

## REVIEW SUMMARY

**DIVISION/UNIT:** Faculty of Arts and Science

**DATE:** January 24-25, 2008

**COMMISSIONING OFFICER:** Vice-President and Provost

**PROGRAMS OFFERED:**

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

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

### EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

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

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

**PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE:** 2004

### SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:

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

#### Academic and Financial Planning

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

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

#### Relationship with other units

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

#### **DOCUMENTATION**

##### **PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:**

Terms of Reference

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

*Faculty of Arts and Science Self Study* (2007)

*Stepping UP – Synthesis*

Faculty of Arts and Science Annual Report

##### **CONSULTATION PROCESS:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Other issues

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

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES**

**Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science**

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

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

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

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

*a) Redefine and empower vice-deans:*

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

*b) Add a chief-of-staff position:*

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

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

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

---

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

*d) Control the proliferation of interdisciplinary units:*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Other issues:*

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

15 May 2008 (updated 12 February 2009)

**Commissioning Officer, Vice-President and Provost**

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

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

Tri-campus organization and administration

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

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

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

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

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

### Role of the Colleges

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

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

*Cheryl Misak*  
Vice-President and Provost

---

2

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



## **Review of the Faculty of Arts and Science**

**University of Toronto**

**March 26, 2008**

**Professor George W. Breslauer** (Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, University of California Berkeley)

**Professor John Hepburn** (Vice President, Research, University of British Columbia)

**Professor Terrence J. McDonald** (Dean, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan)

### **I. Acknowledgements**

The three-member review committee visited the Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto, on January 24 and 25, 2008, at the invitation of Vice-President and Provost Vivek Goel. Our task was to review the Faculty as per the terms of reference provided. We had a full schedule of interviews over the course of our visit, including discussions with groups of undergraduate and graduate students, senior administrative staff, faculty members, Faculty Council members, as well as all the senior academic administrators from within the Faculty and cognate units. All of these discussions were open and frank and we would like to express our thanks to all of the members of the Faculty and University for their constructive cooperation and valuable input. The committee is especially grateful to outgoing dean Pekka K. Sinervo, who was a gracious host and helpful informant. We heard many comments about his excellent leadership during his term.

### **II. Terms of Reference**

Because the Faculty of Arts and Sciences has recently (in 2004) undergone a complete external review, we were asked to consider a more focused brief:

1. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty's internal organizational, operational, and governance structure. Is the current structure the best model for such a large and complex faculty within the context of the University of Toronto?
2. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty's relationships with the other arts and science divisions – i.e., with the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC);

3. The appropriateness and effectiveness of the Faculty's relationship with other divisions at the University of Toronto, including the St. George Colleges;
4. The views of the faculty, students, and staff with respect to these matters.

### **Preamble**

The University of Toronto is one of the jewels in the crown of North American higher education and has been so for a century. For all of this time the Faculty of Arts and Sciences has been at the heart of the University's mission of education and research. It is a tribute to the leadership of the University and the Faculty that both have maintained this status over this long period of time and in the face of much social and economic change. In recent years, in fact, the University and this Faculty have experienced an extraordinary amount of change: a period of fiscal constraint in the Province's budget, the arrival of the so-called "double cohort" of students, the expansion of the number of graduate students, expansion in the number of units within the Faculty (e.g., 15 interdisciplinary units since July of 2005 alone, according to the Dean's annual report for 2006-07), the end of mandated retirement, the shift to a new budget system for the University, to mention only some of the most prominent changes mentioned to us. We were pleased to see that the Faculty – administrators, unit heads, and members of the Faculty Council -- has weathered these changes so well. Indeed, we were struck by the fact that not a single person we met with took the opportunity to lament the "situation." Many offered helpful comments on our charge, but none engaged in the kind of "narrative of declension" that can be characteristic of conversations with review committees during periods of such change.

Nonetheless, it was our very strong impression that the Faculty had weathered through these changes primarily by "doing more with less." There are now significantly more graduate and undergraduate students, significantly more complicated relationships with other campuses, significant uncertainty about the new budget system, fewer degrees of freedom for new faculty hiring because of the end of mandated retirement, uncertainty surrounding a change in the leadership of the Faculty and... about the same number of tenure track faculty as before all these changes. We believe that the strategic decisions made in the next few years will have a very significant long term effect on the Faculty. In this process the historic international reputation of the Faculty is an important resource, as is the extraordinary good will and morale of every person we met. However, the ambition toward international distinction in academia must always be a shared commitment between the central administration of the University and

the faculty of its constituent units. We will ask, and must ask, what the President and Provost intend to do at this point for their part in meeting this aspiration.

It is one of those “true” truisms that a review committee can barely begin to scratch the surface in the two days during which it attempts to fulfill its mandate. We were fortunate to have the benefit of reading an extensive review of the faculty prepared in 2004 by visiting colleagues. We will, therefore, refer to that report from time to time when our views overlap with those of that committee. By doing this we do not intend to subordinate our discussion to theirs, but rather to use the previous report to “validate” some of our impressions that agree with theirs, and to underline the urgency of issues that have now been pointed out to the Faculty and to the University for some years.

In this spirit we endorse the view of our predecessors that the Faculty is “...organizationally very complex. There are colleges, departments, programs, centers, and many other entities within it, and the Committee was struck by the organizational density of the FAS.” We would add to this that it exists in a dense organizational network of other units at the University level including other schools and Colleges on St. George’s campus and those at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC), with which it shares a graduate program. We believe that – as we indicate below – the Dean of the Faculty spends a great deal of his time (and thus that of his faculty members) simply negotiating relationships between Colleges which only partially report to him, and with campuses with whom he shares faculty, but who sit at the table with him in meetings with the Provost, etc. In order for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to be empowered to move strategically, we believe that the University must better define these relationships and empower the Faculty to take control of its destiny vis-à-vis these other institutions.

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

Our predecessors in 2004 noted that “the Faculty of Arts and Science is the largest and most diverse Faculty in the University...” and we agree. Scores of units report up to the Dean’s office – some with better defined reporting lines than others – and as we have noted above, the Faculty is suspended in a dense network of relationships with other schools, colleges, and campuses. We worry that a lack of definition of some of these relationships means that an incredible amount of the Dean’s time must be spent on negotiations. Our first point involves this

"external milieu": the Faculty cannot control its own destiny until the University offers it the power to do so by better defining its relationships with the seven colleges and the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). We note that our colleagues in 2004 called upon the University "now to define what the role of the Colleges should evolve towards," and suggested "A clear mission statement for the future development of the three campuses [that] could be translated into principles for faculty appointment decisions and for the development of future academic programs." For example, the Seven Colleges might be fully subordinated to the Faculty of Arts and Science and given particular responsibility for the undergraduate experience, but we do not see that now. Furthermore, the University might settle, once and for all the relationship between the St. George's faculty and UTM and UTSC in regard to graduate and undergraduate programs. This would help the Faculty of Arts and Sciences -- and especially its Dean and Dean's office -- focus on its internal issues.

That said there are certainly operational issues within the control of the Faculty. One of them would appear not to be splitting the Faculty into several smaller organizations (e.g., Colleges of Natural Science, Social Science, Humanities, etc.) Not a single person we met with, faculty member, unit head, or head of a parallel school or College, favored this idea. One reason for this was pragmatic: one perceived challenge for the Faculty is the level of "transaction costs" required to keep an institution of its size and complexity moving. All observers with whom we met felt that splitting the Faculty would simply multiply those transaction costs by the number of new units. This was especially the view of the deans of other large schools and colleges. It is worth noting that the large, full service, liberal arts college has always been characteristic of the Ivy League Schools in the United States and variably so of the larger state institutions. Today, for example, the University of Wisconsin Madison and University of Michigan retain such institutions -- of similar scale to that of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences -- and that Ohio State has moved its separate colleges under a single "Executive Dean." The University of California at Berkeley, on the other hand, has a College of Letters of Science within which there are Divisions of Arts and Humanities, Biological Sciences, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, and Undergraduate Studies (which combines all-College undergraduate advising and interdisciplinary teaching programs). Each Division is headed by a dean, one of whom also serves an indeterminate term as Executive Dean, and is essentially a convener. Nonetheless, we have the impression that the sheer volume of items that must cross the desk of the Dean -- from the future of relations with other colleges to the start-up packages for beginning

faculty – require some restructuring to separate and subordinate issues. We make some suggestions below.

- a) Redefine and Empower Vice Deans. The Faculty's Vice Deans now are defined by function – academic, students, etc. – and they cut across the sectors of the Faculty. While this assures consistency in policy interpretation across the sectors, it may not be the best arrangement for strategic planning and it does not insure a “voice at the table” for all intellectual tendencies in the Faculty. It might be worth considering a return to the previous practice of “sectorial” Vice Deans – Humanities, Social Science, Natural Science, and Interdisciplinary – along with some functional Vice Deans. We learned that the chairs of units now meet among themselves by sector and we wonder if it would make sense for these meetings to be chaired by a Vice Dean with some authority to convene and budget strategic sector activities. Again, though, such a change would work only if these Vice Deans were empowered and budgeted to make some decisions. For example, they might have the authority to approve offers to faculty, to interpret policy within their sector, be the first and primary point of contact for department chairs, etc.
- b) Add a Chief-of-Staff position. The Dean not only meets weekly with the Vice Deans, but also with the Assistant Deans whose briefs are primarily administrative. We wonder if it would make sense to add a kind of chief of staff position to coordinate these activities, serve as the primary point of contact with these crucial staff members, and, perhaps, sit with the Vice Dean group, but convene the Assistant Dean group.
- c) Re-think the Faculty's planning process. It was our understanding that a primary planning process is “planning the complement” of retirements over a five year period and that this exercise is done by a group of 25. We wonder if this exercise is too narrowly defined and done by too large a group. It was also unclear to us exactly how much reallocation of positions occurs as a result of this exercise. Reviewing the changes this process has produced over the last planning period would be useful, as would reconsideration of whether a group of this size can make the hard decisions that strategic planning requires. A “strategic planning” process for the Faculty may also need a broader definition, as our colleagues in 2004 also suggested.
- d) Control the Proliferation of Interdisciplinary Units. We could not gain a good sense of how and why interdisciplinary units proliferate among the Faculty. It seemed to us that Colleges could host some such activities, that the Provost's office hosted a competition for such ideas, and that the Faculty itself sponsored some. We were surprised to learn

that the faculty had added 15 new such units since July 1, 2005. At a time of seemingly diminishing resources, the proliferation of such units and their accompanying costs in course releases, administrative staff, and demands on units for courses to go along with the new enterprises, seems profligate. Furthermore, we wonder about whether there are perverse incentives here: to gain resources in order to propose a new program. But who loses in this transaction? And are there such projects themselves that are starved for resources (see below) or too small to be meaningful or successful? We came away with the impression that there is a widespread feeling, among both principals and directors (though not among directors of units recently created through the Academic Initiatives Fund), that both FAS and the University need to decide: (1) the importance they attach to the traditional interdisciplinary programs; (2) the steady-state funding these programs can count on ("we need a budgetary compact with the University"); (3) the channels through which the needs of these units can be represented; and (4) the structures and processes that will most smoothly coordinate their interdisciplinary efforts. There was also expressed a deep frustration with the amount of time it takes to get approvals and funding for the most routine expenditures. That primary approval by the Dean of FAS is required for such small expenditures suggests an unsustainable level of over-centralization.

It was our impression that uncertainty -- at times bewilderment -- reigns concerning the most basic matters of administration: to whom do we report? (Note, perhaps symptomatically, that the FAS organization chart has a tall rectangle containing the names of many interdisciplinary programs, but no line outside the rectangle to indicate to whom these programs report.) In what forums can our needs be expressed? (*"I've been here ten years and I'm only barely beginning to figure this place out."*) What are the current rules and the recent rules changes? (*"We're so much on our own that we don't even know what the rules are sometimes."*) Does the administration even value these interdisciplinary programs?

Similarly, there appears to be a profound lack of coordination between departments and interdisciplinary teaching programs, with the students paying the price of such disconnect. To take a vivid example, a student in the South Asian Studies program is required to take South Asian history, which is offered in the History Department. That student, however, may be denied enrollment in the course because it is filled with History majors for whom the course is not a requirement for graduation. Moreover, the heavy reliance on lecturers to teach the

interdisciplinary courses is a product of the under funding of interdisciplinary programs, which do not have the resources to buy out professorial teaching time from their departments.

It is also our impression that the campus, or FAS, needs to take stock of its proliferating number of interdisciplinary programs. How often are they reviewed? How many requests for the establishment of such programs are denied? What are the criteria by which their value is assessed? Are the students receiving the education they deserve from such programs? Such a review would be especially timely, given the rate at which new programs are being created. It is easy to allow interested faculty to pursue their interests and to set up new teaching programs. But, given the structure of funding, representation, and coordination, this is not a sustainable approach -- and students will pay the price.

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

The relationship between the St. George (STG) campus and the two suburban campuses is in transition because of the expansion of the undergraduate program at Mississauga (UTM) and Scarborough (UTSC) campuses. The system of academic governance is currently a little complicated, as UTM and UTSC have separate undergraduate programs (with about 10,000 students enrolled in each of UTM and UTSC), while the graduate programs are run commonly between the three campuses. At the department level, there are department chairs at all three campuses, and a graduate program chair (who was generally also department chair at STG) although this system is now being modified to allow the graduate chair to come from either UTM or UTSC, if appropriate. A further complication is that while there are parallel department structures at STG and UTM, the departmental organization at UTSC is quite different in some cases, making the alignment at the graduate level more difficult.

In spite of this complexity, there seems to be good communication and coordination among the campuses. Because of limited time, we did not get to talk with many people from UTM and UTSC, outside of senior administrators, but we feel comfortable that we gained a good impression of the current relationship, with its strengths and challenges. In large part, we feel that the current system is working, despite its obvious complexities and weaknesses. The main issue we found was the understandable desire to create a more important role for UTM and UTSC through the creation of separate graduate programs. Our recommendation on this is as follows:

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

The advantages of the joint graduate program are clear: it has allowed the suburban campuses to hire very talented faculty, who are attracted by the possibility of teaching in a small university environment, while being part of a major research university and a very strong graduate program. We were told of several cases where talented candidates accepted a faculty position at UTM or UTSC based in large part on being a part of the larger U of T research and graduate education enterprise. One can also assume that the quality of graduate students is higher because of the strong U of T reputation. Furthermore, there is efficiency in graduate course teaching, in that the small departments at UTM and UTSC are not challenged with having to offer a broad range of graduate courses, as graduate teaching is done in common across all three campuses. However, there are some problems. The most important is a sort of hollowing out of the intellectual life at UTM and UTSC, especially in research areas which are more library than laboratory based, as grad students and faculty spend a lot, if not the majority, of their time at STG. There are also problems in laboratory based research areas, as the quality and quantity of technical infrastructure and support is superior at STG. One productive response to these problems is to develop a specialization in research areas at the suburban campuses, an example being environmental science at UTSC. Of course, such developments have to be carried out within the context of a separate undergraduate program, which requires a balance of expertise in departments, and the unified graduate program, which necessitates a balancing across the three campuses.

In the committee's opinion, a less productive response would be to have independent graduate programs at the PhD level at UTM and UTSC. In the extreme case of completely separate graduate programs at the three campuses, this would effectively create three separate universities, similar to the University of California system. Unlike the UC system, however, there would never be parity between STG, UTM, and UTSC, and there is a danger that it would be difficult to attract and retain the same quality of faculty and graduate students to UTM and UTSC without the strong linkages between the three campuses. Of course, this does not mean that specialized masters programs should not be encouraged at individual campuses, or that there should not be a research specialization on the campuses, which would make them the centre for certain PhD programs, while maintaining the principle of a common program.



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

We met with the College principals and also with the directors of several interdisciplinary units that are housed within the Colleges. The FAS self-study of 2007 notes that the colleges "have played a crucial role" in enhancing the quality of student life on the campus. We understand that this has happened in two ways. The first has been through the crucial role of the Colleges in guiding the transition of first year students to the university through their responsibilities for recruitment, admissions, orientation, residence, academic advising, academic support, and student life. The second has been by providing a number of interdisciplinary degree programs.

When programs such as the free-standing Centre for Environment (whose new director we met) emerge by amalgamation of the Environmental Studies Program at Innis College, the Faculty's Division of Environment, and the graduate Institute for Environmental Studies this seems like a good thing. Indeed, the very definition of a high quality undergraduate program in the Faculty would seem to us to include faculty active in research and teaching both graduate and undergraduate students.

But we are skeptical that the Colleges should be the home of more free-standing interdisciplinary degree programs. The problems we noted above of reporting lines, funding, and review for interdisciplinary programs seem to be exacerbated when these programs are housed in the Colleges. We would recommend, therefore, a division of labor for the Colleges:

- a) The Colleges should focus, first and foremost, on enhancing the experience of students new to the Faculty. If they became the headquarters for first and second year students – both residents and commuters – and were resourced for this task on a broad scale the students would benefit from the support and the Faculty would benefit from this important division of labor.
- b) The Faculty should review the appropriate number and location of interdisciplinary programs, including those in the Colleges. We have called for this in general above, but emphasize here that the lack of such consideration may be resulting in a situation where some college-based programs are under-funded, some may lack appropriate connections – curricular and otherwise – to the Departments crucial for their survival (we note the example above from SE Asian Studies), and the Colleges themselves may be overburdened.

With at least a third of the first year students living in the Colleges, and all of them advised there, there is an opportunity to innovate in providing all students in the Faculty with a special educational experience. That is an important mission for the Colleges and a challenge and opportunity for the Faculty.

### **Other issues**

Various other issues emerged during our visit, which were also noted by our 2004 predecessors.

We, too, were surprised by the lack of layered review of recommendations for tenure and promotion that includes decisions intermediate between those of the Departments and those of the President. And we were struck by the very short probationary period for junior faculty.

We, too, noted the lack of international bench-marking for the Faculty. It seems to us that the University administration should select some public peers in Canada and the United States and use them to measure activities and evaluate the activities of the Faculty. (If this was done one thing that would become clear, we think, is the distance that needs to be traveled in serving first year students, as we note above.)

We, too, were struck by what appears to be a lack of strategic clarity in the Faculty and among the Faculty and other units. The annual documentation of the Faculty was impressive, indeed, perhaps excessive. But this extensive documentation did not seem to us to reveal much about where the Faculty thought it was going.

### **Conclusion**

We conclude on the question of strategy, repeating what we have said above. International academic pre-eminence is today more than ever maintained by a strategic partnership between University administrations and the units that compose them. We call upon the administration of the University of Toronto to encourage, empower, and fund the strategic decision making within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences that will lead to continuing North American leadership.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

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

**DATE:** December 13,14, 2007

**COMMISSIONING OFFICER:** Vice-President and Provost

**PROGRAMS OFFERED:**

**Undergraduate** n/a

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

**EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

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

**PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE:** 2003

**SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:**

The review report noted key strengths of the Faculty. The emphasis on externally-funded research and scholarship, the current growth trend in extramural funding, and the high proportion of faculty who devote a significant part of their effort to research and scholarship, were identified as particular strengths. The students are very pleased with the academic programs, particularly the doctoral students.

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

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

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

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

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

### Dean, Faculty of Information

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Brian Cantwell-Smith, former Dean*  
May 29, 2008

#### **Commissioning Officer, Vice-President and Provost**

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

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

In January 2008, Professor Seamus Ross began his term as Dean of the Faculty of Information and I have every confidence that he and the Faculty will meet the challenges outlined by the review. Professor Ross has the background and experience to provide leadership to the Faculty and I look forward to seeing the Faculty continue on its trajectory of excellent and innovation.

*Cheryl Misak*  
Vice-President and Provost

Report of the External Reviewers  
following their visit to the  
University of Toronto Faculty of Information Studies on  
December 13-14, 2007

**Introduction**

External Reviewers Jose-Marie Griffiths and John Leslie King visited the University of Toronto Faculty of Information Studies (FIS) on December 13 and 14, 2007.<sup>1</sup> During this short visit the reviewers met with a number of people who provided an extraordinarily varied and detailed picture of FIS and its current and potential role within the University.<sup>2</sup> The visit was too brief to provide a comprehensive picture of the Faculty or the University, and even with the excellent prepared readings provided to the reviewers prior to and during the visit, this brief report cannot cover fully all of the issues that should be considered. Nevertheless, the reviewers were able to develop a clear sense of the strengths of FIS and the challenges that FIS and the university face in leveraging the remarkable potential that is there.

The reviewers are agreed that FIS has developed remarkably in the past few years under Dean Smith's leadership, and that it now constitutes a great opportunity for the university. The vision Dean Smith has articulated for the information professions in general, and for the FIS in particular is brilliant. There is more to be done in this vision than Dean Smith or any dean could reasonably accomplish in just five years. There is some frustration on the part of Dean Smith and others that more of the vision has not been accomplished. In response, the reviewers observe that this vision is a ten-year project rather than a five-year project. This is due in part to the ambition of the vision itself, which is a pioneering step in the rethinking of

---

<sup>1</sup> Jose-Marie Griffiths is Professor and Dean of the School of Library and Information Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. John Leslie King is Professor and former dean in the School of Information and Vice Provost for Academic Information at the University of Michigan.

<sup>2</sup> The reviewers met with Vice President and Provost Vivek Goel, Deputy Provost Cheryl Misak, Dean Brian Cantwell Smith, Vice Dean Jens Erik Mai, Inforum Director Joe Cox, Vice Dean of Graduate Programs in the School of Graduate Studies Elizabeth Cowper, Director of the Institute of Communication and Culture at Mississauga Louis Kaplan, Director of the Knowledge Media Design Institute Gale Moore, Program Coordinator for Book History and Print Culture David Galbraith, Chief Librarian Carole Moore, Chair of the Department of Health Policy Louise Lemieux-Charles, Director of the Adaptive Technology Research Center Jutta Trevarinus, Coordinator of the Professional Learning Center Eva Kupidura, President of Victoria University Paul Gooch, Assistant Dean Judy Dunn, Finance and Personnel Officer Susan Brown, junior faculty members, senior faculty members, selected graduate students, members of the Advisory Committee for Decanal Search, and two members of the external community, Stephen Abram, Vice President of Sirsi Corporation and Shelley Falconer, Director and Senior Curator at the McMichael Canadian Art Collection.

the whole professional realm of systematic collecting its role in human understanding. It is also due in part because FIS is located in a large and complicated university milieu, and that the University of Toronto, like other great universities, is more adept at creating, propagating, and conserving knowledge than it is at being agile. Great changes have happened in great universities, and they will in the future, but they seldom happen as quickly as ambitious visionaries would like. The goal of FIS and of the University of Toronto should be to build on the foundation established in the transformation of FIS, and continue the work that is already well underway.

The following sections discuss key elements of the vision that has been constructed, the strengths of FIS at this time, the challenges facing the program, and the talents that a new dean should either possess or be able to mobilize in pursuit of the vision.

### **The Vision**

FIS has long been a strong player in the world of information; its strength is not a recent consequence of the vision articulated in the past few years. For example, FIS has a solid international reputation for collaborating with computer science, health sciences, and other fields in exploring the frontiers of information and its role in the modern world. This is not merely in addition to its success in preparing students for careers in information professions such as librarianship, archives and so on: that success was built upon this broad understanding of the information fields. The important contribution of the recent visioning efforts is to see FIS in the context of a great university and located in a great city. The university is, itself, about information in all its forms, represented not only in ongoing academic programs, but as well in wonderful collections held in libraries, archives, museums, galleries and so forth. The city of Toronto is a treasure trove of such collections, as well. Together these collections create an environment in which knowledge communities can form and prosper, augmenting the wealth of the region, the province, the nation and the world. FIS is not responsible for the creation of this great wealth, although it has historically played important roles in shaping components such as public, academic and special libraries. The special role FIS can play is to be the university's and the region's center of expertise on the nature of information *as* information – an issue of growing importance in the digital age.

Toward this end, FIS has adopted a philosophical position that is both enlightened and practical. Rather than looking at information in silos, organized by institutional tradition (e.g., archives, libraries, museums, galleries) or by topic (e.g., health sciences, literature, art), the vision sees across traditions and topics to understand the common elements of information in formation and action. In this way, a comparatively small organization – FIS – can have a very large effect on the ways information is created, handled, and used. This vision in no way challenges or obviates traditions of librarianship or archives, nor the utility of organizing information by field of origin and use: FIS does and will continue to prepare professionals who fit into traditional roles, with expertise in subject domains. However, the vision is somewhat transgressive in that it presumes that people who adopt this vision – faculty as well as students – can look beyond the constraints of the present and help shape a more effective future for information professionals and the society they serve. In short, the vision is to create a growing cadre of leaders who will shape the future, and not merely fit comfortably, albeit expertly, into the future.



It should be noted that this vision is not unique to FIS; in emergent ways, it is present throughout the Information Schools movement, of which FIS is part. Indeed, these I-Schools have been formed and have joined together to explore this frontier and to pioneer new ways of leveraging the power of information in society. That said, FIS has taken important elements of this emerging vision farther than other members of the I-School community. For example, it is the first of the I-Schools to formally incorporate an established program of museum studies into the faculty. It is also building on its historical strengths in collaboration with computer science, health sciences, human-computer interaction and other fields to create important new strengths in research. In this way, FIS is a leader among leaders.

In the view of the reviewers, it would be appropriate for the leadership of the University of Toronto to consider FIS as an experimental endeavor in its own right, and one that provides the university with the opportunity to test new ideas for how the university itself will evolve in the digital age. This does not mean that FIS alone will fulfill this experimental role – other programs within the university are already participating in the process. Rather, FIS should be programmatically empowered to experiment and show the way for other elements within the university that choose to follow. This special status has been achieved to considerable degree among several of the I-Schools, including those at Michigan and North Carolina. The future of the university in the digital age will not be designed: it will be discovered through processes of learning-by-doing. FIS is well-positioned to play a leadership role in these processes.

### **Strengths of FIS**

The most basic strength of any academic program is the quality of the faculty. The faculty of FIS are of high quality; they are established or emerging leaders within their specialties at the national and international level. A close second is the quality of the students, and in this regard as well, FIS excels. The students who met with the reviewers are bright and demanding, with high expectations of their programs and of themselves. Many of them said they came to FIS because of the reputation of the faculty and the university. There are challenges at both the faculty and student levels, as discussed below, but in these critical areas FIS is strong and provides a good base on which the next dean can build.

FIS also has strengths in the area of institutional innovation, working successfully across organizational boundaries within and outside the university to create new and productive collaborative ventures. The fact that the museum studies program was successfully brought into FIS is evidence of this, and the ongoing discussions with other cognate partners bodes well for the future. The challenges in this regard, addressed below, are important, but they would not be salient at all were FIS not so well established as a collaborator.

Perhaps the most special strength of FIS is its location within the University of Toronto and the City of Toronto. The reviewers were struck by the frequency with which faculty, students, staff and others remarked on how important the university and the city are for the historic strengths of FIS and for its potential in the future. The university and the city make it easy to recruit excellent faculty members and students, and provide a rich laboratory for learning, experimentation, and professional development.

FIS has the potential to be an internationally important leader in the information field. Much of the groundwork for that has been accomplished and is evident in the strengths of the faculty and the vision that has been articulated for the school. Nevertheless, there are significant challenges that must be addressed.

### **Challenges**

The most important challenge facing FIS is internal. The senior faculty members, in particular, should determine whether their endeavor for the school is a co-activity or a cooperative. The distinction is important. If a co-activity, individuals among the senior faculty will strive to be the best they can be in their personal areas of scholarship and teaching, and presume that the “glue” that holds FIS together will come from some other source. If a cooperative, individuals among the senior faculty will set aside some personal preferences in order to lead the rest of the faculty as a community. The reviewers believe the senior faculty have been acting largely as a co-activity. This is an appropriate model for an academic unit – many strong departments in traditional fields at well-established universities operate this way with great success. But this model does not work very well if the ambition is to change the direction of a field, or to create a new field. There is simply too much work to be done on the “glue.” This observation should not be read as a criticism of the senior faculty of FIS. They are dedicated and accomplished scholars, and they are doing what senior faculty are normally expected to do. It is, instead, an observation about the means-ends relationship facing FIS. If FIS wishes to be a world leader, the senior faculty are going to have to lead the way by cooperating with one another, with the junior faculty members, with the FIS dean and leadership, with the university’s leadership, and with leadership in the external community of Toronto.

FIS faces a challenge common to other I-Schools, and common as well to many professional programs in other fields such as business, law, and so forth. This is the challenge of balancing intellectual development and professional skills in the program’s students, especially those who plan to go into professional practice. (Perhaps it is better to say that the challenge is not to balance these two factors, but to manage the dynamics of the ongoing imbalances between them.) It is the duty of all programs in a world-class university to provide students with the means for intellectual development and to insist that such development happens in the course of instructional programs. It is also the duty of professional programs to ensure that students are prepared to enter the professional work force upon graduation. The reviewers had the sense that the faculty and the students of FIS are of mixed opinion regarding the management of this difficult challenge. Most professional masters degree students prefer a strong focus on development of professional skills, so it was no surprise to hear that some of the students the reviewers met feel FIS falls short on this. Yet, none of these students claimed that the FIS curriculum or courses over-emphasized intellectual development at the expense of professional development. Rather, there seemed to be some disaffection over whether anyone among the faculty or the school’s leadership was truly concerned about this issue. Among some members of the faculty, there was a sense that this issue was unresolved, or perhaps insufficiently addressed. Hope was expressed that the upcoming effort to revise the masters degree curriculum would address his challenge.

The current fiscal environment of the University of Toronto presents challenges. The ambitions inherent in the FIS vision require resources, and the university (like many of its peers) is facing a period of fiscal uncertainty. It was not clear to the reviewers whether there are mechanisms by which FIS can secure venture capital to embark on its bold vision, and if so, how those mechanisms can be put into action. This is perhaps the most important practical challenge facing FIS. Without venture capital, FIS will be preoccupied doing what it necessary to keep existing efforts going and will find it difficult to put energy into vital new endeavors required to realize the vision. This challenge is not unique to FIS, or to the University of Toronto. It is common to all efforts do truly new things in academic environments that take seriously the mandate to conserve existing strengths. However, unless the leadership of the university and FIS addresses this challenge, it seems doubtful that the vision can be realized.

An especially important challenge at this time is adequate physical space for FIS as it grows. The university has recently provided additional space for FIS, but the new space is located some distance from the main FIS space in the Library building. This separation makes it difficult to faculty to develop cooperatively, and encourages co-activity. It is hard to imagine a university without space problems; the reviewers recognize this and acknowledge that it is usually difficult to meet the needs of all the programs that require additional space or changes in current space configurations. Nevertheless, this is a particularly pressing challenge for FIS, and requires ongoing attention by the university leadership. It might be possible to address some of the space challenges by aggressive exploration and deployment of emerging high-definition video/audio communications capabilities. FIS would be an ideal test-bed for such technologies, and could help pioneer their use for the university as a whole. This strategy has been undertaken with considerable success at the University of Michigan, where the School of Information is split into two locations until the completion of a unified facility in 2010.

The faculty of FIS are embarking on a revision of the masters curriculum. This is needed, but it should be recognized for the challenge it is and ought to be. Curricula are far more than frameworks for instruction leading to conferring of degrees: they are instantiations of a field's identity and purpose. It seems doubtful that the vision of FIS can be achieved without significant modification of and innovation in the masters curriculum. This will require considerable discussion and compromise among the faculty. Not surprisingly, different faculty interest groups desire to see their interests well represented in any curriculum, yet the curriculum has to fit within the normal time-to-degree, and should offer sufficient elective opportunities for students to explore subjects that go beyond any particular, narrow disciplinary or professional focus. The reviewers suggest that the revision of the masters curriculum be seen as the next step in realization of the FIS vision, building on the work done during the term of Dean Smith.

### **Talents in a New Dean**

The ideal dean can do everything, and do everything well. Realistically, the new dean will be strong on some dimensions and less strong on others. The reviewers reiterate the point made earlier regarding the difficulty of gaining deep insights during a relatively brief visit. This applies to recommendations about desirable talents in a new dean. Nevertheless, there are several points worth noting that arise from the review.

FIS has an exciting and ambitious vision. It does not need another highly visionary dean at this point. Rather, this would be a good time to select a dean with strong skills in getting difficult tasks accomplished even at the cost of delaying or deleting other objectives. "Getting things done" in an academic environment means getting the faculty to work together toward shared objectives, and to take ownership of the programs. This is essential not only for implementation of innovative programs, but also for their sustainment. Deans come and go; the faculty remain. The reviewers recommend finding someone with a proven record of getting things accomplished in situations where faculty members disagree about what is to be done, and how. The transformation of FIS into a world leader and innovator will require decisions, and real decisions have winners and losers. The ability to manage the process of moving forward while maintaining the loyalty and commitment of the faculty, despite disagreements, is essential.

It is recommended that the new dean have skills in working with external constituencies on a variety of dimensions, including development. The Toronto region provides extraordinary opportunities to develop a community of support for FIS that will yield resources in the form of funds, research opportunities for faculty and doctoral students, and internships and employment for masters students.

The new dean should have good administrative skills, especially in developing the support functions within FIS. FIS has a competent and loyal cadre of professional staff members, but more will be required of them as the vision takes shape. The professional staff must be partners with the dean and the faculty in the transformation of FIS, and not merely players in support of FIS as it currently is.

## REVIEW SUMMARY

**DIVISION/UNIT:** Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy

**DATE:** May 5 - 6, 2008

**COMMISSIONING OFFICER:** Vice-President and Provost

**PROGRAMS OFFERED:**

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

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

**Diploma/Certificate:** International Pharmacy Graduate Program

**EXTERNAL REVIEWERS**

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

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

**PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE:** 2004

**SUMMARY FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS OF  
PREVIOUS REVIEW:**

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

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

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

- The Faculty will need to significantly expand its clinical faculty cohort, including those performing clinical research.

**DATE OF RECENT OCGS REVIEW:** 2000-2001

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:** Terms of Reference  
*Self Study, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy 2008*  
*Report on Research at the Faculty of Pharmacy, Office of the Vice-President Research, 2008*  
 External Review Report of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, 2005 and response from the Dean  
*Stepping UP – Synthesis*

**CONSULTATION** The committee met with the Vice-President and Provost, the Deputy Provost, Dean of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, groups of faculty, staff, administrators, students (graduate, undergraduate and Pharm.D.), pharmacist preceptors, teaching hospital pharmacy directors, members of the Ontario College of Pharmacists, deans of cognate programs in the health sciences and arts and sciences, and chairs of departments of physiology and chemistry.

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

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

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

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

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

### Academic programs

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

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

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

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

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

#### Research activities

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

#### Faculty members

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

#### Faculty visibility and professional leadership

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

The reviewers identified several challenges and opportunities for the Faculty:

#### Organizational structure

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

#### Approval of the entry-level Pharm.D.

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

attitudes requisite for practice change leader". Furthermore, the Faculty must consider general and specialized residency experiences, and fellowship opportunities, as part of the program.

#### New curriculum implementation scheduled for 2010

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

#### Practice faculty members

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

#### Changing research culture

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

#### Other Possible Revenue Opportunities

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

#### Miscellaneous points raised during the review:

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



## **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES**

### **Dean, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy**

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

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

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

Speedie and Sindelar identified some future challenges which deserve response.

#### **Organizational Structure and Communication:**

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

#### **Approval of the Entry-Level PharmD:**

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

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

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

**New Curriculum Implementation:**

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

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

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

**Practice Faculty Members:**

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

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

**A Changing Research Centre:**

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

**Revenue Opportunities:**

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

**Teaching Priority:**

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

**Student Research Opportunities:**

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

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

**Interviews:**

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

K. Wayne Hindmarsh  
Dean  
August 2008

**Vice-President and Provost, Commissioning Officer**

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

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

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

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

*Cheryl Misak*  
Vice-President and Provost



## **EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT**

**Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy  
University of Toronto  
May 5 and 6, 2008**

**Marilyn K. Speedie, Ph.D., University of Minnesota  
Robert Sindelar, Ph.D., University of British Columbia**

### **1. Introduction**

Drs. Speedie and Sindelar visited the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy at the University of Toronto on May 5 and 6, 2008. The purpose of the visit was to provide a review of the status of the Faculty of Pharmacy and its programs in preparation for the transition to a new dean, and to inquire and make recommendations on a number of specific issues of relevance to the Faculty of Pharmacy, including the potential for implementation of an entry-level Pharm.D program and potential areas of continued growth for the Faculty. Dr. Sindelar is dean of the Faculty of Pharmacy at the University of British Columbia and Dr. Speedie is dean of the University of Minnesota College of Pharmacy. Both have reviewed the University of Toronto Faculty of Pharmacy in previous years.

In order to provide this review, we met with Provost Vivek Goel, Deputy Provost Cheryl Misak, Dean Hindmarsh, and groups of faculty, staff, administrators, students (graduate, undergraduate and Pharm.D.), pharmacist preceptors and teaching hospital pharmacy directors, members of the Ontario College of Pharmacists, deans of cognate programs in the health sciences and arts and sciences, and chairs of departments of physiology and chemistry. Each group was asked to provide its assessment of the quality of the programs they are involved in and to recommend areas of improvement or continued growth. We believe we had the opportunity to receive a comprehensive picture of the Faculty.

The Faculty of Pharmacy is fortunate to be a part of a strong and vibrant comprehensive university in a city rich with healthcare and pharmaceutical industry opportunities. It also is an exciting time for the profession of pharmacy as the patient care practice of pharmacy grows. Our overall conclusions are 1) the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy has excellent faculty members, students, facilities and programs that have undergone significant growth in the past five years; 2) Dean Hindmarsh has provided outstanding leadership and is universally and highly respected by all stakeholders; 3) the challenge will be to consolidate the growth and change that has occurred and to take advantage of the many opportunities that remain for growth and improvement. In support of these conclusions, we are pleased to provide the following findings and to offer several recommendations for achieving even greater excellence.

### **2. Accomplishments during Dean Hindmarsh's two terms**

The External Review Team acknowledges much strength in the leadership and faculty members of the U of T Faculty of Pharmacy. We found broad and enthusiastic support for Dr. Hindmarsh as an innovative and visionary dean. He is considered to be an outstanding ambassador for the profession, the Faculty, and the University. The External Review Team

especially congratulates Dean Hindmarsh and his excellent faculty members within the Faculty of Pharmacy for the following accomplishments (without any conscious ranking):

### **2.1 Expansion of the Undergraduate Professional, Graduate Professional and Research Graduate Programs**

A major accomplishment of the Faculty and the Dean is the planned and well-executed expansion of the Full-time Second-entry B.Sc. program from 670 total students in November 2003 to 904 total students in November 2007. While challenges remain, the applicant pool has shown significant growth over several years, recruitment activities have increased, academic admission standards of accepted students remains high, and the degree completion rates are very good.

While the full-time Pharm.D. program enrolment has remained relatively constant, a new part-time distance education program has enrolled 16-19 students since its inception in the 2004-05 academic year. Both programs received full six-year accreditation in 2007. Special note must also be made of the national recognition achieved by the highly successful post-entry-level international pharmacy graduate (IPG) program.

The External Review Team recognizes that in recent years there have been notable and favourable improvements in the management of research graduate studies and the expansion of seats. From 2000-01 until 2006-07, the total Doctoral enrolment has purposely doubled from 37 students to 76 students (currently 148 total full- and part-time research graduate students) and yield a graduate students/FTE ratio much more comparable to that of other Faculties in Life Sciences. The newer Pharmaceutical Chemistry Specialist Program (B.Sc.) offered jointly by the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Faculty of Pharmacy is expected to positively impact the number and quality of applicants for the graduate programs in the near future. Also, the Faculty must be congratulated on the implementation of a new Flex-time Ph.D. program.

### **2.2 New Building and Solid Fundraising Support**

A major investment made to help the Faculty achieve its goal to be recognized among the best Faculties of Pharmacy in North America is the funding and construction of a state-of-the-art new facility to carry out in one location all of their education and research objectives. Opened in 2006, the Leslie L. Dan Pharmacy Building is situated on one of the most prominent corners in Toronto. The building has raised the perception of pharmacy within the University, the Toronto life science community, and well beyond to the wider Toronto community-at-large. The review team found enthusiastic and consistent excitement generated by the building among all stakeholders and decision makers.

It is important to note that in addition to the funds provided by the University and the province through "SuperBuild" Funds, the priority for fundraising has been the new building. Over Dean Hindmarsh's terms, fundraising initiatives have resulted in more than \$33 million being donated to the Faculty from the private sector, facilitating transformational growth. Total funds raised from all sources were in excess of \$70 million. Foundational is the nearly \$18 million in support garnered in 2000-01 resulting

in the naming of the Faculty and the future building. The Dean has significantly increased the number of Faculty resources devoted to these activities, thus assuring future success while enhancing alumni and stakeholder relations.

### **2.3 Strong Growth in Research Activities**

The Team recognizes that the Faculty is engaged in the development and pursuit of world-class research well recognized by several peer-review granting agencies. The scope, quality and relevance of the Faculty's research activities are excellent and continue to grow in quality and prestige. An Office of the VP Research report dated March 2008 notes that research funding in the Faculty has steadily increased 3.6 fold over an eleven-year period between 1996-97 and 2006-07. In 2006-07, 23 out of 25 Faculty members held at least one grant or contract representing 92% participation, which is very high. Total external research funding has increased over the past 7 years from \$2.0 million in 2000-01 to over \$6.07 million each of the past three years (all sources). These recent successes favourably improve the position and recognition of the Faculty among other Faculties at The University of Toronto, one of Canada's major research-intensive Universities. Furthermore, the Faculty ranking among other Faculties of Pharmacy in Canada has remained among the top three faculties in Canada, along with the University of British Columbia and the University of Montreal.

Several faculty members have received honours and awards for their scholarship activities. This includes: four Canada Research Chairs (Signal Transduction, Chemical Genetics, Lipid Science and Technology, and Adverse Drug Reactions); two Chairs (Pharmacoeconomics, Pharmaceuticals and Drug Delivery); six young, early or new investigator awards; and two career research awards. For CIHR Open Operating Grants, the average for Pharmacy faculty members is now at levels comparable to the rest of U of T, after lagging behind in the past. In addition to operating funds, several faculty members have received substantial funding for equipment and infrastructure from external agencies such as CIHR and CFI.

### **2.4 Strong New Faculty**

Notably, the Faculty of Pharmacy has been able to recruit ten professors at various stages of their careers over the past five years (with three searches in progress at the time of the External Review Team visit). These new hires have occurred as a result of faculty retirements, replacements and modest new funding. While the size of the Faculty has remained relatively consistent over the past five-years, increasing slightly to support program expansion, the hiring has resulted in new named chairs and Canada Research Chairs. Areas of scholarly expertise include drug delivery, public policy, pharmacoeconomics, chemical genetics, signal transduction, lipid science, pharmacy practice, pharmacokinetics, and ethics. During the interview process, the External Review Team consistently heard from Faculty and University colleagues their excitement over the quality of the new hires. The core and adjunct faculty members are viewed as strengths of the Faculty. The Team found the individuals with whom they met to be competitive and seriously engaged in the curriculum and research.

## **2.5 Increased Faculty Visibility**

The Team recognizes that Dean Hindmarsh's and the Faculty's efforts have significantly increased the visibility and prominence of the Faculty. The new academic programs, enhanced research success, and the new physical facilities have all contributed to an increased respect for the Faculty from University colleagues and the wider stakeholder and decision-maker community. They have cemented coalitions between the public, university and private sectors that will enhance translational research and training. Dean Hindmarsh's involvement and proactive style has been pivotal to external expectations of the Faculty's ongoing success.

## **2.6 Strong Leadership with Profession and Within Faculty**

The Team recognizes the outstanding leadership provided by Dean Hindmarsh. He is well respected by his peers and all stakeholders. There is little doubt that he is not only well connected to the profession of pharmacy, but is considered a strong voice for the change in Canadian scope of pharmacy practice and the education context to support that change. Consistent with previous reviews and further supported by his actions the last several years, Dean Hindmarsh is "progressive, forthright, and supportive, and able to garner resources for the Faculty." Some of the stakeholders interviewed by this Team expressed concerns that Dean Hindmarsh's departure could unravel some of the major efforts of the Faculty he so strongly crafted. There is a strong collaborative spirit and a mutual respect amongst faculty and staff. The Dean promotes a friendly and humanistic environment due to the openness of his communication style.

## **2.7 Proposal for New Entry-level Pharm.D. Program**

As with many of the initiatives undertaken by this Dean and his Faculty, the proposal for a new Entry-level Pharm.D. Program has been logically studied, well designed, and innovative in both concept and planned implementation. While much work remains to be done, including gaining Ontario government approval, the Dean has continued to serve as a skillful champion for the initiative. A number of Canadian Faculties of Pharmacy will look toward Toronto as a model for their programs.

## **2.8 Continuous Professional Development Initiative**

The Team found the new institutional priority given to Continuous Professional Development (including the addition of four full-time employees), especially in this rapidly changing pharmacy practice environment, forward thinking, innovative and with the potential to produce cutting edge learning. For example, the "OSCEology" course has attracted students from across the profession as well as from some of the most prominent pharmacy education programs in North America. They make a concerted effort to deliver programs in a variety of formats to accommodate learning preferences and to continuously assess program quality.



## **2.9 A Dedicated Support Staff**

The quality of service provided and the dedication of the staff in supporting the work of faculty and students are commendable. There is a strong collaborative spirit and a mutual respect amongst faculty and staff.

## **2.10 Interprofessional Education**

The Team commends the Faculty for its accomplishments in interprofessional learning including its participation and formative role in the interprofessional pain week. Interviews with members of cognate departments lauded the Faculty of Pharmacy in their commitment to and participation in interprofessional learning and research endeavors on campus. They are expected to play a significant leadership role in these and new programs in the future.

## **2.11 Morale**

While challenged by enrollment increases, a new building, and changes in the University budgeting process, faculty and staff morale appears very strong. Consistently, members of the Faculty commented on their pride in their collective accomplishments, and their excitement for the future of the Faculty. They expressed a willingness to take responsibility for moving various initiatives along if given the authority to do so.

# **3. Future Challenges and Opportunities**

## **3.1 Organizational Structure**

The Team perceived a need to consolidate the organizational structure, which has been recently reorganized. It is important that the leadership ensure that communication is occurring bi-directionally, and that planning is occurring at all levels. Specifically, divisional level strategic planning and the roll-up of divisional plans to a faculty-wide plan seemed weak for some divisions. Division chairs should be charged with the responsibility for ensuring communication and planning. We also found that in some cases roles and responsibilities at various places in the organization may need clarification. These should be in written form and terms of reference at division director level should be developed. Decision-making should be transparent and implementing these roles and responsibilities for communication and planning should help ensure such transparency.

## **3.2 Approval of the Entry-level Pharm.D.:**

The Review Team readily recognizes the strong support the Faculty has garnered from cognate deans and Ontario pharmacy professional organizations for the Entry-level Pharm.D. program being currently developed. We recognize that several daunting issues challenge this great opportunity. These include reticence of the Ontario government in an environment where they seemingly support exploring changes in scope of professional practice. Various stakeholders told us that government adamantly opposes

this change to entry-to-practice and opposes other programs in line for more advanced degrees as well. A clear and careful strategy must be constructed for program approval that must include unequivocal university support and data to show that expanded scope of pharmacy practice leads to better health outcomes. The Faculty must define the abilities of their graduates to meet the expanded scope of practice desired by government. In addition, the implementation action plan developed by the Faculty must fully engage all critical stakeholders such as the key institutional practice sites in the province and ambulatory practice sites to assure that the program graduates possess all the abilities, knowledge, skills, and attitudes requisite for practice change leader. The Faculty must be active in developing general and specialized residency experiences to hone the patient care skills of their graduates as well as fellowship opportunities to develop future generations of clinical researchers and clinical faculty members. Modifying the current University budget model to better reflect the costs of delivering a high intensity professional program would be valuable during new program implementation.

### **3.3 New Curriculum Implementation Scheduled for 2010:**

The Review Team commends the Faculty for their bold plan to implement a new curriculum by the Fall 2010. Recognizing the importance for curriculum revision in the context of scope of professional practice changes is important. The “learning community” concept as well as the development of other new experiential learning paradigms is exciting. However, the Team notes that there are risks associated with the Faculty desire to implement the new curriculum with or without Ontario government approval of the Entry-level Pharm.D. program. While this plan provides for a better learning experience for entry-to-practice pharmacy students no matter what the formal degree may be, unilateral change prior to government approval may preclude the Faculty from attaining the requisite fiscal support from government in the future. Such greater fiscal resources will be required for the expansion of the clinical components of the curriculum as well as for expansion of the Part-time Pharm.D. program to meet the needs of existing practitioners wishing to upgrade their academic credentials. In addition, the Faculty should be careful not to underestimate the resources (i.e., practice sites, training of preceptors, clinical coordinators, site payments) needed to implement the additional expanded experiential program. Support for the new curriculum from the practitioner community is essential if pharmacists are going to volunteer to be preceptors for students in sufficient numbers to implement the program. New funding also may be required to work with the University of Waterloo on experiential learning placements should issues arise due to competition for limited institutional practice sites.

### **3.4 Practice Faculty Members**

The Faculty of Pharmacy has successfully grown its basic and pharmaceutical sciences research enterprise. In the next several years, it must invest equally in its practice faculty as the curriculum evolves and even more so if the Entry-level Pharm.D. program is implemented. This is essential to provide the critical mass of full-time faculty needed to enhance and deliver the core Pharm.D. programs as well as to build and maintain partnerships with practice sites so critical to the curriculum. Furthermore, the Team believes that it is the faculty’s responsibility to lead and evaluate progressive pharmacy

practice models that enhance appropriate, cost-effective and safe drug use as well as further define new payment models for patient care services.

The Pharmacy Practice Division must grow and embrace both the scholarship and teaching missions. While the Division will need a mixture of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty members as well as a mixture of full-time and part-time faculty members, it is the full-time practice faculty who are desperately needed at this time to accomplish these goals. The Division of Pharmacy Practice also needs appropriate leadership to become an equal partner in all missions of the Faculty (i.e., research/scholarship, teaching and community engagement) and will need new fiscal and personnel resources, either from new sources or as part of a reallocation, to accomplish the needed transformation. Faculty members should be selected who can contribute to research and scholarship about medication use and the health outcomes of expanded pharmacy practice as well as to the teaching mission. The opportunities for practice-based research networks in the Toronto area should be attractive to such individuals, but these networks will have to be built. Research should respond to needs of professional organizations and share results with them so the findings are incorporated into practice. Additionally, the divisional faculty members could engage in educational scholarship, leading to evidence-based teaching and learning strategies.

The strengthening and growth of the Pharmacy Practice Division, which is so essential for the curricular transformation that is envisioned, will require leadership at the Division, Faculty and Provostial level. University level leadership is needed to figure out how to change university guidelines so the Faculty can hire full time Pharm.D. faculty. While the Dean of Medicine told us it can be done now using hospitals as employers; other health professional deans say it requires a change in the Faculty Association rules. Whatever the route, the Provost must facilitate the necessary changes, for the benefit of all the health profession Faculties and to optimize the ability of the university to realize its potential for improving health care.

### **3.5 A Changing Research Culture:**

The U of T Faculty of Pharmacy is physically located at the locus of a vast Toronto life science innovation engine. The affiliated hospitals, University health and broader life science units, and the plethora of organizations housed in the MARS facility across the street present unlimited opportunities for expanded Faculty research. The opportunities for translational research may be amongst the strongest in Canada. The US National Institutes of Health has embraced and advocated a shift of focus to translational research, defined as that research which takes discoveries from bench to bedside and bedside to community and best practices. While Canadians certainly are not compelled to follow NIH leads, the concept of translational research seems to present an ideal opportunity for pharmacy faculties and this is especially true in the Toronto environment.

To take full advantage of this opportunity, several cultural changes must be undertaken by the Faculty. Currently, the majority of faculty members seem to embrace an individual PI culture and are focused strongly on federal sources of funding. This will need to change to a greater multidisciplinary philosophy to take full advantage for further expansion of research. The Faculty will need a vision of research in a larger

context beyond the Faculty of Pharmacy. Currently there are very few faculty members working in areas of research that might be called “clinical science”, e.g., pharmacogenomics, pharmacometrics, optimizing drug efficacy or safety, clinical trial research, etc. The Faculty would benefit from new hires in these areas. However, existing faculty members also have opportunities for adding a translational focus to their current work and expanding their funding beyond current levels.

The Faculty may obtain support in this endeavor from the U of T VP for Research Office. This support may take the form of assistance in the preparation of a major program project or multidisciplinary collaborative research proposals. Many opportunities exist but they must also align with areas of major focus for the University. The Faculty will need to formulate a vision of research in a larger context beyond the Faculty of Pharmacy. Areas of possible focus include: patient safety; the drug discovery and development pipeline (linking molecular basis of disease researchers to clinical trials) research; drugs and the health care system, systems biology, informatics, cancer, cardiovascular disease, neurology, global health, health human resources and workforce. Each Faculty division should be involved in strategizing about broader opportunities for collaborative research. This may necessitate the development of future Faculty division leadership capability from beyond the existing faculty members.

### **3.6 Other Possible Revenue Opportunities:**

Challenged by the new University budget model and hungry to become one of the top pharmacy education programs in North America, the Faculty of Pharmacy should explore new revenue generating opportunities that are consistent with the Faculty mission. It is valuable to note that the Review Team heard suggestions from leadership of cognate departments and faculties as well as several external stakeholders that might be explored by the Faculty of Pharmacy. For instance, the pressing shortage of pharmacists in Northern Ontario might present a new revenue opportunity. A satellite learning program opportunity for the U of T Faculty perhaps via a partnership with the new pharmacy program at the University of Waterloo might be a solution. Likewise, the pivotal role pharmacy now plays as part of the integrated health care team might form the basis of new advanced degree programs at the interface of pharmacy and other disciplines. For example, PharmD –MBA or MHA might be considered. The Faculty may find it valuable to capitalize on their success in outreach education to industry as well as pharmacists (CPD capabilities in place).

## **4. Miscellaneous Comments:**

The External Review Team believes that it is worthy to list several other issues raised during our review. These issues were not supported by extensive interview validation. However, several stakeholders raised these issues during our deliberations and fact-finding interviews. Further detail will be provided for specific issues upon request.

**4.1** Some faculty members expressed concern that not all of their colleagues are prepared to teach or give teaching the appropriate priority. We recommend that due diligence be given to faculty development efforts to enhance teaching and learning

facilitation skills. Also, appropriate recognition and reward of teaching excellence as well as leadership regarding the importance of the Faculty teaching and learning mission is prudent.

4.2 A number of students as well as a few faculty members commented on the need for greater research opportunities for undergraduate professional students. The Team recommends that this issue be given some thought in the context of the curriculum revision now progressing. Consideration may also include increased course instruction in research skills most directly related to the patient care activities of the pharmacist such as critical appraisal and literature evaluation.

4.3 The Review Team was surprised by the number of stakeholders (faculty members, staff, students, and the professional community) that suggested a need for interviews as part of an admissions process. Thus, the Team recommends that the Faculty devote some study to this issue.

## **5. Conclusion:**

The University of Toronto Faculty of Pharmacy is strong and vibrant. They have engaged in a great deal of change during Dean Hindmarsh's terms and have increased their visibility, productivity, and impact. A new dean should be able to build upon this firm foundation to solidify the gains that have been made, to implement further changes that are underway, and to envision an even brighter future that will bring credit to the University of Toronto. With change comes opportunity and the Faculty is well positioned to take advantage of those opportunities. The situation should be very attractive to new dean candidates.

Our recommendations for criteria for a new dean are that the individual must be visionary, well-connected to the profession and able to lead in the context of professional, academic, and governmental stakeholders. The successful dean will have excellent interpersonal skills and strongly value excellence and high quality for all the missions of the Faculty. The University of Toronto should provide an attractive environment for someone with these attributes and we are optimistic that the deanship will garner outstanding candidates.

Respectfully submitted July 1, 2008

Marilyn Speedie  
Robert Sindelar

