

**REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS  
2003-2004**

**Annual Report to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs**

**June 2005**

**OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT AND PROVOST**

# REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS 2003-2004

## Table of Contents

	Page No.
Introduction	2
<b>Faculty of Arts and Science</b>	
Aboriginal Studies (undergraduate program sponsored by University College)	6
Botany, Department of	9
East Asian Studies, Department of	12
Fine Art, Department of	15
French, Department of	19
History, Department of	22
Spanish & Portuguese, Department of	25
<b>School of Graduate Studies</b>	
Addiction Studies, Collaborative Program	30
Biomedical Engineering, Collaborative Program	32
Environment and Health, Collaborative Program in	34
Ethnic and Pluralism Studies, Collaborative Program	36
Industrial Relations, Centre for	38
Integrated Manufacturing, Collaborative Program	40
<b>Faculty of Medicine</b>	
Medicine, Department of	42
<b>University of Toronto at Scarborough</b>	
Social Sciences, Department of	49
<b>Provostial Reviews:</b>	
Architecture, Landscape, and Design, Faculty of	53
Arts & Science, Faculty of	57
Graduate Studies, School of	64
Management, Joseph L. Rotman School of	69
Music, Faculty of	78
Pharmacy, Faculty of	84
Physical Education and Health, Faculty of	88

## INTRODUCTION

During the academic year 2003-2004, across the University units participated in academic planning for *Stepping Up* plans for 2004-2010. The multi-departmental divisions re-established their review cycle in the wake of the comprehensive review process associated with the *Raising Our Sights* planning process in 1999-2000. Reviews of units and programs continued with the standard practice of timing the review cycle to the term of the head of the unit followed in most cases. The School of Graduate Studies conducted three- and seven-year reviews of collaborative programs<sup>1</sup>.

The overall assessments of the units and programs were positive, with both faculty excellence and enhancement of the student experience of particular note. Common themes highlighted include: the administrative complexities arising from the multi-site dispersion of units, interdisciplinarity within teaching and research, tri-campus issues, and space and budgetary concerns. The administrative responses have addressed the issues raised by the reviewers.

- One of the priority objectives of *Stepping Up* is to bring scholars and students from diverse disciplines together to meet scholarly challenges through interdisciplinary, interdepartmental, interdivisional and collaborations across campuses and with affiliated institutions. A workshop conducted by the Provost's office in January, 2004 identified some key challenges to interdisciplinary activity (<http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/English/Symposium-on-Interdisciplinary-and-Multi-Unit-Planning.html>). These challenges include: the extra work that is often required to engage in interdisciplinary activities; the lack of recognition at times for this type of work from colleagues; the lack of alignment of budgetary systems and incentives with such activity; the administrative challenges of sustaining smaller centres and institutes; and the sometimes unclear reporting arrangements for interdisciplinary groupings.

The Provost has assembled a standing Committee on interdisciplinary research and teaching. Among mandates of the Committee will be to review the 1984 *Report of Provostial Committee on Centres and Institutes* criteria, modify if necessary, and re-communicate to University; assess governance models for cross-faculty initiatives; and identify mechanisms for fostering interdisciplinarity to overcome barriers.

- Tri-campus issues are highlighted in the Arts and Science departmental reviews, and the Provostial reviews of the Faculty of Arts and Science, School of Graduate Studies, Music and the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management. The re-structuring brought about by the *Framework for Academic Administration for the Three Campuses* continues to evolve and the Provost has been working with the tri-campus Principals and Deans to clarify the implementation of the tri-campus framework.
- As part of the *Stepping Up* academic planning, the Provost's Academic Initiative Funds (AIF) were allocated for 04-05. Consistent with the University's vision and mission, the fund was set up to assist in the implementation of initiatives arising from the academic planning process. The AIF consists of a total of \$30 million in base funding to be available through the new Long-Range Budget, with \$5 million in each year over the next six years. As can be seen in administrative responses to several reviews, Academic Initiative Funds have been allocated to support academic initiatives that have arisen as responses to issues raised in the reviews.

Reviews commissioned by academic administrators of the University of Toronto are presented as part of this annual report to the Committee of Academic Policy and Programs. In the year covered by this report, additional reviews of programs were commissioned by organizations external to the University. Reviews of academic programs by external bodies form part of collegial self-regulatory systems to ensure that mutually agreed-upon threshold standards of quality are maintained in new and existing programs. Such reviews may serve different purposes than those commissioned by the University. A summary listing of these reviews is presented below:

### Reviews of academic programs commissioned externally, 2003-04

<b>Faculty of Applied Science &amp; Engineering</b>	
Biomedical Engineering, M.A.Sc., Ph.D.	OCGS Appraisal
Mineral Engineering, Program	Accreditation: Canadian Council of Professional Engineers
<b>Faculty of Arts and Science</b>	
Classics - M.A., Ph.D.	OCGS Appraisal
<b>School of Graduate Studies</b>	
Ancient Greek & Roman History, joint with York University (new program)	OCGS Appraisal
Biomedical Toxicology, Collaborative Program	OCGS Appraisal
Biomolecular Structure, Collaborative Program	OCGS Appraisal
Biotechnology, Joint Program	OCGS Appraisal
Community Development, Collaborative Program	OCGS Appraisal
Comparative, International & Development Education, Collaborative Program	OCGS Appraisal
Health Services & Policy Research, Collaborative Program (new program)	OCGS Appraisal
Jewish Studies, Collaborative Program (new program)	OCGS Appraisal
South Asian Studies, Collaborative Program	OCGS Appraisal
Theology, Conjoint Program (with Toronto School of Theology)	OCGS Appraisal
<b>Faculty of Medicine</b>	
Doctor of Medicine, M.D.	Accreditation: Committee on Accreditation of Canadian Medical Schools Accreditation: Liaison Committee on Medical Education
Master of Science in Occupational Therapy, M.Sc.O.T.	Accreditation: Canadian Association of Occupational Therapy (CAOT)
Pharmacology - M.Sc., Ph.D.	OCGS Appraisal
Master of Science in Physical Therapy, M.Sc.P.T.	Accreditation: Accreditation Council for Canadian Physiotherapy Academic Programs
<b>Faculty of Nursing</b>	
Nursing Program, B.Sc.N.	Accreditation: Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing
<b>Faculty of Pharmacy</b>	
Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.) and Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy (B.Sc.Pharm.)	Accreditation: Canadian Council for Accreditation of Pharmacy Programs

In 2004, the Office of the Provost, in consultation with Principals and Deans, developed the *Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs* that was approved by Governing Council in January 2005. The *Policy* will govern the overall framework for the internal assessment of proposed new programs and units and the review of existing programs and units at the University of Toronto as of the fall of 2005 and defines the overarching principles, scope, procedures and accountability within this framework. The *Policy* specified two administrative guidelines that outline the procedures for the actual assessment and review of programs and units (<http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/English/page-6-12958-1.html>)

## **Faculty of Arts and Science**

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Aboriginal Studies Program</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	May 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergraduate:</b>	B.A., Major and Minor
<b>Graduate:</b>	None
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	One internal and two external reviewers, submitting a joint report
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International:</b>	Dr. MaryAnn Willie, University of Arizona
<b>Canadian:</b>	Dr. Winona Wheeler, First Nations University of Saskatchewan
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS EXTERNAL REVIEW:</b>	1999 (Cluster review with Anthropology, Sociology, Philosophy)
<b>DATE OF OCGS REVIEW:</b>	Not applicable
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The reviewers received copies of the Director's Report (December 2003), the Aboriginal Studies Program Plan (January 2004), the last external review (1999), departmental handbooks and brochures and cv's of all faculty members involved in the Aboriginal Studies Program. They also received a copy of the August 2003 draft proposal for a Centre for Aboriginal Studies at the U of T.
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	In the course of two days (5-6 May 2004), the reviewers met first with the Dean and the Acting Vice-Dean for Undergraduate Education and Teaching of the Faculty of Arts and Science, and then, at First Nations House, with the Directors of the Aboriginal Studies Program (ABS) and of First Nations House (FNH) and with faculty and students in the ABS program. The reviewers commented in their report that 'Considerable time was spent in introductions as per accepted protocol amongst most Aboriginal peoples which gave the reviewers insight into people's origins and how they fit into the university community' and that they would ideally have liked more time to meet with staff of FNH separately and with students in groups of two or three to accommodate these protocols.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

#### Overall assessment:

With respect to the faculty involved in the ABS program, the reviewers noted that the faculty complement was comprised of one full-time lecturer, three doctoral student lecturers, a half-time 40% assistant professor from Geography, an assistant professor from English teaching an ABS course every other year, one Oneida language lecturer, two elders-in-residence, and the Director, who is a professor in Linguistics. They commented: 'This set up does not bode well for the ABS.'

The existence of a viable ABS program has to be felt throughout the University of Toronto. It has to pierce the culture of the university if it is to be accepted and embraced: it cannot be built on goodwill alone.' They recommended that the program acquire an additional full-time faculty position, that the Director be a full-time faculty member of ABS and that ABS and FNH be housed together, ideally in an expansion of the current FNH space.

#### **Specific issues:**

1. **Undergraduate curriculum:**

The reviewers are unhappy with the reliance on cross-listed courses occasioned by the shortage of faculty in ABS, since in their view 'one of the primary mandates of Indigenous Studies is to critically engage and challenge mainstream treatment and analyses of Indigenous life and history.' They recommend increased teaching of languages (specifically more upper level courses in Ojibway and Onieda, and, perhaps later on, Cree), the development of Nation-specific culture/history courses, additional systems (governance, treaty rights, etc) courses and, as a priority, theory/methods courses which 'survey the range of qualitative and quantitative methods and theories that have been utilized in the study of Indigenous history and life.'

2. **Faculty needs:**

To address the curricular problems identified under 1. the reviewers recommend a fulltime appointment to develop an Indigenous environmental knowledge/issues specialization stream within the ABS program and a parttime position in Aboriginal Health and Healing.

3. **Administrative and support services:**

The reviewers were also concerned that the existing level of administrative support, provided by University College and supplemented by help from FNH staff, leaves too much of the time-consuming administrative functions in the hands Director. This is not an efficient use of her time and does not allow for academic program development given that the current Director position is only a part-time appointment. They also noted that the 1999 review of the ABS program had recognized a need for increased student support services, including 'remedial training in reading, writing and study skills - computer literacy - career counselling and career placement through Toronto-based corporations - degree planning' and recommended the provision of such services by ABS coordinated with those offered by FNH. The present reviewers 'strongly recommend that the recommendation made by the 1999 Review ... be implemented.'

4. **Space:**

To help to solve the problems identified under 4. the reviewers recommend the creation of a single space for ABS and FNH, preferably by expanding FNH.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:**

A major current initiative of the Faculty of Arts and Science is the creation of a Centre for Aboriginal Initiatives. The Faculty is putting forward in its Round 2 (February 2005) proposals to the Academic Initiatives Fund a proposal for such a centre and for two new faculty positions in Social Justice and Aboriginal Communities and in Aboriginal Healing. This proposal directly addresses the reviewers' concerns. The two new hires, the former a joint appointment with the Faculty of Social Work, the latter an appointment in the Adult Education and Counselling Psychology Department of OISE/UT, would strengthen the ABS program by providing the desired courses in theory/methods and in aboriginal health issues (as well as increased graduate teaching and research in aboriginal studies in the appointees' graduate departments). The Centre, which would be 'a hub for teaching, research and community collaborations', would be housed alongside First Nations House and accommodate faculty and staff, elders and counsellors, classes and student support services, in 'a supporting and culturally relevant space'. If the proposal is approved and implemented, the additional administrative services at the Centre

would both relieve the Director of the ABS program of excessive administrative duties and provide the support services to Aboriginal students recommended by the reviewers.

The Faculty is also working with the Provost's office and University College to address the issues of space. There is a real possibility of implementing the space recommendation (4).

Other steps taken by the Faculty of Arts and Science include the allocation in its planning process to ABS of a joint appointment with Political Science, in order to cover the need for systems courses. The ABS program has already been able to add other new courses, Aboriginal representation in mass media and society and Aboriginal people in urban areas in 2004-5, and is proposing a full course in methodology for 2005-6. The Faculty of Arts and Science has set up a Language Task Force which has recommended (March 2005) expansion of the teaching of languages in Arts and Science including Aboriginal languages.

Finally, the Faculty has identified as part of its Stepping Up plan the need to improve the recruitment of aboriginal students. It has agreed to provide funding for three years of an aboriginal recruiter, and has designed recruitment literature appropriate for use in this effort.

Faculty of Arts and Science  
February 2005



## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Department of Botany</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	December 2003
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergraduate:</b>	B.Sc., Specialist, Major, Minor
<b>Graduate:</b>	M.Sc, Ph.D
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE</b>	
<b>COMPOSITION:</b>	Three external reviewers, submitting a joint report
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International:</b>	Dr. Shauna Somerville, Carnegie Institution of Washington
<b>Canadian:</b>	Dr. Maurice Maloney, University of Calgary Dr. Daniel Schoen, McGill University
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS</b>	
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEW:</b>	1997
<b>DATE OF OCGS REVIEW:</b>	2002
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED</b>	
<b>TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The reviewers were provided with full documentation on the department, including the Self-Study, CVs of all faculty members.
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	During the two days of the site visit, reviewers met with the Dean and Vice Dean Graduate Education and Research of the Faculty, the department chair, the chair of Zoology, graduate program committee, undergraduate program committee, and the SGS Associate Dean. They also met with an assistant professor group, the plant ecology group and the plant systematics and evolutionary biology group, the administration group, the technical and horticultural staff, the Botany Graduate Student Association, and postdoctoral fellows and research associates.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

### Overall Assessment:

The reviewers praised the department and its chair, John Coleman for the success in re-shaping the department and attracting "an exceptionally talented group of young faculty." The committee commended the department for focusing on a few research clusters, its growing expertise in bioinformatics and the work on species-species interactions among ecologists and evolutionary biologists. The committee concluded that the department has regained its position as the top basic plant science department in Canada and could become recognized as one of the best in North America.

### Specific issues:

1. **Faculty:**  
The young faculty are outstanding and therefore the department faces the challenge of retaining them. The committee suggests providing more funds for graduate student training, ensuring that the field facilities at Joker's Hill are maintained, and finding more space for the growing research programs.
2. **Undergraduate education:**

The existing introductory courses are very good, but they are taught with resources that are just barely adequate. The committee felt that it was essential for the department be given adequate personnel and resources for these courses. Continued commitment to independent study courses is important to compensate for the impersonal aspects of the large, introductory courses.

3. **Graduate and Postdoctoral:**

The department should maintain its period of intensive training and preparation for doctoral students. The committee felt that the two-year masters serves an important role and should not be phased out. Graduate students should be given more opportunity to experience "outside-the-lab" learning. Providing graduate courses for students at the East and West campuses might be facilitated by the use of video conferencing.

4. **Relations with other units:**

There is a healthy exchange between Botany and Zoology. The three collaborative programs have been successful, but it is essential to implement the planned Ecology and Evolution collaborative program and to have a senior faculty member take charge of it.

5. **Administration:**

The department has excellent administrative staff, but more support is needed for undergraduate advising. In addition, the department manager should meet regularly with the chair and associate chairs.

6. **Facilities and support for them:**

There is an urgent need for more support for the computer resources and this should be clearly distinguished from the development of bioinformatics.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

This is clearly a very positive review. The criticisms and recommendations are generally minor, essentially asking for a strengthening of an already strong and vigorous department. It should be noted that, as the reviewers feared, some key faculty have been lost since the review was done. Efforts are under way to replace them, although there is no question any such loss is serious. However, the previous chair left the department in extremely good shape and the present administration is moving ahead in making new appointment to replace the losses. One very important issue facing the department is the possible reorganization of Zoology and Botany. Such a possibility has been discussed for some time and these discussions are coming to a head in the near future. It is not yet clear what will arise, but one plan that has been considered in some detail would have the two departments realigned in terms of the issues on which the scientists focus (rather than on taxonomy). The most obvious division would be between the evolutionary and ecology groups on one hand and the cell, molecular and developmental groups on the other. This realignment would cut across both departments and would, of course, involve a considerable amount of displacement. However, it is thought by some (and strongly supported by an external review of Zoology) that it would strengthen both Zoology and Botany. Until this issue is settled, some recommendations including providing more research space cannot be dealt with.

1. **Retaining faculty:**

There is no question that with any department that has outstanding faculty, there is a continuing problem of retention. Although the reviewers suggest that providing more funding for graduate training is one way to deal with this, we cannot at the moment increase funding for this department. The university already has a funding guarantee for all PhD-stream students. There is some discussion of increasing the minimum amount, and that would apply to all students. It is not clear why the reviewers also raise a question about Joker's Hill. There is an ongoing budget for research there and the facility is, in fact, being upgraded to facilitate more research and training at the site. The chair of the Botany department is on the committee that manages the scientific enterprise there.

2. **Undergraduate education:**

The department's courses are both popular and successful. We agree that it is important to provide whatever resources we can to support this teaching. We also agree strongly that independent study is extremely useful, especially given the size of the introductory

courses. However, it seems likely that this kind of individualized study will be most important to and therefore mainly available to students who intend to pursue their work in Botany.

3. **Graduate and postdoctoral:**

The department must decide whether it wants to maintain its two-year MSc. The guaranteed funding model provides funding for only one master's year and that is unlikely to change. Therefore, the department must use its own resources if it wishes to support a second year. To facilitate teaching by faculty on the East and West campuses, the reviewers suggest the use of video conferencing. Many departments are planning to experiment with distance education, and it seems likely that the university as a whole will continue to explore this possibility and will be acquiring new technology for that purpose.

4. **Relations with other units:**

We support the collaborative programs. As noted above, the relationship between Botany and Zoology may be altered and one hopes enhanced if the reorganization of the two departments takes place. For example, the environmental scientists in Botany will not have to "cross" department lines and possibly cross several actual streets to interact with their Zoology colleagues, but will be in the same department and perhaps the same building. Thus, interactions and collaborations will be more natural and presumably more common. Moreover, in all of the relevant areas, the combination of excellent people in both departments will make the department more attractive to graduate students and post-doctoral students as well as to new faculty members.

5. **Administration:**

We agree that more attention could be paid to undergraduate advising. The chair and department manager are now meeting regularly, which was one of the reviewers' suggestions.

6. **Facilities:**

Expansion of and support for computer resources will depend in part on any reorganization that occurs.

Faculty of Arts and Science  
February 2005

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Department of East Asian Studies</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	April 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergraduate:</b>	B.A., East Asian Studies - Specialist, Major, Minor B.A., Buddhism and Asian Religions - Specialist, Major
<b>Graduate:</b>	M.A., Ph.D.; collaborative program in Asia-Pacific Studies
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Three external reviewers, submitting a joint report
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International:</b>	Professor Laurel Rasplica Rodd, University of Colorado
<b>Canadian:</b>	Professor David Barrett, McMaster University Professor Thomas LaMarre, McGill University
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS EXTERNAL REVIEW:</b>	1999 (Cluster review with History, Philosophy and Political Science)
<b>DATE OF OCGS REVIEW:</b>	2001
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	In preparation for their visit on 15-16 April 2004 the reviewers received copies of the Chair's Report (August 2003), the last external review (1999 cluster review), the OCGS periodic appraisal (2000-1), departmental handbooks and cv's of all faculty members of the Department of East Asian Studies.
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	During their visit, which began with a meeting with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Acting Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education and Teaching, the reviewers interviewed all the faculty members of the Department, the Director of the Asian Institute and the Director of the collaborative program in Asia-Pacific Studies, a dozen graduate and three undergraduate students. They also met with the Associate Dean for Division I of the School of Graduate Studies and the Director of the Cheng Yu Teng East Asian Library.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

### Overall assessment:

The reviewers were very impressed with the level of commitment to strong East Asian Studies at the University of Toronto 'evident in [all] the interviews ... from the highest levels of the university administration to individual faculty members, graduate and undergraduate students, and staff.' As they put it, 'A rebuilding of East Asian Studies has been successfully initiated over the past few years resulting in good will and collegiality among the faculty, excellent new hires, dedicated language teachers, commitment to research, a general concern with maintaining the quality of the experience of graduate students, an energetic group of graduate students with diverse interests, strong funding for graduate students, and a superb library.' The reviewers identified several challenges in the near future: upcoming retirements and decisions about new hires, severe

enrolment pressures, especially in the understaffed area of language teaching, and the continuing need to define and build on departmental strengths (p. 2).

**Specific issues:**

1. **Faculty:**

With the Department consisting of eight full-time and three cross-appointed tenure-stream faculty, two full-time faculty on spousal appointments, three non-tenure stream faculty on part-time-appointments, and two full-time and three part-time teaching stream lecturers, the reviewers were inevitably concerned with the heavy reliance on non-continuing faculty (p. 2). They also commented on the apparently low level of external research funding to faculty. Yet they noted that the current level of research activity is nonetheless high and shows 'great levels of energy and promise for the future.' (p. 3) They recommended that the Department 'lay out a clear set of expectations for tenure and promotion for junior faculty upon their arrival' and make sure new faculty are fully aware of the research support available.

2. **Undergraduate programs:**

The reviewers were favourably impressed with the recent restructuring of the East Asian Studies programs, which they believe now 'to be on a sound footing' (p. 3). They endorsed the Department's plan to contain the minor program within three courses and recommended that effective mechanisms be found to keep class sizes down 'to a rational level'.

3. **Language instruction:**

The reviewers were particularly concerned about the provision and prospects of language instruction in East Asian languages, which are, of course, integral to the Department's programs. The language classes are too large, students often have to wait until their second, third or even fourth year to enrol in them, there are too few full-time continuing instructors - 'in fact, there are too few instructors of any sort' - and insufficient training of graduate student teaching assistants. While they raise the creation of a 'language institute' at the U of T as a possible solution to this problem, they make more specific recommendations: expansion of opportunities for undergraduate programs to study abroad; an increase in the number of Japanese language instructors and a greater involvement of the other Japanese faculty in (upper level) language teaching; at least one full-time Korean language instructor; three full-time faculty with expertise in Chinese language teaching; and the solicitation of outside funding for teaching these languages.

4. **Graduate education:**

As already mentioned, the reviewers were impressed with the high quality of the students admitted to the Department's graduate programs. They recommend a comprehensive review of program requirements, including language requirements, in order to 'align [them] with those typically found in North American universities.' The language requirements should include, in addition to advanced proficiency in the modern language of the student's field, 'exposure to the classical language ... , reading knowledge of a second Asian language, and reading knowledge of at least European language ... ' (p. 6). Furthermore, 'Given the frequent need for advanced language study and/or field work ... the [review] Committee recommends that graduate students be allowed the choice of either continuing their funding or stopping their funding clock while studying in East Asia.' (p. 6) They also recommend a minimum three-year appointment for the position of Director of Graduate Studies in the Department.

5. **Future directions:**

The reviewers recommended that the new Chair of the Department should be an internal chair who will be 'familiar with recent developments and equipped to coordinate continuing discussion and decision-making.' (p. 7) This chair will face the challenges imposed by four impending retirements of full-time tenured faculty. As the reviewers note, the faculty closest to retirement work mainly on premodern or traditional texts and languages and are mostly in the China field, while the focus of younger faculty is

'decidedly modern' and largely on Japan and Korea. But the reviewers emphasize that the 'divide [which] runs between premodern China specialists and modern Japan and Korea specialists ... is part of the field of East Asian Studies and should be seen as a productive tension in this context (rather than an insurmountable contradiction)' and a (productive) tension of which most members of the Department are aware (pp. 7-8). In the opinion of the reviewers, the new positions which should have priority and which would both work across and build productively on this divide are Modern Chinese Literature and Premodern Japanese Literature.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:**

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science welcomes the reviewers' enthusiastic endorsement of the changes made in the Department in recent years. He has already appointed a chair who fully satisfies the reviewers' criteria described above. The new Director of Graduate Studies has been appointed for a three-year term. The Chair has also appointed departmental committees which the reviewers also suggested. He is an active member of the Faculty's Language Task Force (see below).

With respect to the reviewers' recommendation for 'a clear set of expectations' for junior faculty, since their report one of the junior faculty has successfully passed the third year review. The Department is encouraging faculty members to make applications for external funding. The Department has also been actively, and so far with success, seeking external funding for the language program.

The new Chair has initiated a thorough review of the curriculum of the Department's graduate program which is currently in progress. The Department and the Faculty agree with the reviewers that there is a need for a more flexible internal graduate funding formula to permit students to acquire proficiency in East Asian and other languages. This is one of the recommendations of the Faculty's Language Task Force, which was established in March 2004 to promote and improve language teaching at the U of T.

Several of the reviewers' concerns have been addressed by the Faculty's Language Task Force. The LTF considered the suggestion of a language institute: having reviewed the practices and experience at major US universities, it has concluded that institutional separation of language teaching is inferior to the integrated teaching of languages, literatures and cultures. It recommends expansion of teaching of foreign languages, especially non-European languages, across the University, including summer reading courses for graduate students as well as advanced and upper-level undergraduate courses. It also recommends increased opportunity for U of T students to study abroad, as envisaged in the Faculty's Stepping Up plan.

Last but not least, the Faculty in its planning process has allocated the Department of East Asian Studies four new positions in 2005-2009: premodern Japanese; modern Chinese literature; Buddhism, probably China; and premodern Chinese studies. The Faculty hopes also to create a new lecturer position in Korean if funds become available.

Faculty of Arts and Science  
February 2005

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Department of Fine Art</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	April 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Science
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
Undergraduate:	B.A., Fine Art (History of Art)–Specialist, Major Minor B.A., Visual Studies–Specialist, Major, Minor
Graduate:	Master's and Ph.D., History of Art Master's, Visual Studies
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Three external reviewers submitting a joint report
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	
International:	Professor Hollis Clayson, Northwestern University Professor Michael Holly, The Clark Art Institute
Canadian:	Professor Will Gorlitz, University of Guelph, Ontario
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS EXTERNAL REVIEW:</b>	1999 (Cluster review with East Asian Studies, Museum Studies, Cinema Studies)
<b>DATE OF OCGS REVIEW:</b>	1998
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Full documentation on the department and its programs and courses was provided, including the Self-Study and CVs of all faculty members.
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	Over the two days of the joint site visit, reviewers met with the Dean and Vice Dean Academic of the Faculty, the Associate Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, the department chair and associate chairs, faculty members, and both undergraduate and graduate students.  The reviewers toured the planned new home (when fully renovated) of the whole department, at 1 Spadina Crescent, where the visual studies program is already housed.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

### Overall assessment:

The reviewers pronounced the department to be “in excellent shape,” “vibrant, flexible,” “the leading art department in Canada,” with a “dynamic” chair (who has since been reappointed for a second term). They were especially impressed by the cooperation between the art history and visual studies groups, the department’s ambitious academic plans, the quality of the faculty, the quality of the graduate program, and the placement of PhD graduates. They commented separately in their report on the art history (AH) and visual studies (VS) programs, but made a number of overall recommendations for further improvements, as well as program-specific recommendations.

### Specific issues:

1. **Space:**  
Support should be secured over the next few years for the renovation of 1 Spadina Crescent, “a wonderful nineteenth century building,” to stabilize and consolidate the department’s accommodation and to provide (as prioritized by the VS faculty) a VS workshop, student gallery/exhibition area, and photo (chemical) dark room. The

workshop would provide students with necessary artmaking expertise, and would require the hiring of a studio/shop technician. Student common room space (undergraduate and graduate) should also be considered. (Report: p. 1 #1; p. 4; p. 7)

2. **Library:**  
The departmental library should be moved to 1 Spadina Crescent, immediately or in the very near future. (Report: p. 1 #2)
3. **Undergraduate teaching:**  
(a) Systematic discussion is needed of the undergraduate curriculum, some specific problems with which (including an absence of discussion sections of courses after 1<sup>st</sup> year) have been voiced by various members of the faculty. (b) Consideration might be given to the elimination of the "archaic" specialist programs, with a focus instead on interdisciplinarity. (c) The requirement that the department offer 2 HUM199Y courses (limited-enrolment seminars for first-year students) limits faculty availability for more specialized FA/VS offerings. (Report: p.7; p. 2 #11)
4. **Graduate teaching:**  
(a) Rapid determination of thesis requirements and timing, for the new (2-year-old) MVS program, is required, with the thesis requirement to include a substantial written component. (b) There should be improved funding of MVS internships, and better defined TA'ships. (c) Augmented PhD student funding would enable the department to compete internationally for the best students and perhaps permit the students to do less TA work and more research. (d) Development of the planned Master's program in curatorial studies is recommended. (Report: p.5 #1, 2, 3; pp. 5-7; p. 2 #4)
5. **Faculty:**  
In the visual studies program specifically, larger-percentage appointments (from 33% to 50%), and two-year terms, are recommended for the prominent visual artists who are temporary part-time faculty members. Sculpture is mentioned as an area in which courses are presently lacking. (Report: p. 3)
6. **Technology:**  
(a) The FADIS (digital imaging) program should be re-examined, given poor image quality, copyright issues, and its classroom-only status. Staff should be stabilized and equipment improved. (b) A resident IT technician should be employed, for both office and studio needs, given the current and increasing emphasis in fine art and visual studies on digital technology. (Report: p. 2 #5; p. 2 #9 and pp. 4-5)
7. **Other:**  
(a) Further administrative staff support (reorganization or addition) is required. (b) More team-teaching by faculty would be desirable, to further interdisciplinary work. (c) Cooperative connections with Toronto art institutions should be developed. (d) Graduate students should participate more in departmental governance. (e) Some minor funding for a lecture series is desirable. (f) Some faculty are concerned that the new program being developed in diaspora studies does not include a visual culture component. (Report: p. 2 #10; p. 2 #6; p. 2 #7; p. 7; p. 2 #8; p. 8)

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:**

1. **Space:**  
The renovation of 1 Spadina Crescent is the Faculty's top-priority fundraising project, and \$1M in private funding has already been secured. The building will be renovated in stages, with the whole department planned to be moved in as soon as possible. Workshop space is indeed needed—but multi-purpose space, not the traditional kind with a resident technician. (The department closed a traditional studio space a few years ago because it no longer served pedagogical needs effectively.) A dark room is already being created.
2. **Library:**



A building users' committee will recommend on space allocations, including for the departmental library, and a timetable will be determined.

3. **Undergraduate teaching:**

- (a) The Department agrees that its undergraduate curriculum needs rethinking and revising. The undergraduate curriculum committee has been reconstituted, and is examining the issues both of required courses and their levels, and of field distribution requirements, the latter taking account of the department's shift from a base in Western art paradigms to an international focus. Discussion sections in courses above the first year level, however, while desirable, are not possible given present resources.
- (b) The reviewers did not realize that specialist programs both are a key part of departmental curricula throughout the Faculty and take up only about half of the courses in a student's FA or VS program, leaving a good deal of room for interdisciplinarity. (Also students wanting greater program flexibility can opt to take double majors.) The department is considering further differentiation of the specialist program from the major.
- (c) HUM 199Y courses are a key component of the academic experience offered to first-year students in the Faculty; all departments are required to offer 2 of such courses, taught by ongoing academic staff, and the Faculty believes this to be a reasonable requirement, which brings first-year students into close contact not only with the professorial staff but also often with new areas of study.

4. **Graduate teaching:**

- (a) Glitches perceived by the reviewers in the MVS program, which was in its first year of operation at the time of their visit are being solved as the program develops. A substantial thesis writing component is not, however, necessary, given the writing-intensive nature of the students' course work, which emphasizes critical writing and contemporary theory.
- (b) The department continues to work on the funding of internships in a variety of ways: e.g., through summer teaching, through accommodation and per-diem at art centres abroad, and through fundraising for bursaries. TA'ships have been regularized.
- (c) Funding packages for the recruitment of excellent graduate students is indeed a problem; although the University offers guaranteed funding to admitted students, top US universities can offer much more, and art history field work is an added cost for PhD students. The department will continue to explore ways in which offers might be made more attractive and field work better supported.
- (d) Plans for the curatorial Master's program are well underway, and both UTM and the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design are participating in the discussions.

5. **Faculty:**

The number of temporary part-time faculty in VS, at current appointment percentages, is not out of proportion to the number of ongoing tenured/teaching faculty; to change the VS percentages would create an imbalance. VS is also gaining .4 of a position, and making another .5 appointment, during the current 5-year planning cycle. Sculpture is not absent from the present program; rather, it is addressed through new media and through theoretical concerns, rather than in a traditional workshop manner. (Canadian art and architectural history appointments have recently filled gaps in those areas.)

6. **Technology:**

- (a) The Department plans to improve FADIS image quality through better projection equipment and "smart" classrooms when its operations are consolidated at 1 Spadina Crescent. The scanning position has been stabilized for a few years.
- (b) Ways to fund all or part of an IT technician are being explored; IT is certainly a central and increasingly important aspect of FA and VS pedagogy.

7. **Other:**

- (a) Administrative staff support is a critical issue throughout the Faculty. Space planning for consolidated FA/VS departmental operations at 1 Spadina Crescent

will take into account the best space configurations for efficient and effective use of staff resources.

- (b) Team teaching would not be easily achieved in the department without the expending of scarce resources on staff coordinator(s); faculty cooperative efforts of this kind, promoting interdisciplinarity, are more effectively made use of in student project supervision, in departmental colloquia and workshops, and in individual faculty contributions to extra-departmental undergraduate interdisciplinary programs (e.g., Canadian studies).
- (c) The department already works with a number of arts institutions in Toronto (e.g., the ROM, AGO, Power Plant): in curating, exhibiting, teaching from exhibits, arranging internships, etc. Expanded relationships, however, are always a desiderata.
- (d) Students sometimes may wish to focus on their academic work rather than to become involved in governance.
- (e) The department has 4 endowed lectures or lecture series, and would prefer to work on consolidating and improving the funding for what already exists rather than adding on another series.
- (f) Fine Art is now participating in the diaspora studies program, which had just begun development in April 2004.

Faculty of Arts & Science  
February 2005

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Department of French</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	February 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Science
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergraduate:</b>	B.A.: French Language & Literature–Specialist, Major French Language & French Linguistics–Specialist, Major Second Language Learning (French)–Major French as a Second Language–Minor French Translation–Minor French Studies–Minor French Cultural Studies–Minor
<b>Graduate:</b>	M.A., Ph.D., in French Literature/Linguistics. The department also participates in collaborative graduate programs in Book History and Print Culture, Semiotics, and Women's Studies
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Three external reviewers, submitting a joint report
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International:</b>	Mary Jean Green, Dartmouth College
<b>Canadian:</b>	Marc Angenot, McGill University Douglas Walker, University of Calgary
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS EXTERNAL REVIEW:</b>	1999 (Cluster review with German, Italian, Spanish & Portuguese, and Slavic)
<b>DATE OF OCGS REVIEW:</b>	1997-98
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The reviewers were provided with the Self-Study, full documentation on the department and its programs and courses, including the CVs of all faculty members.
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	Over the two days of the joint site visit, reviewers met with the Dean and Vice Dean Academic of the Faculty, the Associate Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, the department chair and associate chairs and undergraduate advisor, the former chair, the director of the Centre for Comparative Literature, faculty members from all of French linguistics, language study, and literature, faculty from the Helvetius and de Graffigny research projects and from the Sable Centre, and both undergraduate and graduate students.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

#### Overall assessment:

The reviewers call the department one “preeminent” in research, which “trains its graduates to assume faculty positions and take leadership roles in universities throughout English Canada.” It is the only French department in Anglophone Canada to be able to offer real breadth of curriculum, and must maintain this breadth to fulfil its “national role” in French studies.

#### Specific issues:

##### 1. Appointments:

The reviewers recommend 5 appointments as a minimum, to replace retiring faculty. The specific areas, all but the fifth in danger of vanishing from the department over the next

few years, are medieval studies, Francophone literatures (perhaps with a Caribbean focus), 19<sup>th</sup> century, film, and French as a second language (a lecturer position).

2. **Current faculty:**  
Especially strong faculty areas at present include linguistics, and contemporary French and Quebec literature and theory. These provide continuity, and train students in areas of increasing educational demand.
3. **Undergraduate program:**  
The major programs are thriving; and the cultural studies courses, given in English, admirably reach out to the wider university community. The department's newly-developed web-based placement test is a welcome innovation for language teaching, and should be made available to other universities. Language study otherwise, however, needs some attention. Graduate students, who do much of the language teaching, require more training in language instruction. Study abroad opportunities should be increased, and especially low-cost study programs (of one term or two) through universities in Quebec. (But although some students would like increased work in translation, the department should avoid offering more in this area since both Ottawa and York offer translation programs.)
4. **Graduate education:**  
Graduate students praise the department highly, but have constructive suggestions with which the reviewers agree: that all centuries and a full range of theories should be available for study and research, that assistantship workloads should be more evenly spread, and that there be more training for language teaching. The department's graduate program, however, overall is "in excellent health."
5. **Relations with other units:**  
Relations are strong with units such as Linguistics, and (with retirements needing to be replaced) with the Centre for Medieval Studies, Caribbean Studies, and Cinema Studies. Relations with OISE should be further developed, given that many students in the department wish to become teachers. Other areas suitable for collaboration are Comparative Literature, Women's Studies, and Canadian Studies.
6. **Department administration:**  
The department is well structured, and works collaboratively and harmoniously. A new chair should be chosen who will maintain this productive harmony.
7. **Facilities and support staff:**  
Facilities, including a linguistics laboratory, are very good, and support staff are praised. Additional office and research space, and graduate student space, would be desirable.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:**

The Dean is pleased with the strongly positive review of the Department of French, which rightly points to the strength and national importance of the department in both teaching and research.

1. **Appointments:**  
The department has been allocated 9.6 appointments over the next 5 years (which will result in 20.2 departmental faculty by the end of this planning period, in 2009) : including appointments in all but one area (film) of the areas of concern to the reviewers, with film also still a joint appointment possibility. The department is also seeking to involve experts from other departments and universities on its graduate thesis committees where appropriate, and to cross-list useful graduate courses from other academic units, in order to strengthen its breadth of curriculum and of supervisory capacity.
2. **Current faculty:**  
The Dean agrees that the department has special strength in the fields noted by the reviewers, along with great breadth of expertise across French studies generally.

3. **Undergraduate program:**  
In language teaching, the department is continuing to develop the language placement test and will soon make it available to other universities; and it is exploring ways to reduce the size of learning groups and continuously to monitor student progress. It is also working to develop financially-accessible exchange programs with Francophone universities in Canada, the Caribbean, and Europe. Graduate student training in language teaching is being strengthened through a series of weekly pedagogical seminars; and the department will work with other language departments on campus to develop joint courses in language teaching. The department does not intend to move further into translation studies.
4. **Graduate education:**  
The department's size does not permit it always to offer courses from all centuries and over the full range of theories, but it is monitoring its offerings to try to ensure as much course breadth as possible. The workloads of graduate student assistants are being examined, and new ways of monitoring them are being explored. Consideration is being given to the creation of a new academic administrative position of Coordinator of Graduate Assistants. For training in language teaching, see above.
5. **Relations with other units:**  
The department currently cooperates closely with both Comparative Literature and Cinema Studies (e.g., in cross-appointed professors and cross-listed courses), and is exploring ways in which to strengthen current collaboration with OISE, Canadian Studies, and Women's Studies. Cooperation also exists with undergraduate programs at Victoria College (Semiotics, Literary Studies) and at St. Michael's College (Book & Media Studies) and with the Book History graduate program.
6. **Department administration:**  
Although the department's current structure works well, it requires extensive faculty time on committees; and more streamlined decision-making procedures are now being considered, which will reduce time expenditures while still maintaining collegiality and collaboration. An interim chair is in place for 2004-05; a new chair's term will begin 1 July 2005.
7. **Facilities and support staff:**  
The one area in which improvement is still needed is in space for graduate students, 6 to 8 of whom share each student office. The department has been able, however, over the past year to consolidate and to improve graduate student space: adding to it, purchasing new office furniture, and installing a computer. It will continue to work on the situation cooperatively with St. Michael's College.

Faculty of Arts & Science  
February 2005

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Department of History</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	April 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergraduate:</b>	B.A., Specialist, Major and Minor in History; Specialist in History and Political Science. Participation in International Relations Program and several other interdisciplinary undergraduate programs
<b>Graduate:</b>	M.A., Ph.D.; collaborative M.A. programs in Ethnic and Pluralism Studies, International Relations, South Asian Studies, and Women's Studies
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Three external reviewers, submitting a joint report
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International:</b>	Carol Lansing, Professor of History, University of California, Santa Barbara R. Bin Wong, Professor of History, University of California, Irvine
<b>Canadian:</b>	Gregory S. Kealey, VP (Research) and Professor of History, University of New Brunswick
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS EXTERNAL REVIEW:</b>	1999 (Cluster review with East Asian Studies, Philosophy and Political Science)
<b>DATE OF OCGS REVIEW:</b>	2000
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The reviewers received copies of the Chair's Report (August 2003), the last external review (in the form of the extracts relevant to History in the 1999 cluster review), the OCGS periodic appraisal (1999-2000), the Department's preliminary Stepping Up plan (January 2004), the department's Undergraduate and Graduate Handbooks and departmental newsletter, and cv's of all faculty members of the History Department.
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	During their visit on 7-8 April 2004, the reviewers met first with the Dean and the Acting Vice-Dean for Undergraduate Education and Teaching of the Faculty of Arts and Science, second with the Chair of the Department and then, in a series of meetings over the course of the two days, with six graduate students (three new, three senior), six staff members and 37 faculty members of the Department from the St George, UTM and UTSc campuses.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

### Overall assessment:

The reviewers concluded that 'the University of Toronto can be proud of its History Department which occupies an important place within the university's curriculum and whose professors enjoy major reputations internationally. ... History is by its nature "international" and the University of

Toronto's department has done an effective job in remaking itself to reflect positive trends in the discipline at large. 'The reviewers see 'significant opportunities and challenges confront[ing] the department' but believe the department is in 'excellent condition' to seize the opportunities and meet the challenges. They look forward to 'an exciting future' for the Department, given support from the Faculty and with increased communication and coordination with other units.

**Specific issues:**

1. **Undergraduate education:**

The reviewers noted the excellence of the Department's teaching, as evidenced by the number of FAS Outstanding Teaching Awards to faculty members in recent years, by the teaching of large undergraduate classes by senior faculty and high (and increasing) course enrolments. At the same time they believe the undergraduate curriculum needs restructuring. The present structure, with courses clustered in three geographic divisions, is 'outdated, results in laundry lists of classes and does not reflect faculty research strengths in topics that cross geographic boundaries'.

2. **Graduate programs and graduate students:**

The reviewers agreed with the Department that the graduate program also needs curricular reform and supported the proposals of the Department's Graduate Programs Committee, including especially the introduction of historiography and research courses in each of the major fields. They also commended the creation of the five-year funding package for doctoral students and the Department's recent moves to trim the size of the M.A. admissions. As they say, 'With course offerings better geared to getting students prepared for the comprehensives and these exams more explicitly focused on judging the student's ability to engage in research and teaching, we believe the Ph.D. program will be better able to help students meet normative time expectations for completion of degree.' At the same time, however, they were concerned that since doctoral students in history need to acquire one or more foreign languages, increasingly non-Western European languages, to be competitive on the academic job market, they will need more time to complete their programs in order to gain the desired high level of proficiency.

The reviewers were surprised to find that only 25% of doctoral students held external funding (of 105 Ph.D. students in 2003-4, 15 had SSHRC fellowships, 11 Ontario Graduate Studentships and 2 FCARs). An even smaller proportion (20%) of faculty received external research funding in the same year. 'Both measures of external funding strike the reviewers as low for a Department of U of T's reputation.'

3. **Faculty: recruitment, retention, renewal:**

The reviewers congratulated the History Department on its record of recruitment of strong faculty in recent years. They noted, however, the current loss of one and probably two China historians, which they found 'troubling'. They also noted the large number of impending retirements (up to 26 between 2004 and 2010), which will necessitate a large number of appointments if the current strength of the faculty in research and teaching is to be maintained. These replacements will be needed at UTM and UTSc as well as St George and will require more and better coordination in planning, hiring and graduate teaching across the three campuses than they could observe.

4. **Departmental Governance:**

The reviewers noted that the decision-making process in a large department is not transparent and thought it could be improved, though they 'fe[lt] unable to recommend strongly any specific set of procedural reforms'. While younger faculty members often feel left out of decision-making, others, notably women and members of visible minorities' feel unduly burdened with administrative tasks; this is 'the ironic result of the Department's energetic [and successful] efforts to recruit women and minorities.'

5. **Internationalization:**

Looking to the future the reviewers recommended world history as a focus for departmental integration, in line with the Department's increased internationalization in

recent years. They suggested the Department take advantage of its existing strengths. For instance, 'a China appointment in the "medieval" period could look for a scholar who could broaden the Medieval Studies strengths of the university and create the beginning of a world history foundation for medieval history'. In 'the "international relations" area which has grown from being a subject of diplomatic history to being one that embraces social, cultural and economic history dimensions ... [and] international relations within Africa and Asia as well as their relations with the West' the most recent hire in international relations is already 'a good first step' in this direction. Some of the recent thematic concerns of new faculty in gender, cultural and post-colonial studies could also be related to issues of world history.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:**

The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science is pleased at the reviewers' assessment of the current strength and bright future prospects of the Department of History. The Department agrees with the reviewers on the need to restructure the undergraduate and graduate curricula: the process of revision was well underway by the time of the reviewers' visit and the department is now discussing specific proposals to bring forward in the 2005-06 curriculum approvals process.

The reviewers' estimate of external grants to faculty is in fact too low, but the low level of external funding of graduate students will have to be addressed by increased efforts to help them compete successfully for external awards. The Faculty agrees there is a need for a more flexible internal graduate funding formula to permit students to acquire proficiency in the less commonly taught languages, as recommended by its Language Task Force in March 2005.

The Department shares the reviewers' concern with faculty retention issues, especially when losses are concentrated in a particular area, but believes that the retention problem is more acute than the reviewers realized since a large number of the new faculty have 'trailing spouses' and may not want to stay at the U of T if their spouses cannot find permanent positions in the GTA. The Dean's Office is endeavouring to find ways to mitigate such retention problems across the Faculty of Arts and Science.

The Department is reviewing its constitution to recognize the new tricampus arrangements and improve coordination between the three units. It also intends to adopt some of the best practices identified in the report of the recent Faculty Task Force on Governance.

With respect to faculty renewal in the Department of History the Faculty in its Stepping Up planning process has allocated History eight new positions on the St George campus in the years 2005-9. In fields including French, US, Japanese, Canadian, African, Aboriginal and Transnational history, these are intended both to replace senior faculty as and when they retire and to develop the Department's presence in new and increasingly important areas of historical study. This will maintain the size of the department, but does not allow for any growth, the consequence of severe funding constraints.

Faculty of Arts and Science  
February 2005



## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Department of Spanish &amp; Portuguese</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	May 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean of the Faculty of Arts & Science
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergraduate:</b>	B.A., Spanish--Specialist, Major, Minor B.A., Portuguese--Specialist, Major, Minor (The Department is also a major participant in the extra-departmental Ibero-American Studies major and minor programs.)
<b>Graduate:</b>	M.A., Ph.D., in Spanish. 3 areas of specialization: Spanish Peninsular Literature, Spanish American Literature, Hispanic Linguistics (The Department also participates in collaborative graduate programs in Editing Medieval Texts and Women's Studies.)
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Three external reviewers, submitting a joint report.
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International:</b>	Prof. Jorge Guitart, SUNY--Buffalo Prof. David K. Jackson, Yale University Prof. Patricia Graves, Columbia University
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS EXTERNAL REVIEW:</b>	1999 (Cluster review with French, German, Italian, and Slavic)
<b>DATE OF OCGS REVIEW:</b>	1997
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Full documentation on the department and its programs and courses was provided, including the Self-Study and CVs of all faculty members.
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	Over the two days of the joint site visit, reviewers met with the Dean and Vice Dean Academic of the Faculty, the Associate Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, the department chair, groups of faculty and students (both undergraduate and graduate) and individual faculty members.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

#### Overall assessment:

The reviewers commend the department on its "health and vibrancy," "collegial atmosphere, and powerful sense of shared mission." The department has created four broad areas of coverage--Spanish and Portuguese Languages, Hispanic Linguistics, Medieval and Early Modern Textuality, and Modern Luso-Hispanic Cultural Studies--which allow it, despite its size, both to display its traditional historical strengths and also to develop more recent important areas of study. Its commitment to Portuguese, in particular, is impressive; and it has also maintained a commitment to language training, along with its training of future academics for the discipline. The reviewers note that their recommendations are aimed at improving what is already a strong and exciting department, with a productive, dynamic faculty, many of whom are young, actively engaged at a high level in research. Seven tenure-stream and three term appointments have been made over the past seven years.

### Specific issues:

1. **Appointments:**

The reviewers recommend a change in the department's prioritization of areas for new appointments: placing first, instead of a joint appointment with Comparative Literature, a full appointment in Latin American literature (to strengthen Latin American and Luso-Hispanic cultural studies) with emphasis on Brazil (rather than on the US Hispanic diaspora). (Rec. 1) They agree that Hispanic linguistics and nineteenth-century transatlantic studies should be the next two priorities, the 2<sup>nd</sup> of them strengthening interdisciplinarity and theoretical focus. (Rec. 2)

2. **Current faculty:**

The reviewers suggest that, although the junior faculty are happy at Toronto, they may be overburdened in having to "serve two masters" through joint appointments which require their efforts in two academic units. They recommend a reconsideration of joint appointments. (Rec. 3)

3. **Undergraduate program:**

The Spanish program, its faculty, and its students, are praised as of high quality. More Peninsular and Latin American studies would be desirable, and also more courses of specialization taught in Spanish or Portuguese, and more upper-level language conversation courses. Courses taught in Spanish and in Portuguese should not become second to courses taught in English (Rec. 4). The reviewers recommend consideration of the development of more upper-level specialized courses for majors and specialists. (Rec. 5) They also recommend the reduction of class sizes in language courses (especially in first year) and an ongoing teaching-stream position of language program director. Language teaching needs to become more coordinated and professionalized. (Rec. 6) They commend the department for teaching grammar in its language program.

The Portuguese program is "unique in Canada," well-structured, and drawing strength from the Portuguese community in Toronto (one of the largest immigrant Portuguese communities in the world). It also serves both the medieval/early modern and the Latin American groups in the department. Faculty teaching in the program should not be diverted by heavy advising obligations, and the department's obligation to offer two first-year seminars each year might be reduced to allow for more advanced Portuguese courses. The current visiting Lecturer position should become an ongoing position, and Portuguese staffing fixed at four positions to stabilize the program (Rec. 7).

The Ibero-American Studies interdisciplinary program, directed by the current chair of Spanish & Portuguese, is felt by both the department and the reviewers to be moribund. The department advocates that it become a Latin American program in separate quarters; the reviewers, seeing the program as a special opportunity, recommend that the department consider retaining and reinvigorating it as one of its own majors, as perhaps Latin American and Transatlantic Studies with two possible tracks for undergraduates; the students would extend their work into the social sciences, but still have a departmental home. Any separate program resources would be added to the department. (Rec. 8)

4. **Graduate education:**

Students are happy with the program, and especially with recent hirings and with the graduate funding packages. The reviewers feel improvements could be made in four areas. (a) Graduate students should be given adequate training in pedagogy, through initial orientation and then ongoing training, assessment, and workshops. Use of students' teaching experience should also be optimized. (Rec. 9) (b) Program restructuring should be considered, including for the comprehensive examination and the thesis proposal, to reduce students' heavy workload pressures from both teaching and course work. (Rec. 10) (c) Professional development should be enhanced, through measures such as workshops on thesis development and the job market. (Rec. 11) (d) Funding is needed for students to do research travel, language study, and conference attendance. (Rec. 12)

The strength and uniqueness of the undergraduate program in Portuguese provides a natural base for an M.A.; and given student demand, current graduate work in the department on Brazil, and the importance of Brazilian literature in Latin American studies, a field in Luso-Brazilian literature should be added to the M.A. (**Rec. 14**)

5. **Relations with other units:**

Through the work of individual faculty members, relations are strong with Linguistics, French, and the Centre for Comparative Literature, although staffing contributions to the Centre reduce departmental staffing. Greater involvement in the prestigious Centre for Medieval Studies would be desirable. The reviewers recommend serious examination of the department's linkages with other units, to further interdisciplinarity and perhaps to attract students from outside the department, but without sacrificing the department's own offerings. (**Rec. 13**)

6. **Department administration:**

The department endeavours not to burden junior faculty with administration, and otherwise largely rotates academic administrative positions. The one problem is the needed rethinking of the Ibero-American Studies program (see above).

7. **Facilities and support staff:**

The situation is very good, although the emphasis on technology in the classroom is not yet fully supported by what is available. Support staff are highly praised.

**ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:**

The reviewers have recognized the high quality of the Department of Spanish & Portuguese, and the department and Dean have considered their perspectives and recommendations carefully.

Although the reviewers are not enthusiastic about cross-appointments, the department and Faculty remain committed to such appointments, in part as a means of strengthening the interdisciplinarity and inter-unit collaboration which is a focus of the provostial Stepping UP five-year plan. Extensive consultations have ensured that a joint appointment with Comparative Literature in Latin American literature will serve the needs of both units. Cross-appointments in general should, however, be regularly reviewed to ensure that both the appointees and the units concerned are being well-served by the arrangements. (**Recs. 1, 3**) The reviewers, department, and Dean are in agreement on other new-appointment priorities. (**Rec. 2**)

The undergraduate curriculum has undergone extensive review and renewal over the past five years. The department has developed upper-level courses suitable for high enrolments (e.g., in cultural studies), and now plans to introduce, over three years, limited-enrolment courses for majors and specialists in Spanish. All new courses are taught in the target language, and many are non-traditional and interdisciplinary. There are no plans to introduce more courses taught in English. (**Recs. 4, 5**). The department also recognizes the need for improved training of graduate assistants and instructors teaching in undergraduate language courses; it is currently reviewing the training it provides, consulting with graduate students, and examining best practices in other units. Starting in 2006-07 it will introduce a required graduate half-course in second-language pedagogy. (**Rec. 9**) The department believes that improved training, and greater use of its present standing committee for language instruction, rather than use of a language teaching coordinator (an American university norm), will make its language teaching more effective and also keep tenure-stream faculty in the language classroom (a Toronto norm praised by the reviewers). (**Rec. 6**)

The Portuguese undergraduate program is at present well-served by the visiting Lecturership which has been provided annually by the Instituto Camoes since 1981. The Instituto is prepared to continue the arrangement, and to redefine it as best suits the department's needs. The Stepping UP complement plan approved for the department includes 2.6 new positions, in a context where the department will experience 4 retirements; resources at this time do not permit additional appointments, but 1.6 of the new positions may support Portuguese studies, depending on the terms in which the positions are advertised and the applicant pools. Consideration will be given, as new appointments are made, as to whether a request to the Ontario Council on Graduate

Studies for new field approval in Luso-Brazilian literature would be favourably received. (**Recs. 7, 14**)

In the Stepping UP plan the department proposed to review all aspects of its graduate programs: including course requirements, the comprehensive examination, supervisory practices, etc.; and in 2004-05 a committee of both faculty and graduate students is examining these issues. Workshops for graduate students on preparation for the profession have begun; and the department already has an ongoing fund to support graduate students in short-term research travel. Fundraising for conference travel will be explored. (**Recs. 10, 11, 12**).

The Faculty's Stepping UP plan proposes, with full departmental support, to make Ibero-American Studies—which is presently a Faculty, not departmental, program, though directed by the same faculty member who chairs the department—part of an interdisciplinary new Centre in Latin American Studies. This will ensure the interdisciplinarity strength of the program, which is currently too dependent on Spanish & Portuguese, and allow it also to develop other resource bases. (**Rec. 8**)

The department's Stepping UP five-year plan calls for collaboration and interdisciplinary initiatives with Comparative Literature, French, and Linguistics, and with the new Centre in Latin American Studies, and for involvement in the planned new undergraduate three-campus program in diaspora and transnational studies. Ongoing collaborative and interdisciplinary arrangements bring strength and renewal to the department, although care must always be taken not to allow such arrangements to draw resources unwisely from the department's central programs in Spanish and Portuguese. (**Rec. 13**)

Faculty of Arts & Science  
February 2005

## **School of Graduate Studies**

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT/PROGRAM:</b>	<b>Collaborative Program in Addiction Studies (CoPAS)</b> Division IV, School of Graduate Studies  Collaborating Departments: Adult Education and Counseling Psychology, Anthropology, Biomedical Engineering, Criminology, Information Studies, Medical Science, Pharmaceutical Science, Pharmacology, Psychology, Public Health Sciences, Social Work and Sociology.  <b>DATE:</b> May 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean, School of Graduate Studies
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	Master of Science (M.Sc.) Master of Health Science (M.H.Sc.) Master of Arts (M.A.) Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Prof. Umberto De Boni, Associate Dean, Division IV (Life Sciences) – Chair Prof. Rodney White, Director, Collaborative Program of Environmental Studies
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	n/a
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	March 1996, Internal Review
<b>DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:</b>	May 1998
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The Director's Report, September 15, 2003 Program website
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	The reviewers met after they had reviewed the Director's report.

This was a seven-year review, commissioned by SGS, and coordinated with an OCGS appraisal:

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

- The data indicates that a decline in the number of master's students admitted during the last three years and also shows that no Ph.D. students have been admitted during this same period.
- The reviewers note that it is difficult to see, either from the web site or the SGS Calendar entry, what components of the program the common intellectual activity of the CoPAS, although these components are central to collaborative programs.
- The program does provide opportunities for faculty to consult on research questions.

Recommendation #1: The Collaborative Program in Addiction Studies should be continued for another two years, until June 30, 2006, a time coincident with the outcome of the 2005/2006 OCGS Review of the Program.

Recommendation #2: In the near future, and especially in view of the preparation of the brief required for the OCGS Review of the CoPAS in 2005/2006, several issues must be addressed. These include:

- A clear statement for the rationale for the program and a statement for the justification of its continuation to study issues related to the (presumably) increasing social burden related to addictions. The report as presented lacks a "Sense of Mission" of the program. A list of "challenges to be met" should be included in the mission statement.
- The nature and source(s) of resources, including administrative support, required for the CoPAS need to be clearly identified, including the source of release time, if any, for the Director. It is not stated whether the participation of departments is restricted to contributions to teaching or whether it also involves some financial support.
- It should be more clearly stated to what extent the participating departments, other than the Department of Public Health Sciences, which is evidently a major contributor to the program, are involved in the life of the program, other than providing students and faculty. It should also be stated whether any of the participating departments contribute space to the program, space wherein interaction between students and faculty is facilitated. If collaborations have resulted from the participation of departments in the program, they should be identified.
- The continued participation of Departments that have failed to contribute students to the program or did not contribute to teaching in courses identified by the program, should be clearly justified
- The program should endeavor to track the career paths of its graduates.
- Web-sites and links among departments, which participate in the program, require to be updated
- Time to degree statistics should be provided for both the length of time that a student is enrolled in his/her home department, as well as time registered in the Collaborative Program.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

1. The Collaborative Program in Addiction Studies should be continued until the end of the next OCGS appraisal of the Program.
2. Recommendation #2 of the Review Committee should be carefully addressed in preparation for the upcoming OCGS appraisal.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT/PROGRAM:</b>	<b>Collaborative Program in Biomedical Engineering</b> Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  Collaborating Departments: Biomedical Engineering; Biochemistry; Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry; Dentistry; Electrical and Computer Engineering; Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology; Materials Science and Engineering; Mechanical and Industrial Engineering; Medical Science; Pharmaceutical Sciences; Physics; Physiology; and Rehabilitation Science
<b>DATE:</b>	May 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean, School of Graduate Studies
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	Master of Applied Science (M.A.Sc.) Master of Science (M.Sc.) Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Prof. Grant Ferris, Associate Dean, Division III (Physical Sciences) – Chair Prof. Gale Moore, Director, Knowledge Media Design Institute Prof. Richard Bailey, Director, Collaborative Program in Geology and Physics
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b> International Canadian	n/a
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	This was the first review, as the Collaborative Program in Biomedical Engineering was approved to commence by OCGS in June 1998.
<b>DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:</b>	N/A
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The Director's Report, December 7, 2003
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	The reviewers met after they had reviewed the Director's report.

This was a three-year review commissioned by SGS to be conducted after the first three years of operation of a program to ensure that the program is meeting expectations and will be in acceptable shape when an OCGS appraisal occurs.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

- The reviewers note that the operation of the collaborative program and the degree program in Biomedical Engineering have converged to the point where they are "almost indistinguishable" from each other.
- Enrolment growth is also stronger for the Biomedical Engineering degree program.
- The demographics of the home unit have changed – more students are entering from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and far fewer from medical and other departments. This may be a reflection of some students opting for direct entry into the Biomedical Engineering program as opposed to the collaborative program.
- The collaborative program does provide students with the opportunity to explore a broad interdisciplinary area at the same time providing common experiences.



**Recommendations:**

- The Biomedical Engineering Collaborative Program should be continued in anticipation of a formal review by the Ontario Council of Graduate studies in 2005/2006.
- Better distinction should be made between the Biomedical Engineering Collaborative Program and the degree program of the Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering, particularly in terms of purpose, operation, courses and faculty.
- The calendar entry for the Biomedical Engineering Collaborative Program needs to be revised and corrected.
- Small enrollments in some collaborating departments, and their continuing participation, need to be addressed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

This program continues to have a healthy enrolment of excellent students, with active participation from most collaborating departments. This continued participation in the collaborative program has continued in spite of the development of new 'competing' degree programs in the Institute. The collaborative program clearly continues to serve a useful purpose for students in the collaborative units. It is recommended that the program continue in its present form.

The number of reported graduates from the Ph.D. stream of the collaborative program is very low. There is a suspicion that the reported numbers may not be accurate. Since SGS is not able to track these data, it is essential that the collaborative program itself track these numbers. SGS will further evaluate the practicality of doing the tracking centrally at SGS.

It is also recommended that the Director should track and report employment outcomes for graduates of this program.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT/PROGRAM:</b>	<b>The Collaborative Program in Environment and Health</b>  Collaborative Departments: Geography, Institute of Medical Science, and Public Health Sciences, in conjunction with the Institute for Environmental Studies
<b>DATE:</b>	May 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean, School of Graduate Studies
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	Masters (M.A.) Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Prof. Grant Ferris, Associate Dean, Division III (Physical Sciences) – Chair Prof. Gale Moore, Director, Knowledge Media Design Institute Prof. Richard Bailey, Director, Collaborative Program in Geology and Physics
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	n/a
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	November 24, 2003
<b>DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:</b>	n/a
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The Director's Report, November 24, 2003
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	The reviewers met after they had reviewed the Director's report.

This was a three-year review commissioned by SGS to be conducted after the first three years of operation of a program to ensure that the program is meeting expectations and will be in acceptable shape when an OCGS appraisal occurs.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

The program is considered reasonably successful in the opinion of the review committee. However, enrolment in the program is modest (25 students over 5 years) and there was discussion as to whether this was a result of underfunding of the program. The program offers students a 'rich assortment of common intellectual activities' through the Institute of Environmental Studies.

#### Recommendations:

- The Collaborative Program in Environment and Health should be continued in its present form.
- The Program Committee needs to carefully assess the budgetary needs of the collaborative program relative to student demand for the program.
- Potential sources of new program support, both within and outside the University, should be identified with the Program Committee.
- The Program Committee should clarify why they are concerned about the viability of the program.

### ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

The Collaborative Program should be continued in its present form at least until the upcoming OCGS appraisal.

The collaborating departments must be fully engaged in a discussion about the place of this Program in their broader academic objectives. If funding of the Collaborative Program is identified as a problem, collaborating units must reaffirm their desire to keep the Program running and ensure that an adequate resource base is provided.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT/PROGRAM:</b>	<b>Collaborative Program in Ethnic and Pluralism Studies</b> Division II, School of Graduate Studies  Collaborating Departments: Anthropology, Geography, History, Industrial Relations, Nursing Science, Political Science, Religion, Russian and East European Studies, Social Work and Sociology.
<b>DATE:</b>	November 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean, School of Graduate Studies
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	Master of Science (M.Sc.) Master of Arts (M.A.) Master of Nursing (M.N.) Master of Industrial Relations (M.I.R.) Master of Social Work (M.S.W.) Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Seven-year review coordinated with an OCGS appraisal:  Prof. Sandra Acker, Associate Dean, Division II (Social Sciences) – Chair Prof. Shahrzad Mojab, Director, Collaborative Program in Women's Studies
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	n/a
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	1997
<b>DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:</b>	1999
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The Director's Report, November 28, 2003, and the Annual Report, April 30, 2004.
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	The reviewers met on July 22, 2004, after they had reviewed the Director's report.

This was a seven-year review, commissioned by SGS, and coordinated with an OCGS appraisal:

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

The program appears successful and intellectually stimulating. There is a steady demand, although relatively small, and a steady number of graduates from this program. Ten graduate unites are currently members of the program. There has been extensive provision of guest lecturers and conferences. The core course looks strong and there are a number of approved courses from which students may select. Administration of the program is good. However, the reviewers note that some units have provided very few recruits and there have only been a handful of doctoral students in the program.

#### Recommendations:

- The Collaborative Program in Ethnic and Pluralism Studies should be continued until the next OCGS periodic appraisal, scheduled for 2006-2007.
- The list of participating units should be reviewed to see whether any who produce very small numbers of enrolled students should be discontinued.

- Talks with OISE/UT departments should explore whether there are potential units that could be added to the program and/or identify courses that could be approved for students in the program.
- Consideration should be given to additional integrative activities for students such as an e-mail conference and a student research conference.
- Alternative sources of funding should be explored.
- Wording in the SGS Calendar regarding doctoral program requirements “including master’s courses” could be reworded to be clearer (the web site wording is better).

## **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

The Committee of Deans recommends that the Collaborative Program in Ethnic and Pluralism Studies be continued until completion of the next OCGS appraisal scheduled for 2006-2007.

The Director should investigate the expansion of participation in the program, possibly to include graduate units in OISE/UT and the Rotman School of Management. If, upon expansion, the number of interested students exceeds program capacity, admission to the collaborative program could be limited through a competitive application process.

The Program Committee should review the formal integrative activities of the program with a view to ensuring, in particular, that Ph.D. students are adequately engaged for the duration of their programs. The structure of other collaborative programs may provide useful models.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT/PROGRAM:</b>	<b>Industrial Relations, Centre for (CIR)</b> School of Graduate Studies
<b>DATE:</b>	May 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean, School of Graduate Studies
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	Master of Industrial Relations Ph.D. in Industrial Relations
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Donald Cormack, Vice-Dean, SGS (Chair) R. Gartner, Criminology M. Gunderson, Industrial Relations & Economics H. Gunz, Industrial Relations & UTM B. Langille, Law F. Mathewson, Policy Analysis C. Mulhern, Industrial Relations (graduate student) M. O'Neill-Karch (Woodsworth College) E. Perry, Industrial Relations
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International</b>	Prof. Harry Katz, New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations Prof. Bruce Kaufman, Department of Economics, Georgia State University These external reviewers were brought in for the OCGS appraisal. Their report of November 2003 was used rather than bring in new reviewers for the SGS review.
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	1996-1997
<b>DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:</b>	2002-2003 academic year.
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Director's Report, May 2003 OCGS Consultants' Report, November 2003
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	Review Committee meetings.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

The reviewers note that the program is of exceptional quality and ranked CIR as the "top industrial relations program in Canada and one of the best five to six in North America". Both academic programs are highly selective and register the cream of the crop of students. The Centre's excellent library and information service is a key element in the success of the Centre.

### Specific recommendations:

1. The Centre be continued for another seven year term, with the next review to occur at the time of the next OCGS review of the Centre's programs in 2010;
2. The Industrial Relations Library should continue to be nurtured to ensure that it continues to be a valuable educational and research resource;
3. The Director should work to ensure that developments in industrial relations education on all three campuses are complementary and not competitive;
4. The Director should work to further increase the appointment base of the Centre so as to decrease its critical dependence on the hiring decisions of other units;

5. The Director should investigate how joint activities with UTM and UTSC might allow for program growth, while at the same time maintaining a coherent tri-campus program delivery. The Committee recommends that such growth be delayed until it will be accompanied by increased operating revenue for the Program.

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

1. The Centre be continued until the next scheduled OCGS review of its program in seven years.
2. The Director should investigate program growth with a view to maximizing the use of resources on all three campuses. The Director must also work with other academic units to ensure that appropriate teaching resources continue to be available for delivery of the Centre's programs.
3. The Director should continue to pursue funding initiatives that will allow the expansion of the faculty appointment base in the Centre.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT/PROGRAM:</b>	<b>The Collaborative Program in Integrated Manufacturing</b> Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  Collaborating Departments: Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry, Materials Science and Engineering, Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, and the Faculty of Management's Operations Management Group.
<b>DATE:</b>	May 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean, School of Graduate Studies
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	Master of Engineering (M.Eng.)
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Seven-year review coordinated with an OCGS appraisal:  Prof. Grant Ferris, Associate Dean, Division III (Physical Sciences) – Chair Prof. Gale Moore, Director, Knowledge Media Design Institute Prof. Richard Bailey, Director, Collaborative Program in Geology and Physics
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b> International Canadian	n/a
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	June 3, 1999
<b>DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:</b>	n/a
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	The Director's Report, November 2003
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	The reviewers met on May 27, 2004, after they had reviewed the Director's Report.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

This was a seven-year review, commissioned by SGS, and coordinated with an OCGS appraisal:

#### Recommendations:

- The Collaborative Program in Integrated Manufacturing should continue in its present form.
- The program website needs to be updated.
- The role and participation of the Program Committee should be clarified.

### ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

This program continues to register a modest number of students, limited by the availability of internship opportunities. It is recommended that the program continue in its present form.

It is also recommended that the Director should monitor and report for future program reviews employment outcomes of program graduates as evidence of the value added by the collaborative program.

The majority of program registrants appear to be from the department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering. The Program Committee should be encouraged to promote this program in the collaborating disciplines and incorporate a broader range of internship opportunities for an expanded enrolment.



## **Faculty of Medicine**

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT/PROGRAM:</b>	<b>Department of Medicine</b> Faculty of Medicine
<b>DATE:</b>	September 30 / Oct 1, 2003
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Dean, Faculty of Medicine
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
Undergraduate	Undergraduate medical program
Graduate	Graduate programs offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	- postgraduate medical training - fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	continuing medical education
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	2 reviewers submitting a joint report
<b>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS:</b>	n/a
International	Dr. Lee Goldman Chair, Department of Medicine and Assoc. Dean, Clinical Affairs School of Medicine University of California, San Francisco, California
Canadian	Dr. Lorne Tyrrell Dean, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry University of Alberta Edmonton, Alberta
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	1998
<b>DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:</b>	n/a
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Division Directors Report Undergraduate Medical Education Reports Postgraduate Medical Education Report Student Reports Graduate Education Report Continuing Education Report Research Report Previous review reports / responses Departmental budget Departmental communications Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

On a North American scale, the Department was assessed as ranking within the top quintile of departments of medicine for research performance and among the top ten in public universities.

### Undergraduate Medical Education

- **Overall:** The reviewers consider the Department of Medicine's undergraduate medical education program to be "excellent to outstanding" and receiving appropriate emphasis in the Department's mission.
- **Student Feedback:** Medical students raised several issues in their session with the reviewers.
  - **First Rotation:** Students entering Medicine as their first clinical rotation would like a more thorough orientation and guidance.
  - **Variability in Evaluation on Clinical Rotations / Grade Inflation:** Students were concerned re grade inflation and uniformity in the clinical grading system.

### Postgraduate Medical Education

- **Overall:** The reviewers rate the Department's general and subspecialty postgraduate programs as outstanding.
- **Previous University Affiliation:** The reviewers suggest that the high percentage of UofT graduates in the UofT postgraduate medicine program indicates a bias towards UofT graduates.
- **Balance:** The residents consider that there is a good balance between education and service and between scholarship and 'apprenticeship' activities.
- **Mentoring and Research Exposure:** The residents would like to have the current informal mentoring program formalized and to have increased exposure to research.

### Graduate Programs

- **Educational Mission:** The reviewers consider the Department's three graduate programs (Clinician Scientist, Clinician Educator and Master Teachers Program) to be solid evidence for the Department's strong support of the educational mission. The Programs are applauded as being "innovative, successful and popular".
- **Funding:** Although the residents view the Department's graduate programs very positively, they did express concern about stability of funding for the programs.

### Continuing Education

- **Overall:** Drs. Goldman and Tyrell consider the Department's CE program to be "excellent to outstanding".

### Research

- **Research Productivity and Publication Records:** The reviewers consider that departmental research productivity compares well with that of highly regarded U.S. institutions.
- **Canada Research Chairs:** The reviewers are unclear as to who has control over the CRC Chairs in the clinical departments, and recommend that a transparent policy be developed.
- **Basic/Research Scientists:** Some basic scientists and research scientists registered their insecurity about their lack of tenure and the recent CIHR suspension of senior salary awards.
- **Clinician Scientists and Research Institutes:** The Department's strategic planning process should include a clear articulation of the relationship between clinician scientists and research institute directors.

### Budget

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

### Organizational Structure

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

### Faculty Issues

- **Morale:** *The reviewers found morale amongst faculty and students to be generally outstanding – with faculty being proud of the Department and its leadership and students pleased with their programs.*
- **Funding:** The reviewers note that faculty are concerned that the Department chair needs more control over sources of funding in order for the Department to continue to flourish.
- **Recruitment to Community Hospitals:** Some members of the Department are concerned that the community hospitals are recruiting top faculty candidates away from the academic health centres.

### Vision and Future Challenges

- **Next Chair:** The reviewers recommend that the formulation of a vision for the next five to ten years should be the top priority of the next Department chair.
- **Governance Structure:** The reviewers consider that Dr. Phillipson's good management and vision has gone a long way to resulting in the successful maintenance of the delicate balance among the chair and the hospital-based groupings led by physicians-in-chief.

### Stature of the Department

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

## **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

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

I congratulate all the Department members and the Chair, Dr. Eliot Phillipson, for this extremely positive review in which, on a national level, the reviewers consider the UofT Department of Medicine's collective academic portfolio to rank at the top in Canada – having excellent training and research programs and an impressive array of outstanding research and extramural funding.

I was also pleased that, on a North American scale, the Department was assessed as ranking within the top quintile of departments of medicine for research performance and among the top ten in public universities. The benchmarking here was a helpful contrast with the usual generalities, but also illustrates the challenge of making comparisons.

### Undergraduate Medical Education

- **Overall:** The reviewers high rating of the undergraduate medical education program is a credit to all the involved educators/teachers and the Chair.
- **Student Feedback:** The Department's Undergraduate Medical Education Committee have already started to explore the issues raised by medical students in their session with the reviewers. I encourage continuation of this process.
  - **First Rotation:** The Department of Medicine's Clerkship Committee have already gone a long way towards dealing with this issue by providing a Curriculum Outline and planning for a special orientation for students new to ward medicine.
  - **Variability in Evaluation on Clinical Rotations / Grade Inflation:** I am satisfied that efforts are being made to address student concerns re grade inflation and uniformity in the clinical grading system.

### Postgraduate Medical Education

- **Overall:** It is very satisfying to see that the reviewers rate the Department's general and subspecialty postgraduate programs as outstanding.
- **CRISP:** I am sure the renewal of the centrally delivered component of the curriculum (CRISP) will continue and be well-received by residents.
- **Previous University Affiliation:** The reviewers suggestion that the high percentage of UofT graduates in the UofT postgraduate medicine program indicates a bias towards UofT graduates is refuted by Dr. Phillipson in his response to the reviewers' report - stating that the percentage of UofT graduates in the UofT residency programs is lower than the stats for other Canadian universities. I heartily agree with the Department's policy of accepting the best students, regardless of their prior university affiliation.
- **Balance:** I am pleased to see that the residents consider that there is a good balance between education and service and between scholarship and 'apprenticeship' activities.
- **Mentoring and Research Exposure:** The Department is exploring how it might meet the residents' desires to have the current informal mentoring program formalized and to have increased exposure to research.

### Graduate Programs

- **Educational Mission:** I agree with the reviewers' that the Department's three graduate programs are helping to develop the future academic faculty in Medicine for all of Canada.
- **Funding:** I view the funding as relatively stable and am less concerned.

### Research

- **Research Productivity and Publication Records:** It is gratifying to see that the reviewers consider that departmental research productivity compares well with that of highly regarded U.S. institutions. I agree fully with Dr. Phillipson in his opinion that this success has been due to the collaborative efforts of many who have supported research – faculty, division directors, physicians-in-chief, and departmental practice plans.
- **Canada Research Chairs:** It needs to be understood by all that while hospital-based CRCs are allocated through hospital research institute directors, all nominees require the approval of the Department chair. Market share analyses of federal granting council funding with departmental allocations of CRCs show an excellent correlation. Clinical departments are not being shortchanged.
- **Basic/Research Scientists:** We are all hoping that CIHR will reverse its unpopular decision on senior salary awards, and pressure to that end continues to be exerted by academic administrators across Canada.
- **Clinician Scientists and Research Institutes:** The Department's strategic planning process should include a clear articulation of the relationship between clinician scientists and research institute directors. This would go a long way to alleviating the concerns that clinician scientists feel relative to their ability to garner research institute resources.

### Budget

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

### Organizational Structure

- **Job Descriptions:** *The reviewers quite rightly applaud the fact that departmental job descriptions put education and research portfolios on an equal footing.*
- **Governance - Power Balance:** I agree with the reviewers and Dr. Phillipson that the power balance between the Department chair and the physicians-in-chief is a delicate one that demands "moral suasion" on the part of the chair. As Dr. Phillipson notes, despite the challenges posed by this structure, the Department has flourished in both its education and research programs. Dr. Phillipson outlines alternate governance models that could be considered – a committee of physicians-in-chief replacing the Department chair or the Department chair serving as physician-in-chief for all teaching hospitals. I agree with Dr. Phillipson that both of these models have serious drawbacks and that the status-quo model of the Department chair serving as physician-in-chief at one institution has the most credence. On the other hand, the evolution of AFPs raises more urgent questions about governance. I believe horizontal AFPs organized across institutions by department are clearly superior as the way forward for so-called Phase X, and that the next Chair should be integrally involved in governance of such a horizontal AFP.
- **Governance – Priority Setting:** The reviewers comment that the physicians-in-chief consider that they, not the Department chair, set departmental priorities. In his response to the review report, Dr. Phillipson considers that the true reality in hospitals is that the chair and physicians-in-chief are aligned together with occasional tensions arising with hospital research institute directors. I suggest that the Department would be an even more powerful advocate for colleagues' interests in dealing with hospitals and research institutes if there were a horizontal economic umbrella and 'confederacy'.

### Faculty Issues

- **Morale:** *I am pleased to see that the reviewers found morale amongst faculty and students to be generally outstanding.*
- **Funding:** Dr. Phillipson considers that the development of a horizontal Department-wide AFP would facilitate the Department playing a significant role in allocation of AFP dollars. I agree. My understanding is that hospital CEOs would support more horizontal AFPs, provided that local colleagues are on side and there is continued diligence to align clinical and academic activity with the mission and strategic plans of the host hospitals.
- **Recruitment to Community Hospitals:** I agree with Dr. Phillipson that this is a challenge, but not one that has seriously disadvantaged us. The institution of an academic AFP will address this issue to some extent.

### Vision and Future Challenges

- **Next Chair:** I agree with the reviewers in their recommendation that the formulation of a vision for the next five to ten years should be the top priority of the next Department chair. Dr. Phillipson adds that this plan should include a mechanism to ensure ongoing support of the Department's clinician-scientists.
- **Governance Structure:** I concur with the reviewers' opinion that Dr. Phillipson's good management and vision has gone a long way to resulting in the successful maintenance of the delicate balance among the chair and the hospital-based groupings led by physicians-in-chief. As this balance is precarious and personality dependent, the development of a clearly defined academic strategic plan that is endorsed by all key leaders could minimize the potential for future friction.

### Stature of the Department

- **Canada:** It is not a surprise that the reviewers consider that the academic achievements of the Department rank at the top of all Canadian medical schools.
- **North America:** It is tough to assess research internationally based on external funding without full allowance for publication productivity. Furthermore, as Dr Phillipson notes, the Department's ranking would also have been higher if medical education programs had been fully considered in the analysis.

### Conclusion

The Department of Medicine is a large, complex, and highly successful enterprise. Its legacy of achievement is the result of the commitment and talents of a vast number of individuals, including all the current Departmental members, those in myriad leadership roles, and, not least, the outstanding Chair for the last ten years who will be retiring in a few months, Dr. Eliot Phillipson. Given this positive review, one is reminded that thanks and congratulations are due to scores of colleagues in the Department of Medicine for their ongoing contributions to the Department's mission.

## **University of Toronto at Scarborough**



## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Department of Social Sciences</b> University of Toronto at Scarborough
<b>DATE:</b>	January 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	John Youson, Interim Vice-President and Principal
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	<p><u>Specialist Programs:</u> Anthropology, Medical Anthropology, Political Science, Political Science &amp; Economics for Management Studies and Sociology.</p> <p><u>Major Programs:</u> Anthropology, City Studies, Health Informatics, Health Studies, Human Geography, International Development Studies, International Studies, New Media, Physical &amp; Human Geography, Political Science, Public Policy, Society and Environment and Sociology.</p> <p><u>Minor Programs:</u> Anthropology, Health Studies, Human Geography, International Development Studies, Political Science and Sociology.</p> <p><u>Co-operative Programs:</u> International Development Studies; Social Sciences Co-op (Anthropology, City Studies, Health Studies, International Studies, Public Policy and Sociology).</p>
<b>REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION, INTERNAL:</b>	<p>Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Vice-Dean, Arts and Science (Chair)</p> <p>Ms Michelle Coutinho, Senior Development Officer, Office of Advancement, UTSC (Secretary)</p> <p>Professor Wayne Dowler, History, Humanities, UTSC</p> <p>Professor John Bassili, Psychology, Life Sciences, UTSC</p> <p>Ms Ruth Loudon, Manager, Co-op Science, UTSC</p> <p>Professor Larry Sawchuk, Anthropology, Social Sciences, UTSC</p> <p>Ms Chanel Chung, Undergraduate Student, Social Sciences, UTSC</p>
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	February 29, 2000 External Review
<b>DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:</b>	N/A
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b><i>Guidelines for the Review of Academic Programs and Units (University of Toronto, 2003)</i></b></li> <li>▪ "What have we achieved in the last plan period (2000/02-2003/04)?" Document prepared by Sue Horton for UTSC retreat, October 19-21, 2003</li> <li>▪ Most recent external review of the Department of Social Sciences, prepared by Professors Ralph Matthews and Janet Momsen, February, 2000</li> <li>▪ "Review of the University of Toronto at Scarborough," I.V. Samarasekera, and "Review of the University of Toronto at Scarborough," R. Kasdin, B. Lennox, D. Owrn, both submitted February, 2003.</li> <li>▪ "Self-Study, UTSC Department of Social Sciences: December 1, 2003," prepared by Acting Chair John Hannigan</li> <li>▪ From Sue Horton specific materials compiled for the review document listed above, a list of graduate students advised by faculty at UTSC, prepared fall, 2003</li> <li>▪ Recent curriculum vitae of 21 faculty members of the Department</li> <li>▪ Summary data compiled from all course evaluations since spring, 2000 (25 faculty) based on responses to question 11, "All things considered, performs effectively as a university teacher," prepared by Susan Pfeiffer</li> <li>▪ Summary information regarding research productivity of faculty in the Department (number of books and papers published, graduate students advised, value of research grants), compiled by the Acting Department Chair for Rudy Boonstra, fall, 2003.</li> </ul>

**CONSULTATION PROCESS:** The committee emailed solicitations to receive views of members of the Department (both faculty and staff), students in the Social Sciences and the UTSC community at large. A request for comments also was posted on the UTSC web page.

#### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:**

- The Department has undergone a period of rapid expansion, adding ten new colleagues since 2000-01.
- During the past three years seven programs have either added a co-op option, or have been newly created with a co-op component. These programs are very popular with students.
- Some of the strongest increases in enrolment are being seen in the interdisciplinary programs (e.g. City Studies, Health Studies).
- Despite the research activity and teaching success of the group, a culture of faculty absenteeism seems to pervade the department. It is a concern that this pattern persists, despite the existence of a substantial number of colleagues in each of the disciplines in the Department.
- The Review Committee chose to focus its attention on matters of Departmental management.
- **The Department needs to develop a scholarly vision.** While disciplinary identification is a cornerstone of high quality teaching and research, at the same time it is hoped that faculty members make more progress in accepting the proposition that interdisciplinarity can contribute as well. Effective leadership might employ various approaches to building a stronger sense of shared mission, including: (a) include on each search committee Departmental members from more than one discipline; (b) assign a mentor from within the department to each new faculty member, possibly from a discipline other than their own; (c) find ways to help faculty from different disciplines become familiar with one another's research interests and activities, to get to know one another and (d) convene regular faculty meetings at which meaningful decisions are taken.
- **Undergraduate program delivery is strong, but can be improved.** Students appear to be concerned about the culture of absenteeism among faculty, resulting in the sense among students that their inquiries and attempts to talk with their professors constitute an imposition. It is hoped that the new Chair might construct collegial networks and an attractive infrastructure so that faculty are motivated to spend their days at UTSC.
- In some programs, the link between classroom content and the co-op experience needs to be strengthened. While the UTSC administration has given a high priority to co-op and its expansion, it appears that faculty members in the Department may feel poorly informed about the co-op programs and especially about the operations of the Arts Co-op Office. A more meaningful consultation process between the Chair, UTSC administration and Department faculty members must be established. In the short-term, integrating co-op is clearly a pressing issue. In the longer term, new structures and understandings should become integrated into Departmental culture.
- **The Department should consider adding Economics to its range of disciplines.** Some of the programs offered by the Department need this component to be complete. Reviewers were concerned about the absence of appropriate economic content to programs in Health Studies, City Studies, International Development Studies and others.
- **The culture of the Department should continue to encourage research excellence.** The Department should identify creative ways that research excellence can be supported.
- **More support staff should be hired.** This was a firm recommendation of the Matthews-Momsen external review, yet there has been no action on the matter. Reviewers suggested that a staffing plan should include a review of the responsibilities of all staff and responsibilities should be organized in a fashion that assures a reasonable flow of work throughout the calendar year.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

### **Response of the Chair:**

The Chair notes that over the past year the Department has taken several important steps to address issues raised in the Review. The most important of these has been the preparation of an academic plan within the Stepping Up exercise. The Department's plan contains a scholarly vision in which the four disciplines (Anthropology, Geography, Political Science, and Sociology) are the cornerstones and where hiring is focused on those aspects of core research in each of the disciplines that lie at the intersection of two or more of the social sciences. The Department is committed to maintaining disciplinary programs; however, it is also committed to offering various interdisciplinary programs. The Department plan envisages that individual interdisciplinary programs may come and go, but that the Department is committed to interdisciplinarity as a tool to furthering core research in the four disciplines. The Plan also envisages that the Department will review each interdisciplinary program every few years in order to ensure that the program remains relevant to the research and scholarly interests within the Department as these shift over time.

The Chair has also initiated changes within the Department to encourage and enable greater interaction among the Department's disciplines. Search committees for faculty positions include representatives from each discipline and the focus of academic searches is less on specific disciplines and more on finding someone compatible with most if not all disciplines in the Department. To further encourage a mutual understanding of research and scholarship across the disciplines, the Department created a merit-pay committee, which is composed of one member from each discipline and is charged with assessing research, teaching, and service contributions for all faculty in the Department. Further, the Department has begun to have more Department-wide meetings in addition to the regular discipline meetings. And finally, each new faculty member is now assigned a mentor from a discipline other than their own.

As part of the Growth Plan, the Department requested and received one additional support staff.

The Chair is uneasy about the Review's reference to a "culture of absenteeism". He notes that the Department has very high expectations for publishing and research and gives faculty considerable latitude to engage in scholarship at the locations where they can be the most productive. Notwithstanding this, he agrees that it is important for students to see scholarship in action in the various research spaces around the Department and has been proactive in getting research space assigned to professors who have such needs on campus.

### **Response of the Dean:**

The Dean has read the Report of the Review Committee and the response of the Chair. He is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions and is pleased to see that the Department has made much progress over the past year. He will work closely with the Chair as the Department continues to refine its academic plan and develop an inspiring and cohesive vision. The Dean notes that UTSC academic plan identifies enhancing the undergraduate student experience as one of the campus' highest priorities and initiatives are currently underway to assist all departments in meeting this goal.

## **Provostial Reviews**

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	October 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Vice-President and Provost
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergrad &amp; First Professional Degrees</b>	Bachelor of Arts, Architectural Studies (B.Arch) (with Arts & Science)
<b>Graduate:</b>	Master of Architecture (M.Arch) Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA) Master of Urban Design (MUD)
<b>Diploma/Certificate:</b>	
<b>Continuing Education</b>	
<b>COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Four external reviewers, submitting a jointly-authored report
<b>REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International</b>	Peggy Deamer, Associate Dean, Director of Advanced Studies, Yale School of Architecture Alex Krieger, Professor in Practice of Urban Design, Harvard Design School
<b>Canadian</b>	Patricia Patkau, Professor, School of Architecture, University of British Columbia Stefan Tischer, Director, School of Landscape Architecture, University of Montreal
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Terms of Reference for the Review Faculty Self-Study, 2003-2004 Research Report, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost, 2004 CV of faculty members Faculty Calendar Selection of brochures and newsletters from the Faculty
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	During their two-day visit the review team met with the Provost and Vice-Provost, Academic; the Dean, Associate Deans, members of the faculty, administrative and support staff, representatives from graduate and undergraduate student groups, representatives from cognate divisions (Dept. of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and Depts. of Fine Art and Geography, Faculty of Arts & Science) and representatives from alumni and the professional community.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The reviewers conclude that the Faculty is 'poised for uniqueness in North American architectural education'. In particular, its strengths include the trajectory of facility improvement, the undergraduate and Masters offerings, the general level of student satisfaction. The reviewers suggest that the Faculty should concentrate on communicating its strengths and its uniqueness, and resulting impact on faculty and student recruitment from across North America.

### Academic Programs

**Bachelors Level:** The Bachelor of Arts, Architectural Studies was seen as a 'strong and vital program' by the reviewers. They note that the transition from a professional B.Arch 5-year school to current professional program has been successful. The students appear to benefit from sharing faculty with the graduate program. The streams open to students are appropriate and the

combining of the programs is one of the Faculty's strengths. Clarification of the pre-professional track requires clarification. They suggest that this stream should either be a "1) be a full-fledged pre-professional program (mimicking the standard "4 + 2" professional degree system in the United States) with only the exceptional student *denied* advanced placement or 2) be absorbed into the general design track, in which case students with more architectural ambition will be able to choose extra courses in their major if they so choose, but with no mention or promise of advanced placement."

**Masters Level:** The reviewers were supportive of the creation of advanced programs that would allow for research at a Masters or PhD level. They also supported the creation of additional post-professional degrees. The reviewers noted the Faculty is in a position to attract excellent students and there should be more active recruitment of students. In addition, there should be more interaction between the current three graduate programs.

- Master of Architecture: This program 'seems poised at a threshold of opportunity' and the Faculty should work towards increasing the visibility and identity of the program.
- Master of Landscape Design: The reviewers note this program is 'very strong', however, has a small number of students. They suggest that 24-26 students per year would allow for better programming and improve the academic offerings. There is approval for the initiative to internationalize the program.
- Master of Urban Design: The reviewers identified two issues: 1) the need to attract additional students from North America and 2) to clarify the distinction between this program and the Urban Design program offered within the Planning Department.

**Faculty and staff:** The school is in 'excellent shape' and the new Dean's mission would be to establish a clearer overall pedagogical identity and agenda. The Faculty will have to intensify efforts to attract and retain excellent faculty from diverse backgrounds. The reviewers suggest that it may be helpful to cluster individual research initiative to more programmatic research groups. This may increase communication, better utilize internal and external resources, and strengthen the exposure of individual work. The Faculty needs to be supported in terms of research funding opportunities. Mentoring opportunities for younger faculty should be encouraged.

**Students:** The reviewers noted a sense of general satisfaction of the students with the Faculty. However, they note that students expressed a sense of isolation from the 'larger realm of professional and academic discourse' and lack of communication between the students of different programs. The students noted that more computer equipment could be made available to them. The three-dimensional CAD/CAM equipment is on par with other schools, but the reviewers were not clear as to whether students had access to some of the newer machines.

**Physical Resources:** The reviewers lauded the renovations and new exhibition and library space however note that the Faculty still has serious spatial constraints. In particular, the undergraduate students do not have designated work areas.

## ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

### Dean's response:

The Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design is pleased to have received the report of the External Review panel. Generally speaking, we find their assessment of our current state a persuasive one; we are gratified by their commendation of our efforts, and we welcome their various recommendations for improvements to our programs. Our responses to specific commentaries and recommendations are as follows:

**1: Bachelor of Arts, Architectural Studies:** We propose to examine two opposite strategies to address the issues raised by the reviewers. One strategy would be to intensify the "specialist" track (one suggested means of intensification would be to move the studio component of the specialist track into the Faculty's own building at 230 College Street). The opposite strategy to be examined would entail abolishing the specialist track altogether, and agreeing simply to considering applications directly to the Master of Architecture program from students in the architecture major. (At the moment, we accept some – but not all - students applying from the specialist track, as well as some – but not all – students applying from the architecture major.)

**2: Additional and modified Masters' programs:** We propose to mount a series of additional Masters Programs. First of all will be a new Master of Architecture program aimed at students who already hold a professional architectural degree, and who seek to upgrade the education they have already received. Two tracks will be proposed for such a new degree: one oriented to advanced work in architectural design, and the other oriented to research. Research foci proposed will include history and theory of architecture, building science, and green architecture. The research Masters program will also be conceived as a step towards the mounting of a doctoral program at a later stage.

We also propose a modified form of the Master of Urban Design degree that we already offer. This will be an urban design program offering advanced placement to students from our own Master of Architecture and Master of Landscape Architecture programs, who have taken appropriate courses within those degree programs, and who will therefore be eligible to apply of advanced placement in the Master of Urban Design program. By this means, they would be able to qualify to receive the Master of Urban Design degree in one additional year of study, following the completion of their Master of Architecture or Master of Landscape Architecture degrees

Finally, we propose an additional track to our Master of Urban Design program, one parallel to the proposed research-oriented Master of Architecture described above. This will enable us to undertake research focusing on urban issues.

**3: Need for more active recruitment, and for greater outside visibility for al&d, as part of a new strategy for admissions:** We plan to develop a new program of dissemination of information about our programs and faculty, and about the city of Toronto, oriented in particular to prospective students in the USA and Asia. We plan to propose a substantially upgraded and redesigned website as an al&d academic initiative this upcoming February, and plan to make the new website a key tool of recruitment to our programs. We are also exploring the possibility of more of our faculty and staff traveling to other schools – especially to US schools offering various forms of pre-architecture programs. At the same time that this recruitment campaign increases the number of students applying to our professional programs, it will at the same time enable us to raise the quality of the students whose applications to those programs are successful.

**4: Interactions among students in our various programs and student experience:** We plan to develop a series of curriculum ideas to strengthen this interaction. We also note that the creation of new programs (as described above) as well as the proposed expansion of the Master of Landscape Architecture program (described below) will themselves alter the demographic of the faculty as a whole, reducing the perceived statistical domination of the student body by the population of the Master of Architecture program. In terms of student feelings of isolation, we note that the reviewers met with only 3 students and were not able to verify the "rightness or wrongness" of that small group's feelings of isolation. We note that al&d – with a student population less than 300 strong – has a very large adjunct and part-time faculty, comprising some 54 local professional architects, engineers, graphic designers, artists, etc. Our highest profile public outreach event, our evening lecture series and annual symposium is this year bringing 16 high profile designers and scholars from across the United States and Europe to al&d.

**5: Expanded Enrolment in the Master of Landscape Architecture Program:** We plan to expand the enrolment in the Master of Landscape Architecture program. One option will be to increase the first year class from 14 to 18 students; a second one (proposed by the reviewers) will be to increase it from 14 to 24. Both will be studied before a final decision is made.

**6: Need to improve relations between the Master of Urban Design Program and the Master of Landscape Architecture program and the Planning Program, respectively:** In addition to planning the active program of recruitment into the Master of Urban Design program of students from our own professional programs in architecture and landscape architecture, we plan to undertake a thorough review of the curricula shared between our urban design program and that of our colleagues in the planning program in the Department of Geography.

**7: Research support for faculty:** We plan a twofold strategy to address this issue. The first will be to attempt to identify greater research resources for al&d faculty, both within and without the university. The second will be to develop techniques to assist our faculty – especially our younger

faculty - with the preparation of research grant applications. al&d's dean was very impressed recently with the description given of the assistance typically provided to faculty in this regard, in the Department of Political Science. New academic appointments (one in July 2004, and two more to be made in the near future) will significantly broaden the base of our teaching component, enabling existing faculty to some degree to increase their research-related teaching activities. The Faculty plans to fully participate in University multidisciplinary initiatives, focusing on Environment and Urban research, and that research 'clusters' of al&d faculty will occur as a result of this process.

**8: Diversity and new appointments:** We plan to redouble our efforts to recruit diverse candidates for upcoming faculty searches. In addition we will explore the possibility to establish a Junior Teaching Fellowship in the Faculty which will be available to recent graduates of programs in architecture, landscape architecture and urban design around the world. Since it is clear that the greatest diversity of potential applicants for future teaching positions in our programs, we believe that the creation of such a fellowship would attract a broad and diverse range of prospective future faculty to our institution. Mentoring of younger faculty is necessary, and will complement the strategies of expansion of the teaching complement.

**9: Access to CAD/CAM equipment:** We plan to clarify for our students a policy of access to CAD/CAM equipment via the mechanism of registration in proposed new courses focusing on the uses of such equipment.

**10: Physical resources:** As noted above, we plan to explore the possibility to accommodate students in studio classes in the specialist track in the undergraduate program, within the al&d building at 230 College Street. As fundraising permits, we also plan further improvements – and hopefully even – enlargements to the 230 College Street building. In the meantime, the new and expanded programs indicated above will generate a demand for some additional space – on a temporary basis – outside of, and hopefully close to, the main al&d building.

**11: Summary strengths and weaknesses:** We have been gratified by the external reviewers assessments of our strengths, and we plan to vigorously address the weaknesses they have cited. In particular, we plan to clarify our own image of our distinctive programs in our distinctive city, and to make their compelling attractions as widely known internationally as possible.

#### **Provost's response:**

The Provost is pleased with the outcome of the review and is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions. In July, 2004 Professor George Baird began his term as Dean of the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design and this external review has provided positive feedback to the new Dean, students, faculty and staff of al&d.

The Faculty has addressed all the points raised by the reviewers and have clearly begun to formulate action plans to address the issues raised. One of the interdisciplinary areas identified in *Stepping UP* has been initiatives associated with our urban community. The Dean and Faculty have already taken a leadership role in coordinating this initiative across the University.

In terms of raising the profile of the Faculty, al&d has proposed the enhancement and redesign of the Faculty's web site. Recognizing the need for al&d to move forth and act on the recommendation of the reviewers, we have provided funds to the Faculty for this initiative.

The Provost looks forward to receiving the *Stepping UP* plan for the Faculty.



## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Faculty of Arts and Science</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	January 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Vice-President and Provost
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b> <b>Undergrad &amp; First Professional Degrees</b>	Honours Bachelor of Arts, Hon.B.A. Honours Bachelor of Science Hon.B.Sc. Bachelor of Commerce B.Com.
<b>Graduate:</b>	Doctor of Philosophy, Ph.D. Master of Arts M.A. Master of Science, M.Sc. Master of Science in Planning, M.Sc.Pl. Master of Visual Studies, M.V.S. Master of Urban Design Studies, M.U.D.S.
<b>Diploma/Certificate:</b>	
<b>Continuing Education</b>	
<b>COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Four external reviewers submitting a joint report.
<b>REVIEWERS:</b> <b>International</b>	Jeremy Knowles, Harvard University Teresa Sullivan, University of Texas Pauline Yu, American Council of Learned Societies
<b>Canadian</b>	Art McDonald, Queen's University
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	1997
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Terms of Reference for the Review Faculty External Review, 1997 Stepping Up Framework, 2003 Tri-campus Framework (2002) Self-Study, 2003 Planning and Infrastructure Self-Study (1997-2003) Faculty budgetary and enrolment information Report from the School of Graduate Studies (2003)
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	The Committee met with a broad set of representatives of faculty, staff, students and administrators from the Faculty of Arts and Science, as well as administrators from other units of the University, including the colleges and the University of Toronto at Mississauga and Scarborough.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

### Overall assessment

The reviewers report that, given its size and diversity, it will be a challenge to maintain a united vision for excellence with the "most important task for the new Dean is to create a culture of change and quality improvement". Major challenges for the future are related to the financial and enrollment pressures and by the need to link the tri-campus structure. The reviewers note that careful planning will be required in order for the development of "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**

- Resource allocation: The reviewers note that the Faculty is organizationally "dense". They point out that many of the units within the Faculty are very small and costly to the

Faculty in terms of the commitment of faculty members for organizational maintenance. They suggest that the Faculty should review the organizational structure of units and whether each unit is performing its intended function effectively. In the case of departments, there should be an “assessment of whether the way in which subject areas are presently delineated is in line with the central intellectual foci of the field today.” They advise the Faculty to avoid “fragmentation into small administrative units” in that larger units are able to make better faculty appointments, are economically more viable, and can further cross-disciplinary activities while maintaining a center for the discipline. Interdisciplinary centers “should be regarded as incubators for exciting programs, and as foci for bringing major departments together for productive interactions”. The reviewers suggest that in the long-term, interdisciplinary programs could be brought together as a new department if a critical mass and stature within the University and internationally has been achieved.

- Faculty Renewal: The Faculty has made good progress in hiring new faculty. However, the reviewers point out that it is necessary that broader measures of quality be employed. They lauded the hiring process and mentoring of young faculty but point out that the rate of successful tenure reviews is very high (about 99%) and this high rate could “possibly leading to some complacency among the faculty.”
- Financial Planning: The reviewers agreed with the devolution of responsibility and accountability to departments and programs, and suggested that “movement towards bottom-line budgeting” would be useful.
- Planning Process: The reviewers believe that the Stepping UP planning process should address:
  - The establishment and communication of international measures of quality.
  - Broad process of consultation in order to establish priorities.
  - The process should lead to “strategic clarity” for improving quality.

### Quality of education

- Enrolment Management: The overall ratio of graduate to undergraduate ratio seems appropriate, but the reviewers caution that it will need to be carefully monitored as undergraduate expansion occurs at UTM and UTSC. The Faculty should also strive to ensure that every student has some classroom experience as one of a small group. The Faculty’s move to use their facilities more extensively for summer classes is a good.
- Undergraduate Curriculum: The reviewers make several suggestions including: an assessment of the breadth versus depth; managing the range of options; number of courses required for specialist degrees; interdisciplinary programs; encouragement of undergraduate research.

### Relationship with other units

- St. George Colleges: The reviewers remarked that the Colleges play an “important and supportive role in the extracurricular lives of students” but they were unclear about the College’s perceived academic function”. They were concerned with the proliferation of small interdisciplinary programs, not firmly rooted in the disciplines, and the mechanism for monitoring and assessing the quality of the programs. The reviewers also noted that reviewing the role that the Colleges have in addressing the needs of off-campus students.
- UTM and UTSC: A clear mission statement for the development of the three campuses would be beneficial. The nature of curricula offered at the three campuses should be reviewed.
- Academic Divisions: The reviewers note that relationships with other University divisions are strong with ‘admirable’ collaboration on undergraduate teaching. The range and structure of collaborative programs seemed appropriate to the reviewers.
- School of Graduate Studies: The reviewers supported the devolution of graduate education responsibility to faculties and departments. They suggest that the future planning include departments developing a plan for development of their graduate programs across three campuses. These plans can then be used to develop an overall plan for graduate development that ‘optimizes the overall quality of education’.

## ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

### Dean’s response:

## **Decanal Response to Arts and Science External Review**

16 August 2004

An external review of the Faculty of Arts and Science commissioned by Provost Shirley Neuman was held 5-6 January 2004. The Review Committee [1] met with the Dean and his senior staff (Vice-Deans and Directors), numerous chairs of Arts and Science departments, deans and principals from other divisions in the University, and senior University administrators. The Committee was provided the end-of-term report of the previous Dean, Carl Amrhein, and a volume of other information that described the current state of the Faculty and the planning process that Arts and Science was engaged in.

The Committee submitted its findings in a thirteen-page report in late January. The Dean distributed the report to department chairs, centre directors, college principals and program directors within the Faculty, and encouraged these unit heads to make it available to their colleagues. Comments were solicited by the Dean to assist in preparing a divisional response to the review report.

This decanal response provides a Faculty-wide perspective on the review, and the first response to specific recommendations made by the Committee. The Review Committee report was organized into a preamble and four sections, and this response parallels that structure.

### ***The Present State of the Faculty***

The Review Committee found that the Faculty had made notable gains in recent years, despite "meager support" from the province. Specifically, the Committee applauded the closer integration of the Colleges into the Faculty, the guaranteed funding program for doctoral-stream students, and the management of undergraduate enrolment in the face of the "double cohort." However, the Committee recognized that Arts and Science faced numerous challenges in the coming years and that it would be important to "create a culture of change and quality improvement" in order to maintain a united vision and to take every opportunity to seek improved quality.

Response: The message that a cultural change has to occur has been clearly heard and accepted within Arts and Science. It has been reflected in the planning process to date by units working to establish clear priorities, measures of success toward specific goals, and the development of a clear strategic vision for Arts and Science. This quest for greater quality in all aspects of Arts and Science – undergraduate education, research and graduate education – will be the overarching goal of the Faculty's Stepping UP plan.

---

1 The review team consisted of Jeremy Knowles, Harvard University, Art McDonald, Queen's University, Teresa Sullivan, University of Texas and Pauline Yu, American Council of Learned Societies.

### **1. Academic and Financial Planning**

The Committee noted that Arts and Science was "organizationally very complex" resulting in an "undeniable intellectual richness," but this came at considerable cost, with faculty and administrative resources being taken away from teaching and research. They urged that the Faculty look for opportunities to reduce this complexity by considering whether each department is performing its intended function effectively, and looking for opportunities to reduce fragmentation. In addition, the Committee noted that departmental structure should evolve if it is to remain current.

Response: Arts and Science is considering ways of simplifying current structures into more streamlined units that better integrate undergraduate and graduate education and research. Examples of this include the development of a Centre for Environment (integrating the activities of three separate units and many departments across several faculties), greater coordination of undergraduate and graduate drama studies, and closer integration of effort in Asian studies using the recently created Asian Institute as an organizational umbrella. Proposals for these and other initiatives are currently under development and will be assessed as part of the Stepping UP planning process.

At the same time, Arts and Science is reviewing departmental structure and function. A task force on Language Studies within Arts and Science has been established, and active dialogue is taking place with the departments of Botany and Zoology on the most appropriate structure for biological science going forward. As not all of these discussions are expected to conclude by the end of the Stepping UP planning process, the Faculty will continue to examine department and program structure in an effort to identify the best structures to address our academic priorities.

The Review Committee made a number of useful comments regarding support for interdisciplinary work. The Committee felt that "interdisciplinary work should be expected to have a limited lifetime and monitored closely" and that the proliferation of programs should be carefully controlled. The Committee also felt that larger units tended to be more efficient and economically more viable, and that undergraduate students should maintain strong connections to a "core" department even when involved in interdisciplinary studies.

Response: The Committee expressed one view of several on what constitutes interdisciplinary work. The Faculty agrees that some interdisciplinary work should be expected to be time-limited. At the same time, Arts and Science has numerous examples – the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology and the Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Studies to name just two – that although interdisciplinary in nature have evolved into disciplines in their own right and therefore should be expected to have continuing support. Arts and Science therefore has to make such distinctions between the various forms of interdisciplinary activity. However, all activities must be subject to the same expectations regarding quality and academic excellence and be held accountable for their contributions to the Faculty's academic goals.

The other comments made by the Committee will be taken into consideration in the Arts and Science Stepping UP planning process. Arts and Science has been reviewing the process by which units have been evaluated and monitored, and sees opportunities to make this more rigorous. An example of this is the development of a coherent approach to the periodic external review of extra-department programs that vary enormously in size and scope.

The Review Committee noted that as Arts and Science assesses the quality and performance of its faculty, that "broader measures of quality be employed," with some suggested measures being the ISI citation indices, levels of competitive grant funding and faculty distinction internationally.

Response: As part of the Stepping UP process, each department is developing what it believes to be the appropriate measures of quality and excellence for its discipline, while the Faculty overall is identifying a key set of more aggregate measures that will allow it to assess future performance. Arts and Science agrees that there is no room for complacency here, and that a consistent and long-term framework for evaluation has to be developed over the next year.

## **2. Quality of Education**

The Committee noted the innovations taken by Arts and Science in the last planning period, and made a number of suggestions for the Faculty to consider in the planning process: 1) coordinated planning of expansion in the graduate program as undergraduate enrolment growth at UTM and UTSC takes place, 2) close attention to the overall educational experience for students in large-enrolment programs, and 3) support for innovation in the curriculum with focus given to the nature of the specialist degree.

Response: Arts and Science has included in its Stepping UP planning process three-campus graduate planning. Undergraduate curriculum is being examined both at the departmental level and across the Faculty, with the Education Advisory Committee and the Student Experience Working Group developing recommendations that address the comments of the Review Committee.

The Committee made specific note of the large number of credits required for the specialist degree, commenting that "in at least one department, 19 credits are required" [2]. The Committee suggested that consideration be given to reducing the number of credits for the specialist degree.

Response: It is likely that the Review Committee was confused regarding the actual number of required credits (which is substantially less than the number quoted). Arts and Science believes that the specialist degree is an effective undergraduate program structure, as it provides a honours specialization, but leaves "curricular space" for both distribution requirements (typically 3 courses) and a number of elective courses. These program requirements are reviewed annually by the Committee on Standards of the Faculty and this is

---

2 It is important to clarify the question of the specialist degree requirements. The largest number of courses required for a specialist degree is 16 (the BioPhysics specialist, which is a very interdisciplinary program with required courses drawn from physiology, physics, mathematics and human biology) with most specialist degrees requiring between 11 and 13 courses.

considered an effective mechanism to manage this program structure.

### **3. Relationship with Other Units**

The Review Committee correctly noted that the integration of the Colleges with Arts and Science "is surely an excellent move." However, the Committee did not appear to be fully informed as to the formal nature of the Faculty-College relationship, and this apparently led to the suggestion that a review of that relationship be undertaken. The Committee also recommended that special attention be given to the needs of the off-campus students who form such a large part of the student body.

Response: The Faculty does not believe that a formal review of the Faculty-College relationship is necessary at this time, especially as by all measures the Colleges and Faculty enjoy a strong working relationship and have clear sets of common goals defined in large measure by the Memorandum of Agreement between the Federated Universities and the University of Toronto (which itself is undergoing a mid-term review).

Arts and Science is addressing the issue of the "off-campus" student as part of the mandate of the Student Experience Working Group, and will consider the recommendations of this group as part of its Stepping UP planning process.

The Review Committee recommended that a clear mission statement for the future development of the three campuses be developed, as that could be used to guide development and management of future academic programs.

Response: The Dean of the Faculty meets weekly with the Deans from UTM and UTSC to discuss three-campus issues, and this forum has been used to identify and resolve problems on an ongoing basis. The development of a clear mission statement would be a positive outcome of the Stepping UP process, and will be undertaken by this three-campus committee of deans.

The Committee noted that the relationships with other faculties "appear to be very good, with strong and admirable collaboration on undergraduate teaching." It did recommend that the Dean maintain the quality of these exchanges and that the Provost consider mechanisms for their review.

Response: The Faculty agrees that the current relationships are indeed strong and mutually beneficial. In order to maintain their quality, the Faculty will make the management of these relationships the responsibility of one of the Vice-Deans in Arts and Science. As these relationships support specific programs of study, Arts and Science believes that the regular process of program review provides an appropriate mechanism to periodically evaluate these inter-faculty activities.

The Committee made a number of very constructive suggestions regarding graduate program development and management, many of which are already being acted upon. Many of them would properly be addressed in a review of the graduate school, but one specific to Arts and Science is the recommendation that departments "put forward a plan for the development of their graduate programs across the three campuses."

Response: A three-campus graduate plan is part of the unit-level planning effort that is currently underway in the 32 graduate units within Arts and Science. These plans are being developed based on consultation across the graduate unit, and will be the basis on which Arts and Science develops a comprehensive multi-year graduate enrolment plan. This process builds on the graduate enrolment planning process undertaken in Fall 2001, which resulted in unit-level graduate enrolment targets for the academic years 2002-03 to 2004-05.

#### **4. Organizational and Governance Structure**

The Committee used this section to summarize its comments on structure and governance that are found elsewhere in the report. It refrained to comment in more detail on these subjects.

Response: Faculty governance at the department level has been the focus of a task force commissioned by the Dean in Fall 2003. The report of that task force has recently been made available to members of the Faculty, and it is expected to support the development of stronger unit-level governance. Faculty governance overall (and in particular the formal governance mechanism reflected in the Faculty Council and its various Committees) requires some attention, if only to promote a greater sense of accountability and transparency in Faculty affairs. A committee to review Faculty governance will be struck in fall 2004.

**Provost's response:**

This is clearly a positive review of the Faculty of Arts and Science, appreciating the size, diversity and complexity of the Division. The Provost is pleased with the outcome of the review and is grateful to the reviewers for their thoughtful comments and suggestions.

Several of the reviewers' recommendations are already being addressed by the Faculty as a result of the External Report and recent academic planning within the Faculty in 2004 (Stepping UP and the Report of the Task Force on Openness, Transparency, and Consultation in Departmental Decision-Making). As indicated in the Faculty's response, Arts and Science is committed to addressing the points raised within the report. The Faculty did, however, clarify points on which they note the reviewers did not have complete information.

As outlined in the Faculty's response, several of the reviewers' recommendations are already being addressed by the Faculty. In addition:

- In terms of organizational structure and interdisciplinary centres, the Faculty has recently brought forth proposals to University governance regarding changes to the structure of several of its units, including:
  - Centre for Environment: In order to strengthen and highlight the wealth of environmental teaching and research at the University and to improve the collaboration among environmental units, the Institute for Environmental Studies (IES), Division of Environment (DoE) and Innis College's Environmental Studies Program the Faculty has will combine their resources to create a new graduate and undergraduate teaching and research entity, to be named The University of Toronto Centre for Environment.
  - A recent Academic Initiative Fund proposal for the establishment of the Centre for Global Change Science will result in the consolidation of strengths present at the University and demonstrates strong initiative to more effectively use existing resources and to raise the profile of this area of research and teaching.
- The Provost has convened a standing committee on interdisciplinary research and teaching. Among the mandates of the Committee is the assessment of governance models for cross-faculty initiatives.
- Tri-campus models continue to be developed in discussion with the deans, departments, the School of Graduate Studies, and other divisions within the University [mention here of management/commerce]
- In terms of graduate studies at the University, the administrative functions and governance arrangements for graduate education at the University of Toronto were reviewed as part of the Report of the School of Graduate Studies Review Committee (2004) and the Discussion Paper from the Task Force on Graduate Education (April, 2005). In coordination with University divisions, the process to strengthen the profile of graduate education, to assure meaningful student input at all levels of governance, and to increase effective engagement across Faculties, campuses and sites will be continued.

The academic planning process is well underway within the Faculty and it is clear that careful thought and consideration are being given to the report of the external reviewers.



## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>School of Graduate Studies</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	April 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Vice-President and Provost
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergrad &amp; First Professional Degrees</b>	n/a
<b>Graduate:</b>	<p>Juris Doctor and Doctor of Philosophy (Economics, Philosophy, Political Science) combined programs J.D./Ph.D.</p> <p>Juris Doctor and Master of Arts (Criminology, Economics, Russian and East European Studies) combined programs J.D./M.A.</p> <p>Juris Doctor and Master of Business Administration combined program J.D./M.B.A.</p> <p>Juris Doctor and Master of Information Studies combined program J.D./M.I.St.</p> <p>Juris Doctor and Master of Social Work combined program J.D./M.S.W.</p> <p>Doctor of Dentistry and Doctor of Philosophy combined program D.D.S./Ph.D.</p> <p>Doctor of Education Ed.D.</p> <p>Doctor of Juridical Science S.J.D.</p> <p>Doctor of Medicine and Doctor of Philosophy combined program M.D./Ph.D.</p> <p>Doctor of Music Mus.Doc.</p> <p>Doctor of Philosophy Ph.D.</p> <p>Master of Applied Science M.A.Sc.</p> <p>Master of Architecture M.Arch.</p> <p>Master of Arts M.A.</p> <p>Master of Biotechnology M.Biotech</p> <p>Master of Business Administration M.B.A.</p> <p>Master of Business Administration and Master of Arts in Russian and East European Studies combined program M.B.A./M.A.(REES)</p> <p>Master of Business Administration and Master of Nursing combined program M.N./M.B.A.</p> <p>Bachelor of Applied Science and Master of Business Administration Jeffrey Skoll Combined Program B.A.Sc./M.B.A.</p> <p>Master of Education M.Ed.</p> <p>Master of Engineering M.Eng.</p> <p>Master of Engineering in Design and Manufacturing M.Eng.D.M.</p> <p>Master of Engineering in Telecommunications M.Eng.Tel.</p> <p>Master of Financial Economics M.F.E.</p> <p>Master of Forest Conservation M.F.C.</p> <p>Master of Health Science M.H.Sc.</p> <p>Master of Health Science in Health Administration/ Master of Social Work Combined Program M.H.Sc./M.S.W.</p> <p>Master of Industrial Relations and Human Resources M.I.R.H.R.</p> <p>Master of Information Studies M.I.St.</p> <p>Master of International Trade in Forest Products M.I.T.F.P.</p> <p>Master of Landscape Architecture M.L.A.</p> <p>Master of Laws LL.M.</p> <p>Master of Management &amp; Professional Accounting M.M.P.A.</p> <p>Master of Mathematical Finance M.M.F.</p> <p>Master of Museum Studies M.M.St.</p> <p>Master of Music Mus.M.</p>

	Master of Nursing M.N. Master of Science M.Sc. Master of Science in Biomedical Communications M.Sc.BMC Master of Science in Forestry M.Sc.F. Master of Science in Occupational Therapy M.Sc.O.T. Master of Science in Planning M.Sc.Pl. Master of Science in Physical Therapy M.Sc.P.T. Master of Science in Physical Therapy/Master of Science in Rehabilitation Science combined program M.Sc.P.T./M.Sc. Master of Social Work M.S.W. Master of Spatial Analysis M.S.A. Masters in Studies in Law M.S.L. Master of Teaching M.T. Master of Urban Design M.U.D. Master of Urban Design Studies M.U.D.S. Master of Visual Studies M.V.S.
<b>Diploma/Certificate:</b>	n/a
<b>Continuing Education</b>	n/a
<b>COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Sixteen members of the Review Committee
<b>REVIEWERS:</b>	Prof. Vivek Goel, Interim Vice-President and Provost (Chair) Prof. James Barber, Dean, Faculty of Social Work Prof. Rorke Bryan, Dean, Faculty of Forestry Prof. Richard Bond, Director, Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics Ms Kendra Coulter, GSU President, Graduate Student Prof. Ross Ethier, Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Prof. Maryanne Feldman, Rotman School of Management Prof. Edith Hillan, Faculty of Nursing Prof. Glen Jones, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, OISE/UT Prof. David Klausner, Department of English and Director, Centre for Medieval Studies Ms Françoise Ko, Graduate Student Ms Carole Moore, Chief Librarian Prof. Heather Murray, Department of English Prof. Shirley Neuman, Department of English (Chair) Prof. Ian Orchard, Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto at Mississauga Prof. Kwong-loi Shun, Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto at Scarborough Mr. Jorge Sousa, Graduate Student Prof. Anastasios Venetsanopoulos, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering Prof. Robert Vipond, Chair, Department of Political Science Prof. Kim Woodhouse, Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS :</b>	Mandate, Means and Ambitions: A Report on the School of Graduate Studies, 1997-2003. Dean's Report (Sept. 2003) Written submissions from and met with individuals from within the School of Graduate Studies and the University of Toronto community
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	During its deliberations, the Committee received written submissions from and met with individuals from within the School of Graduate Studies and the University of Toronto community. The Committee also held a Town Hall meeting for Graduate Chairs, Coordinators and Assistants, as well as an Open Meeting for Directors of SGS Centres and Institutes. A list of those who appeared before the Committee as well as a list of written submissions was included in the report.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

Graduate studies are an essential part of the University's vision, and our high proportion of graduate to undergraduate enrolment distinguishes us from other Universities and is one of our most distinctive strengths. The Report reaffirms that strong graduate programs are essential to maintaining our vision of linking research and teaching at the University of Toronto. The main observation of the Committee is that "graduate studies engages nearly all aspects of the operation of the University of Toronto".

The Committee invited feedback from across the University community, receiving different views about the role and function of SGS, and noting common themes. "Everyone is in agreement that graduate education is important, that there needs to be constant attention to the maintenance of our standards, to the provision of adequate support for students, to assistance for academic administrators and faculty on how to best develop and manage their programs, and for facilitation of innovation and collaboration, particularly across departments, divisions and campuses."

- There were differences in opinion as to how these functions could best be served. The Committee commented that, at an institution as diverse as the University of Toronto, there will continue to be different appreciations of the kind of oversight that SGS provides. In seeking optimal models, the University must balance flexibility with the need to maintain university-wide standards.
- The Committee also heard the important role of the Dean of SGS in academic matters that cut across Divisions, particularly as we evolve the Tri-campus model, while maintaining unitary graduate departments across the three campuses. One important way in which this is accomplished is through the role of the SGS Dean and designates on tenure committees in maintaining University wide standards.
- SGS also administers programs that cut across divisions on the St. George campus, and it is the view of some that the Dean of SGS could play an enhanced role in fostering and promoting interdisciplinarity and multi-divisional initiatives.
- The Committee was impressed with the work of the SGS Centres and Institutes and their important role in fostering interdisciplinarity, and particularly their potential for building bridges across Divisions and campuses. The Committee also observed that there are many more Centres and Institutes that are *not* in SGS, and that any examination of Centres and Institutes should look at this issue across the entire University and not just within SGS.
- The Committee heard favourable comments about the new policies for post-doctoral fellows (PDFs) and the role of the new SGS office in supporting PDFs.
- The leader of SGS has to be able to be a strong advocate for graduate studies at the University as well as nationally and internationally.
- The Committee did not believe that it had had the time or the mandate to resolve the many issues placed before it as it held its consultations. Nor was there the opportunity to engage external reviewers or consultants as was originally envisioned. Given the importance of graduate education to the mission of the University, it will be necessary to do a comprehensive review of the matter. This should involve a careful examination of new challenges and circumstances for the School of Graduate Studies at the University, reporting structures, the relationship of the administrative functions of SGS with those of Departments and Faculty graduate offices, the relationship with the Vice-President Research and Associate Provost, the role with respect to post-doctoral fellows, and a consideration of the implications of other changes that have or will be taking place at the University of Toronto in light of the implementation of *Stepping UP* and the tri-campus administrative arrangements.
- Devolution must be carefully examined to see how well it has worked, while some faculties or departments may be prepared to take on even more functions from SGS, others may not be willing to do so, and may wish to have certain functions re-centralized. There must be flexibility across an institution as large and complex as ours, while ensuring maintenance of University wide standards. The particular needs of the single department professional faculties need also to be taken into account.
- As noted above, the committee heard that the role of the SGS Dean and designates in appointment, promotion and tenure decisions was viewed as essential to maintaining

University wide standards, and any new model would have to maintain this capacity. More likely, if there were to be such a change, a combination of the position with a senior administrative position, such as Vice-Provost may be the option to consider.

Recommendations of the Committee:

1. A Task Force should be struck to conduct a review of graduate education across the entire University in order to ensure that its vision is consistent with the overall vision of the University as outlined in *Stepping UP*. The Task Force should engage external reviewers and consultants who will be able to comment on how graduate studies is administered and coordinated at peer institutions, and how best to do so in the unique environment of the University of Toronto.
2. The primary goals of such a review are to (a.) examine and propose any revisions to structures for the administration of graduate studies within the overall vision of the University of Toronto, (b.) consider the role and reporting structure for the Dean, and (c.) facilitate the continuing development of quality academic leadership for graduate programs.
3. Careful consideration should be given to the administrative staff working in SGS and to ensuring that their essential work is not disrupted. The proposed review is about ensuring the appropriate support for graduate studies at the University of Toronto and ensuring that high-quality service continue to be provided in support of the mission of graduate studies.
4. The role and function of SGS Centres and Institutes should be considered by the committee on interdisciplinarity recommended in *Stepping UP*.
5. The new Dean should be actively engaged in the work of the Task Force.

**Administrative Response**

In October 2004, the Graduate Education Task Force was formed following the recommendation of the Review of the School of Graduate Studies. The key recommendation of the report was that "...given the centrality of graduate studies to the vision and mission of the University of Toronto, the School of Graduate Studies Review Committee recommends that a Task Force be struck to do an overarching review of the place of graduate education at the University of Toronto." After consultation with Principals and Deans, a Graduate Education Task Force was been struck.

The Task Force prepared a Discussion Paper containing draft recommendations. The goals of the suggested changes are to strengthen the profile of graduate education, to assure meaningful student input at all levels of governance, and to increase effective engagement across Faculties, campuses and sites. The draft recommendations:

- 1) Restructure and strengthen the SGS Dean's role. An appointment to a Vice-Provostial position should be presented to Governing Council for approval this academic year.
- 2) Establish a Graduate Education Co-ordinating Committee. This group will be responsible for academic oversight of both governance and administrative activities where change is considered or anticipated in the months ahead. It will be comprised of a core committee and two working groups with broader membership..
- 3) Through the Co-ordinating Committee, align governance functions to appropriately reflect Faculty and Graduate School responsibilities. This will include consideration of appropriate governance approaches to policy matters, curriculum management, and new program development, with attention at all times to the inherent distinctions between professional and doctoral stream graduate programs and maintenance of quality. Recommendations for change and oversight of arrangements will be the responsibility of the Co-ordination Committee. An initial focus will be on moving curriculum changes in existing programs to Faculties, once arrangements are in place. Using the preparations for a system that will take curriculum changes from a Faculty to a committee of Academic Board as an example, such arrangements will include:
  - Develop standardized templates where necessary (e.g. New Course Proposal form, etc; a responsibility of SGS)
  - Develop training and support activities, to be available to Faculty staff (responsibility: SGS and Policy & Planning)

- Identify the Faculty protocol to be followed and the body to be used for Faculty approvals, including assurance that elected graduate students and graduate administrative staff, as well as faculty members engaged in the Faculty's graduate programs, will sit on that body
  - Support Faculties with any necessary constitutional amendments.
- 4) Through the Co-ordinating Committee, assess the appropriate level for graduate administrative functions: department, campus, training site, Faculty, SGS or other central office. The Co-ordinating Committee will be expected to consult broadly and to recommend approaches that will best support the provision of excellent graduate education and experience. The co-ordinating committee will need to identify where within U of T each activity should be positioned, and, where necessary, provide for flexibility across units. Activities to be examined include but are not limited to the various activities listed in the Task Force Discussion Paper: international transcript assessment, fellowships and financial aid, oversight of visiting scholars and postdoctoral fellows, monitoring student progress, career guidance, academic misconduct and appeals, English Language Writing Support, the office of graduate education research (OGER), handling final doctoral examinations, and support of the OCGS Appraisal process.

(The Discussion Paper is available at [http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/userfiles/page\\_attachments/library/6/Grad\\_Ed\\_TF\\_Paper\\_FINAL\\_11Apr05\\_13939\\_3881943.pdf](http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/userfiles/page_attachments/library/6/Grad_Ed_TF_Paper_FINAL_11Apr05_13939_3881943.pdf)).

**Provost's response:**

In September 2004, Professor Susan Pfeiffer began her term as Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. Professor Pfeiffer is committed to following up on the recommendations of the Report of the Review Committee of the School of Graduate Studies. The Provost is confident that under her leadership, the School of Graduate Studies will continue to work in ways that will further enable it, and all of the Divisions of the University, to achieve our objectives for graduate education and to embody our vision to be a leader among the world's best public teaching and research universities.

The Graduate Education Task Force has sought feedback on the recommended strategy. In particular, the Task Force has sought perspectives on what is needed to make this strategy's implementation successful. Following this consultation period, the Task Force will produce a final report and the University will move forward with its implementation in co-ordination and consultation with University Divisions.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Joseph L. Rotman School of Management</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	June, 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Vice-President and Provost
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergrad &amp; First Professional Degrees</b>	Master of Business Administration, M.B.A.
<b>Graduate:</b>	Doctor of Philosophy, Ph.D. Master of Financial Economics M.F.E. Master of Management & Professional Accounting M.M.P.A.
<b>Diploma/Certificate:</b>	Advanced Program in Human Resources Management Advanced Program in Managing Strategic Change Diploma in Investigative and Forensic Accounting (D.I.F.A.)
<b>Continuing Education</b>	
<b>COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Three external reviewers submitting a joint report.
<b>REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International</b>	Michael C. Jensen, Harvard Business School Jitendra Singh, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania Eleanor Westney, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
<b>Canadian</b>	
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Terms of Reference for the Review Self-Study, 2004 Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	The Committee met with a broad set of representatives of faculty, staff, students and administrators from the Rotman School, the Dean's Advisory Board (Toronto-based) and other outside friends/stakeholders, and a UoF Tri Campus Group consisting of Deans and Chairs from cognate units at UTSC, UTM and St. George campus.

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

#### Progress

The reviewers noted that over the past five years, the School has made 'astonishing progress'. The School has expanded, doubling the size of full-time MBA cohort and Executive MBA, growing full-time faculty to 80 from 45. They were impressed, that despite the 'ambitious' expansion, the quality of students and the program has also risen. They commented upon the 'impressive achievements' in faculty recruitment. The reviewers also pointed out that the School's 'growing reputation is demonstrated by its dramatic rise in the global rankings of Business Schools.'

One of the challenges for the future will be even greater given that rising even further in the rankings is more difficult. The reviewers caution, however, that the intense focus on competitive rankings can 'lead to behaviours that neither improve the quality the educational experience nor serve the long-term career interests of students or society'. The reviewers urged that the School should develop a clear set of metrics by which to assess the School's progress over the planning period.

The reviewers consider that the School will need to consolidate and build on its achievements. In particular, the School will have to articulate its 'strategic distinctiveness' including development and consolidations as a centre for "Integrative Thinking", and the institutional context of the School.

The School "has good momentum; it is essential to capitalize on this. In addition to specific issues outlined below, the School should concentrate on strategically strengthening senior faculty ranks, giving thought to succession planning for the Dean and Associate Dean roles, and realigning the goals among the faculty and student body.

### **Strategic Direction and Distinctiveness**

The Rotman School has a strategy based on its vision of "Integrated Thinking" that is "highly innovative, and if successfully executed, will distinguish Rotman from its worldwide competitors and make potentially major contributions to business education". This achievement will require: the hiring of at least one more highly talented senior faculty member; that the School invest in creating a new field of research and teaching in the profession around Integrative Thinking; and, develop its curriculum to provide teaching opportunities that will complement the faculty's research interests in Integrative Thinking.

### **Institutional Context**

The reviewers commented strongly that the School should control its 'brand quality' and be 'the main focal point for all of the University of Toronto's professional business education related activities'. The School should cooperate closely with the Faculty of Arts and Science on undergraduate programming, and at the graduate level with the Mathematics and Economics departments, among others. Furthermore, the reviewers suggest that the School must also control the faculty as well as students who are allowed to identify themselves as associated with the School since 'this is a critical component of building and protecting the brand'.

The current relationship with the St. George, Scarborough and Mississauga campuses is complex, however, the current arrangements 'do not recognize the distinction between academic and professional graduate programmes'. The current tri-campus structures do not satisfy either greater autonomy or greater integration. The reviewers suggest that, within the context of the University's Tri-Campus Framework, moving towards greater autonomy is the better option.

Within the School, the reviewers suggest that the functional structures (areas such as Marketing, Finance, etc.) should be reorganized to more align with the focus on Integrative Thinking.

### **Space Requirements**

The School will require additional space in order to accommodate the expansion of staff and students. In addition, the reviewers agree with the Schools' need for an executive education facility.

### **Distance Learning and International Alliances**

The reviewers that the potential of informational technology for distance learning for business schools has not been successful and lower the standards of these schools. The reviewers do, however, recommend that the School explore formation of greater global intellectual content at the School and integrating such content into the curriculum.

## ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

### Dean's response:

The Rotman School's response to the External Review is organized with focus on five themes stressed in the report: Progress, Integrative Thinking, Metrics, Institutional Context and Space. It has been reviewed with the Decanal team and represents our reflection on the review document itself as well as the result of further internal consultation.

### Progress

We are exceedingly pleased and gratified to have a committee of three chaired professors, each a senior member of one of the top five (not ten!) business schools in the world describe the School as having achieved "astonishing progress" (p. 1) and made "a remarkable leap" (p. 1) over the past five+ years. We strongly recommended top scholars from the very top-ranked schools as reviewers in order to make sure that we received an academically sound evaluation of the progress we believed we were making. So we are pleased to have these respected scholars confirm that the progress is substantial and real. It is heartening indeed.

It is also heartening to see that they believe that the objective of reaching the lofty heights of the top ten globally, while very ambitious, is not completely out of reach. They provide sobering warnings about the nature of the competition in the upper echelon and the challenges we will face: "Rising higher in the top 20 can be even more difficult than rising into the top 30" (p. 3). We agree entirely with their assessment. Six years ago, there were many business schools at lesser universities ahead of us. Now (with the exception of the four elite stand-alone European business schools) we trail great business schools housed at great American universities. Each one of the 11 schools standing between Rotman and the top 10 is a formidable competitor, and those that we have already passed won't likely stand still. With respect to the path forward, we see entirely eye-to-eye with the reviewers.

### Integrative Thinking

We are particularly pleased to garner the review committee's unqualified support for the concept of Integrative Thinking. These are three extremely senior scholars who have reached the top of their respective business disciplines within the current research context that does not reward Integrative Thinking – though each of the three is to some degree an academic rule-breaker. So to have them support the concept of Integrative Thinking so enthusiastically is highly encouraging. We are highly gratified for them to declare with respect to Integrative Thinking becoming the heart of the differentiated position of the School: "We heartily endorse it." (p. 5)

That having been said, their other messages with respect to Integrative Thinking are sobering.

*On the Narrowness of Current Support* – They argue that "At this time the faculty, with the exception of 2 or 3 people, are not actively enrolled in actively executing Integrated Thinking" (p. 6). We agree with the assessment as expressed. Broadening the number of faculty members actively involved in the Integrative Thinking agenda is a central priority for the current year and efforts have begun already.

*On the Need for More Resources from Outside the School* – They argue that: "While strongly endorsing this strategy we hasten to add that it will not be easily or quickly achieved. It will require at least one more highly talented senior faculty member to help lead the effort" (p. 6). We agree entirely and are in the process of attempting to attract just such a scholar. We have a prestigious chair available for the recruiting effort and the availability of considerable research support from the second CCMF gift beginning in fiscal 2005-2006.

*On Cranking Up the Effort* – While the review committee didn't say it in so many words, we take from their comments that the Rotman School can and should crank up Integrative Thinking into high gear. We have acted on this already. The Centre for Integrative Thinking has reinvigorated its agenda. The Dean has personally dedicated more of his personal time to the Integrative Thinking agenda. We are actively broadening the work across the School on Integrative Thinking. We have created a new locus for the Centre's activities in the new addition opening September 2004. The bit is more firmly than ever in our teeth.



*On the Time Required for True Impact* – They argue that to make meaningful progress on Integrative Thinking it “requires Rotman to create a new field of research and teaching...it is reasonable to expect this to take 15 to 20 years” (p. 7). On this front, we would be foolish to disagree with the review committee and their much longer experience on transformations such as this. We accept their judgment on this timing. While we are indeed quite confident to make meaningful progress on the Integrative Thinking agenda within the Rotman School, to achieve lasting impact in the academic community at large will require time and the dedicated efforts of many scholars. The view of the review committee as to the importance of the task, the degree to which it needs to be broadened to something more than “the Dean’s project”, and the time required to bring about such an ambitious objective have reinforced the importance of continuity in the leadership of the School.

In summary, while some of the feedback on Integrative Thinking is sobering, we think it is valuable, insightful and actionable. It also reinforces many of our own observations contained in the School’s self-assessment. We intend to follow scrupulously the committee’s advice on all of these points.

### **Metrics**

The review committee warned strongly against overly slavish adherence to the published rankings (Financial Times, Business Week, and Wall Street Journal) and recommended that we “develop a clear and parsimonious set of metrics” (p. 4) within the Rotman School. This echoes advice the Dean’s Advisory Board received from one of its members, Michael Spence, a Nobel Laureate, UofT honorary doctorate, UTS graduate and former Dean of the Stanford Graduate School of Business, whom we also hold in high regard.

At the time, we agreed that we would review our own set of metrics and publish them on our website. However, that work went into the best intentions file and was not acted upon. With this further prodding, we have already started to refine a set of metrics by which we will judge our own progress. We will publish them on the website and the metrics will be ready to go by sometime this fall.

Business school rankings vary greatly in design and quality. The most meaningful one, the Financial Times Index, tracks more than 20 individual indicators that attempt to measure various characteristics of business schools, ranging from strictly academic indicators to measures of student satisfaction and professional success. It is important to note that the set of indicators overlaps substantially with the indicators the Rotman School uses to evaluate its success. What is controversial, and can lead to distortions in a school’s strategy, are the relative weights attached to individual indicators when combining them into an overall score. Few people would dispute the merits of any of the individual metrics, but the overall ranking reflects an implicit value judgment that is not universally accepted. We will continue to carefully monitor all measurements of the School’s success across a broad range of dimensions without undue focus on the overall score.

That having been said, we must also continue to pay closer attention to the traditional rankings than would members of the review committee. If we were currently a long-time top five school like their three schools, we would join the reviewers and not spend much time worrying about the rankings. However, we are a recent top seventy-five (not five) school and our rise in the rankings has done wonders for our visibility and credibility. To be realistic, we are in a position where we need the external validation provided by our ranking to attract high-quality applications of students and faculty alike. So while we will heed the review committee’s admonition to not be slaves to the ratings, we would have to admit that we have not earned our complete freedom from the tyranny of the popular rankings.

### **Institutional Context**

The review committee is most pointed and critical in respect of the institutional context in which the Rotman School operates. The following two quotes exemplify their sobering views:

“We believe, however, that the current institutional context of the Rotman School will seriously constrain the School’s ability to achieve the goal...of rising into the global Top

Ten. In the current context, the Rotman School cannot effectively control its reputation – its “brand equity” – in terms of its programmes, curricula, and the quality of faculty able to claim membership in the School. **Indeed, unless the institutional context becomes more conducive to attaining its global top ten aspiration, there are no guarantees that Rotman will even maintain its current position.**” (p. 7, emphasis added)

“Rotman must control the faculty as well as students who are allowed to identify themselves as associated with the Rotman School since this is a critical component of building and protecting the brand. It is our view that the status quo in the institutional context will be an anchor weighing down the future progress of the Rotman School. **Left as it is, this single factor will ensure that Rotman will not reach the top ten in business school ratings.**” (p. 10, emphasis added)

We will deal with the issues regarding the institutional context under three categories: the Rotman Brand, Tri-Campus Faculty, and the Commerce Program.

### ***Rotman Brand***

We have to admit to feeling a sense of relief at having three great research academics write so forcefully and extensively about the need to protect the Rotman brand. As the reviewers state, the concept of branding has particular currency for professional schools and this has been an extremely challenging issue on which to make progress at the University of Toronto. We agree entirely with the views of the review committee on the importance to Rotman’s success of building and protecting the brand. We also agree that the current institutional context promotes the misuse of the brand by various parts of the UofT.

On branding, the review committee’s summary position is as follows:

“We’d envisage a more autonomous Rotman School as the University of Toronto’s flagship for all business education and research related activity, with greater control over the Rotman brand paired with strong accountability to the university leadership.” (p. 9)

We agree entirely with the “greater control” portion. We need greater control given the use and treatment of the brand by others in the UofT community. However, we do not seek or covet a relationship with the UofT that is “more autonomous”, nor do we see ourselves as the flagship for all business-related research and education at the University of Toronto. The UofT is far too vast and rich a community for one division to ever take that position. Furthermore, we want to continue to be a full contributing member of the UofT and not distance ourselves from the UofT in any way. The Rotman School has always recognized the great value its brand derives from being associated with the UofT brand. Given the School’s recent rise in the rankings, it is now in a position to reciprocate. Careful management of the Rotman School brand will ensure that it continues to strengthen and not weaken through confusion in the market, to the benefit of the UofT overall.

To that end, we believe that the Dean of the Rotman School must have final and complete control rights over any use of the Rotman brand. In concrete terms, that implies that no program or research activity can be allowed to be undertaken under the Rotman brand yet outside the control of the Dean of the Rotman School. This is not an issue up for negotiation with other faculties or campuses.

There are three uses of the Rotman brand that are problematic at this point in time and stand as examples of exactly the concerns expressed in the review. Two are outlined briefly, and the third will be discussed below under Tri-Campus Faculty.

- The most prominent use of the Rotman Brand outside the School is the Master of Management in Public Accounting (MMPA). This program was once called the MBA in Accounting at the UofT Faculty of Management. In 1994, Faculty Council of the Faculty of Management voted to eliminate the program. Thereafter, it was revived at UTM as the MMPA and, since UTM had no rights at the time to take graduate programs forward to the School of Graduate Studies, the Faculty of Management was asked to act as the academic overseer of the program. However, from the beginning of the MMPA program,

academic direction of the program has resided at UTM, admissions to the program has resided at UTM and all the revenue associated with the program has flowed to UTM.

At the time of the Rotman gift and the naming of the Rotman School of Management, the MMPA program simply adopted Rotman MMPA branding without that important decision being considered in any explicit way, probably because at the time the brand meant very little and the brand portfolio was not actively managed. However, at the current time the Rotman brand has considerable value and there is no good rationale to have the MMPA program in the Rotman portfolio. It does not enhance the quality or coherence of the brand portfolio and the control the Rotman School can exercise over the MMPA program is tenuous indeed. Consistent with the recommendations of the review committee with respect to the Rotman brand, the MMPA program should cease to use the Rotman brand and adopt the UTM brand.

This has the added benefit of being much more truthful to customers. MMPA students are unlikely to ever enter the Rotman School building physically, are not enrolled in the Rotman School, are not admitted by the Rotman School and are taught principally by non-Rotman School faculty, plus a very few Rotman School faculty teaching on overload. Being truthful with customers is, of course, a cornerstone to building a great brand.

- Similarly, the Diploma in Forensic Auditing (DIFA) at UTM is currently fully branded Rotman DIFA. The branding was done with permission of the current Dean of the Rotman School. That decision was, unfortunately, an error. In the interim, it has become clear that many of the characteristics of the program (distance-based learning, almost no full-time UofT faculty involvement, among others) are incompatible with Rotman quality standards. As such, we view the continuation of the program under the Rotman brand to be detrimental to the School's overall market image. Since the program is offered by a suburban college and the academic director reports to the college's Principal, our preference is to have the program offered under the auspices of UTM. Alternatively, we intend to cancel the program because it does not meet the economic or quality standards of the Rotman School.

These programs illustrate a key problem with the current approach to the use of the Rotman brand. The Rotman School would find it perfectly acceptable for UTM to run UTM-branded accounting programs. The programs do appear to fill a need among accounting professionals and are supported by the Canadian Institute for Chartered Accountants. However, the position of UTM is that all graduate management programs run at UofT must be branded Rotman. As a consequence, at present the decision is between having a program that is of the quality and the fit necessary to enhance the Rotman brand portfolio and having no program at all. We think that is a draconian choice. We would rather see DIFA and MMPA be continued as UTM programs rather than be cancelled because they have to meet the Rotman School strictures. However, currently under the management of the Rotman brand at UofT, that is not a possibility.

### **Commerce Program**

The branding issue also extends to the Commerce Program and we are relieved to hear the review committee's concerns regarding the institutional structures governing the Commerce Program. The program has been a great concern to the Rotman School for some time, and the current Dean has devoted substantial energies to review and understand its structure and rationale.

Because of the complexities of the Commerce Program within the overall UofT context, it makes sense to step back and consider the context very carefully. The program is a joint venture of the FAS and the Rotman School. The program is run by an academic director, currently Professor Wendy Rotenberg, who reports jointly to the Deans of FAS and Rotman. Students are enrolled in the FAS and get a degree from FAS. Students are required to take a minimum of six courses in Economics, six courses in management (organized and taught by the Rotman School), and the rest in FAS generally.

Arguably, the Commerce Program is the greatest undergraduate business program in Canada due to its long history (it is 85 years old) and high quality of graduates. However, over the past twenty years, its history has been troubled, especially in the decade leading up to 1998. A

considerable part of the problem was structural. The Rotman School and Rotman faculty members resented the program because they felt they were merely “service teaching” in an FAS-controlled program and that the program was draining resources from the Rotman School. Also, because there was no specific budget envelope for the Commerce Program within FAS, it was difficult for FAS to ensure that resources generated by Commerce students were applied to Commerce students instead of drifting to other parts of FAS.

As a result of these and other forces by the mid-1990s, the UofT Commerce program was falling considerably behind the Ivey HBA and the Queen’s Commerce programs in terms of the entering qualifications of students and the brand reputation in the marketplace.

Post-1998, Deans Martin and Amrhein, working with Director Rotenberg and Provost Sedra (with Dean Sinervo seamlessly continuing the work upon his succession of Dean Amrhein) concentrated efforts on a turnaround of the Commerce program. Most of the unhelpful squabbling between FAS and Rotman has been eliminated. A new funding formula is in place that puts meaningful funds in the hands of the Director to improve the program. On a number of measures, including the grades of incoming students, the Commerce program has closed the gap with Ivey and Queen’s.

That work and those improvements notwithstanding, we agree with the Review Committee that the current institutional arrangements governing the Commerce Program are not in the interests of the long-term health of the Commerce program.

We agree entirely with the review committee that having control of the program vested primarily with FAS is sub-optimal. As a consequence, students are not registered in the Rotman School, are not students of the Rotman School, and are not considered alumni of the Rotman School.

However, Commerce students want their degree to be branded ‘Rotman’ just like Wharton undergrads want their degree to be branded ‘Wharton’, and Ivey HBA’s want to be branded ‘Ivey’. That notwithstanding, UofT Commerce students are branded ‘FAS.’ If an employer calls up the Rotman School asking to confirm the degree of a Commerce student, they are told to their surprise to call the FAS registrar.

In addition, Commerce students want to affiliate after graduation with the Rotman School. However, since they are considered graduates of FAS, the Rotman School needs to ask permission each time it wants to reach out to Commerce graduates. Permission is sometimes successfully negotiated and sometimes not.

The Review Committee recommends that control of the Commerce Program be shifted to reside solely with the Rotman School. Given the history of the program, we recommend that:

1. Control of the program be fully shared and that students in the program be registered in both FAS and the Rotman School
2. The program be called the Rotman Commerce Program, though the involvement of FAS should continue to be clearly promoted.
3. The Rotman Commerce Program be strictly limited to the St. George campus, and similar programs on suburban campuses be clearly distinguished from the Rotman Commerce Program.
4. The Rotman School have unlimited rights to communicate with Commerce graduates

In addition, the Review Committee questions the current structure of the program in which the students take a combination of FAS and Management courses in each of their four years (though the Management courses are primarily taken in years two through four).

We agree fully with the Review Committee. The history of the program and asymmetry in control has inhibited fundamental changes in the program. But the students are voting with their course selection: en masse, they take the minimum number of economics courses required and the maximum number of management courses allowed. If they were allowed to

take fewer economics courses they would. If they were allowed to take more management courses they would. The program structures of Wharton and Ivey, with two full years of Arts and Sciences and then two full years of Business, allow students to take more business/management courses.

Moving to a structure similar to Wharton and Ivey would not be easy for FAS. It would mean reducing the number of economics and other FAS courses taught. In addition, if an economic structure similar to Ivey were adopted in which FAS tuition is charged for the two FAS years and higher professional school tuition is charged for the two Rotman years, the economics would change substantially.

As a consequence, we recommend:

5. The upcoming external review of the St. George Commerce Program be charged with seriously exploring moving to a “two and two” structure
6. The funding formula for the program be appropriately adjusted to reflect a change in the structure toward higher management content in the program

### ***Tri-Campus Faculty***

As the review committee observes, the tri-campus agreement is deeply problematic for a unit such as the Rotman School. This should come as no big surprise in that the tri-campus agreement was an agreement between the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Principals of UTM and UTSC. The Rotman School was not a party to the agreement. A clause in the agreement suggested that specific arrangements needed to be worked out in respect of the other faculties. Some discussions have been had in this vein with UTM but the results thus far would not be at all comforting to the review committee.

The review committee correctly points out that the Rotman School brand cannot afford to have professors whom the Rotman School neither hired nor tenured nor promoted be associated by the outside academic and professional communities with the Rotman School. That, however, is what the current structure of the University of Toronto propagates. It will be important in future to re-affirm that Rotman faculty members are only those that are evaluated and compensated by the Rotman School. It is important to note in this context that the original naming gift that created the Rotman brand in the first place did not contemplate the brand covering anything but the faculty housed in the Rotman School. It is useful to recall the wording of the Rotman agreement: “The Faculty of Management will be physically located in the building now known as the Joseph L. Rotman Centre for Management at 105 St. George Street...the University shall, in perpetuity, cause the Faculty of Management be named the...Joseph L. Rotman School of Management.” We would argue that extending the brand of the Rotman School to cover programs and faculty members of UTM and UTSC runs against the spirit if not the strict letter of the Rotman gift.

Consistent with the reviewer committee’s comments concerning the Rotman brand, it would be optimal from the perspective of the Rotman brand for all management faculty members at the suburban campuses to be identified unambiguously, and properly, as faculty members at either UTM or UTSC. It may be impractical to enforce the distinction for existing faculty. However, it is imperative that all new management hires at the suburban campuses be hired onto the faculty of the suburban campus only, with a courtesy appointment at the Rotman School reserved for individuals explicitly identified for affiliation by the Rotman School.

In addition, we will change the custom followed by the Rotman School but not actually necessitated by the rules of the UofT to automatically grant full membership in the graduate faculty to suburban campus professors who earn tenure at the suburban campus. With tenure committees no longer chaired by the graduate chair, the Rotman School will need to have a separate committee chaired by the graduate chair to determine whether the graduate faculty feels comfortable in making the professor in question a full member of the graduate faculty or whether the professor needs to remain an associate member.

### **Space**

With respect to space, we agree with the review committee and appreciate that the UofT also agrees with the reality that the Rotman School needs the space that would be provided by a building on Site 11 to the south of the Rotman School. In addition, we concur entirely with the view that for Executive Education to continue to expand its critical role in the competitiveness of the Rotman School and the Canadian business community, it needs physical space.

Executive Education is a catchment area enterprise in which the competition is local and not global and for that reason the key competition for Rotman Executive Education consists of Ivey, Schulich and Queen's. With Schulich's truly impressive new residential facility coming on stream, Rotman is alone in not having its own residential facility and in therefore needing to use remote rented sites for its programs. This is not a sustainable position, regardless of how terrific our School brand becomes. Hence, a significant part of the space to be built must be dedicated to executive education, not just public program teaching and research.

We fully understand that we will need to fund the building of new space, but we will need to have the University's commitment to expand our space with a flexible facility that can support our long range strategic goals for growing the scale and scope of our program offerings and that can be responsive to the changing competitive needs of a global business school. We must build the volume and type of space that can meet those needs, and in particular, dedicate some of the space to executive education, not just public program teaching and research.

### **Summary**

We are pleased to be affirmed in our goals and progress by the external review committee. We agree with them that a select number of things need to be put in place to ensure that we continue to have a chance to achieve our lofty goals.

These include the following:

- Enhancing and extending our efforts on Integrative Thinking: adding resources; broadening faculty participation; thinking long term and addressing the academic community at large; and intensifying the effort
- Pursuing our own performance metrics: weaning ourselves off the externally mandated metrics
- Improving the institutional context for the Rotman School within UofT: enhancing Rotman control of the brand; overhauling the structure and branding of the Commerce Program; and clarifying uncertainties with respect to tri-campus faculty
- Providing flexibility for future expansion: providing Rotman with the site to the south of the current building; support building of executive education space

The Rotman School is on a steep trajectory, following an ambitious agenda which the review committee endorses fully. Success in this mission requires the concerted efforts of the leadership, faculty and staff of the School, as well as continued support from the University.

### **Provost's response:**

This is a very positive review and the recommendations are insightful with the aim of improving an already strong unit. In July, 2005 Dean Martin will begin his second term as Dean of the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management and the Provost has every confidence that he and the Faculty will meet the challenges outlined by the review report. The Faculty has clearly begun to formulate action plans to address the issues raised. The Provost looks forward to receiving the academic plan for the School within the next academic year.

The Provost has been working with the tri-campus Principals and Deans and Dean Martin to clarify the implementation of the tri-campus framework for management. The Provost has proposed a building site adjacent to the current building for expansion and a project plan is to be prepared. The Provost awaits the review of the Commerce program to be conducted jointly by the Deans.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Faculty of Music</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	September 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Vice-President and Provost
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergraduate:</b>	Bachelor of Music – Mas.Bac. Bachelor of Music in Performance – Mus.Bac.Perf.
<b>Graduate:</b>	Doctor of Philosophy, Ph.D. Doctor of Music – Mus.Doc. Master of Arts, M.A. Master of Music – Mus.M.
<b>Diploma/Certificate:</b>	<u>Undergrad &amp; First Professional Diplomas &amp; Certificates</u> Artist Diploma - Art.Dip.Mus.  <u>Graduate Degrees with Advanced Specialty training, grad diplomas &amp; grad certificates</u> Diploma in Operatic Performance – Dip.Op. Perf. Advanced Certificate in Performance – Adv.Cert.Perf.
<b>Continuing Education</b>	
<b>COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Three external reviewers, submitting a jointly-authored report
<b>REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International</b>	Prof. Robert Freeman, Dean, College of Fine Arts, The University of Texas at Austin Dr. Bernard J. Dobroski, John Evans Professor of Music, Northwestern University School of Music
<b>Canadian</b>	Prof. Don McLean, Dean, Faculty of Music, McGill University
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	May 1999
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Terms of Reference for the Review Faculty Self-Study, 2003-2004 Research Report, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost, 2004 Letter from Dean Gage Averill <i>Curricula Vitae</i> of faculty members Faculty Calendar Selection of brochures and newsletters from the Faculty
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	During their two-day visit the review team met with the Provost and Vice-Provost, Academic; the Dean, Divisional Co-ordinators, members of the faculty, administrative and support staff, representatives from graduate and undergraduate student groups, and representatives from cognate divisions (Faculty of Arts & Science - Drama, Medieval Studies, OISE/UT, Hart House, University of Toronto at Scarborough, Victoria College).

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The reviewers note that the Faculty of Music at the University of Toronto “has some remarkable assets in Music: very promising new leadership, an able and dedicated faculty, a home in one of the most attractive cities in North America, the strengths of the University of Toronto itself, and the degree of flexibility with which music students can enroll in courses in other faculties and colleges, and positive relationships with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra and the Canadian Opera Company, are certainly among them”. The strength of UofT Music is the integrative potential of musical creation and performance that, along with broad intellectual training and research, is possible in a comprehensive music school environment.

1. Faculty: The reviewers point out that “all faculty, full- and part-time, have impressive resumes, with degrees from fine universities and impressive scholarly/research productivity and accomplishments”. They note that the faculty work well together as a team and are strong and dedicated teachers. The students described an open door policy, with most faculty being supportive, dedicated open and helpful individuals. The reviewers suggest that the Faculty may want to rethink the ratio of full- and part-time faculty as they believe that a somewhat higher number of full-time appointments would allow for the maintenance of a critical-mass core of fully invested and informed faculty who are knowledgeable of the curriculum and degree requirements, as well as qualified and available to serve on music and university committees.

2. Top Schools in North America: The reviewers recommended two measures of comparison that could be used to assess the standing of the Faculty top programs in North America including the compilation of G10 and AAU data with comparable music programs along with an ongoing study of the institutions along with a tabulation of win rates for UofT.

3. Relationship with the Royal Conservatory of Music (RCM): There is a long historical relationship between the RCM and the Faculty of Music, and the reviewers noted that, with the arrival of the new Dean, there is an opportunity to develop a new atmosphere for better cooperation going forward:

- Such cooperation is essential not only to the wellbeing of UofT Music, but also to ensure the greater good of higher education in music in Canada”.
- Exploring the development of mutually beneficial agreements with RCM as in the current configuration, the two institutions can end up competing for students, external financial support, and public profile.
- The Faculty should aim to be best positioned to balance quality professional training against the broad educational experiences and research opportunities that a major university affords.
- Possibilities for partnership that moves towards maximizing student mobility from one program (or level) to another between institutions.
- The Faculty may need to focus on educational content, on building niche strengths, and on fostering those opportunities for mobility and collaboration that will improve the overall quality of music education for our students and communities.

4. Financial: The reviewers were concerned with the level of projected funding for the Faculty given the current budgetary restraints of the University.

5. Service to community: The reviewers recommend that Faculty as a whole should be involved in the wider community and that this involvement should be effectively communicated.

6. Interdisciplinary Majors: The reviewers suggest that the Faculty should work towards developing and implementing specific plans for interdisciplinary programmatic and/or curricular initiatives:

- UofT Faculty of Music should consider the expansion of opportunities for students desiring to elect a major in addition to their primary areas of interest.
- The UofT is uniquely positioned to promote curricular paradigms that promote cross-unit initiatives (both for students and faculty) with opportunities for students to perfect their technique and artistry in their individual instrumental or vocal specialty, but also to pursue competence in a substantive area in another field of interest or area of strength within other disciplines at UofT.
- May be entrepreneurial interest in targeting arts and science courses offered through particular colleges towards the program and scheduling needs of music students.

7. Music Lessons: Currently, selected undergraduate majors including music education majors, are limited to half-hour lessons during their studies at UofT. However, one-hour lessons would be best and they strongly endorse across-the-curriculum regular studio instruction for all majors, regardless of specialization. One-on-one studio study is critical as it is the experience that provides the foundation for most music students, regardless of their eventual specialization. The mentor relationship between professor and student, so characteristic of doctoral study in traditional graduate science and engineering curricula, may well be unique to music at the undergraduate level and it is an important tradition to support.



8. Music education and OISE: Faculty should build on its strength as a leading music education presence in Canada:

- Expand the integration by expanding education's offerings to new subjects via inter-area collaboration within the Faculty.
- Explore opportunities for linkages with existing community and school outreach programs.
- Exploration and development of new models for cooperation and collaboration between OISE and Music Education programs. Students who have gone through a four-year Bachelor of Music program at UofT within the music education concentration are well positioned for a one-year teacher certification program.

9. Library: The quality and breadth of collections housed in the Music Library is impressive based on almost any outside measure of excellence. However, the library budget appears to be in need of additional support with regard to its acquisitions and technology support budgets, as well as funds for space assigned to the collection for the storage, research, study. In addition, space (storage, research and current holdings) is and will become a major issue if not addressed.

10. Technology: The technological infrastructure of the Faculty was considered inadequate by the reviewers. The deficiencies outlined included: lack of regular capital equipment replacement for staff and administrative computers; weak technological support in the library; virtual absence of sound recording facilities and support structures.

11. Performing Arts Council: The various performing arts units at the University should come together as part of an arts council in order to potential synergies among the arts for the whole of the university might be explored and opportunities optimized.

12. Central Fund for the Dean: The reviewers suggest that the University may consider a central fund for the Dean.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

### **Dean's response:**

The next few years will be exciting ones for the Faculty of Music. The External Review has brought additional perspectives and scrutiny to the process of renewing a significant resource in North American music education. This has been especially helpful to the Dean in the process of crafting the Faculty's Stepping Up Response. The Faculty is located in a great university in a great city and hopes to fully exploit its institutional and municipal location. ~~We hope to rethink our mission and mandate and to become the best possible comprehensive music school for Canada's preeminent research-oriented public university in the nation's largest and most diverse city.~~

1. Faculty: We agree with the reviewers that our Performance Division would benefit from a larger ratio of full-time to part-time and sessional faculty. It is our goal to propose a number of such appointments in the upcoming two years. The benefits of having committed teachers who also advise and fulfill service responsibilities more than outweigh the loss in flexibility and economy, and so we will be creative in our reallocation of resources to make a number of these positions feasible.

2. Top Schools in North America: It is widely thought that the University of Toronto and McGill constitute the two best comprehensive music schools in Canada, although The University of British Columbia may indeed be moving into their ranks in the foreseeable future. We strongly embrace the Committee's recommendations on the development of comparable data and on our comparison pool.

3. Relationship with the Royal Conservatory of Music (RCM): This section of the Review was prepared by an external reviewer with a long history of familiarity with the RCM and with a current interest in the relationship between University music programs and conservatories; hence its considerable length. In the last six months, we have gone a long way towards normalizing

relations—the current Dean of the Faculty has already opened up many channels of communication between the two schools and has cooperated with the RCM in scheduling and sharing masterclasses.

There are compelling reasons, however, to explore the kind of articulation between post-secondary programs at the Faculty and GGS as suggested in the External Review. The RCM has succeeded in garnering high visibility for their programs, and they are taking steps to improve their degree-granting capability. The historic rivalry and inter-school tensions, especially with the facilities so proximate, confuse donors and supporters of both institutions as well as the general public. And, as the Review points out, similar relationships have been structured in other parts of the country between comprehensive music schools and conservatories. What the Review doesn't note is that the Province has signaled its interest in achieving better coordination and student mobility between the college system and the universities; the RCM-UofT situation is at least roughly analogous. Even before the External Review was completed, I had opened discussions with the RCM, in consultation with the Provost's Office, on whether there might be a joint degree option for the RCM's Glenn Gould School that would return adequate revenue to both institutions while solving the RCM's "degree problem" and helping to put the rivalry to rest. Discussions on this proposal are pending.

4. Financial: This section of the review is devoted to the base budget austerity measures that are planned for the fiscal years 2004-'05 through '09-'10. With a new dean, the Faculty has engaged in a dialogue about how to eliminate or reduce some additional budget items as a part of the process of challenging how we deliver education. However, the 2006-06 cuts, proportionate to a 30%+ additional loss of our remaining flexible expenditures, would irreparably damage the Faculty's curriculum, programs, and stature among music institutions. Under those kinds of survival pressures, little or no progress could be made toward our Stepping Up goals and the faculty would spend a number of years trying simply to survive and to fundraise for survival. We agree wholeheartedly with the External Review that, "we do not see how the current quality of the faculty of music can be maintained, much less advanced, without some notable increase in revenues."

5. Service to community: This section does justice neither to the extent of the Faculty's plans in this area nor even to the current programs of outreach, service learning, and public service. This is a central theme of our "Stepping Up" report currently in preparation. We will look towards ways of facilitating the impressive range of outreach and service activities that we imagine providing. It is our contention that the Faculty of Music can be an important gateway between the University and the City.

6. Interdisciplinary Majors: The Faculty administers a successful major and minor in Music for A&S students and we are currently pursuing two degree proposals with other units of the University. A centerpiece of our Stepping Up Response is our focus on "Music education for the real world and 21<sup>st</sup> century," which targets new degrees, career and professional training, grounding in the liberal arts, and flexibility as key determinants of the success of future music students, especially given the extraordinary changes in recent decades in the music industry and the arts. The External Review's recommendations on interdisciplinary majors and on dual majors are well taken; earlier in this academic year we broached the subject with A&S (meeting with a positive response). We expect that many of the new degree options in upcoming years will involve interdisciplinary study.

7. Music Lessons: The External Review team has provided an eloquent argument to support equitable provision of applied lessons across the divisional structure of the Faculty. This has been a concern voiced by every group of students with whom I've met in the last nine months, in part because applied lessons are a backbone of any music curriculum. We have submitted a Provost's Academic Initiative Fund proposal to make this possible and to give the breathing room to administer a more equitable program in the near future.

8. Music education and OISE: We agree with the general concerns expressed in this section about the relationship between Music Education programs in music schools and teacher training schools such as OISE. We have been meeting with OISE all year to advance the 5-year concurrent degree proposal, which we think is feasible within the UofT context. There would be difficulties in implementing and administering such a program, but there are difficulties currently for students who, after finishing a four-year Music Education B.M., enroll for an often partly

redundant and poorly interfaced fifth year in a school of education. We are intrigued by the External Review's proposal for cross-appointed faculty with OISE and for a network pulling together OISE music specialists, music educators from the Faculty of Music, and benchmark teachers from the schools systems. We have also had preliminary and very tentative discussions about a greater cooperation with the RCM on their own school-age programs.

9. Library: The first paragraph of this section suggests that the Library lacks "an important collection of on-line journals and reference works." Our collection is in fact quite comprehensive, and it is supported by the Central Library's determination to acquire all appropriate electronic resources for research and study. Access within the Library (as distinct from access available to anyone in the University community with a computer and internet hookup) is indeed limited to the 18 public workstations, and should be improved as the Review correctly point out. Our Library Committee has already proposed a plan for adding to and updating our computing resources in the Library. We have also applied for AIF funding to support online access for all University students to the Naxos catalogue of 185,000 + (mostly classical) recordings, which will provide some breathing room for our efforts to provide online access to the Library's collection, or at least to those parts of the collection used for course assignments. Music libraries encounter a heightened version of the digital dilemmas facing all libraries: what media and formats should be supported? Should we transfer all recordings once their formats begin to become obsolete or do we maintain the capacity forever to play '78s, LPs, CDs. Mini-DVDs, compact CDs, DATs and so forth? Do we devote our shrinking staff time to cataloguing the recordings that are donated to the Library or to digitalizing important recordings for streaming? We have dedicated ourselves to leading in the process of rethinking music libraries in the digital age.

10. Technology: We agree with the Committee about the current lamentable state of the technological resources in the Faculty for student labs, recording, teaching, and research. This is a product of both the entirely distributed approach to technology at UofT and to the Faculty's limited experience and concern with technology in recent decades. This a major focus of our Stepping Up plans and of our facilities plan as well. In addition, our Technology Committee in the Faculty is studying the many interrelated issues involving technology and is advising the Dean on planning. We envision a Faculty in which students, faculty, and staff have the technological resources needed to do their jobs well and to innovate in their fields. We are pursuing a CFI grant for an ethnomusicology lab, talking with representatives of the music industry about our recording facility and possible composer arranging labs to complement our electronic composition lab, and are looking at issues of classroom teaching technology, library streaming of audio resources, and an increasingly multi-functional and attractive website, among other issues.

11. Performing Arts Council: The historic failure to create coherence and interdisciplinary collaboration among the arts on campus has been a principal concern of mine since arriving at the UofT. I've been involved in assessing this situation and consulting with the Provost on appropriate responses. We hope to take an active role in a Council, although we hope such a Council will be broad enough in its composition and mandate to incorporate the visual arts as well.

12. A Central Fund for the Dean: Much of the purpose served by such a fund could be achieved by proper decanal shaping of the AIF proposals generated by the Faculty of Music. Keeping the bulk of such funds within the AIF process maintains a University-wide monitoring and vetting of innovative proposals for Music and a role for the Provost's Office in the renewal of the Faculty, and we feel that this is right and proper. Should the Provost choose to make some funds available for more "local" efforts at innovation in the Faculty of Music, the Dean would have additional leverage to quickly and more powerfully steer the Faculty in the achievement of Stepping Up goals. I would be happy to discuss this proposal by the Committee in relation to the AIF and Stepping Up process.

In summary, the Faculty of Music is committed to:

1. Being an international centre of excellence for musical creativity, performance, and scholarship.
2. Providing a stimulating environment in which its outstanding resources may support not only instruction of the highest quality but also the creation of new knowledge about all aspects of music.

3. Balancing its various performance and academic programmes so that all may be mutually informative and complementary, thus promoting the multi-dimensional study of music.
4. Strengthening its ties with other divisions of the University of Toronto and the community, and extending its influence in the musical life of Toronto and Canada.

**Provost's response:**

The Provost is pleased with the outcome of the review and is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions. In July, 2005 Professor Gage Averill began his term as Dean of the Faculty of Music and the Provost has every confidence that he and the Faculty will meet the challenges outlined by the review.

The Faculty has addressed all the points raised by the reviewers. The academic planning process is well underway at the Faculty and careful thought and consideration have been given to the report of the external reviewers.

The Provost has already made an investment with Academic Initiative Funding (AIF) in the Faculty to address the enhancement of the student experience. The Faculty of Music AIF proposal will extend universal access to lessons and expand practice facilities for the music students. The proposal also contains a plan to negotiate with a major classical record label to allow all of the UofT community to legal online music access. The Faculty aims to use these recordings for course listening assignments, thus alleviating a significant amount of traffic congestion currently in the Music Library. This would be especially important to students at UTM and UTSC, because travel to the St. George campus is time consuming. In addition, the University community would have access to unlimited access to the online recordings, through University or home computers.

The Stepping UP process identified the creative and performing arts as one of the areas within which to improve collaboration and synergy, enhance the student experience, raise the profile of these activities and improve opportunities for partnerships with cultural organizations in Greater Toronto Area. The Faculty is committed to ensuring that the Faculty of Music is recognized as an arts and culture destination and to raise the profile of the Faculty as an arts presenter. The University has committed to greater coordination of the Arts on campus and thanks the Dean for providing academic leadership for this activity.

In terms of the Faculty's presence on the campus, the Provost is aware that the lack of physical visibility of the Faculty and is engaged in ongoing discussions with the Faculty and its neighbours regarding the improvement of its space needs.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Faculty of Pharmacy</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	December 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Vice-President and Provost
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
<b>Undergraduate:</b>	B.Sc.Pharm. Program (second entry) Bachelor of Science in Pharmaceutical Sciences (with Arts & Science) Doctor Of Pharmacy (PharmD) Program
<b>Graduate:</b>	Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
<b>Diploma/Certificate:</b>	International Pharmacy Graduate Program
<b>Continuing Education</b>	
<b>COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Two external reviewers, submitting a jointly-authored report
<b>REVIEWERS:</b>	
<b>International</b>	Dr. David S. Hill, FCSHP, Associate Dean, Administration and Clinical Affairs, School of Pharmacy University of Colorado Health Sciences Center Professor. Marilyn Speedie, Dean, College of Pharmacy, University of Minnesota
<b>Canadian</b>	
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	1999
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	Terms of Reference for the Review Faculty Self-Study, 2003-2004 Faculty <i>Stepping Up</i> Plan, 2004 Research Report, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost, 2004 CVs of faculty members
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	During their two-day visit the review team met with the Provost and Vice-Provost, Academic; the Dean, Associate Deans, members of the faculty, administrative and support staff, representatives from graduate and undergraduate student groups, representatives from cognate divisions (Faculty of Medicine and the Dept. of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts & Science) and representatives from the Teaching Hospital Pharmacy Directors, Ontario Pharmacists Association and Ontario College of Pharmacists. The reviewers also met with the Pharmacy Decanal Search Committee.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The reviewers state that the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy at the University of Toronto is very strong. Its pharmacy graduates are well regarded by the profession and its research programs are thriving. Strong leadership by Dean Hindmarsh has helped them weather many changes and the Faculty is "remarkably forward-looking".

Many challenges and opportunities are on the horizon. Foremost among these challenges is the fact that, if the Faculty is to truly compete on an international level with its professional program, they will have to make the transition to the entry-level doctorate. As it stands now, no B.Sc.

pharmacy graduate is 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. If U of T pharmacy graduates can no longer gain access to advanced or specialty clinical training opportunities in the US (as these training programs are very scarce in Canada at this time), the Faculty will be limited its recruitment of faculty for clinical positions to those who have received their education solely within Canada.

**Specific issues:**

1. Enrolment

- The reviewers note that B.Sc in Pharmacy is a very large professional school program and is nearing its upper limit size if it is to maintain the high quality of its graduates. At 240 students per class it is one of the largest programs in North America. They suggest that it is essential to provide sufficient TA support and educational infrastructure to maintain the quality of the program.
- The reviewers point out that the BIU system for pharmacy does not recognize the increased costs of delivering a professional program with an extensive clinical component. Needs for additional faculty remain, especially with the implementation of the B.S. in Pharmaceutical Sciences program and should be addressed as quickly as possible.

2. Entry Level Doctor of Pharmacy Degree Curriculum

- This is an important initiative and there is much work to be done with stakeholders to arrive at the optimal program/degree for educating pharmacists who are equipped to contribute competent and comprehensive patient services as part of the Canadian health care system. While it may be tempting to delay or defer this question, the issue has critical importance to pharmacy students with respect to emerging practice roles for pharmacists, access to specialty residency training and fellowship opportunities in the US, and the leadership position of the U of T to influence education policy change.

3. Institute for Drug Research

- It is not clear how the Faculty of Pharmacy has fully participated in the Institute of Drug Research. The spectrum of faculty and research issues in the Faculty of Pharmacy go beyond the programmatic scope defined for the IDR and the work of the Department of Pharmacology. It was not clear that faculty members from Pharmacy are as integrated into the Institute as they could and should be.

4. Size, Scope, Quality and Priorities of the Faculty's Education Activities

- The B.Sc.Pharm. program was given a full accreditation award in 2001 and remains a strong, contemporary curriculum. Even with the larger applicant pool, entrance academic admission standards of accepted students remains high and degree completion rates are very good.
- The international pharmacy graduate (IPG) program appears to be a highly successful initiative. It clearly addresses a need of the province to ensure the practice competency of pharmacists entering the profession who received their education in other countries. Expansion of the IPG model is a desirable development.
- The reviewers were pleased to see that the University now provides line budget funding to the post B.Sc. Doctor of Pharmacy program. This program received a full accreditation award in 2001. A new program director has been appointed who has made a number of changes to improve the structure of the curriculum and to increase student retention and degree completion rates.
- The fulltime post B.Sc. Pharm.D. program continues to struggle from declining applicant interest and presents a dilemma to the Faculty. Resolution of this dilemma is not likely to be achieved until the Faculty establishes its direction with respect to conversion of the current B.Sc.Pharm into an entry-level Pharm.D. degree curriculum.
- The new B.Sc. in Pharmaceutical Sciences (pharmaceutical chemistry stream) offers another avenue to enhance cross-linking interdisciplinary relationships between the Faculty and other campus units. While the design of the program structure is well advanced, concerned that the cost sharing arrangements and need for additional faculty have not been finalized.

6. Scope, Quality, and Relevance of Faculty's Research Activities

- The scope, quality and relevance of the faculty's research activities were deemed excellent by the reviewers. New faculty members have been hired who are at the forefront of their fields and have proven that they can both perform externally funded research and teach in the graduate and undergraduate programs. The reviewers noted that more should be done to highlight faculty research outside the Faculty.

7. Scope and Nature of the Faculty's Relationship with External Government and Professional Organizations

- Strong alliances have been formed with key stakeholders. Community and hospital pharmacy representatives support the undergraduate program through provision of clinical placement training sites. Employers and the provincial regulatory authority (OCP) are impressed with the quality and skills of pharmacy graduates. The increase in enrolment levels over the past five years has generated favor for the Faculty from the OPA and most other segments within the profession.
- Fundraising for development and capital projects from major friends of the Faculty in the generic pharmaceutical industry, from some community pharmacy corporate sources, and from alumni has been "outstanding". Provincial government support to the new building and seed money to start the IPG program has also been impressive.
- The dean's successful leadership has generated an enormous amount of "goodwill" capital within the profession and key stakeholders for the Faculty.

8. The Appropriateness and Effectiveness of the Faculty's Organizational and Financial Structure

- The growth in programs and activities in recent years, combined with the extent of change, has created a situation in which the dean has a great number of direct reports. Many of these changes have reached a point of maturity where they need consistent oversight and coordination, with delegated administrative responsibility and accountability. A divisional structure with heads taking some responsibility for this communication may help. This second tier of leadership could also facilitate more focused mentoring of young faculty and attention to scholarly productivity in the priority areas of the Faculty.
- The financial structure appears to be lean given the diversity of programs with which the Faculty of Pharmacy is engaged. Compared to some of the other health profession programs at the U of T, the amount of money received per student as the pharmacy program has expanded does not appear to have been commensurate with the expanded instructional infrastructure that is required.
- The Faculty of Pharmacy has been quite creative in generating a variety of new sources of income through innovations such as the International Pharmacy Graduate program and the B.Sc. in Pharmaceutical Sciences.

9. Vision of the Special Challenges Facing the Faculty in Long-Range Planning

- The transition to the entry-level PharmD degree curriculum will be a special challenge and calls for a great deal of work with all stakeholders. Whether the PharmD becomes the standard entry-level degree in Canada or not is a matter for the profession and the Faculty to decide together. Given the fact that pharmacy graduates are already well beyond usual B.Sc. credit requirements and that the international standard of entry-level pharmacy practice is rapidly becoming the Doctor of Pharmacy, it seems that the strategic objective the Faculty has decided upon is the correct path.
- The reviewers note that the Faculty will need to significantly expand its clinical faculty cohort, including those performing clinical research. Attention should be paid to the faculty titles, roles and employment policies for clinical faculty members and there may be models in the medical school that would suit the Faculty of Pharmacy.

## ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

### Dean's response:

We believe that the review report provides a reasonable snapshot and fair assessment of the current state-of-affairs of the Faculty. The reviewers comments serve, in a number of places, to highlight current issues with which we are dealing as well affirm the prudence of many of the strategic endeavors presently underway at the Faculty.

Within the reviewers' comments and across the categories they used to organize their report some recurring themes became apparent. Responses are provided for only the issues to which most emphasis was given by reviewers and those of most relevance to the Faculty's current strategic plan.

**A. Human Resources:** The scope and pace of new developments over the past few years have created some stresses. As we move forward it is clear that we must ensure that the necessary faculty and the appropriate mix of support staff are in place to enable the smooth operation of our day-to-day activities. The quality of teaching and research must be maintained and enhanced and this can only happen with the strategic and intelligent allocation of necessary resources.

The Report makes reference to the fact that the number of faculty hired to date has been less than expected. While some of this is due to budget realities, hiring can only occur as we realize the increased income resulting from increased enrolments as cohorts move through our programs. In addition we need to balance the rate and number of faculty and staff hires with other demands on available resources (for example, mortgages for the Pharmacy building and CCBR). We are currently advertising for new faculty positions. The space limitations in our current facilities which have impeded our ability to 'house' new hires will be resolved with the move into the new building. Having our entire faculty compliment along with support staff in our new building will provide opportunities for great synergy and will alleviate the stresses created by our being currently divided and housed in four different buildings on campus

An assessment of support staff requirements and functions is urgently required in order to effectively address two major issues: 1. increase in support staff workload resulting from enrolment growth and 2. the need to adapt to new function-based groupings and take account of and respond to expanded needs with the imminent move to our new building. As part of this assessment we will be restructuring the Faculty's administration with a view to creating a new 'middle' level of management to share responsibility and assume greater accountability.

While the review recognized there must be adequate TA support, it may be time to re-examine the process of distribution of Faculty TA support. We intend to clarify guidelines for allocation of TA support to ensure equitable distribution of limited resources. Although concern was expressed by graduate students with respect to funding, it is important to note that the Faculty of Pharmacy does adhere to SGS policies and little can be done to change funding formulas.

**B. Fiscal Resources:** Faculty resources are strained largely because we continue to be subject to antiquated, out-dated and inappropriate funding formulas. Meaningful and necessary change would require an alteration in BIU funding. The changes in education requirements for our profession, since the basis of the formula was established, have been significant and require that our graduates can provide pharmaceutical care – a 'patient' focused, skills intensive, clinically demanding model of direct patient care. These new educational imperatives have required significant changes in teaching methodologies and include experiential training, problem-based teaching, small group teaching, and the use of standardized patients. These methods are resource intensive and have had a major impact on operating budgets. While we continue to struggle under the strain of this burden, it is heartening to know that the Provost is committed to implementation of a new revenue-based budget model that could benefit the Faculty. There is an agreement to re-examine the budget of the Faculty if such a model is not implemented within the next 12 months.

**C. Organizational Structure:** We agree with the Report in that the growth in programs and activities in recent years, combined with the extent of change, has created a situation in which the dean has great number of direct reports. The Faculty will be dealing with this issue in near future.



#### **D. Program Development and Growth**

**Entry-level Pharm.D.** The transition to an entry-level Pharm.D. will be a 'special challenge' and calls for a great deal of work with all stakeholders. A coordinator will be hired to provide leadership in the planning and direction of the Faculty with respect to this potential change in the curriculum.

**Pharm Chem. Program:** Pharmacy has accepted their first students into this collaborative program in September 2004. The 2004-2005 course content is mainly provided by the Faculty of Arts and Science. The immediate focus has been ensuring the necessary faculty and laboratory instrumentation are in place for the fall of 2005. It is evident the financial needs of this program will not be met through income sharing with Arts and Science. Some resources may be secured through AIF initiatives. Fund-raising initiatives should also be considered.

**Graduate Studies:** While the Report does not address this program, except for policies related to stipends, the program is very successful. Excellent leadership and the quality of the faculty within the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences have resulted in a program classified as of 'Good Quality' by the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies. Enrolment increase has also been significant. Over the past six years, student numbers have nearly doubled with the major increase in Ph.D. candidates.

**Institute of Drug Research (IDR):** Over the next few months, it will be important that IDR define themselves and clearly identify the roles of the Faculties of Pharmacy and Medicine.

**Waterloo Campus:** The role of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy in the development of the Waterloo campus is envisioned as one of potential collaboration. Negotiations are underway to determine the extent of this collaboration.

**B.Sc.Pharm. Enrollment Target:** The B.Sc.Pharm will enroll its target number of 240 students in September 2005 and will continue henceforth to admit 240 students annually. This intake realizes our promise to double enrollment from our intake of 120 in 1998. Continued effort is needed in the areas of student recruitment and counseling. Admissions is another area in which an increase in administrative assistance may be required.

**E. External Affairs:** Unfortunately the issue Big Pharma and their support of the Faculty is not about to change until there is acceptance by other health professionals for an increased role of the pharmacist in the delivery of health care. The profession of pharmacy has been challenged to become integrated into the family healthcare networks. From an academic point of view it is important to ensure there are interdisciplinary opportunities in our educational experiential components. The timing is right for 'thinking outside the box' as we consider the possible introduction of an entry level Pharm.D. degree and the role of these graduates in the delivery of healthcare.

#### **Provost's response:**

This is clearly a very positive review and the Provost welcomes the reviewers' enthusiastic endorsement of changes made in the Faculty in recent years. In July, 2005 Professor Hindmarsh will begin his second term as Dean of the Faculty of Pharmacy and the Provost has every confidence that he and the Faculty will meet the challenges outlined by the review report and within their own *Stepping Up Plan*. The Faculty has begun to formulate action plans to address the issues raised.

The Provost has allocated Academic Initiative Funding (AIF) for the development of entry level PharmD Program. The funding will allow the employment of a practitioner that will aid the Faculty in the development of the Entry Level Pharm.D. curriculum and assist with the organization of information sessions for the greater pharmacy community. A new curriculum is proposed that embraces the Faculty's goal of bringing expanded knowledge, skills and experience to students who aspire to become the needed Pharmacy professionals of tomorrow. The proposed curriculum change will have significantly more experiential training time, 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 more of a leadership role and to work more effectively as part of the health care team with physicians and nurses. The Pharm.D. committee has proposed a curriculum change that will require changes in course content and coordination of delivery that will set a quality standard for pharmacy education in Canada.

The proposal will result in the ability of the Faculty to greatly enhance the student experience and will result in strong connections of the University with the broader community of pharmacy and health professionals.

We are pleased that the Dean has commenced an examination of the Faculty's administrative structure. The Provost continues to work with the Dean to ensure that the Waterloo Pharmacy arrangement is successful.

The external review team astutely identified the challenges facing the Faculty and provided sound strategies and advice for responding to these challenges. The Dean has taken decisive measures on key issues raised in the reviews:

## REVIEW SUMMARY

<b>DIVISION/UNIT:</b>	<b>Faculty of Physical Education and Health</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	November 2004
<b>COMMISSIONING OFFICER:</b>	Vice-President and Provost
<b>PROGRAMS OFFERED:</b>	
Undergraduate:	Bachelor of Physical Education & Health – B.P.H.E.
Graduate:	MSc., PhD in Exercise Sciences
Diploma/Certificate:	
Continuing Education	
<b>COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:</b>	Two external reviewers, submitting a jointly-authored report
<b>REVIEWERS:</b>	
International	Prof. Art Quinney, Deputy Provost and former Dean of Physical Education and Recreation, University of Alberta
Canadian	Prof Janet Starkes, Department of Kinesiology, McMaster University
<b>DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:</b>	Administrative Review, January 2003
<b>DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:</b>	<b><i>Terms of Reference for the Review</i></b>  <b><i>Faculty Self-Study, 2004</i></b> Research Report, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost, 2004 <i>Curricula Vitae</i> of faculty members Faculty Calendar Selection of brochures and newsletters from the Faculty
<b>CONSULTATION PROCESS:</b>	During their two-day visit the review team met with the Provost and Vice-Provost, Academic; the Dean, Divisional Co-ordinators, members of the faculty and athletic instructors, administrative and support staff, representatives from graduate and undergraduate student groups, representatives from cognate divisions (Arts & Science, Medicine, OISE/UT, Hart House, University of Toronto at Scarborough) and representatives from the professional community.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

### Size, scope, qualities and priorities of the Faculty's educational activities

#### (a) Undergraduate program in Physical and Health Education

- Overall, the reviewers viewed the undergraduate program as a high quality, high demand program. They noted that with approximately 460 students in the program, this would be considered one of the smaller programs in Canada and within Canada's largest research-intensive university is quite a small undergraduate program.
- The undergraduate students were uniformly pleased with their program, would recommend it to others and all would select the program again if given the option. The students noted that the Faculty had been responsive to issues raised by them. They recognized that the Faculty had taken appropriate measures to recruit a diverse pool of students but suggested that there were some negative cultural aspects within the undergraduate experience. It was indicated that unacceptable levels of sexism, homophobia, and discrimination exist within the program. The students raised concerns about the lecture and laboratory facilities in the Faculty.

- Of the 32 undergraduate programs in Physical Education / Kinesiology across the country, U of T is one of only 4 accredited by CCUPEKA in both Kinesiology and Physical Education Teacher Preparation. U of T undergrads are generally very supportive of the program and satisfied with the content. They are excellent ambassadors of the program.

(b) Graduate program in Exercise Sciences

- The Graduate program in Exercise Sciences is small in size relative to faculty complement and size of the Undergraduate program. The program draws good applicants but few offers are accepted. Faculty are concerned that the cost of living in Toronto is a deterrent. They feel that while guaranteed funding levels are helpful to students it reduces the number of students that could potentially be accepted. Based on size and faculty complement the reviewers felt it would be possible for the faculty to take more graduate students.
- The students expressed that they often had good individual working relationships with their supervisors but they outlined a number of problems they felt were inherent to the program. While the calendar lists a large number of course offerings, they indicated the actual offerings were far fewer. They lamented the lack of a quantitative statistics course offered within the department. They were disappointed with the amount of research being conducted within the department and when asked if they would recommend the program to others, all indicated they would not. None of the students brought up the issue of support funding or lack thereof. Finally, students felt they were not well supported by the faculty in terms of adequate work space or access to computer facilities. They indicated that there are few opportunities for students to meet or share research ideas. While there is a graduate seminar in place that is well attended by students, they reported few faculty attend on a regular basis. The students felt that the student-organized graduate research conference hosted by PEH last year was a very positive experience, and they hoped to offer this once again.
- The Graduate program is in need of immediate attention particularly in light of the upcoming OCGS review of the program.

(c) Co-Curricular Program

- The U of T Athletics and Recreation programs planned and managed within the FPEH are the largest in scope and diversity in Canadian universities. The Faculty has maintained the strong U of T tradition of prioritizing the academic aspect of the athletic/academic balance and that was viewed very positively. The coaches were critical of the facilities available for practice and performance and based on facilities that exist at other universities in Canada; this concern is viewed as valid. There was consensus that the dean must be a strong advocate for excellence in athletics and that the breadth of the intercollegiate sport program should be reviewed with a view to reducing offerings and increasing support for 'priority' programs. The coaches also raised the issue of maintaining two budgets within the Faculty and felt that Athletics and Recreation subsidized the Academic program.
- The intramural, physical activity instruction and leadership development programs appear to be very well managed within the Faculty and attract large numbers of appreciative participants. The limiting factor to enhancing quality and access was facility availability and that free recreational access was a major concern.
- The incidental fee that supports all of the co-curricular programs is the highest in Canada and based on the reviewers' knowledge of other Canadian universities, the facilities are not congruent with the size of the institution nor the level of fees charged. The role of the Athletics and Recreation program in the quality of student life at the U of T was also raised and there was a strong representation that an investment in facilities for these programs was a priority for students. There was also a feeling that central administration devalued the contribution of physical activity and sport in personal development and only appreciated the intellectual component of the university student experience.

**Scope, quality and relevance of the Faculty's research activities**

- As with most Canadian faculties of Physical Education / Kinesiology, the scope of research covered is very broad. While there is great variability in productivity level and research funding amongst the faculty, the research conducted is generally of high quality and very relevant to the field. We would characterize the infrastructure for research (lab

space, equipment, computer support, etc.) as adequate for this type of research but not reflective of what might be expected at a research intensive university.

- The FPEH's self-study suggests that they have not pursued as much research funding as would be optimal. The reviewers concur and note that there have not been many applications for CFI or New Opportunities funding. Faculty members indicate there is little reinforcement for preparation and submission of grants, either in terms of staff support for grant preparation, mentorship, or positive merit assessment for submissions. The reviewers did not view the teaching workload as prohibitive in terms of research productivity.

#### **Faculty's relationship with cognate academic departments and units at the University of Toronto**

- The reviewers believe that continued effort must be made in the academic and research programs to develop and maintain linkages across the U of T campus. Building bridges and facilitating partnership development must be a high priority of the dean.

#### **Faculty's relationship with external government and professional organizations**

- The current Dean has been particularly active and effective in lobbying for Tri Council funding of sport / physical activity related research. He is an active member of CCUPEKA and over the past few years has hosted bi-annual meetings for this group. The Faculty and current Dean are viewed as valued contributors to the broader community decisions made with regard to physical activity programming in the City of Toronto, lobbying ventures by the Ontario Assoc. of Physical and Health Education, and the work of the Canadian Olympic Association.

#### **Appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty's organizational and financial structure**

- There is strong support for a merged FPEH with mandate for academic and athletic and recreation programs. Many of the people who met with the review team recognized the challenges of a merged Faculty, but they also believed that this was the best option for both components and recognized that under Dean Kidd's leadership that there was continuing progress to address ongoing issues.
- The difficulty of maintaining two separate budgets within the FPEH was raised on several occasions and the request for more transparency on budgeting was made in several meetings. It was also apparent that great effort has been taken to rationalize costs related to shared services needs.
- Virtually all persons who met with the review team recognized the advantage of logistics in access to facilities but also pointed to the overall lack of adequate facilities both academic and athletic and recreation programs. In particular, there was strong disappointment in the failure of efforts to date in developing a new facility on the Varsity Stadium site.
- The administrative structure within the Faculty appears to be functioning effectively.

#### **Vision of the special challenges facing the Faculty in long-range planning**

- a) The need for a Strategic Plan:** The Faculty lacks a well-documented Strategic Plan for the next 5 years. Such a plan should provide links with the university's framework for academic planning as presented in the "Stepping Up" document. Likewise, it should provide direction when decisions are necessary with regard to competing resources, staffing, etc. This is particularly important in light of FPEH's joint academic and co-curricular mandate and separate budget lines.
- b) Varsity Stadium:** The development of a facility on the Varsity Stadium site represents a new opportunity for academic / research facilities to be incorporated within a new design. The inclusion of research facilities could provide the opportunity for a CFI funding application.
- c) Succession of the Dean:** At present there appears to be no plan for the succession of Dean Kidd. While Dr. Kidd enjoys considerable support as Dean, in either the short or long term, a successor will be necessary. The Faculty is developing considerable talent and strength in its Associate and Assistant Deans and nurturing this skill is important. As reviewers we echo the recommendation of the Administrative review in 2002, that the

cohort of senior administrators in the Faculty need to be empowered to carry out a strategic plan that has been developed and endorsed by the Faculty at large.

**Research environment:** The reviewers noted a lack of enthusiasm and energy for research. Across the country Physical Education / Kinesiology programs are rapidly becoming more research oriented and productive. As a result U of T will quickly fall behind if action is not taken on this.

**The morale of the faculty, students, and staff:** It was the reviewers' impression that this is an area of concern in that there was constant reference to lack of resources, facilities and appreciation of effort. There does not appear to be a cohesive, interactive team in the academic programs area and this was a focus of comment by both undergraduate and graduate students.

**FPEH within the community:** The large urban location of the FPEH presents many challenges. It also presents tremendous opportunity for service to the community. At times the athletic facilities available are not top quality and probably influence community perception of both the university and its commitment or lack thereof to physical activity. The Leadership Development program within FPEH is unique and worthy of special commendation. Participation is growing within the program, students enjoy their placements and at the same time provide valuable service to the community.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE**

### **Dean's response:**

The Faculty is grateful to the reviewers for their frank assessment of its strengths and weaknesses. We were pleased to read their affirmation of the quality and relevance of the Faculty's research, the undergraduate program, the student-supervisor relationships in the graduate program, the co-curricular intercollegiate, intramural and leadership development programs, and the extent of Faculty outreach. We were pleased to see that they judged the merger (in 1998) of the former School of Physical and Health Education and the Department of Athletics and Recreation to be a success. We do not intend to rest upon these achievements. We will build upon them in the years ahead.

As the reviewers noted, 'in this type of review process, it is common for more negative elements to be identified since individuals see this as an opportunity to raise issues of concern rather than to comment on positive aspects'. This response will focus on those 'negative elements', in some cases to clarify or contextualize them, in others to indicate how we have begun to address them.

### **1. Size, scope, qualities and priorities of the Faculty's educational activities**

#### **(a) Undergraduate program in Physical and Health Education**

The students interviewed by the reviewers expressed concern about lecture and laboratory facilities, a concern we have long shared. While the reviewers did not mention computer facilities for undergraduate students, there is also a need for more there. The problem, however, is not the want of plans but the scarcity of funds and the technological limitations of the University IT backbone. The renovation of classrooms and labs is one part of the deferred maintenance challenge facing the Faculty. While we were able to create an undergraduate teaching lab and have expanded computer facilities in recent years, other plans have had to be put on hold. The funds generated by enrolment expansion have been taken by budget cuts. We were largely unsuccessful in raising funds for academic facility renewal during the recent Campaign. The endless politics facing the plans for the proposed Varsity Centre have taken considerable energy away from these efforts. On the other hand, when Varsity revitalization goes ahead, the Faculty intends to include three new labs, faculty and graduate student offices, one seminar room and several other spaces suitable for teaching, to the benefit of both undergraduate and graduate programs.

We were very concerned to learn from the reviewers that students believe a culture of sexism, homophobia and discrimination exists within the undergraduate program. Although we understand that these concerns were expressed by only a few individuals, this number does not diminish the significance of these issues. We fully share our students' expectations for a culture of inclusion, equity and diversity. We address issues of social equity every year in the curriculum, and are committed to addressing the reviewers' concerns seriously and immediately. Since the reviewers submitted their report, the dean and associate dean (undergraduate) have met with student leaders to plan appropriate educational events, and a student-led Positive Space Committee has been formed as a sub-committee of the Faculty's Equity Issues Committee.

(b) Graduate program in Exercise Sciences

The reviewers felt that it would be possible for the Faculty to accept more graduate students. We agree, estimating that we have supervisory capacity for another ten students. The barriers are financial and facility-related. We hope that in response to the Rae Commission, the current cap on funded enrolment will be lifted, and funds will become available to enable the Faculty to extend the graduate student financial guarantee to additional students.

While reviewers reported, on the basis of student comments, that few of the EXS courses listed in the calendar are actually offered, in fact all but three of 16 courses have been taught at least once during the last five years, and all but four at least three times. One of the courses not offered is the responsibility of the dean; his administrative duties necessarily reduce his teaching and during the last five years, in response to student demand, he has confined his teaching to a large class undergraduate course. The other two courses were taught by a recently retired colleague whom we hope to replace.

The reviewers reported that students 'lamented the lack of a quantitative statistics course.' Perhaps the Faculty should offer its own course, but this is an area where we think our students can benefit from one of the good courses offered elsewhere in SGS. We would much prefer to see our small faculty teach in their areas of specialty.

The graduate students complained about the shortage of work space and computers. We share these concerns, and continue to work very hard to improve their conditions. Since the reviewers' visit to the campus, in a long-planned expansion, we were able to increase the number of graduate student computers from 11 to 41. Additional space for students in the behavioural area will be created during the summer of 2005.

Finally, we were shocked by the comments attributed to graduate students that they have few opportunities to meet faculty or to share ideas. There are ongoing journal clubs in all three disciplinary areas in the graduate program, and faculty and graduate students debate issues and intermingle at the monthly faculty seminars, the 'Gender Matters' series conducted by the Centre for Girls' and Women's Physical Activity and Health, and the 'Policy Matters' seminars conducted by the Centre for Sport Policy Studies. There is no shortage of opportunities for students to meet faculty or to hear and discuss research.

In the last five years, there has not been a required course that all graduate students, regardless of discipline, must take. The need for such a course has been a matter of extensive debate among faculty and students alike, and the absence of such a course may well have contributed to the perception among some students that they lack opportunities to share research ideas. In response, the graduate committee, in cooperation with the graduate students' association, has been developing an interdisciplinary course. That course has now been approved in principle, and it will be conducted as a pilot (as a reading course) in 2005-2006, prior to submission to SGS Council as a new optional course for 2006-2007.

The graduate student body is highly diverse, pursuing different disciplines and a wide range of research topics, in different stages of studies/career and life course, and separated by location. These circumstances undermine morale. Since the reviewers' visit, the dean and the associate dean (graduate) have met with graduate student leaders to identify other ways to address students' needs more effectively. As one outcome, a bi-weekly coffee hour to bring faculty and graduate students together informally has been started. Meetings have also been planned to discuss faculty-student relationships on a disciplinary basis.

(c) Co-Curricular Program

The reviewers suggested that 'the breadth of the intercollegiate sport program should be reviewed with a view to reducing offerings and increasing support for "priority" programs.' While we recognize that some colleagues and students would prefer a more tightly focused program, the Faculty respectfully rejects this advice. Given the benefits of participation, the breadth of the U of T program—currently we field teams in 24 women's and 22 men's sports, one of the largest overall programs in North America—is one of our great strengths. It may well be that in the current climate of under-funding, the quality of individual programs may not be as great as at other universities where the same resources are distributed more narrowly. But to the student participant, a less- than-perfect opportunity to train and compete in her/his sport is far preferable to no opportunity at all! Recent history across North America suggests that nothing poisons the climate for athletic excellence in the university setting more than a divisive debate about whose sport should be chopped. Reducing the breadth of intercollegiate programs makes no sense at U of T. Moreover, the Faculty is determined to increase the resources available for the intercollegiate programs by increasing endowments, outreach initiatives and other fund-raising ventures.

The reviewers also suggest that 'the issue of athletic awards needs to be revisited.' If the advice is to break from the long-standing U of T, Council of Ontario Universities and Ontario University Athletics opposition to the practice of entering awards, the Faculty respectfully rejects it. On the other hand, the Faculty is committed to increase the needs-based and merit-based financial awards with an athletic component that it awards to continuing students in accordance with OUA rules. Last year, the Faculty distributed more than \$100,000 in athletic-based awards to U of T students.

The reviewers contend that 'the incidental fee that supports all of the co-curricular programs is the highest in Canada.' In response, we should point out that the policy of the Faculty, through the Council of Athletics and Recreation, is to fund programs as much as possible through the universal fee rather than user fees. While this approach may give us higher incidental fees, we believe that it makes the overall cost of participation lower (and fairer) than at comparable institutions. There is no charge for access to the Strength and Conditioning Centre in the Athletic and Recreation Centre at U of T, for example, while at the Ontario university where one of the reviewers is employed, a user fee of \$52 a term (\$94 for two terms) is charged for access to the comparable facility. Such user fees are rarely taken into consideration in such comparative analyses.

That being said, we agree that 'the facilities (for co-curricular programs) are not congruent with the size of the institution.' In fact, analysis by the Office of Space Management suggests that U of T provides but 60% of the athletic facilities recommended by the Council of Ontario Universities for a university of our size. Moreover, the fact that the University decided in 1991 to offload virtually all financial responsibility for co-curricular athletics and recreation onto the student incidental fee and fund-raising gives weight to the reviewers' contention that 'central administration devalued the contribution of physical activity and sport in personal development' and 'relative to most universities ... the level of financial support provided by central administration is relatively low.' These issues embitter students, student governments, faculty, staff and alumni/ae, hinder recruiting, invite embarrassing media commentary and tie up Faculty leadership in endless and frustrating politics.

On this difficult terrain, the Faculty strives to provide students with the best possible co-curricular opportunities. To a very considerable extent, we have been successful. Surveys (such as the 2004 U of T Facilities Study with responses from 8,000 students) indicate that more students are engaged in co-curricular athletics and recreation than any other student activity, and participants highly value those experiences. With respect to facilities, while the primary focus has been upon Varsity renewal, the Faculty is also working hard to revitalize the Athletic and Physical Education Centre, the Back Campus and Robert Street Field. During the last three years, with the support of student leaders on CAR and COSS, it has created annual facility renewal and equity funds to address the challenges of facility development, facility improvements such as accessibility of the Clara Benson wing and deferred maintenance.



The responsibility for the under-funding of co-curricular athletics and recreation cannot be entirely placed upon the U of T administration, but is rather the consequence of the short-sighted under-funding of higher education in Ontario overall, and the withdrawal by the Ontario government from capital funding for co-curricular facilities. The Faculty is committed to working with U of T administration to realize national-average funding for higher education in Ontario as a step to restoring operating budget support for the co-curricular programs and services, and provincial capital funding for co-curricular facilities.

## **2. Research**

While the reviewers deemed Faculty research as 'generally of a high quality and very relevant to the field' and 'library support as probably the best in Canada', they 'characterized the infrastructure for research (lab space, equipment, computer support, etc.) as adequate ... but not reflective of what might be expected at a research intensive university.' They also suggested a number of steps by which the Faculty could stimulate research. We agree with this assessment, and have forwarded the reviewers' suggestions to the newly formed Research Committee, chaired by the associate dean (graduate education and research) to co-ordinate grant preparation and research. The Faculty is also committed to providing additional administrative support to research. With respect to facilities and equipment, the academic wing intended for the new Varsity Centre will include research and testing laboratories for exercise physiology, biomechanics and motor learning and offices for faculty and graduate students, not only providing a hub for important biophysical research but opening up laboratories for colleagues in other disciplines in the existing Athletic and Physical Education Centre.

The reviewers note that 'there have not been many applications for CFI or New Opportunities funding.' In fact, three of the four eligible faculty have applied for such funding. One has been funded and another is waiting for a decision. During the last year, three faculty members have been successful in obtaining funding for post-docs.

## **3. Faculty's relationships within U of T**

The reviewers note that while members of the Faculty enjoy a large number of associations and collaborations within U of T, outside of the co-curricular area few of these are highly visible. They also note that the Faculty does not seem to benefit significantly from its involvement in the Council of Health Science and Social Work Deans. The Faculty has long recognized this dilemma. Some of this is inevitable given the small size of the professoriate and the decentralized nature of research at the University. That being said, the dean and the associate deans are working to strengthen the Faculty's involvement with the programs of inter-disciplinary professional education being conducted under the auspices of the CHSSWD, and to bring greater visibility to research relating to active physical activity and health.

## **4. Faculty's relationships with external government and professional organizations**

With respect to outside relationships, the reviewers note the dean's advocacy and lobbying, but little else. Many other members of the Faculty provide leadership to professional, scholarly and scientific bodies, such as the International Association for the Sociology of Sport, the Canadian Society of Exercise Physiology and the Ontario Camping Association, and contribute to various community-based task forces related to physical activity and health. Associate Dean Gretchen Kerr is a member of a national task force to revitalize the links between coaching education and the universities, for example. Associate Dean Carol Rodgers is a member of the Ontario Chief Medical Officer of Health's Advisory Committee for Healthy Weights and Healthy Lives. Professor Peter Donnelly has created an international network of university-based sport policy centres. Under the leadership of Assistant Dean Liz Hoffman, staff in the co-curricular area are working to link the Faculty's plans for Active U of T 2010 to the City of Toronto's campaign to increase physical activity, 'Get Your Move On, Get Active Toronto' and the provincial campaign, Active Ontario 2010. Other co-curricular staff have created a new NGO, Athletes for Africa, to provide developmental assistance to sports programs in that troubled continent. In the months ahead, the Faculty will endeavour to coordinate and publicize these activities more effectively.

## **5. The appropriate and effectiveness of the Faculty's organizational and financial structure**

While the reviewers indicated that 'the administrative structure ... appears to be functioning effectively,' they noted 'the difficulty of maintaining two separate budget envelopes' and recommended greater transparency. In fact, the Faculty must operate within three different budgetary approval and accountability regimes. It receives operating budget support for the degree programs and related activities. It receives ancillary fees, as regulated by Ontario policy and the Protocol on the Increase or Introduction of Compulsory Non-Tuition Related Fees, in support of co-curricular activities. Thirdly, it enjoys endowment income and generates annual and other funds, and these monies are administered in still separate accounts, and overseen by the Faculty's Restricted Funds Committee. Moreover, it generates still other revenue through outreach, ticket sales, marketing and sponsorship. These different regimes do complicate planning and budgeting, and in those years when fees in one regime are increased and those in another are frozen or cut, it can create the concern, noted by the reviewers, that 'the two elements of the Faculty did not share equally in these shared services.'

In an ideal world, tuition and ancillary fees would be determined by a responsible, accountable but provincially-unregulated regime as envisioned by the Rae Commission, and the Faculty would plan and budget for all its activities on an integrated basis. We will work with the University leadership in the weeks and months ahead to realize that goal.

In the meantime, the Faculty has initiated two steps to strengthen the integration of its various budgets with a view to increasing effectiveness, efficiency and transparency: (1) a task force of the associate and assistant deans is reviewing the planning, administration and budgeting for all community programs, such as Camp U of T, Junior Blues and continuing education courses and conferences, which draw upon resources from all sides of the Faculty but fall outside the regulated regimes, with a view to strengthening programming through an integrated system of planning and budgeting; and (2) the director of financial services is developing a single reporting template for all monies raised and spent in the Faculty.

## **6. The need for a strategic plan and succession planning**

The reviewers note that the 'Faculty still lacks a well-documented strategic plan for the next five years', in keeping with the University's goals for *Stepping UP*. We deeply regret that omission. The sole reason for the delay has been the uncertainty about the proposed Varsity Centre. The new facility is essential to the realization of every one of the Faculty's goals for the next planning period. On several occasions during the last few years, we thought that a favourable decision was imminent, and we are even more hopeful that Governing Council will give the green light to a comprehensive plan in the next few months.

The basic outline of the Faculty's *Stepping UP* submission and strategic plan was forged in faculty and staff meetings more than a year ago. The priorities are to:

- Strengthen Faculty research addressing the society-wide crisis of physical inactivity.
- Strengthen the preparation of teachers, through a concurrent program in Physical and Health Education, to contribute to the revitalization of school-based physical education and healthy physical activity. The Faculty is an active member of the Concurrent Teacher Education Program being convened by OISE/UT.
- Strengthen the outreach of co-curricular programs, so participation will more closely reflect the demographics of the student body, and faculty and staff can be more engaged in healthy physical activity. In keeping with the Province of Ontario's campaign for Active Ontario 2010, plans for an Active U of T 2010 campaign are well underway.
- Strengthen the Faculty's research, teaching and programming links with the GTA, so in still other ways we can contribute to the revitalization of public opportunities for sport and physical education and the overall revitalization of the region.
- Obtain the facilities and financial resources we need.
- Increase student financial aid.
- Sharpen and strengthen performance measures.
- Ensure that the Faculty continues to be a stimulating and supportive work environment.

These goals have been communicated within the Faculty. With the submission of the Project Planning Report on the proposed Varsity Centre Varsity to governance now being scheduled, the Faculty can complete its planning exercise this spring.

It is hoped that a shovel in the ground on Varsity, and some relief on the funding front from the recommendations of the Rae Commission, will help re-energize members of the Faculty, and give us 'wind in our sails' to realize the ambitious goals set out above.

### **Provost's response**

The Provost was pleased that the review of the Faculty indicated that the merger of the former School of Physical and Health Education and the Department of Athletics and Recreation had strengthened the Faculty.

The Faculty has addressed the points raised by the reviewers and have begun to formulate action plans to address the issues raised.

The Provost has made an investment with Academic Initiative Funding (AIF) in the Faculty to address the enhancement of the student experience. The Faculty's proposal for Anatomy Labs for Physical and Health Education Students proposal will enhance the laboratory component of the compulsory, first year Anatomy course. This course introduces students in the first year of the program to the anatomy of the human body, taught through the collaboration of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health and the Faculty of Medicine. The AIF resources will allow the Division of Anatomy to continue providing laboratory education to students in the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, enhancing both the student experience and opportunity for interdisciplinary teaching collaboration.

The revitalization of Varsity Stadium has been a goal of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health for the past 40 years. The first Users Committee for *Varsity Centre* was struck in 1998 and since that time a variety of projects have been explored. A new Project Planning Committee was established in November, 2004 and with particularly strong and enthusiastic student representation, has diligently assembled a creative phased plan for Varsity Centre that addresses the needs of the students, the University community and the neighbouring community. Following the precise identification of the phased-in plan, a series of informative town-hall meetings and smaller group meetings were held to solicit response and ideas from students, internal university neighbours, members of various Governing Council committees and the community. The Provost was directly involved in each of these meetings. The feedback received from all who attended these information meetings was exceptionally positive; suggestions, as appropriate, have been incorporated into the report presented to Governing Council.

In July, 2005 Professor Kidd will begin his second term as Dean of the Faculty. With the approval of the new Varsity Centre by Governing Council, the Faculty can focus on developing its academic plan. The Provost has requested that the academic plan for the Faculty be presented before September 2005. The Provost will work with the Dean regarding the administrative structure for the Faculty.