer term, repatriation of the Matrix Physiology Group to Dentistry's site would complete the transformation of space for the Department.

- **Vision and Long-Range Plan:** The Department faculty have begun considering the challenges that confront them, including likely further budget cuts, faculty retirements and inadequate space and the need for long range planning. Further matters that need to be considered include:
 - i. reaching a clearer sense of the department's areas of excellence and areas that need additional improvements;
 - ii. development of a formal strategic plan; and,
 - iii. succession planning that involves the teaching hospitals.

With further budget cuts inevitable, upcoming retirements, and space constraints, I agree with the reviewers and the Department chair that it is timely for the Department to do some long-range proactive planning and develop a strategic plan.

Administrative Response

Nutritional Sciences has a long and proud history at the UofT, and it is now wonderfully clear that the right decision was made to maintain the Department rather than disperse or restructure it in the 1990s.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology
DATE:	December 3/4, 2001
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean, Faculty of Medicine
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	Undergraduate medical program
Graduate	Graduate programs offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	Postgraduate medical training Fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	Continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. Harold Fox, Johns Hopkins University
Canadian	Dr. Peter Mitchell, University of Alberta
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1996
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	N/A
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Member's Report Undergraduate Medical Education Report Postgraduate Medical Education Report Student Reports Continuing Education Report Divisional Reports Research Report Previous Review Reports Departmental Budget Annual Report Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:
The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

Undergraduate Medical Education

- **1996 external review:** The 1996 departmental external review raised several issues relative to the clerkship portion of the undergraduate medical program. Some of the same concerns arose in this review and are discussed below. The reviewers advise that they be addressed more proactively.

The Undergraduate Education Committee has started a serious review of the issues. I trust that this process will proceed to a successful conclusion.

- **Financial support:** The reviewers note that Undergraduate Education Committee is concerned that the Department's large unfunded clerkship teaching activity is unsustainable unless stipends are introduced and infrastructure support is increased. Many faculty do not have protected time to allow them to participate in teaching.

I am very sympathetic to the pressure on income faced by all of our clinical faculty as they do clinical teaching. However, the budgets of the Faculty and the clinical departments are so constrained that I do not see how we can introduce major stipending systems. If anything, the trend is away from stipends, with concentration of limited resources on those with major organizational roles in education. A discouraging proportion of new revenue coming to the Faculty has gone to off-set a series of budget cuts arising from the inadequate levels of government funding that have taken a cumulative toll on the entire University over the course of a decade. The most attractive solution for this problem is the initiation of Alternative Funding Plans (AFPs) that will allow full-time academic obstetricians/gynecologists to balance their clinical, teaching, and research responsibilities, while providing an overdue enhancement of their incomes.

- **Student feedback:** Students raised a number of issues of concern:
 - i. Split rotations between University and community sites were seen as disruptive but preferable to an alternative where students may be allocated to a sub-optimal site for the entire rotation;
 - ii. Students would view an expressed requirement that they participate actively in a vaginal delivery during their clerkship as a positive factor;
 - iii. Students noted variability in quality among teaching sites and teachers and expressed a desire for a standardized curriculum and the initiation of a central core-content lecture program. Students requested this of the Undergraduate Committee and perceived that it was not considered seriously by the Committee. The reviewers recommend that feedback and communication be improved between these two groups.
 - iv. Students would like to see residents participate more actively in undergraduate teaching, particularly at Mt. Sinai Hospital.
 - v. Students viewed the general obstetrical and gynaecological experiences at some sites to be inadequate and considered some educational experiences to be too oriented to subspecialties.

The Chair notes that the aim of these subspecialty experiences has been to allow students to sample a wide range of obs gyn experiences. As mentioned above, the Undergraduate Education Committee has started a serious review of a number of these issues. I shall leave it to the Committee and Associate Dean Rick Frecker to work through these issues that have been helpfully highlighted by the review process.

- **Examination:** The reviewers recommend the institution of an OSCE examination to help students prepare for the part II LMCC examinations.

Postgraduate Medical Education - Residency Programs

- **Service versus education:** With the stress created through the recent mergers of hospitals, the service versus education conflict has come to the forefront, particularly at Mt. Sinai Hospital. The use of physician-extenders at Mt. Sinai has been effective in restoring a better education/service ratio. Resident morale has steadily improved as conditions have improved.
- **Resident evaluation:** The reviewers recommend that infrastructure support be provided to result in a more uniform system of resident evaluation.
- **Communication:** The residents and reviewers recommend improving communication between the Department and residents on several issues, including orientation of residents to hospital-specific policies, programmatic change, and impending infrastructure changes.
- **Mentoring:** Residents would like to see the institution of career counseling/mentoring throughout the residency program.

The faculty response notes that junior faculty could benefit from this type of mentoring as well. The Chair responds that career counseling was done annually in the past, but has been

neglected recently due to time constraints relative to restructuring issues. I see this as an important issue and am pleased that it will be revisited. As is the case with many of the postgraduate programs, the Department faces some tensions between producing specialists who will meet the pressing community need for well-rounded obstetrician/gynecologists, and the Faculty's research intensity and its focus on academic leadership, frequently manifested as super-specialization.

- **Research block:** The residents see the research block as ill-defined, noting that mentoring of residents as to what constitutes a realistic research project would be valuable.

I trust that this issue will be resolved as the Chair reports that the block will be restructured to be more rewarding and competitive.

Postgraduate Medical Education - Fellowship Programs

- **Commitment to education:** The Chair and several faculty indicated to the reviewers that the Department's primary commitment to education is at the level of subspecialty fellows.

See above re the tension that is inevitably created by this understandable commitment as regards generalist trainees, and the corollary need for mentorship.

- **Administrative structure:** The reviewers were unclear about the administrative structure of the subspecialty programs - with programs appearing to function independently. As a result, they recommend establishing a Fellowship Education Committee to address common issues in the programs.

Junior Faculty

- **Bench lab space:** With bench lab space at a premium for new faculty (some share lab space or work in shifts) the reviewers conclude that this problem needs to be solved to ensure that junior investigators have an opportunity to advance their academic careers.

I think this concern is correct, but needs re-framing. First, we have strength in bench research in reproductive science at the MSB and at MSH. There is a long-standing perception that the Samuel Lunenfeld Research Institute is not particularly clinician-friendly and has been selective in its support for translational research. Whatever the fairness of this perception, the Institute is in evolution with a reproductive scientist (Dr Lye) as the new VP-Research at MSH and Dr. Pawson serving as the new Director of the Lunenfeld Institute. I believe that in future, a sufficiently strong clinician-scientist is very likely to find space in either the MSH or the MSB. Second, and as a corollary, I accept that relatively few clinicians will be successful at competing head-to-head in fundamental science with PhD investigators, but it surely stands to reason that the comparative advantage of clinician-scientists is in translational research. We have examples of clinician-investigators in the Faculty who run successful bench programs with clear cross-over to the clinical sphere, and consistent with the spirit of the McLaughlin Program, we must develop and support more such activity. Third, I also expect that as the configuration of SWCHSC stabilizes and new research space is created there, it is likely that specialized foci of reproductive science will be given bench space and core support in that institution. Accordingly, I understand the concern but believe it is readily manageable within our current operational framework.

- **Protected time:** New faculty expressed concern about their lack of protected time for academic endeavours. The reviewers recommend increased infrastructure support to remedy the discrepancy between the number of abstracts produced and the number of peer-reviewed publications. Mentoring of faculty may also help their productivity.

In my view, there is a disconnect between recommending more stipends for clinician-teachers and asking for more dedicated support for major-time researchers. Choices must be made by the next Chair. As a former research administrator who has now had the privilege of participating as Dean in the assessment of multiple departments and scores of investigators in the faculty, I would also like to encourage department chairs and other senior faculty to avoid infecting our trainees and junior faculty with 'abstractitis'. Massive amounts of time and money in modern medical research are invested in the production of abstracts and posters, often disrupting other productive work to meet some deadline and the presentation

requirements of a particular meeting. One sometimes sees the same abstract submitted to multiple meetings. Relatively few scientific meetings allow for focused, sustained, and high-level interchange. More generally, countless abstracts and posters never make it to full peer-reviewed publications. In sum, a partial answer to the problem of abstracts and posters that do not see the light of full publication may be to redirect our energy and resources away from 'meetingsmanship' and into writing full papers for proper peer review.

Research

- **Research capability:** This topic was covered indirectly by the reviewers as above.

Cognate Academic Departments

- **Clinician-scientists:** The reviewers report that some cognate chairs perceive that basic science research has flourished in the Department but that there are relatively few clinician-scientists.
- **Partnering with Family and Community Medicine:** It was suggested that there is a need for more proactive partnering with the Department of Family and Community Medicine. *The Chair will pursue this issue further.*

Departmental Organizational Structure

- **Executive Committee:** The reviewers were impressed that the Executive Committee members represent a broad base and are very aware of departmental issues.
- **Infrastructure support:** The reviewers and the departmental Executive Committee feel that the research and education committees need increased infrastructure support to function effectively - for the education committee to support program development and the research committee to provide publication support. The reviewers note that it will be difficult for the Chair to provide this support due to the limited resources available to him.

The Chair admits that scarce departmental resources have been moved to advance the research mission at the expense of teaching - and that a way needs to be found to redirect resources. See above for my general comments on this issue.

- **Centralized responsibility vs decentralized funding:** The reviewers note a large discrepancy between the Department's centralized responsibility for educational and research programs and its decentralized sources of funding. In addition, the Department has no authority for wet lab space, with basic research development dependant on research institute plans - which may not be strongly supportive of translational or purely clinical research.

The Chair echoes that he has had 'considerable difficulty' with this issue of institutional lack of support for bench-to-bedside research. Please see above for Decanal comments.

- **Chiefs Operations Management Group:** As hospital chiefs are in a good position to negotiate resources controlled by hospitals, the reviewers recommend the establishment of a combined hospital chiefs group that could potentially mobilize resources to meet the Department's academic mission and be involved in active operations management discussions.

The Chair reports that the hospital chiefs have already been meeting monthly over the last year.

- **Chair/chief model:** The reviewers, after departmental faculty feedback, concluded that the Chair/Chief model is the most effective one for the Department at the present time as it provides needed resources to the Chair.

The Chair considers that it would be very difficult to attract an external candidate to the chair position without the combined position and the resources it brings.

Morale

- **Effect of mergers:** Although hospital mergers have affected staff morale, the reviewers were impressed that the Department also recognizes these as opportunities. The uncertainty over

the move to Sunnybrook of the Women's College site has created an unsettled situation that needs to be clarified.

Department Management, Vision and Leadership

- **Credibility:** The Department is seen to have experienced substantial growth in academic credibility - being recognized as the outstanding academic department in Canada. The reviewers consider that it has the potential to be among the best international departments with its breadth and depth of excellence in each subspecialty.

I see this assessment as a credit not only to the Chair, who has done an outstanding job, but to the entire Department.

MSH Maternal and Fetal Medicine practice plan: The reviewers claim that there is dissatisfaction amongst faculty concerning the Mt. Sinai Hospital Maternal and Fetal Medicine practice plan, which is seen to be encouraging 'individual entrepreneurial creativity, rather than academic productivity'. The reviewers see the development of Alternate Funding Plans as a way to increase departmental financial stability. The reviewers stress that the Department should be an active partner in the development of AFPs, particularly as it was not involved in the development of the AFP for gynecologic oncologists.

The Head of the Mt. Sinai Hospital Division responds that this is not an accurate representation of reality - that, since the merger between MSH and TGH, there has been significant reorganization of the group's activities and practice plan, with everyone receiving defined protected time for academic endeavours. I accept the Division Head's assessment. Both the Chair and I agree completely with the reviewers' emphasis on the Department being an active partner in the development of AFTs. In the interim, I expect all sites to maintain and enhance their fee-for-service practice plans. The role of part-timers is a complicating factor in the Department, and requires close attention in the restructuring of both existing plans and any AFPs.

Future

- **Long-range plan:** Although retreats have allowed the Department to identify issues and long term goals, the reviewers were not able to identify a long-range plan for the whole Department. The reviewers recommend that the Department should undergo a strategic planning process.

In the faculty response to the report, the Executive Committee agrees that although strategic issues have been discussed, a follow-through plan has not necessarily been put in place. The Chair quite rightly notes that doing this has been difficult in light of the fluid state of affairs resulting from the restructuring process. The Chair agrees that the Department should undergo a strategic planning process now that the environment is more stable.

- **New Chair:** The reviewers have identified multiple attributes for the next Chair of the Department.

We are well along with the search and confident that a strong successor to Prof. Ritchie will be found. The Executive Committee also commented that it will be important for the potential new Chair to negotiate with the Faculty for improved core infrastructure to support the Department's academic mission. About fifteen departments have been reviewed in the last three years, including eight clinical departments, and every single review has recommended more resources. Suffice it to say that monies are not being hidden in the Dean's office - as resources become available, they flow to departments on an equitable basis. As noted above, most of our new revenues have been deployed to protect the quality of our educational programs against the corrosive effect of budget cuts.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

See the Dean's response in italicized font above.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Otolaryngology
DATE:	November 13/14, 2001
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean, Faculty of Medicine
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	Undergraduate medical program
Graduate	Graduate programs offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	Postgraduate medical training Fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	Continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. Joseph Nadol, Harvard Medical School
Canadian	Dr. Howard Lampe, University of Western Ontario
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1996
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	N/A
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Member's Report Undergraduate Medical Education Report Postgraduate Medical Education Report Student Reports Continuing Education Report Research Report Previous Review Reports Departmental Budget Departmental Communications Audiology Report Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:
The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

Undergraduate Medical Education

- **Medical student exposure to Otolaryngology:** The undergraduate medical student exposure to Otolaryngology consists of four days in the third year clerkship and opportunities for electives in the second, third and fourth years. The medical students feel that their formal exposure is too brief, and are apparently disturbed that the one-day introductory session on the otologic examination has been eliminated from their curriculum. The reviewers recommend re-instituting this one-day introduction.

- **Teaching faculty:** The posting of curriculum material on the web is considered a positive move by students. Students still consider that there is significant variation in faculty availability from academy to academy. The reviewers recommend spreading the teaching load across academies by shifting faculty or students to provide balance.

The reviewers did not realize that non-GFT faculty are used to balance out numbers of clinician teachers at academies with fewer GFT otolaryngologists. Julian Nedzelski notes that students have already been re-allocated.

- **Disenfranchisement from curriculum planning:** The reviewers noted that both students and the departmental Undergraduate Education Committee voiced feelings of disenfranchisement from the curriculum and curriculum reform decision-making process.

Correction of this situation may come about in the agreed-to re-allocation of pre-clinical teaching responsibility - whereby the Department will now be responsible for a meaningful block of additional teaching.

Postgraduate Medical Education

- **Morale:** Although the postgraduate program is internationally known and respected, the Royal College review has had an adverse impact on morale. The reviewers recommend team and morale-building mechanisms. *The Department has already started this process, and will continue it.*
- **Academic program:** By addressing deficits noted in the Royal College review, the program has been improved with the addition of a required research rotation and development of a community hospital rotation to ensure exposure to general otolaryngology. The reviewers recommend coupling the research rotation with a lecture series on research issues.
- **Clinical fellows:** The reviewers recommend the establishment of departmental guidelines to clarify the separate roles of residents and clinical fellows in order to ensure that clinical fellows do not encroach on resident-level cases.

Although each of the Department's fellowship programs already has specific job descriptions to counter this, the Department will make further efforts to ensure that this does not happen.

- **Rationalization of clinical care and training:** The reviewers recommend that the Department consider rationalizing clinical care and training by further developing centres of excellence and clinical concentration - a move that could result in a change from hospital-based to subspecialty-based rotations.

Faculty support of this recommendation varies. Some faculty feel that consolidation in a smaller number of hospitals would maintain the Department's strength and provide a greater focus in teaching, clinical and research areas. Others feel that this could be difficult to implement due to service requirements at each centre and the lack of concentration of clinical expertise in areas other than head and neck oncology and neurotology within the major teaching hospitals. General otolaryngology would need to be identified as a priority program to ensure adequate training.

- **Anonymous evaluations of clinical rotations:** The reviewers recommend the establishment of a departmentally-sanctioned methodology for systematic and anonymous evaluations of clinical rotations.

The Department will revisit their current practices. The current evaluations are considered to be anonymous, but adoption of a software program for web-based evaluations, as pioneered by Medical Imaging, may be worthwhile.

Continuing Medical Education

- **Department-wide involvement:** The reviewers recommend that the Department strive to establish department-wide involvement in continuing education, particularly as the majority of current activity occurs via one location - Mt. Sinai Hospital.

Julian Nedzelski notes that once the clinical environment has stabilized, department faculty may take more interest in continuing education activities.

Research

- **Curriculum for Research Issues:** The departmental research faculty feel that the research community is not sufficiently involved in the core curriculum of the residents and fellows. As mentioned above, the reviewers recommend the establishment of a curriculum for research issues, coupled with the new research rotation. *Julian Nedzelski notes that elective research rotations have been available for several years.*
- **Practice Plans:** Faculty feel that standardization of practice plans would allow for rationalization of the departmental budget - resulting in new research initiatives and renewed awareness of opportunities for expanded monies and space needs.

From the perspective of the Dean's Office, establishment of practice plans is a priority. All GFT/FFT clinicians should be enrolled in a practice plan with income-sharing or academic enrichment funds. Standardization of the terms of such plans across institutions, as occurs to some degree in the Department of Surgery, would be beneficial.

- **Research Endowments:** The reviewers also recommend that there be an effort to increase department-specific research endowments. *This is a useful idea for the next Chair.*
- **Lack of awareness of opportunities:** The reviewers note that the researchers were unaware of the Canada Research Chair Program and the Academic Priority Fund as potential sources of support.

Cognate Academic Departments

- **Interdisciplinarity:** The reviewers note that collaboration between Otolaryngology and other departments has led to 'excellent interdisciplinary approaches to disease ...and teaching'.
- **Collaboration:** The reviewers recommend an increase in collaboration in the area of translational or basic research. *Julian Nedzelski points out that there are already several examples of such collaborations with cross-appointees.*
- **Audiology:** In light of changes in fee schedules, the reviewers and the Chair agree that audiology and audiology rehab services need to be supported.

Future

- **Power and authority:** The reviewers note the considerable financial clout and clinical authority of hospital chiefs.

I agree with both the reviewers and the Chair that standardization and openness of practice plans - including a conjoint set of principles and use of a portion in support of the academic mission - would strengthen the Chair's role in the Department's administration.

- **Teamwork with hospitals:** Rationalization of clinical care priorities that impact teaching and research programs needs to be done in consultation with the University to prevent a number of negative consequences, and ensure that Otolaryngology is more proactive than reactive.

I believe this is a priority, particularly as the Department has not fared well with overall hospital restructuring or the emergence of program management within hospitals.

- **Departmental endowment:** The reviewers urge the next chair to enhance departmental endowment for the academic and research missions.
- **Next Chair:** The next Chair needs to be a strong and respected leader with a strong sense of the academic mission - enhancing its role as an academic centre and taking the Department to the next level of academic distinction.

I am pleased that we have recruited Prof. Patrick Gullane to the Chair for a 5-year term, and confident that he will make a major contribution in this role. I also want to extend my personal thanks to Prof. Julian Nedzelski for his excellent leadership during the last 10 years.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

See above for actions to be taken on specific issues by the Department of Otolaryngology.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Public Health Sciences
DATE:	March 26/27, 2003
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean, Faculty of Medicine
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	Do not offer an undergraduate program, but do teach in the undergraduate medicine program
Graduate	MSc/PhD and MHSc degree programs
Postgraduate	Postgraduate medical training programs in Community Medicine and Occupational Medicine
Continuing	Continuing education courses
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. Leonard Syme, University of California, Berkeley
Canadian	Dr. Martin Schechter, University of British Columbia
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	N/A
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	1998
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Member's Report Undergraduate Education Report Postgraduate Medical Education Reports Graduate Education Report Student Reports Continuing Education Report Research Report CIHR Institute Reports Departmental Budget Departmental Communications Previous Review Reports Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

Graduate Programs

- **Size and Scope:** The size and scope of the Department's graduate programs are seen to be broad and complex, with the relationships with partner institutions providing "rich and fertile" opportunities for graduate work.
- **Organization:** The organization of the graduate programs is considered by the reviewers to be overly complex and unwieldy, and they recommend that a process of integration and simplification be undertaken.

I support the Department's commitment to integrate all Masters level training into a single degree program – the MHSc – and to concentrate on PhD-level research training; thereby reducing the number of programs and program directors, simplifying/streamlining curriculum delivery, and enhancing integration among core public health disciplines. However, I should highlight two caveats. First, I believe it would be useful from a 'social marketing' standpoint to call the professional master's degree an MPH, or MPHSc (Master of Public Health Science). Second, there will continue to be a need for individuals who are trained at the MSc level with a thesis. I am confident that the Department will be able to consider these and other ideas in formulating its final plans.

- **Course Offerings:** When considering course offerings, the reviewers note a number of issues – uneven quality of course offerings, some lack of change after poor course evaluations (particularly in the Epidemiology stream), and redundancy between programs and with the Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation courses.

Assuming that the reviewers are correct, I trust that the Department will work to rectify this situation.

- **One-year MSc:** The reviewers do not support the Department's plan to convert the MSc to a one-year program – noting that although it would be an effective feeder to the PhD program, it would not represent an appropriate terminal degree program.

As mentioned above, the Department has most recently voted to adopt a new model for its graduate stream – phasing out the MSc degree and concentrating on PhD level research training and the MHSc degree. Having just spent a substantial amount of time considering the future of public health in Canada, I agree with the reviewers. I think a terminal MSc remains a useful degree for some individuals who want greater research emphasis rather than a professional-stream MPH. Ultimately, this is the Department's call. However, I am concerned that they will reduce their ability to contribute to the renewal of public health in Canada and to capture federal funding streams unless they show a more demand-driven approach to their educational programs.

- **Student Issues:** The reviewers comment on a number of issues of importance to graduate students, generally surfacing as funding inequities between MHSc and MSc students.

The Department's commitment to integrate all Master's level training into one degree should resolve this issue internally, but does not address the broader question of professional-stream Master's degree support. Furthermore, as indicated, I do not agree with the direction being taken to abandon the MSc.

Faculty

- **Off-Campus Instructors:** The reviewers note that the Department has made increasing use of off-campus faculty for course instruction and question whether this is sustainable.

I disagree with the reviewers. This is an essential and generalized modus operandi in the Faculty.

- **Morale:** The reviewers report that morale in the Department is good, despite frustrations with space and support staff shortages.

I am gratified to hear this and expect that morale will be increase once new space is available for the Department.

Research

- **Breadth:** The reviewers consider the breadth of research within the Department to be diverse and impressive, with the strong research links to partner institutions recognized as a major strength of the Department's program. *I am very pleased to hear this.*
- **Benchmarking:** The reviewers suggest that a departmental benchmarking process needs to be undertaken to document scholarly activity. This process would clear up the confusion experienced by the reviewers in trying to determine the Department's actual productivity in terms of grants and publications relative to faculty numbers.

I agree. The Department's commitment to review primary academic appointments relative to academic role of each member will bring clarity to the Department's productivity picture.

External Relationships

- **Partnerships:** The reviewers consider the richness and diversity of the Department's partnerships and relationships to be a major strength and as providing exceptional research and training environments. They stress that it is important for these partnerships to benefit both partners, and recommend regular meetings with the Department's major external partners on an annual basis.

I strongly agree and fully support their recommendation; moreover the Chair is committed to establishing holding regular meetings with major external partners.

- **Service Activities:** Although the reviewers commend the Department for their current service activities, there is a sense that the Department could benefit from a communications strategy that would raise its public and community profile.

I am particularly concerned that the Department develops a more strategic approach to these issues given the recent commitments by the federal and provincial governments to support a renewal of public health in Canada.

Organizational Structure/Communication

- **Advisory Committee:** The reviewers consider the Department's Advisory Committee to be a "positive structural element" that fosters input on governance issues and familiarity within the Department. Furthermore, they note that communication is "steadily improving" in this complex department.

I commend Dr. Skinner for his plan to put in place additional mechanisms to engage faculty, students and the community.

- **Name Change:** The reviewers note the Department Chair and the faculty strongly favour renaming the Department as a School of Public Health in order to accomplish their academic mission. The reviewers are not enthusiastic about this plan, feeling that an accredited School of Public Health would require a health policy and management component and would most likely be a stand-alone school, administered by a Dean.

I am opposed to stand-alone Schools of Public Health, as they run the risk of exacerbating the already insufficient integration between community-based public health and clinical activities. However, I have no problem with the Department's desire to reposition itself with a name change, and do not agree with the reviewers' inference that this is 'false advertising'. Furthermore, over time, it is entirely possible that a more integrated and wide-ranging School may emerge.

Future Challenges

- **Leadership Decisions:** Although the reviewers report positively on the Department's view of Dr. Skinner's leadership, they do note that he has some tough decisions to make in the future to deal with several difficult and challenging issues facing the Department.

Personally, I would like to see more crosscutting recruits who could fit into multiple segments of the Department's current activities.

- **Departmental Involvement:** Frustration was expressed by on-campus faculty relative to the proportion of time that they spend in teaching and research activities as compared to off-campus faculty. The on-campus faculty's feeling of being "second class citizens" is exacerbated by their feeling that they are disadvantaged on several fronts.

The departmental response to the review report notes that some externally-based faculty also feel marginalized for a number of reasons. For on-campus faculty, the space constraints are a major issue that is being addressed with a new building. I also support the Department's commitment to clarify the roles and balance between core and external faculty through the development of Faculty Teaching Expectation Guidelines. However, I do want to caution against a reinstatement of the type of system that existed under the old Department of Behavioural Sciences, whereby status-only faculty were not allowed to supervise graduate students. Similarly, on-campus faculty have the security of tenure-stream positions or the equivalent, with some perquisites (e.g. sabbatical leaves) that are virtually unknown in hospital research institutes. Their social contract is clear: In exchange for their stronger influence on Departmental affairs and the extraordinary privilege of a tenured position, campus-based faculty are expected to do somewhat more teaching and administration. That said, in an ideal world, teaching loads should be shared with off-campus faculty as part of another social contract -- i.e. in exchange for an academic appointment and the privilege of supervising graduate students, status-only faculty must contribute to the academic life of the Department. The basic science sector has made major strides in finding the right balance on these matters, and I urge PHS to emulate the success of sister departments in that sector.

- **Departmental Integration:** There is a difference of opinion between the reviewers and the Department members as to the success of merging the original three departments into one department. The reviewers consider that the academic units brought together in the 1997 merger have not truly merged into one department yet, whereas the Department thinks they have. Although the reviewers question whether the current incremental change will result in integration, Dr. Skinner and his key departmental faculty feel that the process of bringing people together must be a step by step process, one that has been successful so far.

I support the reviewers' opinion that "more attention must be given to integration of the Departmental silos" in order to reap the benefits of more interdisciplinary collaboration and result in a more effective and efficient teaching and research program. The departmental response to the review report notes that as the Department matures, areas of common research interest or themes are being developed and joint grant proposals being submitted.

- **Space:** There is universal agreement among the Chair, Department members, and the reviewers that the Department's space is grossly inadequate and needing to be addressed.

By the time of the next external review, I trust that this will not be an issue as the Department will have moved into newly renovated space at 155 College Street. As we all know, the challenge is to secure funding for this renovation.

- **Leadership:** The reviewers' recommend that Dr. Skinner be re-appointed for another term.

I strongly support their recommendation and am gratified to see the reviewers' opinion that he has the respect of his Department faculty and is well-positioned to lead this group through future challenges.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

See above for actions to be taken on specific issues by the Department of Public Health Sciences.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Surgery
DATE:	January 31 and February 1, 2002
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean, Faculty of Medicine
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	Undergraduate medical program
Graduate	Graduate programs offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	Postgraduate medical training
Continuing	Fellowship subspecialty training Continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. James Herndon, Harvard Medical School
Canadian	Dr. Jonathan Meakins, McGill University
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1996
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	N/A
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Member's Report Undergraduate Medical Education Report Postgraduate Medical Education Report Student Reports Continuing Education Report Research and Graduate Education Report Previous Review Reports Departmental Budget Departmental Communications Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENTATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The Dean's responses to the reviewers' assessment and recommendations are contained within the summary and appear in italicized font.

Undergraduate Medical Education

- **Amalgamation of Anatomy into the Department of Surgery:** The reviewers found the presence of the Department of Anatomy as a Division of Surgery an unusual construct.

Although the reviewers found this marriage 'an unusual construct', the authors of the faculty response to the review report quite rightly note that this amalgamation has meant a re-invigoration of the Anatomy department and has benefited both the anatomists and the Department in a creative and mutually beneficial way.

- **Student Feedback:** The reviewers noted student perception of an unevenness of the evaluation process from site to site as well as problems with the exam questions.

As was pointed out in the departmental response, the students had no criticisms of the education program itself, only the evaluation process. I am satisfied that the Department will follow through on its commitment to rectify these problems.

Postgraduate Medical Education

- The reviewers considered a major problem with respect to the residency program to be the decreasing number of residents and the increasing workload that is placed on the attending staff. They recommend that consideration should be given to a whole variety of physician extenders, physician's assistants, hospitalists, and other means of replacing the work done of a service nature by the residents.

These problems are not exclusive to the University of Toronto, and are partly within the domain of hospitals and group practices, rather than exclusively within the University's domain. It would be wise for the Department to explore potential solutions in order to ensure that the final solutions impact beneficially on academic programs. As John Wedge noted, it is interesting that the reviewers focused on this issue rather than the actual quality of the education programs. I assume that there will be continued exploration of the potential of physician-extenders and -assistants by the group practices. Also, there will be an increase in residency positions over the next 4 years, and this may help ameliorate some of the workload issues. It is a positive tribute to the Department's members that they are shouldering the workload rather than shifting it to residents and adversely affecting the service:education ratio.

Continuing Medical Education

- **Potential revenue stream:** The reviewers suggest that the Department consider developing its substantial commitment to continuing education as a potential revenue stream.

This is a worthwhile suggestion. The Office of Continuing Education in the Faculty already transfers revenues from Continuing Education back to departments to an extent that is virtually unparalleled in the country. Thus, for this activity to generate more revenue, the Department will need either to increase its offerings or increase the charges for such offerings.

Research

- **Quality of research and extent across divisions:** The reviewers consider that research endeavours are stronger in some divisions of the Department than others and feel that the next Chair should address this balance issue.

I agree with the reviewers that the next chair 'will have to continue the (Department's) strong commitment to research as well as plan for continued growth in each division'.

Cognate Academic Departments

- **Collegiality:** The reviewers found the level of collegiality within divisions of the Department of Surgery and between the Department and other cognate departments to be 'striking'.

Organizational Structure

- **Absence of funds for clinical teachers:** The reviewers think that the issue of paying clinical teachers needs to be clarified. They note that a larger Chair's budget would allow for resumption of support for teaching as well as continuation of support for research.

The Department has received funds from the Dean's Office to offset the 2.75% budget cut from the 'Centre' in the last year. The Faculty has no additional funds at this time. The development of Alternative Funding Plans appears to be the best prospect for improving the compensation of academic activities, including both research and teaching.

Future

- **Morale:** Morale of students is seen to be excellent. Morale of faculty is considered by the reviewers to be 'fragile' due to a number of circumstances, both University -based - such as lack of funds for clinical teaching - and hospital-based - such as fiscal restraints and increased case complexity - with a resulting increase in service commitment for attending staff. As well, there is concern in the Department as to how the increase in medical student tuition fees that come to the Faculty are allocated - particularly as it is felt that they do not trickle down to clinical teachers. Added to this is concern that the Faculty is not receiving its fair share of research overhead funds / revenue from the University.

The Departmental response to the perceived 'ever-decreasing Faculty and University support of the Department' notes that an achievable solution lies in the creation of alternate funding arrangements. I share many of the concerns identified by the reviewers and agree with the departmental response. On the specific issue of tuition revenues, the Department's fair share of these additional revenues was allocated in part to offset the 2.75% budget cut.

- **Departmental funding increase:** The reviewers urge the next Chair to explore ways to increase departmental funding - either through taxation of the practice plan, revenue generation opportunities, and/or fundraising.

*John Wedge quite rightly notes that fundraising will probably not be the solution to the Department's inability to fund clinical teachers. I believe, however, that we can do more to recognize and reward clinical teachers and fundraising may help to a small degree. I am **strongly** opposed to taxation of practice plans. While morale is already fragile, there is a high degree of trust and collegiality, a tremendous amount of volunteer commitment, and meaningful income redistribution through practice plans. Taxing the plans to pull funds into the University would destroy this volunteer system and alienate the Department's members.*

- **Dual Chair and Surgeon-in-Chief:** The reviewers and the authors of the faculty response recommend that the chair not serve as both chair and surgeon-in-chief.

I understand the theory of a 'neutral chair'. It is manageable for large departments such as Medicine and Surgery, but is probably unworkable for smaller departments where the Chair's budget is very small relative to hospital resources, and is a mixed blessing for mid-sized departments. Furthermore, we have had and continue to have many Chairs who are also site chiefs. No one has shown that there is a systematic bias from these joint appointments, notwithstanding the potential for conflict of commitment. The supposed advantages turn out to be due almost invariably to institutional commitments by the base hospital, not to redirection of University resources by the Chair. Within the Department of Surgery, some of the division chiefs for the University have been and are currently site chiefs, and yet this is apparently not an issue. Finally, the current Chair is acknowledged widely to have done a superb job, but was Surgeon-in-Chief of the Hospital for Sick Children for much of his term.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

See above for actions to be taken on specific issues by the Department of Surgery.

OISE/UT

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL)
DATE:	January, 2003
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean. OISE/UT
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate:	BEd, MT
Graduate:	Main programs in CTL are MA, M.Ed, Ph.D, and Ed.D in the areas of: Curriculum; Second Language; Teacher Development; Measurement and Evaluation Collaborative graduate degrees (with other OISE/UT departments) in Comparative, International and Development Education; Environmental Studies (also with Institute of Environmental Studies); Women's Studies
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	2 external reviewers (1 Canadian, 1 American)
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International:	Professor Emeritus Nel Noddings, Stanford University, and Teachers College, Columbia University
Canadian:	Professor Lee Gunderson, University of British Columbia
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	Not applicable. CTL was established as a department in 1996, at the time of OISE/U of T merger. The same Chair served from 1996 to 2003.
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	1998-1999; documentation submitted for 2003-2004 review

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

UofT Guidelines for Reviews of Academic Programs and Units
Overview of OISE/UT and its programs and organization
Initial teacher education calendar
Graduate calendar
Annual research report
Academic Plan for 2000-2004 (2000)
Report of the Dean's Task Force on OISE/UT's Structure (2002)
Report of the Dean, OISE/UT for the Period 1996-2002
Departmental self-study prepared by the Chair (December, 2002)
List of faculty members and the programs in which they participated
CVs of all tenured and tenure-stream faculty

CONSULTATION PROCESS:

Two-day site visit in which the external reviewers met with: Dean; Associate Dean, Academic Program; Associate Dean, Academic Development; Chair and Associate Chair of CTL; Departmental Executive; Coordinators of the Curriculum, Second Language, Teacher Development and measurement/Evaluation graduate programs; Coordinators of Elementary and Secondary Teacher Education program; Coordinator of MT program; administrative staff; and student representatives from all graduate programs.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The external reviewers were requested to pay particular attention to three matters: (1) the graduate studies program, including scholarship and teaching by faculty; (2) the interactive relationship of the CTL program with the preservice (teacher education) program; and (3) the role of CTL within OISE/UT

Although the reviewers commented that, in this very complex department, they focused primarily on graduate programs as a result of the documentation provided and schedule of interviews, they did in fact pay considerable attention to the interactive relationship between the graduate and teacher education programs.

Overall assessment: Reviewers commented on the following departmental strengths: (1) the strong record of research funding, particularly by SSHRC; (2) the high quality and reputation of graduate programs in Second Language, Measurement and Evaluation, and Comparative, International and Development graduate programs; (3) the perception that the quality of teaching is very high; (4) the expressed commitment to preservice teacher education despite tension between those programs and graduate education; and (5) the commitment of faculty, staff and students to solving problems.

Specific Issues: The reviewers did address the tension between preservice and graduate programs. This tension, they indicated, is a universal one in schools of education. Major research universities usually resolve the tension in favor of their graduate/research programs; universities whose major mission is teaching accept their mission but agonize over the little time they can

devote to research. Universities (e.g., UBC) which have high-enrolment teacher education programs have a very high percentage of teacher education classes taught by seconded and contract teachers.

The reviewers indicated that OISE/UT has made a commendable commitment to the preparation of teachers, and to involve tenure-stream faculty in the program. This makes it unusual among top-tier research institutions. However, there are still organizational tensions and concerns: (1) the perception that CTL has little control over the preservice programs, even though it has major responsibility (in terms of numbers of faculty participating) for preservice education; (2) decision-making is currently divided between CTL and the Associate Dean's Office, and there is consequent confusion about locating and allocating resources; (3) the model for making teaching assignments for tenured and tenure-stream faculty, with an attempt to assign .75 of the workload to preservice teaching; and (4) the danger of CTL losing some of its most prestigious graduate programs if the department is required, in a context of declining resources, to devote substantial resources to preservice programs.

The reviewers suggested that these concerns could be alleviated by eliminating the divided model of control, and suggested three ways of doing so (though recognizing that none of these is perfect). One option is to split off the preservice programs as an independent department. Although this option seems clear and simple, it may create new problems as it has done in other institutions: the separation may create an invidious distinction, almost two classes, with the research programs retaining their prestige and the practice faculty falling into second class citizenship.

A second option is to locate teacher preparation entirely within CTL. This would resolve the problem of dual control, but would require a considerable infusion of resources into CTL and could mean that within CTL the graduate department is overwhelmed by the preservice program. It could also create unease within other departments if CTL—already a very large department—were to become large enough to handle this new task, and other departments might well become reluctant to help in staffing of the preservice programs because CTL would have control.

A third option would build on the matrix model currently used. The preservice program would be made into a separate unit without departmental status; that is it would not have its own tenured and tenure-stream faculty. This new unit would have a governing board drawn from each contributing department, its own budget, and a faculty director in addition to the coordinators it has now. All contract and seconded faculty would be hired directly to this unit. CTL, like other departments, would request faculty hires it needs to sustain graduate programs and to meet its responsibilities for preservice education. Formulas for the assignment of faculty would be abandoned. Under this plan the preservice education governing board and coordinators would work together to plan rigorous but flexible programs. Needs for the preservice program would be identified and each relevant department would be asked to meet some of these needs. The new CTL Chair would invite (even strongly urge) faculty participation. It seems likely that teams teaching methods courses in particular subject matter fields would be headed by CTL faculty members, while other courses might draw leaders from other departments. In general there would need to be an optimal balance between theory and practice. It is possible that a degree of flexibility could be built in to the preservice program so that CTL professors and others could cycle in and out of the program.

In general their comments were compatible with the directions outlined in the administrative responses.

Administrative Response

In the Dean's response, he suggested the following priorities for the incoming Chair of CTL: (1) to coordinate preservice and graduate programs as co-equal programs; (2) to focus on building a sense of community across the department as a whole; (3) to build on the strong teaching and research capacity of the department, including support for the large number of recently appointed faculty; (4) focus on the upcoming OCGS review of programs and the 2004-05 Ontario College of Teachers accreditation of the preservice program; (5) strengthen the department's core emphasis on schools, with appropriate liaison and linkage with other departments; and (7) foster connections with other departments and units in the University as a whole.

The priorities identified by the incoming Chair of CTL in his administrative response are consonant with the directions identified by the Dean. In particular, as CTL builds for the future, there will be three major priorities: (1) further defining and enhancing the department's emphasis on school-centred scholarship; (2) maintaining and enhancing the department's strong commitment to both preservice and graduate programs, working with colleagues within OISE/UT, in other parts of the University, and in the field; and (3) continuing and enhancing CTL's engagement and impact on policy makers and practitioners.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AT MISSISSAUGA

Establishment of UTM Departments

Prior to the establishment of its departments, UTM engaged in an evaluation of its current disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs and faculty cohorts. UTM determined to create groupings of faculty that were large enough to function as distinct academic departments with their own appointing authority and budgets, while remaining sensitive to the fact that hiring and retention is often best conducted by finely individuated departments based on standard disciplinary lines. The departments were determined after considerable consultation with all members of the UTM community, taking into account the need for departments to be of a size and coherence that represents a critical mass of faculty.

Planning Process

The planning process was a combination of bottom-up and top-down where discipline representatives/directors, working with faculty members, developed plans in consultation with the Deans. Faculty members wishing to form unique, innovative clusters, discussed these directly with the deans. The plans were then developed within the framework indicated below and submitted to the Vice-President and Principal.

Assessment criteria

In considering the creation of a department, groups were guided by the principles laid out in the *“Raising our Sights: The Next Cycle of White Paper Planning”*, specifically that departments have the ability to:

- have a critical mass of academic complement that can be sustained and further developed
- attract and retain faculty who are leading scholars and who bring their scholarship to bear in their teaching
- identify the graduate home department(s) for its faculty
- have programs of research and teaching that are at the leading edge of their field of study and that enhance the student experience
- have programs that are in demand by outstanding students
- identify and respond to emerging areas of the field of study
- have the potential to be the best programs of their kind in Canada
- exploit fully and efficiently all of the resources of the university that are relevant to the field of study
- develop, where appropriate, partnerships with other universities and other organizations to foster research and deliver teaching programs advance the mission of the University of Toronto (to rank with the best public research universities in the world and to offer a standard of education commensurate with that rank).

These proposals were then reviewed by the planning committee who in turn developed a proposal for a set of proposed academic units. In March, the incoming Dean engaged in intense consultation with each of the disciplines about those proposals. The result of that consultation was a more finely individuated set of departments than had been initially envisioned. There were some mergers of small disciplines, in an effort to retain central disciplines in which only a small handful of faculty resided (classics and physics, for instance). These mergers were based on careful thoughts about how research and teaching might be made better and stronger.

In spring 2003, Erindale College Council recommended approval of the following academic units:

Departmental Structure of the University of Toronto at Mississauga

Sciences

Department of Biology
Department of Chemical and Physical Sciences (including Chemistry / Physics / Astronomy / Earth Sciences)
Department of Psychology
Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences (including Statistics / Mathematics / Computer Science)

Humanities

Department of English and Drama
Department of French, German and Italian
Department of History and Classics
Department of Philosophy

Institute of Communication and Culture

This institute consists mostly of faculty who are cross appointed, but it will also have also the ability to make tenure stream appointments. A core of faculty dedicated to this institute include the Director of CCIT, the faculty members associated with Professional Writing, the faculty members within Fine Art History, the Curator of the Blackwood Art Gallery and possibly one or two faculty members from other groups.

Social Sciences

Department of Anthropology and the Study of Religion
Department of Economics
Department of Geography
Department of Management
Department of Political Science
Department of Sociology

PROVOSTIAL REVIEWS

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Faculty of Information Studies
DATE:	February 2003
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Vice-President and Provost
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Graduate:	M.I.St., J.D./M.I.St., M.B.A./M.I.St. and Ph.D.
Collaborative Graduate Programs:	Addiction Studies, Ageing and Life Course, Environmental Studies, Ethnic and Pluralism Studies, Women's Studies and Book History and Print Culture.
Post-Graduate:	Graduate Diploma of Advanced Study in Information Studies
Continuing Education	Courses offered through the Professional Learning Centre
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	Three external reviewers, submitting a joint-authored report. One external reviewer, submitting a sole-authored report.
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	C. Olivia Frost, University of Michigan Leah Lievrouw, University of California, LA Toni Carbo, University of Pittsburg
Canadian	Jacob Slonim, Dalhousie University
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	January 2003 – External Review for ALA Accreditation March 2000 – External Review for <i>Raising Our Sights</i>
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	May 2002
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Terms of Reference for the Review Faculty Self-Study, 1997-98 to 2001-02 OCGS accreditation report External Reviewers' Report, Raising Our Sights Raising Our Sights Academic Plan Provost's Response to Plan FIS programs materials Curricula Vitae of faculty members
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	During their two-day visit the review team met with the Provost and members of her staff; the FIS Dean, Associate Dean, members of the Dean's Advisory Board, most of the tenured/tenure-stream faculty, two adjunct faculty members, the Registrar, the Finance and Personnel Officer, the professional staff of the

Inforum, the Director of the Professional Learning Centre, approximately twenty-four Ph.D. and M.I.St. students, and a few alumni and emeriti; a faculty member from the Department of English, who co-administers the program in Book History and Print Culture and the Chair of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning at OISE/UT. The team toured all areas of the FIS facilities, including student and faculty offices, classrooms, labs, the Inforum, special project offices and common areas.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

Strengths:

1. The emphasis on externally-funded research and scholarship, the current growth trend in extramural funding, and the high proportion of faculty who devote a significant part of their effort to research and scholarship, were identified as particular strengths.
2. The students are very pleased with FIS' academic programs, particularly the doctoral students.
3. Faculty members all agree that the change in dean provides an opportunity to reflect, reorient priorities and overcome past problems. They are eager to contribute to a new vision for FIS, in concert with the new Dean.
4. The Inforum Lab is outstanding in every respect: collections, facilities, services, staff and especially as an ancillary resource to teaching.
5. The Professional Learning Centre is a model for outreach and continuing education for LIS and its related professional specialties.
6. FIS alumni seem to be engaged, active and eager to participate in the next steps of the Faculty's planning and future growth.

Challenges:

1. FIS does not have an overarching vision about what constitutes "information studies" or its intellectual place *vis a vis* the universe of other disciplines and professions. There is a corresponding lack of agreement among faculty members about FIS's shared foundations for the future. The Faculty does not seem to have established a clear reputation for excellence or prominence in any particular research front or aspect of practice. A major part of the new Dean's brief will be to raise the Faculty's visibility by helping them to articulate such a vision and by representing the FIS vision elsewhere on campus, in the academic community generally, and to the larger public.
2. The Faculty needs a consistent, ongoing process for strategic planning and decision-making that involves meaningful participation by all its constituencies. This problem was reflected in several ways:
 - a. Complement planning: The distribution of students does not adequately match the specializations of the faculty members. In addition, the current priorities for faculty hires seem somewhat misdirected and not guided by a larger vision of the Faculty's future direction and strengths.
 - b. Programmatic initiatives: Given the Faculty's small size, it is essential that the Faculty form alliances and partnerships with other groups at the University that share its interests and values and enhance its visibility and influence.

- c. Curriculum: The current three-stream structure of the M.I.St. curriculum does not seem to be working. The result is that FIS offers multidisciplinary rather than truly interdisciplinary academic programs. The doctoral curriculum is largely unstructured with a heavy reliance on directed reading courses, which may have an adverse effect on time to degree. There is little opportunity for doctoral students to interact across tracks. There is an immediate need for fundamental restructuring of the academic curricula to reflect the larger, integrated and interdisciplinary brief of information studies.
 - d. Budget/financial: Approximately 99% of the FIS base budget is encumbered for salaries and benefits. Other expenses must be covered by other sources of revenue and there is very little room to plan even for routine contingencies, much less to seed new projects or to expand existing programs.
3. Other areas of concern include:
- a. Indicators of Research Quality: The review team noted that the documents provided did not provide evidence that FIS is currently recognized for any particular areas of research excellence or prominence.
 - b. Students: The review team noted the urgent need for broad faculty oversight and engagement in admissions decisions to insure consistently high admissions standards.
 - c. "Genetic Diversity": The review team had concerns about the geographic, cultural and intellectual diversity among both faculty and students. There is little effort to recruit students outside of LIS and outside of the GTA. Salary and startup packages are not competitive with similar units on campus or with FIS' peer programs at other major research universities. The reviewers urged that a concerted effort be made to bring in students and faculty from a broader range of backgrounds and experience.
 - d. Staff: In light of the planned change in leadership, the reviewers noted that a careful review of what staffing structure would be appropriate, including consideration of adding a full-time research grants officer and converting the position of development officer to full-time.
 - e. Infrastructure: The reviewers noted the need to review and redesign the physical space in order to make better use of the Faculty's existing facilities.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

The Provost is pleased with the outcome of the review and is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions. In July, 2003 Dr. Brian Cantwell Smith began his term as Dean of the Faculty of Information Studies and the Provost has every confidence that he will be a superb leader. Professor Smith has an established reputation as an original, inventive thinker, an inspiring and supportive teacher and mentor and a very able administrator. The academic planning process for 2004-2010 is well underway at FIS and careful thought and consideration are being given to the report of the external reviewers.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	OISE/UT
DATE:	February 2003
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Vice-President and Provost
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate:	B.Ed.
Graduate:	M.A., M.T., M.Ed., Ph.D. Ed.D.
Diploma/Certificate:	Diploma in Technical Education Certificate in Adult Training and Development Certificate in Non-Profit Social Accounting
Continuing Education	Additional Qualification (AQ) courses
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	Four external reviewers, submitting a joint-authored report.
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Victoria Chou, University of Illinois at Chicago David Pearson, University of California at Berkeley Karen Wixson, University of Michigan
Canadian	Bernard Shapiro, McGill University
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	2000 – Review for <i>Raising Our Sights</i>
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Terms of Reference for the Review Faculty Self-Study, 1997-98 to 2001-02 External Reviewers' Report, Raising Our Sights Raising Our Sights Academic Plan Provost's Response to the Academic Plan OISE/UT programs materials Curricula Vitae of faculty members
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	During their two-day visit the review team met with the Provost and members of her staff; the Dean, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, Advisory Board, and representatives from student groups, the administrative staff, the Teacher Education program, the Institute for Child Study, the Education Commons, University of Toronto Schools, Continuing Education, and the School of Graduate Studies. In addition opportunities were provided for faculty and students to meet with the team on an individual basis.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) was created in 1996 by the merger of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto. The reviewers found OISE/UT to be clearly pre-eminent in its field in Canada, and widely known and highly regarded elsewhere. Since the merger it has sustained a very well qualified student body and has enhanced its teacher education programs, its programs of continuing education, its various partnerships with schools and its success in attracting competitively awarded research funds. There is a high level of energy, relevance and productivity within OISE/UT. There are, however, current and future challenges.

Central Challenges:

There are two central challenges for OISE/UT – mission and intellectual ownership. OISE/UT must define its mission far more clearly than is evident from its current range of activities and commitments. As a result of the merger, OISE/UT now embraces a transformed mission that includes both research and the preparation of professional educators at all levels, but OISE/UT must find and articulate the appropriate intellectual boundaries and limits of its work. A more clearly identified mission would provide greater focus in the allocation of resources and incentives and would be a source of strength and synergy for teaching, research and service.

A transformed mission would require that a number of important issues be addressed:

a. Mix and Size of Programs

- i. The reviewers stress the importance of both a mix of programs that relates clearly to the mission and careful enrolment planning so that the mission of the Faculty is not determined entirely by external market forces. The reviewers recommend that consideration should be given to consolidating a number of its graduate programs. Of particular salience for OISE/UT are the ideas behind the MACS (Child Study and Education) and MT, i.e. the involvement of regular faculty in the integration of teacher preparation, practice and research on the one hand and the development of future professional leaders on the other. OISE/UT might consider reducing the size of the B.Ed. program in favour of models such as the current MACS and MT programs. In addition, with the view of consolidation and collaboration, OISE/UT might consider combining the MA and MT.
- ii. The reviewers applaud OISE/UT's initiative to reduce its Ph.D. enrolment from approximately 550 to approximately 385. This will enable faculty to provide higher quality supervision and mentoring to its Ph.D. students.
- iii. OISE/UT should undertake a review of its various centres, not only in the context of their relationship to the overall mission but also in terms of both their size and their character. Such centres are and can be very helpful in encouraging faculty and students to work collaboratively on important areas of scholarship.
- iv. OISE/UT should undertake a much more active recruitment program for international students.

b. Assembly and Allocation of Intellectual Resources

- i. The delivery of the teacher preparation program is primarily in the hands of secondments from the teaching profession rather than faculty. While these secondments bring real value to the program, the ratio of approximately 2/1 secondments/faculty seems wrong. Over time this ratio should be reversed in order to achieve a more widely shared intellectual ownership of the programs across faculty and departments.
- ii. All new faculty are expected to actively participate in both the teacher preparation and research missions of OISE/UT. While the reviewers support the reasons for this, they consider the current combination of expectations to be unreasonable. They urge OISE/UT to find alternative ways to fund clinical supervision, including the use of secondments, lecturers and experienced graduate students.
- iii. The graduate students could play an important role in the teacher preparation program. Their involvement in this program would respond not only to the present overuse of secondments but also to the need for preparing doctoral students for teaching experience in higher education and to the current budget constraints. In addition, it would provide research opportunities for graduate students in the area of teacher education. In addition, the reviewers urge more active use of graduate students as teaching and research assistants throughout the OISE/UT program range.

- c. Administrative Structures
 - i. The Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning should be restructured. It is too large and unwieldy in the OISE/UT context. In addition, as the predominant locus of activity with respect to teacher preparation, it unwittingly acts as an excuse and a disincentive for other departments to assume a greater role in both the work and ownership of this program.
 - ii. A Teacher Education Council should be established. It would help to spread the ownership of teacher preparation more widely within OISE/UT. The Council should include faculty representatives, in addition to those with administrative responsibilities, and it should be established at the Provostial level within the University as a symbol of the importance of teacher preparation to the entire institution.
 - iii. The relationship between the Dean and the Departments should be reviewed. OISE/UT would be better served either by some increase in the autonomy of its departments or by some reexamination of the relationship between the Dean and the Department Chairs.
- d. Broad-scale Ownership
 - i. Ownership of both teacher preparation and research agendas should be as broadly spread as possible within OISE/UT.
- e. Relationship to the University of Toronto
 - i. The relationship should be characterized by a complex set of substantive and continuing links between the various units of the University and OISE/UT.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

The Provost is pleased with the outcome of the review and is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions. In July, 2003 Dr. Jane Gaskell began her term as Dean of OISE/UT and the Provost has every confidence that she will be a superb leader. Professor Gaskell has a reputation not only as a fine scholar, teacher and university administrator, but as a leader who builds consensus, focus and a firm sense of direction through carefully researched groundwork, a high degree of consultation and an ability to inspire others. The academic planning process for 2004-2010 is well underway at OISE/UT and careful thought and consideration are being given to the report of the external reviewers.

Dean's response to the external review

The comments of the external reviewers have been useful stimulants for thinking and discussion at OISE/UT as we move into academic planning and take up the issues in more depth. We agree with their assessment of our preeminence in the field, our strong research record and our highly qualified student body. We are determined to further enhance all of these.

OISE/UT is a Faculty of Education that understands learning as a life long activity. The mission of OISE/UT is to create a dynamic synergy among research, teacher education and graduate programs, in order to improve teaching and learning in the many contexts where it occurs. OISE/UT includes scholars educated in traditional disciplines like psychology, sociology, history and economics as well as scholars educated in various fields of education, and in educational practice. It is in the interaction among these intellectual traditions that we find our vitality and growth. This understanding of our mission informs our response to the review.

We agree the MA at ICS and the MT are examples of the unique synergy we can bring to teacher education in Ontario. However space in these programs is limited by government funding. This fall, we convinced the government to increase spaces in the MT and we will continue to expand the program as we get funding support for it. Similarly, our enrolment in the BEd program is constrained by agreements with the government. We currently teach 1250 students in a 9 month program, a third of which is spent in school classrooms. A BEd program that fully integrates regular faculty members and their research must be longer, and we are working with our educational partners towards this change. In the meantime, some changes in working conditions and orientation for regular faculty, including less responsibility for supervision, will make participation in teacher education more attractive to them. A Teacher Education Council is being set up, not under the auspices of the Provost, but with representation from all OISE/UT

departments and seconded faculty, and under the leadership of a newly defined role: associate dean, teacher education. New clarity around the organization of the program has been worked out among the deans and chairs in order to encourage involvement from all departments in teacher education, while ensuring accountability, efficient use of resources and awareness of accreditation requirements.

The PhD enrolment is being reduced as the reviewers suggest, in the context of a more comprehensive effort to do strategic enrolment planning with department chairs. Funding for centres is being reduced, and competitively allocated. Our academic plan includes an emphasis on proactive recruitment of the best students from around the world. Opportunities for all graduate students to participate in teaching and research are being monitored more carefully, and expanded. Unique union agreements with research officers (ROs) and graduate assistants (GAs) make this more complex at OISE/UT than elsewhere on campus.

The Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning has reduced its numbers as the Measurement and Evaluation faculty move to Human Development and Applied Psychology and a substantial number of retirements have occurred. Its current complement of 56 tenure stream faculty allows for senior level administrative staff and is not out of line with other large academic departments at the University. In light of the reviewers' recommendation for more autonomy in Departments, the organizational problem seems to be not CTL, but the staff and infrastructure to handle more complex financial and administrative systems in other, smaller departments. The Deans office is encouraging discussion of amalgamation among some of these units.

Finally, increased links with various units of the University of Toronto and OISE/UT are being developed, in teacher education, graduate programs and research.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	University of Toronto at Scarborough
DATE:	February 2003
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Vice-President and Provost
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate:	Hon.B.A., B.A., Hon.B.Sc, B.Sc., B.B.A.
Graduate:	M.A., M.Sc., Ph.D.
Diploma/Certificate:	Cert.Bus.
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	Three external reviewers, submitting a joint-authored report. One external reviewer, submitting a sole-authored report.
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Robert Kasdin, Columbia University
Canadian	Bill Lennox, University of Waterloo Doug Owram, University of Alberta Indira Samarasekera, U.B.C.
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	No campus-wide review was done previously
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Terms of Reference UTSC Self Study Framework for new Tri-Campus structure Green Papers for the current planning process Performance Indicators Annual report ROS - key planning priorities for 2000/2004 UTSC Academic Calendar Information Sheet on Co-op Programs Various brochures & leaflets on activities at UTSC
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	During their one and a half days visit the review team met with academic leaders at both the Scarborough campus and in central administration as well as with student representatives.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

The reviewers noted that UTSC is entering a stage of strategic transformation. The growth of enrollment over the next decade will lead to a net growth in faculty members, the cohort of department chairs will shortly be replaced and a new principal is about to be selected. This opportunity builds upon the campus' accomplishments over the past decade, including the increasing academic quality of the students and consistent attention to effective teaching. It also builds upon a diverse student body whose diversity must be celebrated for the richness it brings to the classroom and community.

Academic Configuration:

1. The highest priority in selecting the new principal must be the identification of an individual with a strong academic vision, who is able to engage the faculty, staff and the community in furthering that vision. A consistent effort should be directed to brand the campus as a distinctive yet integral element of the University.
2. The expansion of the campus must rest on four principles: the emphasis on research, the unity program of graduate studies, the notion that all faculty hired have graduate departmental homes and the principles governing the structure of the academic administration as identified in the Tri-Campus Commission Report. UTSC will need the support of the President and Vice-President and Provost in meeting the considerable financial challenge presented by expansion.
3. Two major challenges to expansion of research capacity at UTSC are the lack of space and the high teaching loads. Morale among researchers has fluctuated as a result of the absence of a well-defined vision for research growth and inadequate research space and concerns have been raised about the increasing teaching loads as enrolment increases. The research infrastructure needs to be considerably strengthened, or facilities at the St. George campus must be accessible to UTSC faculty and students. This is a strategic decision that must be made in the context of an overall vision for UTSC.
4. The reviewers recommend as a visible commitment to research the establishment of an Office of Research Services. Research opportunities are significantly more diverse and complex than they were a decade ago and local support for faculty and staff is critically important. It would also be useful for the Office of Research Services to incorporate some capacity to support and advise on technology transfer issues.
5. The reviewers applaud the commitment of central administrators to maintaining UTSC as the sole source of co-op programs. These programs are not only a valuable enhancement to classroom education but a valuable source of income for students. Expansion of these programs and the movement to a trimester format will present new challenges, including finding instructors for the spring term, maintaining 100% placement, ensuring co-operation between the co-op programs and maintaining quality.
6. The reviewers stressed the importance of UTSC developing its own graduate programs of the highest national and international standards. While development of these programs needs to consider offerings and relationships across all three campuses, UTSC could begin by developing areas where local research excellence already exists.

Student Recruitment:

1. The concerted effort at student recruitment currently underway at UTSC must be supported. Recruitment programs must be built around local strengths as well as the reputation of the University of Toronto.
2. The co-op program has clearly proved to be a significant recruitment tool and is able to attract students from outside the GTA. Efforts must also be made to attract students from across Canada to the rest of UTSC programs.

Student Experience:

1. Students are concerned about the lack of student social space, over crowded classrooms and facilities, and the lack of on-campus housing, local rental accommodation and other amenities. The current construction projects, when complete, will significantly enhance the student experience and support the expansion of the UTSC student body.
2. The sense of community at UTSC is a source of strength and pride. This sense of community will be at risk as enrollment continues to grow and it is important that the new principal carefully nurtures the sense of the whole and finds new ways to enhance social connections.

Government and Community Relations:

1. Stronger links must be forged with the communities proximate to the campus, which can serve as both partners in regional issues and as advocates on behalf of the campus to all levels of government. These linkages can be strengthened through organization of events that bring the community onto campus and the creation of adult-learning opportunities through continuing education programs.
2. The expansion of the student body and the new programs at Scarborough also provides a base on which to build linkages with the provincial government and the City of Toronto.

Administration

1. The UTSC campus is well managed. Nevertheless, the reviewers encourage the new principal to review the management structure to see if it can be further simplified. In addition, there needs to be clearer delineation of responsibilities between UTSC and the center in areas like capital budgeting.
2. The reviewers expressed particular concern that financial provision is not being made for deferred maintenance and infrastructure at UTSC. The reviewers consider the current estimate of \$15 million to be an underestimation of the costs. The Government of Ontario audit of facilities that is currently underway is expected to confirm this point.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

The Provost is pleased with the outcome of the review and is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions. In January, 2004 Dr. Kwong-loi Shun joined the University of Toronto at Scarborough as its new Vice-President and Principal. Dr. Shun is a distinguished scholar and an accomplished academic administrator who is deeply committed to undergraduate education. He is excited about the opportunity to help set the academic direction of UTSC over the coming years.

Several of the reviewers' recommendations are already being addressed and UTSC is committed to addressing the remaining issues in its new academic plan. Of particular note are the following:

- a) UTSC plan will identify a science building as the highest remaining capital priority. This builds on the considerable effort that has already been expended on the first two phases of science renovation (the Chemistry renovations and the Soil Erosion Lab renovation), which are currently going through the governance process.
- b) UTSC is committed to enhancing its support of research on campus and has created both the position of Vice-Principal, Research and a grants officer position.
- c) The co-op programs are an integral part of the *Stepping UP* plan, and UTSC is committed to increasing numbers in these programs from 1,100 to 2,000 students in steady state.
- d) UTSC has two professional Master's programs, the Master's of Environmental Science and a cohort of the existing Master's of Industrial Relations, now in the approval process. The tri-campus Deans' committee has also agreed that "streams" of the graduate programs in existing graduate departments can be focused at UTSC and UTM. UTSC plans to establish such streams in Public Management (within the new programs in Public Policy) and in Contaminants (within Environmental Sciences).
- e) The new Student Centre, which will be opening this year, will contribute greatly to enhancing the student experience.
- f) The Office of Advancement has taken the lead on community relations. In addition, the Director of the School of Continuing Studies is working with the UTSC Registrar to offer pilot courses in September 2004 and the Vice-Principal, Research has invited in researchers from the local hospitals for a research discussion.

Reviews Waived

**Departments with Chairs in Final Year of Term, 2001-2002 and 2002-2003,
For Which Reviews Were Waived**

Faculty of Arts and Science

Department	Appointment	Last OCGS
2001-02		
Germanic Languages & Literature	New	1998
Italian Studies	New	1998
Linguistics	New	1998
Slavic Languages & Literatures	New	1998
Statistics	New	2001
2002-03		
Chemistry	New	2001
Computer Science	New (to begin 07/01/04)	2000
English	Re-appointment	2002
Geography	Re-appointment	2000
Philosophy	New	2002
Political Science	Re-appointment	2001

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering

Department	Appointment	Last OCGS
2001-02		
Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry	New	2002
2002-03		
Materials Science and Engineering	Re-appointment	2001
Civil Engineering	New (to begin 01/01/04)	2001
Electrical and Computer Engineering	New (to begin 01/01/04)	1999

OISE/UT

Department	Appointment	Last OCGS
2001-02		
Human Development and Applied Psychology	New	2004
Sociology and Equity Studies in Education	Re-appointment	2004

University of Toronto at Scarborough

Department	Appointment	Last OCGS
2001-02		
Physical Sciences	New (to begin 12/01/02)	NA
Social Sciences	New (to begin 01/02/03)	NA
2002-03		
Computer and Mathematical Sciences	New	NA
Life Sciences	New	NA
Management	New	NA

As the multi-departmental divisions re-established their review cycle in the wake of the comprehensive review process associated with the *Raising Our Sights* planning process in 1999-2000, reviews were waived in a number of departments at the end of the terms of the respective chairs, as listed in the above tables.

In the Faculty of Arts and Science, six chair searches were conducted in 2001-2002, resulting in six new appointments. Reviews were waived in five of these cases, given the recent *Raising Our Sights* reviews. A review was conducted for the Department and Centre for the Study of Religion, as reported in this volume. In 2002-2003, eight chair searches were conducted, resulting in four new appointments and four re-appointments. Reviews were waived in six of these cases, largely on the basis of the existence of recent OCGS reviews. Reviews were conducted for Anthropology and Sociology, as reported in this volume. The Faculty is in the process of re-establishing its review cycle. Six external departmental reviews are currently underway; eight to ten reviews are planned for 2004-2005; and a review plan is being established to ensure that all of the

Faculty's departments and centres and interdisciplinary programs are reviewed over the course of the next five to six years.

In the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering the terms of two Chairs in were renewed – the Departments of Materials Science and Engineering and of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry – and searches were conducted for the Chairs of the Departments of Civil Engineering and of Electrical and Computer Engineering. In all cases the reviews were waived in light of the recent reviews completed for *Raising Our Sights* and the anticipation of reviews to be conducted in 2004/05 in the context of the *Stepping Up* planning cycle.

In OISE/UT, searches were conducted for new Chairs of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL), the Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology (HDAP) and the Department Sociology and Equity Studies in Education (SESE). A review of OISE/UT's largest department, CTL, was conducted, but external reviews of HDAP and SESE were waived in view of recent external reviews by OCGS, and the review of OISE/UT as a whole commissioned by the Provost at the end of the dean's term in 2002-2003.

At the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the University of Toronto at Scarborough, departmental reviews were waived due the extensive administrative restructuring associated with enrolment expansion. The process for establishing new departments at UTM is discussed elsewhere in this volume. At UTSC, existing divisions were re-established as departments. The Division of Physical Sciences was divided into two departments: Physical Sciences and Computer and Mathematical Sciences. No reviews were done at the time of the chair searches given the recent formation of the two departments. The remaining chair searches took place at the time when UTSC was deeply involved with the external review related to the search for a new Vice-President and Principal. UTSC intends to establish a formal review process for all its undergraduate programs on a seven year cycle. This commitment will be included as part of the UTSC Stepping UP academic plan.