

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Faculty of Arts and Science

DATE: January 24-25, 2008

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Vice-President and Provost

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate: Honours Bachelor of Arts, Hon.B.A.
Honours Bachelor of Science, Hon.B.Sc.
Bachelor of Commerce, B.Com.

Graduate: Doctor of Philosophy, Ph.D. (tri-campus)
Master of Arts, M.A. (tri-campus)
Master of Science, M.Sc. (tri-campus)
Master of Financial Economics, M.F.E. (with Rotman School of Management)
Master of Science in Planning, M.Sc.Pl.
Master of Visual Studies, M.V.S.
Master of Urban Design Studies, M.U.D.S.

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

International Professor George W. Breslauer, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost,
University of California Berkeley
Professor Terrence J. McDonald, Dean, College of Literature, Science, and the
Arts, University of Michigan

Canadian Professor John Hepburn, Vice President, Research, University of British
Columbia

PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE: 2004

SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:

The reviewers reported that it would be a challenge to maintain a united vision for excellence noting that the new Dean's paramount task would be "... to create a culture of change and quality improvement". Major anticipated challenges related to financial and enrollment pressures and the need to link the tri-campus structure. Careful planning would be required to develop "separate and somewhat distinct Arts and Science programs at UTM and UTSC, while maintaining a unified graduate program across all three campuses". Overall, the Faculty must be vigilant in the quality of appointments and of programs.

Academic and Financial Planning

- The Faculty should review the organizational structure and efficacy of units. The reviewers advised against "fragmentation into small administrative units". Interdisciplinary centers "should be regarded as incubators for exciting programs, and as foci for bringing major departments together for productive interactions".
- Good progress had been made with hiring new faculty, and a good hiring and mentoring process was in place. Broader measures of quality should be employed. The high rate of successful tenure reviews could lead to complacency.
- The reviewers agreed with the devolution of responsibility and accountability to departments and programs, and supported a move towards "bottom-line budgeting".

Enrolment Management: The overall ratio of graduate to undergraduate seemed appropriate, but careful monitoring would be required as undergraduate expansion occurs at UTM and UTSC. Each student should have some small group classroom experience.

Relationship with other units

- Although the Colleges play an “important and supportive role in the extracurricular lives of students”, their academic function was unclear. The reviewers were concerned about the proliferation of small interdisciplinary programs not firmly rooted in the disciplines and the mechanism for monitoring and assessing the quality of the programs.
- A clear mission statement for the development of the three campuses would be beneficial along with a review of the curricula offered at the three campuses.
- Relationships with University divisions were strong with ‘admirable’ collaboration on undergraduate teaching.
- The reviewers supported the devolution of graduate education responsibility to faculties and departments. Future planning should include departments developing a plan for development of their graduate programs across three campuses.

DOCUMENTATION

PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

Terms of Reference

External Review Report of the Faculty of Arts and Science and administrative response (2003)

Faculty of Arts and Science Self Study (2007)

Stepping UP – Synthesis

Faculty of Arts and Science Annual Report

CONSULTATION PROCESS:

The committee met with the President, Vice-President and Provost, Deputy Provost, and the Faculty Dean, senior academic administrators, chairs, directors and College principals. They met with undergraduate and graduate students, senior administrative staff, faculty members, Faculty Council members, and representatives from cognate units.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The reviewers eloquently described the extraordinary changes pressing on the Faculty of Arts and Science in recent years, including provincial fiscal restraint, the undergraduate double cohort, graduate expansion, expansion of the number of units, end of mandatory retirement, and the University’s new budget system. They asserted that, although the Faculty has weathered the changes well, it has resulted in a climate of “doing more with less.” Thus, the reviewers highlight that the “the strategic decisions made in the next few years will have a very significant long term effect on the Faculty.”

Acknowledging the Faculty’s complex organization, the “dense network of relationships with other schools, colleges and campuses”, and the resulting amount of time devoted to “negotiating relationships” by the Dean, the reviewers recommended that in order for the Faculty to strategically move forward, the “University must better define these relationships” with respect to institutional partners and facilitate the Faculty’s focus on its internal matters.

Appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty’s internal organizational, operational, and governance structure

The reviewers noted, with the 2004 reviewers, that the Faculty is the largest and most diverse unit in the University. Some of the organizational recommendations summarized below are external and others internal to the Faculty.

The role of the Colleges in within Arts and Science with regards to programs and undergraduate student experience requires greater clarity. Similarly, the relationship of the three campuses with respect to faculty members and teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs requires clarification.

In terms of strictly internal, operational matters, the reviewers assert that the idea of spitting the Faculty into several smaller units was not supported by anyone with whom they met and point to the perception that such a split would result in increased transaction costs by a greater number of units. However, the reviewers do suggest some restructuring that might assist in streamlining the Faculty's operations:

- *Redefinition and empowerment of the Vice-Deans:* The reviewers suggest that, in addition to defining Vice Deans' responsibilities functionally, positions could be also be partially defined according to sector (humanities, social sciences, sciences). This could result in a better arrangement for strategic and academic planning at the Faculty level. Such a change would need to be coupled with vice-decanal empowerment with respect to budgetary decisions.
- *Administrative organization:* A chief of staff position could be created to convene the administrative activities of the Assistant Deans and sit with the Vice Dean group.
- *Re-thinking of the Faculty's planning process:* The Faculty's planning process could be more broadly defined as a strategic planning process that could be led by a smaller group.
- *Interdisciplinary units:* The proliferation of new interdisciplinary units surprised the reviewers in light of costs and the unsustainable attention they require on the part of the Faculty Dean. There is considerable uncertainty about administration and reporting of interdisciplinary programs, and a lack of coordination between interdisciplinary teaching programs and departments and this should be clarified. The reviewers suggest a review of the interdisciplinary programs and their sustainability.

Appropriateness and effectiveness of relationships of the Faculty's relationship with UTM and UTSC

The reviewers note the complicated nature of the relationships and responsibilities for the administration and governance of undergraduate and graduate programs. Although graduate programs are run commonly as tri-campus programs, the undergraduate programs are centred on one campus. There are academic administrators at the levels of both the departments and the tri-campus graduate departments. The different departmental structures across the campuses makes "alignment at the graduate level more difficult."

In spite of the complexity, the reviewers note that there is good communication and coordination among the campuses and that "the current system is largely working, despite complexities and weaknesses". In terms of graduate programs however, the reviewers report that the main issue is "the understandable desire to create a more important role for UTM and UTSC through the creation of separate graduate programs." The reviewers recommend that

"While it may be appropriate to create some specialized masters level programs (particularly course work and professional programs) based at, or even unique to UTM or UTSC, we recommend that the current common graduate program between the three campuses should be maintained for research masters and PhD programs."

The reviewers outline the positive aspects of tri-campus graduate programs in terms of the caliber of faculty and students attracted to the programs and administrative efficiencies. However, they note several problems. "The most important is a sort of hollowing out of the intellectual life at UTM and UTSC, especially in research areas which are more library than laboratory based, as grad students and faculty spend a lot, if not the majority, of their time at STG. There are also problems in laboratory based research areas, as the quality and quantity of technical infrastructure and support is superior at STG. campuses. The reviewers suggest that developing specialization in research areas at a campus is a possibility for responding to such stresses (for example, environmental sciences at UTSC).

The reviewers are not supportive of the creation of independent doctoral programs at the three campuses but are supportive of the idea of creating specialized masters programs at individual campuses as well as encouraging distinct research specializations by campus. Individual campuses could become the locus for certain tri-campus PhD programs, while maintaining the principle of a common program.

Appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty's relationships with other divisions at the University of Toronto, including the St. George Colleges

The reviewers note that the Colleges play a critical role in enhancing the student experience by both guiding the transition of first year students (recruitment, admissions, orientation, residence, academic advising and support, and student life) and by providing interdisciplinary programs.

The reviewers agree on the advisability of the creation of programs such as the Centre for Environment which bring together undergraduate and graduate programs within the Faculty, as this results in a high quality faculty research and academic program.

However, due to complexities of reporting lines, program reviews and funding, the reviewers are skeptical about Colleges housing "...more free-standing interdisciplinary degree programs." They recommend instead that the Colleges, first and foremost, focus on enhancing the experience of new students, seizing an opportunity to "innovate in providing all students in the Faculty with a special educational experience." They recommend that the Faculty "review the appropriate number and location of interdisciplinary programs, including those in the Colleges."

Other issues

The reviewers note several matters that arose during the process of the review:

- "The lack of layered review of recommendations for tenure and promotion that includes decisions intermediate between those of the Departments and those of the President" and by the short probationary period for junior faculty members.
- A lack of international bench-marking for the Faculty. The reviewers suggest that the University select public peers in Canada and the US.
- What appears to be a "lack of strategic clarity in the Faculty and among the Faculty and other units".

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES

Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science

We are grateful to the members of the review committee for their insightful and constructive report. They have acknowledged the scope of the Faculty's recent achievements despite the large number of fundamental changes occurring inside and outside the university in recent years that have had a major impact on our operations and financial situation. Their observation that the Faculty has been "doing more with less" is, in our view, accurate. So too is their assertion that "strategic decisions made in the next few years will have a very significant long term effect on the Faculty."

We agree with the review committee's contention that the successful evolution of the university's divisions must be based on a strategic partnership with the central administration, and we welcome their recommendation that the university find ways to "encourage, empower, and fund the strategic decision making" within the Faculty in order to ensure its continuing pre-eminence within North American higher education. At the same time, we acknowledge that the Office of the Dean of Arts and Science has a responsibility to review and refine the internal structure of the Faculty and its current practices with respect to governance, administration and decision-making, to participate actively in the ongoing university-wide discussions concerning the structure of the university and its three campuses, and to lead the process of change with a strong strategic focus.

In the following sections, we respond to the specific recommendations contained in the report.

1. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty's internal organizational, operational, and governance structure. Is the current structure the best model for such a large and complex faculty within the context of the University of Toronto?

a) Redefine and empower vice-deans:

We agree with the need to empower the vice-deans by giving them more authority over decision-making, including budgetary authority. This would not only reduce "the sheer volume of items that must cross the desk of the Dean", but would also address what the review committee perceived as "an unsustainable level of over-centralization". The dean has already taken steps to implement this recommendation through discussions with each vice-dean, which have led to the definition of clear areas of authority. With respect to the recommendation that the Faculty consider reintroducing sectoral vice-deans (humanities, social sciences, sciences), in our view there are both positive and negative aspects to recognize. Such a revision to the structure of vice-deanal portfolios could provide a stronger framework for strategic planning within each sector by enabling the integration of multiple dimensions – undergraduate and graduate education, research, complement and space planning, etc. – and would ensure effective representation of sectoral needs within the Dean's Office. On the other hand, it could make the consistent application of Faculty and university policies and practices (e.g. with respect to hiring, labour relations, undergraduate degree and program requirements, graduate funding, TA allocations) more difficult than is the case under the current structure of functional vice-deans. It may also do little to enhance our ability to plan strategically *across* the individual sectors. Moreover, the current system already provides each sector with a "voice at the table" by ensuring that all sectors are represented through the disciplinary backgrounds of the vice-deans.¹ Nevertheless, we are committed to the objective of optimizing the operations of the Dean's Office and recognize that this could well be achieved by rethinking the structure of the vice-deanal portfolios. We are now in the process of studying the administrative structures of arts and science faculties within peer North American jurisdictions, including those referenced in the review report, and plan to borrow the best ideas as appropriate for our local context.

b) Add a chief-of-staff position:

The appointment of a chief-of-staff would help reduce the number of direct reports to the dean, while enhancing the administrative efficiency of the Office of the Dean, ensuring better responsiveness to departments and other units, and providing more support for strategic decision-making within the Faculty. The dean has prepared a job description for a new Chief Administrative Officer position, working closely with the Provost and Vice-President Human Resources and Equity. However, pressing budgetary constraints have compelled us to consider other, lower cost options, including defining new dotted-line reporting relationships of assistant deans to particular vice-deans to reduce some of the reporting burden on the dean. These changes have now been in place for nearly one year, and are already having a significant impact on the efficiency of operations in the Dean's Office.

c) Re-think the Faculty's planning process:

The report raises important questions about whether the scope of current planning in the Faculty is too narrowly focused on complement issues, and at the same time, too broadly structured (in that the planning committee is comprised of some two dozen members). It implies that such a structure may not be conducive to making "the hard decisions that strategic planning requires." We agree that it makes sense to review our current structure and process for planning to enhance its strategic effectiveness. Now is an especially auspicious time to consider a new structure as the Faculty prepares to enter its next major planning cycle. Moreover, there is a strong emerging consensus that the current budget challenges facing the Faculty demand a more strategic approach to future decision-making and resource allocation. We have already taken a significant first step in this direction with the formation of a new budget strategy subcommittee in the Faculty to lead the process of strategic decision-making linked to resource allocation (see below).

¹ At present, two vice-deans are humanities scholars, two vice-deans come from the sciences, and the social sciences are represented by one vice-dean and the dean.

d) Control the proliferation of interdisciplinary units:

The review committee's observations concerning the 'proliferation' of interdisciplinary units and programs deserve very serious consideration. At a time when resources are ever more constrained, it does seem appropriate to ask if our current portfolio of programs can be sufficiently resourced to deliver high quality. Presumably this too would be best addressed through a Faculty-wide strategic planning process in which all units within the Faculty offer only those programs that align well with our academic priorities, and for which appropriate resources can be identified. It would also seem prudent to revisit the criteria for the selection and approval of new interdisciplinary initiatives, as well as the reporting relationships and channels through which they are represented within the university's governance framework. We further agree that better structures need to be identified to enhance the coordination between interdisciplinary programs and discipline-based departments, to help ensure greater complementarities and enhance the student experience in such interdisciplinary programs. We have already embarked on this process and are currently undertaking a review of all teaching and research units within Arts and Science as part of our strategic budget planning. The first wave of recommendations from this work will be brought forward during the current term for wider discussion and implementation. With our budgetary pressures having become more severe in recent months, the urgency of this process has been elevated even further.

2. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty's relationships with the other arts and science divisions – i.e. with the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC).

We agree with the assessment of the review committee that, despite the complexities of the relationships between the three campuses, "the current system is working". This has been aided tremendously by the effective operation of the Tricampus Deans Committee, whose biweekly meetings serve as an important forum for communication, consultation, and coordination across the three arts and science divisions. We concur that the current three-campus structure for doctoral-stream graduate programs should be maintained. Where appropriate, it makes sense to promote the development of particular campus-based specializations within these three-campus graduate programs. We believe that this can be readily accommodated within the existing framework. Notwithstanding this, we agree that future expansion of graduate activities at UTM and UTSC should be focused primarily on campus-based professional masters programs. We are also supportive of the idea of initiating new three-campus doctoral programs headquartered at UTM or UTSC so long as these do not compete with existing doctoral programs but instead complement our current offerings.

3. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty's relationship with other divisions at the University of Toronto, including the St. George colleges.

We strongly endorse the view that the colleges play a crucially important role in enhancing the quality of student life and the student experience, through their activities in recruitment and admissions, orientation, residence services, academic advising and support, and student life in general. At a time when there is widespread commitment to improving the undergraduate student experience, the importance of these functions needs to be reaffirmed, and the Faculty needs to work with the colleges in these activities as we strive to increase student engagement. Historically, the colleges have also served as home to some of the Faculty's interdisciplinary undergraduate programs. The reviewers raise questions about the sustainability of these programs, for many of the reasons addressed under 1(d) above, although they argue that problems pertaining to reporting lines, funding, and review "seem to be exacerbated when these programs are housed in the Colleges." Once again, we would agree that the time is right to review our current offering of interdisciplinary programs within the Faculty – including those offered by the colleges – to ensure that they are academically strong and sustainable. In our view, it makes most sense to conduct the review of college programs within the broader Faculty-wide strategic planning exercise described above.

At the same time, we welcome the opportunity to engage the Colleges in a discussion about new opportunities for collaboration arising from initiatives such as graduate expansion. With the anticipated reduction in undergraduate enrolments and growth in graduate enrolments, there would seem to be real prospects for the Colleges to engage more fully in the graduate expansion process. For example, they

might work collaboratively with graduate units to provide space for graduate students and/or graduate programs. Such developments would, in our view, achieve mutual benefits for both graduate and undergraduate students, by enhancing opportunities for interaction between them.

Other issues:

With respect to processes for tenure and promotion review, we would simply indicate that we recognize the importance of ongoing public discussions within the university community about the strengths and weaknesses of our current policies, and potential alternative models. On the subject of international benchmarking, we very much agree with the sentiment underlying this comment, although we hasten to point out that past practice has consistently invited scholars from leading universities within Canada *and abroad* to participate in reviews of our undergraduate and graduate programs. We propose to continue and extend this practice where possible. Finally, with respect to strategic clarity in the Faculty, we would like to reiterate that we accept enthusiastically the need to determine future choices, priorities and directions through an open and consultative process that is fundamentally strategic in nature.

15 May 2008 (updated 12 February 2009)

Commissioning Officer, Vice-President and Provost

The reviewers have recognized the quality of the Faculty of Arts and Science, and the Faculty and Dean have carefully considered their perspectives and recommendations. In December 2008, Professor Meric Gertler began his term as Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and I am confident that he and the Faculty will meet the challenges outlined in the review.

I concur with the reviewers that the relationships between the Faculty of Arts and Science, on the one hand, and the campuses and colleges on the other, are a shared responsibility between Faculty, the campuses and colleges, and the University. Progress has been made, since the review – progress which addresses some of the review recommendations:

Tri-campus organization and administration

The *Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses* (2002) was an initial step in recognizing the evolving relationship between the three campuses and the Faculty of Arts and Science. The 2004 *Stepping Up* academic planning process confirmed the University's commitment to a unitary tri-campus framework for graduate studies, "while acknowledging and seeking to enable the distinctive strengths that exist on each campus." *Stepping Up* noted that this endeavour will require a high degree of collaboration and cooperation among departments and faculty at UTM, UTSC and St. George.

In 2007, the University ignited a bold and comprehensive planning strategy - *Towards 2030* – which is, amongst many other things, the next step in the evolution of the tri-campus structure. It explores a set of strategic questions regarding university relations and context, enrolment, institutional organization, governance, and resources as the university considers its long-term plans. The *Towards 2030 Framework* was approved in October 2008 by Governing Council. It will help guide and shape academic planning at the divisional and departmental levels in the years ahead.

The *Framework* notes that the University is a de-facto tri-campus university system and that we will need to selectively consider features of other successful multi-campus institutions as we move forward. The document affirms the University's commitment to "sustain inter-campus collaboration while enabling strategic tri-campus differentiation of academic programs. Campus-specific autonomy will be supported insofar as it does not compromise efficiency or academic quality".

The *Towards 2030* process highlighted that, as the main provider of graduate education in Ontario, the University must continue to expand its graduate student base, including selective growth of graduate programs at UTM and UTSC. It affirms "the importance of tri-campus graduate collaboration and

university-wide oversight of any campus-specific graduate offerings". Again, for this complex endeavor to be successful, the continued goodwill, collaboration, and cooperation between the arts and science divisions on all three campuses is essential.

Role of the Colleges

The question of the role of the Colleges and the Faculty of Arts and Science has also been recently clarified, as part of the 2008 process of reviewing the 1998 *Memorandum of Agreement between the University of Toronto and the Federated Universities (MOA)*. The 1998 memorandum was an updated version of the original 1974 memorandum of understanding between U of T and its federated universities, but the newer version had grown to include sections that related to the nature and role of the St. George arts and science colleges, including provisions that apply in whole or in part to both the federated and constituent colleges.

One upshot of the 2008 review is a *Statement on the Roles of the Constituent and Federated Colleges*², which sets out the roles of the St. George Colleges and a framework of principles, procedures and institutional facts within which the Colleges operate. It outlines the role of colleges in student life and academic programming; rights, responsibilities and accountabilities; and operating agreements with each federated university with regards to services, accountability reporting and funding.

Cheryl Misak
Vice-President and Provost

2

<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Policies/PDF/Policy+Statement+on+the+Roles+of+the+Constituent+and+Federated+Colleges.pdf>

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Faculty of Information
Formerly Faculty of Information Studies

DATE: December 13,14, 2007

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Vice-President and Provost

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate n/a

Graduate: Master of Information, MI
Master of Museum Studies, MMSt
Doctor of Philosophy, PhD
Graduate Diploma of Advanced Study in Information Studies, GDiplSt

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

International Jose-Marie Griffiths, Professor and Dean, School of Library and Information Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
John Leslie King, Professor and former dean, School of Information, and Vice Provost for Academic Information, University of Michigan

PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE: 2003

SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:

The review report noted key strengths of the Faculty. 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. The students are very pleased with the academic programs, particularly the doctoral students.

An overarching challenge was identified as the need for greater clarity and coherence of its intellectual vision and mission and a strategic ongoing process of planning.

DATE OF RECENT OCGS REVIEW(s): 2001-02: Master of Information, Doctor of Philosophy and Graduate Diploma of Advanced Study in Information Studies
1999-2000: Master of Museum Studies,

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS: *Terms of Reference*
External Review Report of the, Faculty of Information Studies (2003)
Report on Research, Faculty of Information Studies, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost (2007)
Faculty of Information Studies Dean's Report (2007)
Stepping UP – Synthesis
Faculty academic plan (2004)

CONSULTATION PROCESS: The reviewers met with the Vice President and Provost, Deputy Provost, Dean of the Faculty of Information, Vice Dean, Inforum Director, Vice Dean of Graduate Programs in the School of Graduate Studies, Director of the Institute of Communication and Culture at Mississauga, Director of the Knowledge Media Design Institute, Program Coordinator for Book History and Print Culture, Chief Librarian, Chair of the Department of Health Policy, Director of the Adaptive Technology Research Center, Coordinator of the Professional Learning Center, President of Victoria University, Assistant Dean, Finance and Personnel Officer, junior and senior faculty members, graduate students, and two members of the external community.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

The reviewers characterized the Faculty Information Studies as a strong, long time "player in the world of information" with "a solid international reputation for collaborating with computer science, health sciences, and other fields in exploring the frontiers of information and its role in the modern world." Faculty teaching staff are "high quality", "established" and "emerging leaders within their specialties at the national and international level." The students are excellent, "bright and demanding, with high expectations of their programs and of themselves. Many of them said they came to Faculty because of the reputation of the faculty and the university." The reviewers felt that under the Dean's leadership, the Faculty had "developed remarkably" in recent years, and now presents "a great opportunity for the university."

The reviewers noted that there is "more to be done in this vision than ... could reasonably [be] accomplish[ed] in just five years." Although the Dean and others expressed some frustration that more of the vision had not been realized, the reviewers considered this vision as a ten rather than five-year project. "This is due in part to the ambition of the vision itself, which is a pioneering step in the rethinking of the whole professional realm of systematic collecting its role in human understanding." The goal of the Faculty and of the University should be to build on the foundation established in the transformation of the Faculty; that the Faculty could have a special role as being the "university's and the region's center of expertise on the nature of information as information – an issue of growing importance in the digital age."

The Faculty has adopted and "enlightened and practical" approach by seeking common elements related to information across a variety of disciplines, noting that: "This vision in no way challenges or obviates traditions of librarianship or archives, nor the utility of organizing information by field of origin and use: FIS does and will continue to prepare professionals who fit into traditional roles, with expertise in subject domains. However, the vision is somewhat transgressive in that it presumes that people who adopt this vision – faculty as well as students – can look beyond the constraints of the present and help shape a more effective future for information professionals and the society they serve. In short, the vision is to create a growing cadre of leaders who will shape the future, and not merely fit comfortably, albeit expertly, into the future." Although this vision is not unique to the Faculty, it has "taken important elements of this emerging vision farther than other members of the I-School community. For example, it is the first of the I-Schools to formally incorporate an established program of museum studies into the faculty. It is also building on its historical strengths in collaboration with computer science, health sciences, human-computer interaction and other fields to create important new strengths in research."

The reviewers highlighted the Faculty's strengths including its high quality faculty members and students, and in the area of institutional innovation. The Faculty has worked successfully to develop collaborations across units of the University.

Challenges for the Faculty include the inclusiveness of the vision as an information school across the Faculty. The reviewers observing that in their view "senior faculty have been acting largely as a co-activity" in that individuals are moving forward within their "own personal areas of scholarship rather than setting aside some personal preferences in order to lead the rest of the faculty as a community". The reviewers suggest that in order to change the direction of the information field and be perceived as a world leader, the senior faculty will need to "lead the way by cooperating with one another, with the junior faculty members, with the FIS dean and leadership, with the university's leadership, and with leadership in the external community of Toronto".

The reviewers note that the challenges faced by the Faculty are common challenges faced by Information Schools: "This is the challenge of balancing intellectual development and professional skills in the program's students, especially those who plan to go into professional practice." The reviewers commented that they had the sense that the faculty members and students are of mixed opinion regarding the management of this balance, reporting that "hope was expressed that the upcoming effort to revise the masters degree curriculum would address his challenge."

The current university financial environment was identified as a practical challenge for the Faculty. They acknowledge that this challenge is not unique to the Faculty or to the University. It was not clear to the

reviewers how the Faculty could secure additional funding in order to realize its vision, however, they noted that it would be critical to do so.

In particular, the Faculty did not have adequate physical space to accommodate its growth and for faculty members to develop cooperatively. They suggested it may be possible to “address some of the space challenges by aggressive exploration and deployment of emerging high-definition video/audio communications capabilities”.

The reviewers noted that revising the masters curriculum is and ought to be a challenge for the Faculty: “Curricula are far more than frameworks for instruction leading to conferring of degrees: they are instantiations of a field’s identity and purpose. It seems doubtful that the vision of FIS can be achieved without significant modification of and innovation in the masters curriculum. This will require considerable discussion and compromise among the faculty.” The reviewers suggest that the revision of the masters curriculum be seen as the next step in realization of the Faculty’s vision.

Based on their visit, the reviewers recommended that the new Dean for the Faculty have a proven record of getting things accomplished and the ability to manage the process of moving forward while maintaining the loyalty and commitment of the Faculty. In addition, the new Dean should have skills in working with external constituencies on a variety of dimensions, including development, noting that “the Toronto region provides extraordinary opportunities to develop a community of support for FIS that will yield resources in the form of funds, research opportunities for faculty and doctoral students, and internships and employment for masters students.”

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

Dean, Faculty of Information

The external review report has been distributed to FIS faculty members and senior administrative staff. The Faculty appreciates the reviewers’ endorsement of the overall progress the Faculty has made over the past five years, and in particular its recognition of the importance and time-scales inherent to the vision it has adopted. We are grateful as well for their recognition of the fact that the Faculty’s mandate and progress places it squarely within the emerging information school (“i-school”) tradition—a move soon to be reflected in a change in the Faculty’s name from “Information Studies” to “Information” *simpliciter*.

In terms of the reviewers’ specific comments and recommendations, the overall Faculty response was one of agreement and appreciation. More specifically:

1 The report identifies a challenge facing the Faculty having to do with degree and character of participation of senior Faculty. As expected, Faculty response to this issue was divided, in essentially predictable ways. The issue itself, and the internal range of opinions, is taken very seriously by Faculty leadership.

2 The issue of balancing professional and intellectual goals has been given top priority during the design of the new curriculum—a process that was just getting underway at the time of the reviewers’ visit, and just now coming to closure. The main emphasis has been to concentrate and improve *both* of these dimensions, rather than allowing them to be seen in opposition—by employing new pedagogical methods and innovative teaching techniques that deal with them synergistically. In particular, the new curriculum puts greater emphasis on *practical engagement* and *reflective practice*—not at the expense of increased theoretical rigour, but as a form of empirical grounding for theoretical and intellectual insights, as well as introduction to professional practice for professionally-oriented students.

3 The report identified suitable long-term space for the rapidly-growing Faculty as an additional challenge—a point with which the Faculty strongly concurs. Unfortunately, the additional space at 90 Wellesley St E granted to the Faculty by the Provost’s office has proved impracticable, due to the sound volumes generated by music students practicing in other spaces throughout the building. Recognizing the problem, the Provost generously made new arrangements, soon to be completed, for transfer of this “second wing” of the Faculty to new space in the New Residence of New College—a high-quality facility with the added advantage of being much closer to the Faculty’s main premises in the Bissell Building. As a medium-term solution, we look forward to taking up

residence at New College later this summer (2008). Longer-term, it remains a top Faculty priority to find a permanent home that unites its members in the goal of creating a world-class interdisciplinary collaborative Information School ("iSchool").

4 Finally, the Faculty appreciates the reviewers' comments regarding issues and characteristics that would be advisable to look for in a new Dean. We believe that the Provost's office, who conducted the search, was mindful of the issues that the reviewers raised during the selection of Seamus Ross, who will be installed as the new Dean of FIS on January 1, 2009. He has been apprised of the issues raised in the report, and is committed to address them (for example: he has identified the acquisition of suitable long-term space for the Faculty as one of his 3 top priorities).

Overall, as stated at the outset, we believe that the report presents a fair and accurate report on the state of the Faculty.

Brian Cantwell-Smith, former Dean
May 29, 2008

Commissioning Officer, Vice-President and Provost

I am pleased with the outcome of the review and am grateful to the reviewers for their insights and recommendations.

Governing Council approved the renaming of the Faculty to the *Faculty of Information* in June 2008. Similarly, the Master of Information Studies was changed in name to the Master of Information. Each of the name changes the Faculty has undergone in the last 80 years has reflected — and responded to — changes in the intellectual context within which the Faculty operates and the ongoing expansion of topics covered by the field. This most recent name signifies the Faculty's membership in the emerging community of Information Schools ("i-schools").

In January 2009, Professor Seamus Ross began his term as Dean of the Faculty of Information and I have every confidence that he and the Faculty will meet the challenges outlined by the review. Professor Ross has the background and experience to provide leadership to the Faculty and I look forward to seeing the Faculty continue on its trajectory of excellent and innovation.

Cheryl Misak
Vice-President and Provost

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy

DATE: May 5 - 6, 2008

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Vice-President and Provost

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate: Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy, BScPhm
Doctor of Pharmacy, PharmD
Pharmaceutical Sciences, Chemistry, BSc: Spec (offered with the Faculty of Arts and Science)

Graduate: Master of Science, MSc
Doctor of Philosophy, PhD

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

International Professor Marilyn Speedie, Dean, College of Pharmacy
University of Minnesota

Canadian Professor Robert Sindelar, Dean of the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences,
University of British Columbia.

PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE: 2004

SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: The Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy is very strong: Its pharmacy graduates are well regarded by the profession and its research programs are thriving. Strong leadership by the Dean had helped them weather many changes and the Faculty is "remarkably forward-looking".

Foremost among future challenges is the fact that, if the Faculty is to truly compete on an international level with its professional program, it will have to make the transition to the entry-level doctorate. As it stands now, no B.Sc. pharmacy graduate will be eligible for licensure in the United States in the near future. This lack of mobility does not bode well for the long-term competitive advantage of the Faculty of Pharmacy and the University.

- The B.Sc.Pharm. program is a strong, contemporary curriculum. Entrance academic admission standards of accepted students remains high and degree completion rates are very good. The international pharmacy graduate program appears to be a highly successful initiative.
- The new B.Sc. in Pharmaceutical Sciences offers an avenue to enhance cross-linking interdisciplinary relationships between the Faculty and other units.
- The scope, quality and relevance of the faculty's research activities are deemed excellent.
- Strong alliances have been formed with key stakeholders. Community and hospital pharmacy representatives support the undergraduate program through provision of clinical placement training sites.
- Fundraising has been "outstanding". Provincial government support to the new building and seed money to start the IPG program has been impressive.
- The growth in programs and activities in recent years, combined with the extent of change, suggests that a second tier of leadership where divisional heads take some responsibility for this communication would be helpful.
- The Faculty will need to significantly expand its clinical faculty cohort, including those performing clinical research.

DATE OF RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	2000-2001
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Terms of Reference <i>Self Study, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy 2008</i> <i>Report on Research at the Faculty of Pharmacy, Office of the Vice-President Research, 2008</i> External Review Report of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, 2005 and response from the Dean <i>Stepping UP – Synthesis</i>
CONSULTATION	The committee met with the Vice-President and Provost, the Deputy Provost, Dean of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, groups of faculty, staff, administrators, students (graduate, undergraduate and Pharm.D.), pharmacist preceptors, teaching hospital pharmacy directors, members of the Ontario College of Pharmacists, deans of cognate programs in the health sciences and arts and sciences, and chairs of departments of physiology and chemistry.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

The reviewers concluded that the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy has “excellent faculty members, students, facilities and programs that have undergone significant growth in the past five years”. Individuals with whom reviewers met were reported to be seriously engaged in the curriculum and research. Faculty expressed pride “in their collective accomplishments” and “excitement for the future of the Faculty.” Quality of service and staff dedication in support of faculty and students were commended. “[S]trong collaborative spirit” and “mutual respect amongst faculty and staff” were acknowledged. The reviewers lauded the Faculty’s accomplishments in interprofessional learning.

The new building has raised the profile of pharmacy within the University and wider communities, and generated great excitement amongst stakeholders and decision makers. It has allowed for consolidation of the Faculty’s education and research missions. The reviewers lauded the fundraising activities of the Dean and the Faculty, while at the same time “assuring future success will require enhancing alumni and stakeholder relations”.

The reviewers characterized the Dean as “innovative and visionary”, an “outstanding ambassador for the profession” who had “provided outstanding leadership and is universally and highly respected by all stakeholders”.

The reviewers concluded that the challenge for the Faculty will be to “consolidate the growth and change that has occurred and to take advantage of the many opportunities that remain for growth and improvement”.

Academic programs

The reviewers noted that the second-entry B.Sc. program had increased in total number of students from 670 total students in 2003 to 904 total students in 2007, while maintaining academic admission standards and degree completion rates. The Full-time Pharm.D. program enrolment had been fairly constant. However, the part-time distance education offering has significantly increased the numbers in this post-baccalaureate program. Both programs received full six-year accreditation in 2007. The reviewers highlighted the “national recognition achieved by the successful” post-entry-level international pharmacy graduate (IPG) program.

Graduate programs were lauded by the reviewers, in particular the ‘notable and favourable improvements in the management of research graduate studies and the expansion of seats. The reviewers lauded the Faculty for implementing of a new flex-time Ph.D. program.

The newer Pharmaceutical Chemistry Specialist Program (B.Sc.) offered jointly by the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Faculty of Pharmacy was expected by the reviewers to positively impact the number and quality of applicants for the graduate programs in the near future.

In terms of the Faculty's proposed new entry-level Pharm.D. program, the reviewers concluded that it has been logically studied, well designed, and innovative in both concept and planned implementation. While much work remains to be done, including gaining Ontario government approval, the Dean has continued to serve as a skillful champion for the initiative. A number of Canadian Faculties of Pharmacy will look toward Toronto as a model for their programs."

The reviewers found the new institutional priority given to continuous professional development "forward-thinking and innovative" in the current rapidly changing pharmacy practice environment.

Research activities

The reviewers noted that the "scope, quality and relevance of the Faculty's research activities are excellent and continue to grow in quality and prestige" acknowledging that faculty members' "world-class research was well recognized by several peer-review granting agencies". Research funding has increased. Faculty have received honours and awards and significant equipment and infrastructure funding from external agencies.

Faculty members

The reviewers commented that while the size of the Faculty has remained relatively constant, increasing slightly to support program expansion, hiring of new faculty members has resulted in new named chairs and Canada Research Chairs. They observed that "faculty and University colleagues are excited about the calibre of recent hires. Core and adjunct faculty members are considered as strengths.

Faculty visibility and professional leadership

The Faculty's visibility and prominence has increased significantly as a result of its new academic programs, enhanced research success, and new building. External relations have been well developed. The reviewers acknowledged the Dean's role in fostering relationships within and external to the University. They noted that there "is a strong collaborative spirit and a mutual respect amongst faculty and staff".

The reviewers identified several challenges and opportunities for the Faculty:

Organizational structure

Despite the fact that the organizational structure was recently reorganized, the reviewers felt it needed consolidation in order to ensure bi-directional communication and planning at all levels. In particular, "divisional level strategic planning and the roll-up of divisional plans to a faculty-wide plan seemed weak for some divisions. Division chairs should be charged with the responsibility for ensuring communication and planning." Some roles and responsibilities "may need clarification. These should be in written form and terms of reference at division director level should be developed. Decision-making should be transparent and implementing these roles and responsibilities for communication and planning should help ensure such transparency."

Approval of the entry-level Pharm.D.

The plan being developed for an Entry-level Pharm.D. program has garnered "strong support" "from cognate deans and Ontario pharmacy professional organizations." However, it will be critical that the Faculty garner government approval for such a program: "A clear and careful strategy must be constructed for program approval that must include unequivocal university support and data to show that expanded scope of pharmacy practice leads to better health outcomes. The Faculty must define the abilities of their graduates to meet the expanded scope of practice desired by government." The reviewers advised that "the implementation action plan developed by the Faculty must fully engage all critical stakeholders such as the key institutional practice sites in the province and ambulatory practice sites to assure that the program graduates possess all the abilities, knowledge, skills, and attitudes requisite for practice change leader". Furthermore, the Faculty must consider general and specialized residency experiences, and fellowship opportunities, as part of the program.

New curriculum implementation scheduled for 2010

The reviewers commended the Faculty in their progress to implement a new curriculum by the fall 2010. They were excited by the “learning community” concept and “the development of other new experiential learning paradigms.” However, they were concerned about risks associated “with the desire to implement the new curriculum with or without Ontario government approval of the Entry-level Pharm.D. program.” “[U]nilateral change prior to government approval may preclude the Faculty from attaining the requisite fiscal support from government in the future” and such fiscal support will be needed “for the expansion of the clinical components of the curriculum as well as for expansion of the Part-time Pharm.D. program to meet the needs of existing practitioners wishing to upgrade their academic credentials.”

Practice faculty members

The reviewers highlighted that strengthening of the Pharmacy Practice Division is vital for curricular transformation and as the curriculum evolves the Faculty must invest in its practice faculty: “The Pharmacy Practice Division must grow and embrace both the scholarship and teaching missions. While the Division will need a mixture of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty members as well as a mixture of full-time and part-time faculty members, it is the full-time practice faculty who are desperately needed at this time to accomplish these goals.” Opportunities and networks for practice-based research will need to be built. Leadership at the Divisional, faculty and Provostial level will be necessary in order to change university guidelines to allow the Faculty to hire full time Pharm.D. faculty.

Changing research culture

The pharmacy building is located in the midst of a “vast Toronto life science innovative engine” which includes affiliated hospitals and MaRS. Such a location provides “unlimited opportunities for expanded Faculty research.” To take best advantages of such opportunities, cultural changes - such as a more multidisciplinary philosophy - must take place. New hires in clinical science together with the addition of a more transnational focus on the part of existing faculty would help. The Faculty should formulate a broad collaborative research vision and approach the University’s Vice President Research for support.

Other Possible Revenue Opportunities

The Faculty should explore new sources of revenue generation that fit its mission and the reviewers noted possible examples.

Miscellaneous points raised during the review:

- Some pharmacy faculty members may not be giving appropriate priority to teaching. Incentives for teaching excellence as well as skills development opportunities should be put into place.
- Undergraduate research opportunities should be considered with regards to the current curriculum revision.
- The Faculty should study the possibility of interviews becoming part of the interview process.
- The next Dean must be able to build on the Faculty’s successes to implement further change and a “brighter future.” He or she must be visionary, well-connected and able to lead in the context of professional, academic and government stakeholders. She or he must possess strong interpersonal skills and strongly value quality and excellence.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES

Dean, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy

A review of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy was conducted by Speedie and Sindelar on May 5th and 6th, 2008. In addition to addressing the standard terms of reference for the University of Toronto External Reviews, Speedie and Sindelar asked each group to assess the quality of the respective programs and to recommend areas of improvement or continued growth. In our opinion, their report provides a valid description and fair assessment of the current state-of-affairs of the Faculty. Upon reviewing the document we were pleased to note that no findings or observations were ones we were not aware of or had not anticipated. In fact, the reviewers' comments serve to highlight current issues with which we are dealing as a result of strategic initiatives.

The Faculty has undergone tremendous growth since the last review, including expansion of the undergraduate professional, graduate professional, research graduate programs, as well as in the area of Continuous Professional Development. Growth provided the opportunity and necessity to fundraise for a new building, which was opened in September 2006, on the corner of College and Queen's Park. Our research activities have increased significantly with the hiring of excellent new faculty, including a number of Canada Research Chairs and other named Chairs. It is important to note that in 2006-07, 92% of the research faculty held at least one grant or contract which is a significant accomplishment. Several faculty have also received honors and awards for their scholarship activity.

Faculty, staff, and students certainly can take pride in all that has been accomplished. Their collective efforts have raised the visibility and prominence of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy.

Speedie and Sindelar identified some future challenges which deserve response.

Organizational Structure and Communication:

While change in organizational structure is not always easy, we have been aware that further clarification is necessary and, in fact, discussed this during our last Strategic Planning session. The Faculty is divided into three Divisions, with a newly appointed Division Head in two of the three Divisions. The Division Heads are charged with responsibility for strategic planning and communication within their Division. They also serve in an advisory capacity to the Dean. Coverage for the teaching requirements and Research initiatives are handled through discussions with the appropriate Associate Deans. The Division concept is relatively new to Pharmacy but has resulted in strategic focus in some instances. Faculty meetings provide the means of communicating with the faculty as a whole while Faculty Council is the main forum of governance for the Faculty. Additionally we have hired a Marketing and Communications specialist who shares Faculty news on a daily basis via digital screens throughout the building and through a regular newsletter.

Approval of the Entry-Level PharmD:

Extensive consultations occurred during the development of the new curriculum. The proposal for the new curriculum was approved by the Academic Planning and Programs (AP&P) Committee on May 13, 2008. An implementation committee has been formed, with the projected start date for the new program of September 2010. AP&P also approved in principle, the change to the entry-to-practice degree for this program from the current baccalaureate (BScPhm) to the Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) degree.

We realize the challenges that we will encounter with the government for the change in degree; however, on the advice of the Provost, the Faculty is working with the Vice-President, University Relations, Judith Wolfson and Marny Scully, the Director, Policy and Analysis, Government, Institutional and Community Relations in order to ensure the submission process proceeds well and the government's response will be favorable.

Considerable dialogue occurred with our stakeholders. Their involvement in the new curriculum is absolutely crucial to the success of the proposed change. For advanced practice training the Faculty is considering a combined Masters and Residency program or a combined Masters and Fellowship training.

New Curriculum Implementation:

A number of possibilities have been considered to ensure that the resources needed to launch the expanded experiential training component (Communities of Practice) are in place. In the current program, preceptors are reimbursed for their contributions to the experiential training. Within the new curriculum, six Communities of Practice will be identified. The funds used to pay preceptors will be used to hire coordinators for each Community of Practice who will have the responsibility of ensuring the students are receiving the necessary training within their Community of Practice. Many practitioners who have received Status appointments with the Faculty will be part of these Communities of Practice. Fourth-year students will also mentor junior students.

While the University of Waterloo has a different model for experiential training, they have secured a number of sites that will be paying the students to participate in a Co-op program within their facilities. The environment within the province has thus changed and while there will be challenges we are confident we will be able to address them.

The reviewers indicated that expansion of the part-time PharmD program will be required. In our plan, the focus of the current part-time program will shift to that of providing practitioners with a Bachelors degree a means to upgrade to an entry-level PharmD, not to obtain advanced training as is currently the case. This program will be provided on a cost-recovery basis. Advanced training will still be provided as described above under "Approval of entry-level PharmD".

Practice Faculty Members:

We recognize that strengthening and growth of the Pharmacy Practice Division is essential to the curricular transformation. We are currently advertising for tenured track Faculty in this area. The recent approval of a number of status appointments has also increased access to a number of excellent practitioners within the University of Toronto affiliated teaching hospitals and throughout the province. Strengthening this Division is a major priority.

The Pharmacy Practice Division has undertaken a number of initiatives and is currently examining their research output, appointments to Graduate Studies, and graduate student supervision. Faculty have already been hired who have practice-based research programs, examining medication use and health outcomes.

A Changing Research Centre:

Speedie and Sindelar have provided a thoughtful list of potential future research opportunities for the Faculty. It is not uncommon for researchers to be somewhat disconnected from each other but it remains important for faculty members to consider the opportunities for future success. The faculty members within the Divisions of Biomolecular Sciences and Clinical, Social and Administrative Pharmacy are working on achieving a more multidisciplinary research environment, with an aim towards translational research. Although the groups have not yet achieved this goal, we have instituted changes that will move us toward a new, more integrated research environment.

Revenue Opportunities:

Faculty revenues will always be a challenge. The recent appointment of a new Assistant Dean of Advancement and the formation of a Dean's Advisory Committee will undoubtedly lead to potential opportunities. While a satellite program might be considered as a possibility, it can not be a short-term goal, as there are so many other pressing issues to be considered at this point in time.

Teaching Priority:

The quality of teaching is a priority in the Faculty of Pharmacy. We instituted a teaching committee as part of the PTR process. Teaching activities are given the same weight as research. There are workshops and training sessions on campus which many faculty have attended. Two of our faculty members, who have received teaching awards, will provide annual faculty development sessions beginning in August 2008. In addition, the Implementation Committee for the new curriculum includes a member who is dedicated to faculty development.

Student Research Opportunities:

We do hire a number of students during the summer months for research projects. The demand for these placements is always greater than our financial capability. This is something worth consideration in future

fundraising initiatives. The undergraduate program does include some research skills coursework and this, along with critical appraisal and literature evaluation within the new curriculum, will greatly enhance student preparedness for such projects.

Interviews:

While the evidence that interviews provides a better quality of student is not strong, an *ad hoc* committee has considered the possibility of interviews as part of our admission process. Their very thorough report has recommended that interviews be used beginning with the 2010 applicant pool and that we re-evaluate their effectiveness after three years. This recommendation was approved by the Faculty Admissions Committee in June 2008.

K. Wayne Hindmarsh
Dean
August 2008

Vice-President and Provost, Commissioning Officer

This is clearly a very positive review and I welcome the reviewers' enthusiastic endorsement of changes made in the Faculty in recent years. The external reviewers astutely identify the challenges facing the Faculty and provided strategies and advice for responding to these challenges. The Faculty has begun to formulate action plans to address the issues raised by the reviewers and careful thought and consideration have been given to their report.

An advisory committee for the search for the next Dean of the Faculty was struck at the beginning of this academic year. It has been meeting regularly during the course of the term. The committee has taken into consideration the external review report and the decanal response to it.

As noted in the review report, over the last three years, the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy has had ongoing and extensive discussions about curriculum renewal. Based on the recommendations of the review report, the Faculty has continued to forward on its planning related to the projected entry-level PharmD program. The curriculum for the Faculty's BScPhm program was approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs on May 13, 2008, effective September 2010. The revised curriculum reflects the Faculty's goal of bringing expanded knowledge, skills, and experience to students who aspire to become the Pharmacy professionals of tomorrow. The curriculum will have significantly more experiential training, providing students time to develop their clinical skills and thus increasing their confidence. This is critical given the mandate of Primary Health Care Reform within Ontario and the need for pharmacists to take on leadership roles and to work more effectively within health care teams.

The Faculty has further recommended that the entry-to-practice degree for the undergraduate professional pharmacy program be changed from the baccalaureate BScPhm to the entry-level Doctor of Pharmacy PharmD degree. It is in discussions with professional government agencies regarding an entry-to-practice degree recognition by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

Cheryl Misak
Vice-President and Provost