



Proposal to establish a School of the Environment

February 27, 2012

Executive Summary

The Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) is proposing the establishment of a new School of the Environment as an extra-departmental unit B (EDU:B), concurrent with the disestablishment of the current Centre for Environment. The School would differ from the current Centre by establishing Faculty support for shared undergraduate and graduate programs, alignment of the School's activities with its academic mission, affiliation with research and teaching units, and a cohesive space. The Faculty has many teaching and research strengths in the area of environment that cross a wide range of disciplines; individuals and groups from many, if not most, of our academic units are heavily engaged. In particular, we have faculty with expertise in areas including but not limited to: global change science, the chemistry of alternative energy sources, conservation biology, environmental policy, environmental planning, environmental ethics, who can provide students with the opportunity to address underlying questions related to environment and resources from the perspective of the Humanities, the Social Sciences and the Sciences.

Recent reviews of the Faculty of Arts & Science and the Centre for Environment, coupled with academic planning within several FAS units, led to much discussion on how to offer our students the best possible environmental programs and the most appropriate academic structure for teaching and research programs related to the environment. This proposal is the result of ten months of extensive deliberation and consultation by the FAS Environment and Resources Working Group. Within the 2011-12 academic year, the Working Group issued three reports that were informed by three comprehensive rounds of consultation with faculty, staff and students in FAS academic units and with cognate divisions.

The proposed School of the Environment would bring together the wider range of expertise across all our disciplines, provide a home for student advising and activity, better support research and scholarship in environment, rebuild shared undergraduate teaching programs, develop graduate programs and reinforce strong links to activities embedded in other disciplines.

The Centre's current academic programs and activities would continue as the development of new or revised programs occurs and while programs are approved through FAS and university governance processes. Students would be able to complete their current programs.

The Centre for Environment budget provides for the mounting of its current programs, staffing and a professional development series of courses. The faculty members, administration and budget of the current Centre would be transferred to the new School. The existing organizational structure and administrative positions would migrate to the School to continue to support its academic mission. However, changes may be required in the future as the School and its programs evolve. Senior lecturer appointments, cross-appointments and tri-campus graduate appointments would continue into the new unit. A committee would be struck by the Dean's Office to assess the space needs for the proposed School. The capital funding resulting from a space assessment would be allocated from existing operating resources or through appropriate mechanisms within the Faculty. The establishment of a new School of the Environment would not result in any changes in base funding resources at the Faculty and University level.

Background

The Faculty of Arts & Science (FAS) is very active in teaching and research in the area of environment; faculty, staff and students from many of our units are engaged in the teaching, scholarship and study of environment. FAS faculty with expertise in such areas as global change science, the chemistry of alternative energy sources, conservation biology, environmental policy, environmental planning, environmental ethics, and so on, provide students with the opportunity to address underlying questions related to environment and resources from the perspective of the Humanities, the Social Sciences and the Sciences.

The current FAS Centre for Environment was formed in 2005 as a merger of three separate units with missions directly related to the environment: the undergraduate Division of the Environment, the undergraduate Innis College Environmental Studies Program and the School of Graduate Studies Institute for Environmental Studies. It is an EDU:B that offers a variety of undergraduate programs in environment and a graduate collaborative program. Reviews of the Faculty of Arts & Science (2008) and the Centre for Environment (2010), coupled with academic planning within several FAS units during 2010, led to much discussion of the most appropriate academic structure for teaching and research programs related to the environment and natural resources. These informal discussions helped identify a number of important issues related to the most effective way to offer high quality undergraduate and graduate programs in these areas of critical importance.

Given the number of groups involved in the informal discussions it became difficult to ensure that all units strongly affiliated with programs in the environment and resources were fully consulted and informed of ongoing discussions. In order to focus the discussion and consider how best to offer high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs and support for internationally significant research related to the environment and resources, the FAS Environment and Resources Working Group was struck as a broadly-based committee to review our activities in these areas and to make recommendations for the Faculty (Appendix 1). The committee was representative of the units involved in programs and research in the area of environment and resources and included faculty and students. The Faculty of Forestry was invited to participate due to their existing FAS undergraduate programs related to the environment and conservation. The specific charge of the Working Group was to:

1. Summarize and review the existing Arts & Science undergraduate and graduate programs in the general area of environment and resources.
2. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the current Faculty unit structures, considering the academic plans of the units and cognate disciplines.
3. Make recommendations (either organizational or otherwise) that would strengthen environment and natural resources programs overall, identifying specific outcomes and measures of progress toward academic goals and ensure that the resources we place into initiatives on the environment and resources achieve the greatest scholarly and educational impact.

As part of its review process, the committee was also to consult with units that are currently involved in delivering such programs. The Working Group met from May 2011 to January 2012

to consider oral and written submissions and consulted with the A&S community.¹ Three reports, summarized below, were released during the 2011-12 academic year. The reports invited input from faculty, staff and students which were discussed at meetings with academic units and at FAS Faculty Council.

Initial Update Report

The Working Group decided to concentrate first on undergraduate programs with the aim of outlining what would be considered components of high-quality undergraduate majors in the area of environment and resources and/or how to strengthen our existing core programs in this area. The committee reviewed the various environment and resource programs offered by FAS as well as the aspirations of the units offering the programs. Written materials made available to the Working Group included 2011-12 program calendar entries, academic plans, recent external undergraduate and graduate review reports and enrolment data for the environment and resources programs offered by the Department of Chemistry, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Centre for Environment, Forestry Conservation programs, Department of Geography, Department of Geology, and the Department of Physics, as well as the draft report of the 2007 Earth & Planetary Sciences Ad Hoc Working Group.

Although it was acknowledged that there would likely be suggestions for additional programs and program modifications that would emerge over the course of consultations and discussions, the Working Group considered that it was important to begin the process by presenting programs that had emerged in their initial discussions. A set of principles were proposed for the consideration of undergraduate programming:

1. Programs should be distinct without major overlap with other programs in order that students are able to clearly distinguish programs. Academic rationales and program learning objectives should be clear and allow students to be able to understand both professional and academic career paths that may be available upon completion of their studies.
2. The entry way to and path through programs must be clear to students and reduce the confusion surrounding the current array of environmental programs. A 'road map' would be helpful for students to allow them to select programs and sequences of courses.
3. Within programs, prerequisites and other obstacles to courses in other units must be minimized so as not inhibit student progress, especially of students that are enrolled in double majors.
4. Programs should be well subscribed and make better use of existing teaching capacity in the area of the environment and resources to maximize the number of courses taught by continuing tenure and teaching stream faculty and to ensure students are taught by a range of faculty members within a program.

The Working Group then established three subcommittees to review three program themes: Earth System Science, Environmental Science and Environmental Studies. The subcommittees were to consider associated undergraduate programs and pedagogy and included members from the

¹ The Working Group reports, committee membership, terms of reference, and related memos are available at <http://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/faculty-staff/committees-reports/envres>.

Working Group as well additional faculty, undergraduate and graduate students from environment-related FAS units. Each subcommittee reviewed and discussed the Faculty's strengths in environment, resources and related programs and invited guests to speak or write to the committee from additional disciplinary areas.

The initial report from the Working Group, circulated in September 2011, outlined its progress and, building on the work of the subcommittees, proposed three program themes for further development: Earth System Science, Environmental Science and Environmental Studies. Of critical importance, these programs would be shared in order to make use of FAS research strengths and complement discipline-specific programs as well as allowing a greater number of faculty members to participate in the programs. A new Environmental Science program would provide students with a multidisciplinary analysis of the scientific basis of environmental processes as well as exploring problems and solutions. Courses would reflect the strong science department strengths in FAS. A new Earth System Science program would provide an integrated study of processes that happen within the earth system in the solid earth, hydrosphere, biosphere and atmosphere over time. The study of the interactions within this system in space and time is currently the frontier in the field. A modified Environmental Studies program would provide an integrated study of the complex and interdependent societal forces shaping our outlook.

Interim Report

With the release of the initial update, the Working Group invited comments on the suggested programs and rationales, as well as comments on how to best administer and support the programs and possible implications for existing programs and units. This first round of extensive consultation (Appendix 2) was overwhelmingly positive. In all the feedback received there was general agreement that the Faculty has huge strengths in environment and resources that has not been properly presented to students or the external community. The Working Group was encouraged to enhance the visibility of activities and coherence of programs and enthusiasm was expressed for moving forward in FAS. The Working Group Interim Report was circulated in November 2011 and reflected input received on the initial report:

1) Undergraduate programs

The Interim Report noted that the academic rationales for the Earth System Science and the Environmental Science programs may overlap to such a degree that it would be better to offer a single program that covered both areas. Offering distinct, complementary programs could make it easier for students to choose their area of study and allow for the most efficient allocation of resources. As the details of the program curricula had not been developed, the reports highlight the general input received regarding the level of programs proposed, general curriculum contents and opportunities for students. There was agreement that, in order for the proposed shared programs to be successful, the programs must be of excellent quality and admit academically strong students with a passion for their studies.

Many FAS faculty indicated that they could have positive contributions to the programs and the Interim Report outlined criteria developed to encourage participation of departments and faculty members in the shared programs. Given current student trends to partake of double majors as well as student demand for interdisciplinary programs, the

Working Group proposed that the programs be offered at the level of majors so that the programs could complement disciplinary programs. Several units indicated they have current course offerings that could be offered as part of the programs and/or that they are considering developing new courses. It was also stressed that it would be imperative to ensure that cross-linkages are built in between the programs in terms of their sciences-social sciences-humanities aspects. The Interim Report highlighted several possibilities for achieving such cross-linkages as well as the need for program research, field and international experiences.

Because of the support and great enthusiasm for the proposed program themes, the Working Group recommended that two program committees be established as soon as possible. One would consider modifications to the existing Environmental Studies program; the other would first consider whether one or two science programs are desirable and then develop the appropriate curriculum. The four principles outlined by the Working Group with respect to programmatic considerations should remain at the fore of program development. These included consideration of the distinctiveness of learning objectives and academic rationales, clear entry ways to and paths through programs, minimization of prerequisites, as well as ensuring programs are structured so that they can be well subscribed and make use of existing teaching capacity.

2) *Administrative and Structural Models*

A clear need was expressed that, regardless of administrative model, we ensure that the various programs and units are ‘talking to each other’ in order to maximize our faculty strengths and minimize the duplication of courses/programs. This led to the recommendation for the establishment of a FAS curriculum committee that would have the responsibility to review courses and revisions to curriculum before they are approved further in the Faculty. Similar to the FAS Life Sciences Curriculum Committee, the proposed committee would review all new entries and revisions for environment courses and programs with the aim of harmonizing courses and programs and to collectively identify and resolve possible conflicts.

Along the same lines, chairs and directors stressed the importance of receiving recognition for their faculty members teaching in shared undergraduate programs. Suggestions included recognition of the importance of interdisciplinary teaching through FAS indicators and recognition of department contributions when proposals are brought forward to the FAS Appointments Committee. The Working Group thus recommended that, in coordination with academic units, the Dean’s Office should develop a mechanism to acknowledge academic units that contribute teaching resources to the shared environment and resources programs.

Although the Working Group consultations were focused on discussions of proposed undergraduate programs, three administrative models that could administer the programs emerged and were described in the report. Although, in the first instance, the Working Group focused on undergraduate programs, the Interim Report noted that an organizational structure should allow for the development and administration of masters and PhD programs, research opportunities, internal and external community building and profile, and professional development programs. Similar to undergraduate teaching, several FAS units have strengths in graduate teaching and research, with some units, in

fact, having greater presence of environment and resources in research and graduate studies.

Model 1 – Establish a Department or EDU:A: A department/EDU:A would offer a full suite of undergraduate and graduate programs and have full faculty appointing abilities to teach and conduct research in environment and resources. It would continue to administer the collaborative graduate program and could in future house tri-campus masters and PhD programs. The benefits noted for this model included having a visible presence on campus and externally. There would be a full breadth of undergraduate and graduate teaching and synergies. Creation of a department/EDU:A would provide for a core of faculty members to teach in the programs. Students would have a home that could ensure advising and coordination across the spectrum of sciences, social sciences and humanities.

Importantly, however, the majority of A&S faculty working in environment and resources that were consulted indicated that they would not be comfortable with such a model. The proposed programs may be perceived as Department programs rather than shared programs or programs spanning other disciplines. For the most part, scholars who study environment and resources see themselves aligned with their disciplinary unit first and then with environment and resources. We learned that, relatively few FAS science faculty have participated in or interacted with the current Centre for Environment. As well, given that many FAS departments consider environment and resources as part of their own research and teaching, it would be difficult to recruit and/or move current faculty into a department; doing so may lead to a weakening of disciplines.

Given the strengths of our current FAS departments in areas related to environment and resources, it is difficult for many to envision how a department would complement existing activities. Also, without transferring colleagues from existing departments extensive resources would be required to develop a department with sufficient number of faculty members that would reflect a balanced mix of social studies/humanities or sciences required to represent the full breadth of environment and resources science and studies.

Model 2 – A distributed model in which shared programs are administered by an existing department. The Centre for Environment would provide important internal and external community building functions.

In this model, teaching in the programs would be shared but for practical purposes (timetabling, etc.) each program would be administered by an existing department. The programs would be separately promoted in the calendar and to students (i.e., not under the administering department), clearly indicating the participation of all the units involved in offering the programs. Administrative homes that were suggested included the Department of Geology for the Earth System Science, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology for Environmental Sciences and the Department of Geography for the Environmental Studies and also for the Environmental Sciences program.

This model has served FAS well for the Biology program (administered by the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and offered with the Department of Cell and System Biology) and the Cognitive Science program (administered by the Department of Philosophy and offered with the Departments of Computer Science, Linguistics and Psychology). The model is efficient in that it builds on the expertise of the home departments in the practical, day-to-day administration of a program. Some resources would need to flow to the home department in order to support the additional responsibilities of program administration.

The Centre for Environment would take on a stronger role in serving as the community-builder for the Faculty and the external community in the area of environment and resources, but would no longer administer stand-alone programs. The graduate collaborative program and continuing education programming would continue to be housed in the Centre.

Three main concerns related to this model emerged in the process of consultation. Firstly, there is a worry that the environment and resources programs, although presented as shared programs, would eventually be seen as aligning with their single administrative departments. In essence there would be an academic drift towards one discipline. Although this has not been the experience in long-standing and large programs such as the Biology program, still there is a concern that in the area of environment and resources this could be a strong possibility. Secondly, the Department of Geology considered that it would be of greater benefit for the Earth System Science to be housed in a School/Institute so that the program is connected to a broader initiative on environment and resources. This would allow more students to learn about the earth system and be attracted to the Department's own geology program. Thirdly, the model was viewed unsatisfactory from the perspective of student advising and a "space" for all environment and resources students to feel welcome and ensure dialogue occurs across the spectrum of sciences, social sciences and humanities. Lastly, the model does not extend to support any future graduate programs or research in the environment and resources.

Model 3 – Establishment of a School or Institute that administers programs but does not appoint faculty (i.e., EDU:B model).

Similar to the Department Model 1 above, the benefits noted for a School model include having a visible presence on campus and externally for environment and resources. There would be a full breadth of undergraduate and graduate teaching and synergies. Students would have a home that could ensure advising and coordination across the spectrum of sciences, social sciences and humanities. A School would administer the proposed undergraduate programs in environmental science/earth system science and environmental studies. It would continue to administer the collaborative graduate program and could in future house tri-campus masters and PhD graduate programs. A School would need to complement and provide benefits to departments with interests in the environment, in particular those offering programs and/or with existing faculty research strengths. This would allow the programs to reflect the academic scope

to effectively cover the extraordinarily diverse field of environment and resources. The School of Public Policy and Governance was repeatedly noted as being perceived by faculty members as a successful academic unit along these lines, although it is clear that a School/Institute of the environment would be considerably broader in offering both science, and social sciences and humanities programs.

The benefits noted on this model included that it would reinforce the principle that the environment and resources programs were conceived as shared programs with several departments contributing teaching resources and expertise to the programs and benefiting from recognition of their contributions towards teaching a greater number of students and/or the involvement of faculty members in teaching environment and resources courses they are particularly interested in. Programs housed within a School can also provide a valuable overview and entry point and help expose students to a wider array of disciplines at an earlier point in time; this may lead to higher enrollments in some existing low enrollment programs.

This model would add value to the teaching of environment and resources through the proposed programs but also contribute to and complement department strengths. A School/Institute would not appoint faculty members through primary appointments; although cross-appointments would be possible so that faculty members are genuinely engaged in a School. In consultations, we clearly heard that the field of environment and resources is huge and thus, almost by definition, a small core cannot possibly represent the full spectrum of environment and resource scholarship. There was much concern that a School focused on small primary appointments would run the risk of drifting to one or two select areas of scholarship of particular interest to core members. There was an expressed desire to reinforce the shared commitment by many large groups as opposed to a few individuals. We also heard that it would be critical for a School/Institute to attract high-caliber professionals that would interact with students and faculty members.

Unlike the current Centre for Environment, a School would both affiliate with and serve as a home for other centres, allowing it to take advantage of the full span of activities in environment and resources in FAS. For example, the Centre for Global Change Science (EDU:C; CGCS) was spoken of highly in consultations as a Centre that has built an enthusiastic community of science scholars and students that attend its seminars and lectures and that participate in its undergraduate offerings. The Director of the Koffler Scientific Reserve has also indicated that an affiliation with the School would be advantageous. Such 'symbiotic' relationships with and within the School allow the offerings of each unit to be highlighted, complement and strengthen each other and create a space where conversations/relationships can develop between social science, humanities and science faculty and students. Other academic units may be developed or consider being housed within a School in order to benefit from its administrative structure and community, and to increase the critical mass of teaching and research that is associated with the School/Institute. The fact that faculty members would have

their primary appointments in a FAS department was seen as a benefit in fostering these relationships.

Final Report

Upon the release of the Interim Report, the Working Group co-chairs engaged in a second phase of consultations, meeting with academic units as well as individually with faculty, staff and students in order to hear their suggestions and comments regarding possible administrative and structural models. As discussions continued in this consultation phase, the presentations to various departments evolved, incorporating ideas and comments presented in previous meetings.

Based on the input received and deliberations of the Working Group, the Final Report made eight recommendations designed to strengthen and coordinate FAS activities in the area of environment (Appendix 3). In particular, consultation on the three models proposed resulted in much thoughtful discussion and led to a general consensus that a School at the level of an EDU:B (Model 3) be proposed as the administrative structure for environment within the Faculty of Arts & Science at this time. Thus, the Final Report recommended the disestablishment of the Centre for Environment and the establishment of a new School of the Environment. The proposed School would rebuild shared teaching programs and forge strong links to activities embedded in other disciplines, provide a home for student advising and activity, and serve to better support research and scholarship in environment. The Final Report also recognized the difficulties inherent in spreading its activities across too broad an array of subject areas. Specifically, while the Working Group was struck to investigate the Faculty's activities in Environment and Resources, it became clear that some aspects of "resources" would best be served if they were led by existing units and not included within the School. For example, much teaching and research in Geology relates to exploration for natural resources (minerals, oil, etc.) and, while such activities are clearly linked to environmental issues, it would be difficult to subsume all of such research and teaching within one unit.

The Final Report outlines the input received on the three administrative proposed models in light of general principles (reaffirmed during the second round of consultations) that an administrative structure should fully support teaching and research programs in environment. A department/EDU:A (Model 1) aligned with most of the principles but it was acknowledged that synergies between the sciences-social sciences-humanities in the area of environment are currently lacking and would need to be developed before a truly interdisciplinary department could be considered. Also, most faculty active in teaching and research in environment align themselves with their discipline first and are not supportive of a move to a new unit. Finally, there was also a strong sense that a movement of activities in environment out of the multiple units they are currently embedded in would lead to a weakening of programs in those units and of the faculty as a whole. Thus, although there was some support for Model 1, there was explicit recognition by its supporters that, while possible in the future, it is unrealistic at this point.

The 'distributed model' (Model 2) was deemed inappropriate in that it would not provide a suitable home for student advising or activity, serve as an appropriate platform for graduate programs, nor lead to a strong intellectual community for students, staff and faculty.

An EDU:B (Model 3) reinforces the concepts of shared programs and maintenance of strong links to activities embedded in other disciplines through judicious use of cross-appointments and involvement of faculty not appointed in the unit in the undergraduate and graduate programs. It also provides a well-defined home for students; i.e., a place for academic advising, dedicated teaching space, a place to interact with faculty and a site for student activities. This model also calls for the unit to work to better identify sources of research funding and help support the preparation of grant and contract proposals related to the environment.

The Final Report thus recommended that the Faculty should establish a new School as an EDU:B, with the proposal being brought forward for governance approval in spring 2012 effective for July 1, 2012. The Working Group considered that the name 'School of the Environment' would be appropriate as the name encompasses the general focus on research and teaching of humanities, social science, and science faculty working in the area. Based on the Working Group's consultations, the term 'Environment' resonates with undergraduate students.

The Report also reiterates recommendations regarding additional institutional structures and process to support the proposed School. Discussions with faculty, staff and students made it clear that several aspects of the new unit would be critical for its success and there was some concern that a new EDU:B would not be sufficiently different from Centre for Environment, also an EDU:B, to ensure its success. Consensus emerged that there were several important areas in which the new EDU:B would need to differ considerably from the existing centre. These elements include establishing Faculty support for shared undergraduate and graduate programs, alignment of the School's activities with its academic mission, affiliation with research and teaching units, and a cohesive space. These are discussed in the next section as they relate to the mandate of the proposed new School.

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science has accepted the Final Report recommendations (Appendix 4), tasking the Working Group co-chairs to develop a proposal for the establishment of the School to bring forward to Faculty and University governance.

Proposed School of the Environment

The proposed School of the Environment would support programs that are truly shared with different departments and programs, including units that are not currently active with the Centre for Environment. The mandate of the School would be to:

- Involve multiple units and administer programs as *shared* endeavours.
- Provide an intellectual community for students in the programs, as well as academic advising about the programs.
- Offer Masters and PhD programs.
- Maintain student co-curricular sustainability-related opportunities.
- Support a 'value-added' A&S research and intellectual community in the area of environment that builds on existing disciplinary strengths.
- Offer high quality professional development opportunities.

There are several important areas in which the proposed School would need to differ considerably from the existing centre. These elements include establishing Faculty support for shared undergraduate and graduate programs, alignment of the School's activities with its academic mission, affiliation with research and teaching units, and a cohesive space:

1) Institutional support for shared undergraduate and graduate programs

Undergraduate teaching in the Centre for Environment is currently heavily dependent on stipend teaching and a limited number of lecturers. It is necessary to involve the breadth and depth of expertise of faculty members in other units within the shared programs.

Faculty structures and processes would support the proposed School and the Faculty's activities in environment shared endeavours. The Working Group recommended the establishment of a standing Environment Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with the responsibility and authority to review courses and curriculum for environment-related programs offered across the Faculty. The committee will begin to meet in the 2012-13 academic year, chaired by the Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Programs. The bulk of the committee would be comprised of academic administrators from units that participate in environment programs. The Director of the School would be a member of the Committee. The need for the Committee would be reviewed in three years.

In addition, the Dean's Office, in coordination with academic units, will develop a mechanism to allow academic units to receive full recognition for faculty involved in the shared environment programs, and the numbers of students taught by those faculty members. This is critical for the continued participation of the academic units. Several colleagues pointed to the lack of such a mechanism in the past as leading to a lack of involvement by some units in the Centre for Environment.

Within the proposed School, an academic associate director would be required to coordinate undergraduate programs, assist in advising students, and oversee other academic program-related activities such as those in the Sustainability Office.

Similar to undergraduate teaching, several FAS units have strengths in graduate teaching and research, with some units, having greater presence of environment at the graduate level.

There was strong support for the proposed School to continue to offer a range of graduate collaborative programs with units active in environment, although it is appropriate that they be reviewed in the near future. There was also much interest for the development of new tri-campus masters and PhD degree programs. Following the recommendation of the Final Report, the Dean's office will establish a program committee to develop proposal(s) for new graduate programs in environment. Given the enthusiasm expressed in continuing the momentum on environment programs and the fact that the Centre had already developed a proposal for an MA, the graduate committee will be struck early in 2012. It will be co-chaired by the Vice-Dean Graduate and Research and the Director of the Centre to begin the task of preliminary work for program development. The committee will include tri-campus representation.

2) Alignment of the School's activities with its academic mandate

Faculty and students were keen to ensure the mission of the new School would be directly relevant to their needs and interests and, wherever possible, bring together faculty members from across the humanities, social sciences and sciences.

Joint seminars offered by the School, mounted in collaboration with departments and focused on the research interests within the Faculty, would provide a forum for cross-disciplinary conversations spanning local, regional and global scales and would help develop a stronger intellectual agenda. Seminars would aim to attract university faculty and students. Similarly, a faculty research fellowship program and pre-doctoral fellowships for senior graduate students would support the academic basis of the School and contribute to the sense of activity and place. The proposed School would also make it explicit that its activities are relevant to, and dependent on, faculty from the humanities, social sciences and the sciences. The goal of the School would be to provide opportunity for interdisciplinary activities in both teaching and research.

The input of faculty from units outside the School would also help provide academic input to the professional development programs; this is seen as important in that the professional programs are an important aspect of the external face of environment at the Faculty.

While the Working Group focused on undergraduate programs, there was a strong sense, supported by the feedback, that the new unit work to identify sources of research support and facilitate development of grant proposals related to environment. The School would strive for better identification of research funding opportunities as several colleagues indicated that there are real opportunities to develop greater linkages with government agencies beyond the tri-councils and to better facilitate joint, interdisciplinary grant and contract proposals. There should be a forum for cross-disciplinary conversations to begin and an intellectual agenda to develop. Some form of dedicated research support would be offered by the School that would facilitate applications to environment-related granting agencies and provide support to faculty members across FAS units. Metrics of success would include number of application and success rates.

Wherever possible, the proposed School should strive to engage its undergraduate students in the research programs of faculty. This could be facilitated by the seminar program described above and through possible support for summer undergraduate research projects. Greater involvement with tenure track faculty from collaborating units should also work to provide access to more research experiences for undergraduate students.

3) Affiliated research and teaching units

Stronger academic links between faculty and students in environment from different units in the Faculty can be facilitated by formalizing relationships with existing units.

The School would both affiliate with and serve as a home for other centres, allowing students and faculty to take advantage of the full span of activities in environment in Arts & Science. The Directors of the Centre for Global Change Science (CGCS) and the Koffler Scientific Reserve (KSR) have indicated a willingness to be formally aligned with a new School.

The CGCS has built an enthusiastic community of science scholars and students that attend its seminars and lectures and participate in its undergraduate offerings. Incorporating such units would allow for the science community to complement and strengthen other activities of the School that in turn could further highlight the offerings at CGCS and KSR. Other academic units may be developed or consider being housed within the School in order to benefit from its administrative structure and community, and to increase the critical mass of teaching and research that is associated with the School. That faculty members would have their primary appointments in a FAS department was seen as helpful in fostering these relationships.

4) Infrastructure and resources

The Working Group heard repeatedly that physical location and layout would be critical to the success of a School. Space occupied by the Centre for Environment in the Earth Sciences Building currently works to severely limit its sense of identity, its academic cohesion, and the efficiency of its operations. Students and faculty find the space overly dispersed and hard to find.

The proposed School's physical space would need to be carefully considered. Ideally, environment teaching and activities should be visible internally and externally; there should be welcoming spaces where students and faculty can meet and participate in joint events both formally and informally. The Working Group recommended that a space assessment committee be struck by the Dean's Office to assess the space needs for the proposed School. The committee would conduct a space assessment and identify a suitable location for the School. Its composition would include faculty, staff and students associated with programs in the environment.

As an EDU:B, the School would be able to make cross-appointments of up to 49%. Consultations indicated that potential cross-appointments would need to be carefully considered by the Director once the programs are more fully developed; it would be important that appointments reflect the balance of disciplines in environment.

The Centre's budget provides for the mounting of its current programs, staffing and a professional development series of courses. Wherever possible, the School would aim to ensure its budget reflects the ability to maximize support for its academic programs including the undergraduate and graduate student experience.

Consultations

In order to focus the discussion and consider how best to offer high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs and support for internationally significant research related to the environment and resources, the FAS Environment and Resources Working Group was struck in as a broadly-based committee to review our activities in these areas and to make recommendations for the Faculty. The committee was representative of the FAS units involved in programs and research in the area of environment and resources and included faculty and students. The Faculty of Forestry was invited to participate due to their existing FAS undergraduate programs related to the environment and conservation.

A memo was issued by the Dean to announce the establishment of the Working Group and a web site was set up to present information on the Group's progress and reports (Appendix 1). The Working Group began its deliberations in May 2011. The group's program subcommittees included members of the Working Group and additional faculty and students. During the formulation of the initial update report, it was decided that the Working Group would be permanently expanded to include the additional subcommittee members. Within the 2011-12 academic year, the Working Group issued three reports: an initial update report on progress (September 2011), an Interim Report (November 2011) and a Final Report (January 2012). These reports were informed by three comprehensive rounds of consultation with faculty, staff and students in FAS academic units and with cognate divisions. Appendix 2 includes a listing of consultations with groups and individuals, including those that provided written submissions to the Working Group.

The first round of consultation occurred during September to October 2011 in order to solicit input on the undergraduate program proposals, rationales and possible alternatives, as well as comments on how to best administer and support the programs and possible implications for existing programs and units. The co-chairs of the Working Group met with faculty, undergraduate and graduate students and staff in units that offer programs in the environment and resources in order to listen directly to their comments and suggestions. The first update report was presented and discussed at the FAS Council meeting of October 3, 2011.

As the initial consultations had focused on input on the program themes and various administrative models emerged as part of the discussion, the Working Group considered that a second round of consultations should occur regarding proposed administrative models. These consultations occurred through November and December 2011. The co-chairs of the Working Group again met with faculty, undergraduate and graduate students and staff in units that offer programs in the environment and resources. The Interim Report was presented and discussed at the FAS Council meeting of December 5, 2011.

Upon the release of the Final Report in January, the Working Group recommended a third round of more focused consultation. In particular, the co-chairs met with the Centre for Environment faculty, staff and students on January 31, 2012. Although a meeting had been organized for environment program students in December, the Working Group considered that additional meetings with students within environment courses would be most helpful. Thus, in addition to the Centre circulating the memos to the environment community, the co-chairs visited a large undergraduate class in January (ENV 222) in order to ensure students were aware of discussions and could ask questions regarding the School proposal and development of programs. A series of frequently asked questions was developed and presented at the meeting with students (Appendix 5). The Final Report was presented and discussed at the FAS Council meeting of February 6, 2012.

The proposal will be brought forward to the FAS Council meeting of March 7, 2012. If approved, the proposal requires approval by the Planning and Budget Committee, Academic Board and Governing Council.

Financial and Planning Implications

Continuity of academic programs

The Centre's current academic programs and activities would continue as the development of new or revised programs occurs and as programs are approved through FAS and university governance processes. Students would be able to complete their current programs. The undergraduate and graduate program committees would be tasked with ensuring student input to possible proposals and keeping them informed of the progress.

The Working Group recommended the establishment of a committee to propose modifications for the Environmental Studies Program and another to develop proposals for either two new programs in Earth System Science and Environmental Science or a single program that combines aspects of both areas. Each committee will include undergraduate students. The program committees would consult widely with participating academic units and begin work with the aim of having proposals developed for review by the end of the 2011-12 academic year. The proposals would then move through governance approvals the following year and be ready for students to enroll in 2013-14.

Organizational structure and staffing

The existing organizational structure and administrative positions would migrate to the School to continue to support its academic mission. However, changes may be required in the future as the School and its programs evolve. Senior lecturer appointments (who currently hold 100% appointments in the Centre), cross-appointments and tri-campus graduate appointments would continue into the new unit. As an EDU:B, the School would be able to make cross-appointments of up to 49%. Consultations indicated that potential cross-appointments would need to be carefully considered by the Director once the programs are more fully developed; it would be important that appointments reflect the balance of disciplines in environment. Any new partial appointments would need to be proposed by the Director, in collaboration with other academic units, to the Faculty of Arts & Science Appointments Committee. The mandate of this committee is to review requests for academic appointments on an annual basis and advise the Dean on searches to be undertaken in the academic units.

Physical space

As noted above, the proposed School's physical space would need to be carefully considered. Ideally, environment teaching and activities should be visible internally and externally; there should be welcoming spaces where students and faculty can meet and participate in joint events. A committee would be struck by the Dean's Office to assess the space needs for the proposed School. The committee would conduct a space assessment and identify a suitable location for the School. Its composition would include faculty, staff and students associated with programs in the environment.

Director

Pending governance approval of a new School, the FAS Dean would strike an advisory committee to recommend a Director. The Director would ensure that the mandate of the new School encompasses the principles outlined in the Working Group reports. The Director would consider the School's operations in order to ensure they support environment undergraduate and graduate programs and research. An essential quality for the consideration of candidates for the directorship includes the ability to appreciate the interdisciplinary and disciplinary breadth reflected in environmental programs and research.

Budget

The Centre for Environment budget provides for the mounting of its current programs, staffing and a professional development series of courses. The faculty members, administration and budget of the current Centre would be transferred to the new School. The Director of the new School would review the budget with the Dean's office to ensure the fit with the unit's mission, activities and commitments. The School would aim for its budget to maximize support for its academic programs including the undergraduate and graduate student experience.

The establishment of a new School of the Environment would not result in any changes in base funding resources at the Faculty and University level. Any capital funding resulting from a space assessment would be allocated from existing operating resources or through appropriate mechanisms within the Faculty. While there may be space and/or renovation costs, the sources of funding would be identified as part of planning for the School.

Review

A review of the new School and its programs would be conducted within the next 5-7 years in line with the university's quality assurance process for academic programs and in order to assess whether an EDU:A model would be appropriate at that time.

APPENDIX 1



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

CPAD #74, 2010-11

MEMORANDUM

Date: 11 May 2011

To: Council of Chairs, Principals and Academic Directors
Coalition of Arts & Science Directors

From: Meric S. Gertler, Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science

Re: Working Group on Environment, Resources and related Programscc Sandy Smith, Dean, Faculty of Forestry
Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), UTSC
Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean, UTM

Recent reviews of the Faculty of Arts & Science, the Faculty of Forestry, and the Centre for Environment, coupled with academic planning within several Arts & Science units, have led to much discussion of the most appropriate academic structure for teaching and research programs related to the environment and natural resources over much of the past year. These informal discussions have helped identify a number of important issues related to the most effective way to offer high quality undergraduate and graduate programs in these areas of critical importance.

Given the number of groups involved in the informal discussions so far it has been difficult to ensure that all units strongly affiliated with programs in the environment and resources have been fully consulted and informed of ongoing discussions. In order to focus the discussion and consider how best to offer high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs and support for internationally significant research related to the environment and resources, I am striking a broadly based working group to review our activities in these areas and to make recommendations for the Faculty of Arts & Science. The committee will be representative of the units involved in programs and research in the area of environment and resources and include faculty and students. The committee will consult with units that are currently involved in delivering such programs across the three campuses. The specific charge of the Working Group is:

1. To summarize and review the existing Arts & Science undergraduate and graduate programs in the general area of environment and resources.

2. To identify strengths and weaknesses of the current Faculty unit structures, considering the academic plans of the units and cognate disciplines.
3. To make recommendations (either organizational or otherwise) that would strengthen environment and natural resources programs overall, identifying specific outcomes and measures of progress toward academic goals and ensure that the resources we place into initiatives on the environment and resources achieve the greatest scholarly and educational impact.

The group will begin its work immediately, and we expect a report on these discussions to be submitted by October 2011.

The membership of the Working Group will be:

Prof. Robert Baker, Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Programs, Co-Chair
Prof. Sandy Welsh, Acting Vice-Dean, Teaching and Learning, Co-Chair
Prof. Jonathan Abbatt, Department of Chemistry
Prof. John Caspersen, Faculty of Forestry
Ms. Raluca Ellis, Graduate Student, Department of Chemistry and Centre for Environment
Prof. Don Jackson, Interim Director, Centre for Environment
Ms. Helen Lasthiotakis, Assistant Dean
Prof. Bernd Milkereit, Department of Physics
Prof. Virginia Maclaren, Chair and Graduate Chair, Department of Geography
Mr. Benjamin Normand, Undergraduate Student Department of Religion and Centre for Environment
Prof. Don Jackson, Interim Director, Centre for Environment
Prof. Russ Pysklywec, Interim Chair and Graduate Chair, Department of Geology
Prof. Locke Rowe, Chair and Graduate Chair, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Prof. Sandy Smith, Dean, Faculty of Forestry

APPENDIX 2**List of consultation meetings and submissions****1st round of consultations - environment undergraduate programs (June-October 2011)**

Department of Anthropology
Department of Chemistry – Environmental Chemistry Group
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Centre for Environment
Department of Geography
Department of Geography Alternatives Working Group
Department of Geology
Department of Physics Atmospheric Physics Group

A&S Faculty Council
Arts & Science Students Union (ASSU) Executive
Council of Chairs, Principals, and Academic Directors (CPAD)
Coalition of Arts & Science Directors (CASD)
Tri-Campus Deans

Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Steven Bernstein, Professor Department of Political Science and Director, Master of Global Affairs Program
Janice Boddy, Professor and Chair, Department of Anthropology
Mel Cappe, Professor, School of Public Policy and Governance
Michael Chazan, Prof. Department of Anthropology and Director, Archaeology Centre
Deborah Cowen, Professor, Department of Geography
Hilary Cunningham, Professor, Department of Anthropology
Helene Cyr, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Joe Desloges, Professor, Department of Geography
Miriam Diamond, Department of Geography
Matthew Farish, Professor, Department of Geography
Jeff Geddes, Graduate Student Atmospheric Chemistry
Emily Gilbert Professor, Department of Geography
Mark Hathaway, PhD student, Environmental Studies Collaborative Program, Adult Education, OISE
Joe Heath, Professor and Director Centre for Ethics
Matthew Hoffmann, Professor, Department of Political Science
Karen Ing, Senior Lecturer, Centre for Environment
Don Jackson, Professor, Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology and Director, Centre for Environment
Bryan Karney, Chair, Division of Environmental Engineering and Energy Systems, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Marieme Lo, Professor, Women and Gender Studies Institute
Mike Luke, Professor and Chair, Department of Physics
Doug Macdonald, Senior Lecturer, Centre for Environment

Virginia Maclaren, Professor and Chair, Department of Geography
Robert Morris, Professor and Chair, Department of Chemistry
Michelle Murphy, Professor Department of History and Acting Director, Women and Gender Studies Institute
Dick Peltier, Professor Department of Physics and Director, Centre for Global Change Science
Russ Pysklywec, Professor and Chair, Department of Geology
Helen Rodd, Professor, Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology and Director,
Rowan Sage, Professor and Acting Chair, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Beth Savan, Senior Lecturer Centre for Environment and Director, Office of Sustainability
Barbara Sherwood-Lollar, Professor, Department of Geology
Sandy Smith, Professor and Dean, Faculty of Forestry
Mark Stabile, Professor and Director, School of Public Policy and Governance
Ron Swail, Assistant Vice-President, Facilities & Services
Ingrid Stefanovic, Professor Philosophy and former Director, Centre for Environment
Donna Workman, Manager, Program and Partnership Development, Centre for Environment
Ann Zimmerman, Professor, Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

2nd round of consultations - administrative and structural models (November 2011-December 2011)

Department of Anthropology
Department of Chemistry – Environmental Chemistry Group
Department of Classics – Environment Group
Centre for Environment
Department of Geography
Department of Geology
Department of Physics - Atmospheric Physics Group

A&S Faculty Council
Arts & Science Students Union (ASSU) Executive
Council of Chairs, Principals, and Academic Directors (CPAD)
Coalition of Arts & Science Directors (CASD)
Environmental Students' Union (ENSU)
Humanities Chairs
Tri-Campus Deans

Steven Bernstein, Professor, Department of Political Science and Director, Master of Global Affairs Program
Phil Byer, Professor, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Joe Desloges, Professor, Department of Geography
Miriam Diamond, Professor Department of Geography
Steve Easterbrook, Professor, Department of Computer Science
Bill Gough, Professor Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences and Vice-Dean Graduate Education and Program Development, University of Toronto Scarborough
Karen Ing, Senior Lecturer, Centre for Environment
Don Jackson, Professor, Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology and Director, Centre for Environment
Mike Luke, Professor and Chair, Department of Physics

Doug Macdonald, Senior Lecturer, Centre for Environment
Virginia Maclaren, Professor and Chair, Department of Geography
Jennifer Murphy, Professor, Department of Chemistry
Dick Peltier, Professor Department of Physics and Director, Centre for Global Change Science
David Powell, Undergraduate Student Advisor and Work Placement Coordinator, Centre for Environment
Scott Prudham, Professor, Department of Geography and Centre for Environment
Russ Pysklywec, Professor and Chair, Department of Geology
Rowan Sage, Professor and Acting Chair, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Beth Savan, Senior Lecturer Centre for Environment and Director, Office of Sustainability
Ron Wilson, Interim Director, Human Biology Program
John Zilcosky, Chair, Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures

3rd round of consultations on Final Report and proposal development (January-February 2012)

Centre for Environment
A&S Faculty Council
Arts & Science Students Union (ASSU) Executive
Council of Chairs, Principals, and Academic Directors (CPAD)
Coalition of Arts & Science Directors (CASD)
Environment Students - ENV222
Tri-Campus Deans

Christian Abizaid, Centre for Environment and Department of Geography
Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Bryan Karney, Chair, Division of Environmental Engineering and Energy Systems, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Stephen Scharper, Centre for Environment and UTM Anthropology

...To include additional groups/names as we engage in February in proposal development.

APPENDIX 3

**Environment and Resources Working Group
Final Report
19 January 2012**

Summary of recommendations

Recommendation 1: Establish two program committees to develop full proposals for new programs in Earth System Science and Environmental Science (or for one program that combines both) and modifications for the Environmental Studies Program. In consultation with participating academic units, the proposals should be developed by the end of the 2011-12 academic year with the aim of seeking required approvals and offering the programs by 2013-14. Some degree of overlap in the committee membership will be needed.

Recommendation 2: The Faculty should establish a new School as an EDU:B. The mission of the School should reflect the general principles characterized above. The proposal should be brought forward from the Dean's Office for governance approval in spring 2012 effective July 1, 2012.

Recommendation 3: Pending approval of a new School, the Dean should strike an advisory committee to recommend a Director. The Director's mandate should encompass developing the mission of the new School to encompass the principles outlined above and alignment of activities to support environment undergraduate and graduate programs and research.

Recommendation 4: Establish a standing Environment Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with the responsibility and authority to review courses and curriculum for environment-related programs offered across the Faculty of Arts & Science.

Recommendation 5: In coordination with academic units, the Dean's Office should develop a mechanism to acknowledge academic units that contribute teaching resources to the shared environment programs.

Recommendation 6: Establish a program committee to develop proposal(s) for new graduate programs in environment.

Recommendation 7: A committee should be struck by the Dean's Office to assess the space needs for the School.

Recommendation 8: The Director of the new School should review the existing budget with the Dean's office to ensure the fit with the unit's mission, activities and commitments.

APPENDIX 4

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

Please distribute this memo broadly within your units to faculty, staff and students.

This memo is available online at <http://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/faculty-staff/cpad-info/2011-2012>

CPAD #55, 2011-12

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 25, 2012

To: Council of Chairs, Principals and Academic Directors
Coalition of Arts and Science Directors

From: Meric S. Gertler, Dean

Re: Working Group on Environment, Resources and Related Programs – Final Report

cc Working Group on Environment, Resources and Related Programs
Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), UTSC
Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean, UTM

I announced the formation of the Working Group on Environment, Resources and Related Programs (<http://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/faculty-staff/committees-reports/envres>) in 2011. The committee was charged with reviewing the Faculty of Arts & Science activities in the area of environment and resources and making recommendations for the Faculty; it includes faculty and students and is representative of the units involved in such programs. The Working Group met from May 2011 to January 2012 to consider oral and written submissions and consult with the Arts & Science community. It provided two interim reports that were discussed at meetings of Faculty Council; the Final Report is attached.

The Faculty is very active in teaching and research in the area of environment; individuals and groups from many, if not most of our units are heavily engaged. The Working Group reports make several recommendations designed to strengthen and coordinate our activities in this area. Based on the Working Group reports and feedback from consultations, I am accepting all of the recommendations in the Final Report. In particular, two program committees will be established to propose modifications for the Environmental Studies Program and to develop proposals for either two new programs in Earth System Science and Environmental Science or a single program that combines aspects of both areas. The committees will begin to meet this term. We will move to establish a standing Environment Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with the responsibility and authority to review courses and curriculum for environment-related programs offered across the Faculty. The committee will begin to meet in 2012-13 and will be chaired by the Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Programs. The co-chairs of the Working Group, in

coordination with the academic units, are tasked with developing a mechanism to acknowledge academic units that contribute teaching resources to the shared environment programs.

The Final Report recommends the disestablishment of the Centre for Environment and the establishment of a new School. The new unit would rebuild shared teaching programs and reinforce strong links to activities embedded in other disciplines, provide a home for student advising and activity, and serve to better support research and scholarship in environment. The Final Report will be discussed at the 6 February 2012 meeting of Faculty Council.

I have tasked the co-chairs of the Working Group to proceed with exploring ways to set up appropriate mechanisms that will enable us to fulfill the recommendations of the Final Report. A proposal to recommend the establishment of the School will be developed for consideration by Faculty and university governance this term. In the meantime, I am also accepting the recommendation in the Final Report to strike a committee to begin to draft a space assessment program that will identify a suitable location for the School.

I extend my gratitude to the Working Group and subcommittee members, as well as the many members of the Faculty and University community who shared their knowledge and enthusiasm with the committee.

APPENDIX 5

Faculty of Arts & Science

January 31, 2012

The proposed School of the Environment - Frequently Asked Questions**1) Why is the Faculty of Arts & Science proposing the creation of a new School of the Environment?**

The Faculty of Arts & Science has many teaching and research strengths in the area of environment that cross a wide range of disciplines. We decided to review our offerings to ensure they are as robust as possible. In particular, we have faculty with expertise in such areas as global change science, the chemistry of alternative energy sources, conservation biology, environmental policy, environmental planning, environmental ethics, and so on, who can provide students with the opportunity to address underlying questions related to environment and resources from the perspective of the Humanities, the Social Sciences and the Sciences. Recent reviews of the Faculty of Arts & Science and the Centre for Environment, coupled with academic planning within several A&S units, led to much discussion on how to offer our students the best possible environmental programs and the most appropriate academic structure for teaching and research programs related to the environment.

The proposed new School would bring together the wider range of expertise across all our disciplines, provide a home for student advising and activity, better support research and scholarship in environment, rebuild shared undergraduate teaching programs, develop graduate programs and reinforce strong links to activities embedded in other disciplines.

2) What was the process leading to the development of the proposal?

Last year, the Faculty established a Working Group on Environment, Resources and Related Programs to review A&S activities in the area of environment and resources and make recommendations. The Working Group includes faculty and students and is representative of the units involved in environment programs. The proposal to establish a new School is the result of ten months of extensive deliberation and consultation by the Working Group. The committee considered oral and written submissions and consulted with the A&S faculty, students and staff. Two interim reports were released last fall that were discussed at meetings within academic units and at Faculty Council; the third and Final Report was recently released. [The three reports, membership of the committee, terms of reference, and related memos are available at <http://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/faculty-staff/committees-reports/envres>].

3) What would happen with the Centre for Environment?

The Final Report of the Working Group, released in January 2012, recommends the establishment of a new School and the concurrent disestablishment of the Centre for Environment. Should this change be approved through governance, the Centre's operations and budget would be transferred into the new School.

4) I am enrolled in a program offered by the Centre. How would this change affect my studies?

It won't. You would be able to complete your current programs; your program and degree requirements would be unchanged. The Centre's current academic programs and activities would continue while the development of new or revised programs occurs and as programs are approved through Arts & Science and university governance processes. The Centre's senior lecturer appointments and faculty member cross-appointments would continue into the new School. The School would enrich the experience of students enrolled in environmental programs by providing a well-defined home with academic advising on its programs, dedicated teaching space, as well as a place to interact with faculty and a site for student activities.

5) I am involved in projects with the Sustainability Office – would these opportunities continue?

Definitely. We have heard throughout our consultations that students greatly value their interactions with the UofT Sustainability Office and we would ensure that these co-curricular opportunities continue.

6) What would be different about the new School? What would it do that the Centre for Environment doesn't already do?

The proposed School of the Environment would support programs that are truly shared with different departments and programs, including units that are not currently active with the Centre for Environment. The mandate of the School would be to:

- Involve multiple units and administer programs as *shared* endeavours.
- Provide an intellectual community for students in the programs, including enhanced experiences for students to have research opportunities with faculty, as well as academic advising about the programs.
- Offer Masters and PhD programs.
- Maintain student co-curricular sustainability-related opportunities.
- Support a 'value-added' A&S research and intellectual community in the area of environment that builds on existing disciplinary strengths.
- Offer high quality professional development opportunities.

7) I have heard that the School would be developing new undergraduate programs. When would they begin?

The Working Group has recommended the establishment of a committee to propose modifications for the Environmental Studies Program and another to develop proposals for either two new programs in Earth System Science and Environmental Science or a single program that combines aspects of both areas. Each committee would include undergraduate students. The program committees would consult widely with participating academic units and begin work with the aim of having proposals developed by the end of the 2011-12 academic year. The proposals would then move through governance approvals the following year and be ready for students to enrol in 2013-14.

8) How have students been involved in the consultation process for the School and programs?

The Working Group conducted two rounds of consultations last fall in academic units that included meetings with students, faculty and staff. This consultation continues with the release of the Final Report. Meetings with units, including the Centre for Environment, faculty, staff and students over the course of the fall term have been constructive and helpful in forming the Final Report. A meeting was organized for environment program students in December but the Working Group considered that additional meetings with students within environment courses would be most helpful. Going forward, each program committee would include two undergraduate students. The committees would be charged with keeping undergraduates informed of proposed new programs and program modifications.

9) When would the School of the Environment be established?

The process for final consultation is currently underway. Pending A&S Council and university governance approval, we hope that the School is established effective July 2012. New undergraduate programs would then be brought forward to governance for approval, to begin Summer 2013 (as in #7 above).

10) Where would the School of the Environment be located?

The location and layout is yet to be determined but we realize physical space would be critical to the success of the proposed School. We know that students find the space currently occupied by the Centre in the Earth Sciences Building to be overly dispersed and hard to find. Activities should be readily visible both internally and externally to the University with welcoming areas and entry points where students and faculty can meet and participate in joint events. The Final Report recommends that a committee be

struck soon to conduct a space assessment and identify a suitable location for the proposed School. Its composition would include faculty, staff and students associated with programs in the environment.

11) Where can I find more information?

Background information, reports, committee membership, terms of reference, and related memos are available at <http://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/faculty-staff/committees-reports/envres>. If you have any questions or would like to be involved, please email us at envres.artsci@utoronto.ca.