UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT & PROVOST

APPENDIX "A" TO REPORT NUMBER 167
OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD – April 21, 2010

TO: Planning and Budget Committee

SPONSOR: Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget
CONTACT INFO: 416 978-2819, sally.garner@utoronto.ca

DATE: April 5 for April 12, 2010

AGENDA ITEM: 4

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:
University of Toronto Scarborough: Proposal to establish a Department of English and a Department of Philosophy.

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:
The Committee recommends to the Academic Board on plans and proposals to establish, disestablish, or significantly restructure academic units and resulting planning and resource implications.

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:
The current University of Toronto Scarborough departmental structure was established in 1964. Executive Committee of Governing Council approved the change of name of the UTSC Division of Humanities to the Department of Humanities on February 3, 2003.

HIGHLIGHTS:
The Department of Humanities is the largest, most complex department at University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC). It houses disciplines in the humanities, including English, French, History, Linguistics, and Philosophy. It offers a broad array of programs, including African Studies, Classical Studies, English, French, Global Asia Studies, History, Intersections, Exchanges and Encounters in the Humanities, Journalism, Languages, Linguistics and Psycholinguistics, Media Studies, New Media Studies, Philosophy, Religion, Women's and Gender Studies, and Visual and Performing Arts.

The increase in the breadth disciplines, teaching and research activity in the Department of Humanities has posed a serious challenge to the leadership, direction and effective management and promotion of the Department. It has become clear in recent external reviews of the Department that its structure is no longer optimal and that the needs of the teaching staff and students would be better supported through three separate academic units. Based on external reviews of the Department and extensive consultation within the unit, across the three campuses, UTSC proposes the establishment of a new Department of English and a new Department of Philosophy. The attached proposal sets out the academic rationale for the establishment of the departments in order to strengthen these disciplines, allow for thriving interdisciplinary activity, and create a size and coherence that represents a critical mass of programs and faculty, brought about by expansion at UTSC.

The proposed structure will provide an environment that allows for the improvement of the teaching and research missions of the three departments. The changed structure will not affect the curriculum or the delivery of academic programs, although it will result in the relocation of the English and Philosophy programs to the new departments. The Department of Humanities will continue to offer programs in African Studies, Classical Studies, French, Global Asia Studies, History, Intersections, Exchanges and Encounters in the Humanities, Languages, Journalism, Linguistics and Psycholinguistics, Media Studies, New Media Studies, Religion, Women's and Gender Studies, and Visual and Performing Arts . The graduate departments currently assigned to faculty in English and Philosophy will remain unchanged. The tri-campus graduate Department of English will remain the graduate home of the English faculty and the tri-campus graduate Department of Philosophy will remain the home of the Philosophy faculty.

There has been extensive consultation regarding the proposal within UTSC. The proposal was considered by the UTSC Planning and Budget Committee on March 16, 2010 and approved by the UTSC Council on March 30, 2010.

FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS:

The increases in funding to support the two new departments are described in the proposal and will be allocated from existing operating resources within UTSC. There are no resource implications for the University's operating budget resulting from this proposal. The financial plan has been reviewed and approved by UTSC and by the Vice-Provost Academic Operations Office.

Complement planning, implementation strategies, and communication to students are delineated with the proposal. Faculty members and academic programs related to the proposed departments are currently housed in the Department of Humanities, and comprise approximately one third of the faculty complement and one third of the program and course enrollments.

Delivery of the existing undergraduate programs will be unaffected although programs will be housed in the new departments as described. As the programs were not thoroughly reviewed in 2009, they will be scheduled for external review within the next two years. The proposed restructuring will not affect the current tri-campus graduate structure; new academic units will align with the existing graduate departments. The Chairs of these departments as well as the Deans of Arts and Science, UTSC and the School of Graduate Studies have been consulted and view this change as a positive step forward for UTSC.

The reorganization will have no immediate implications for space allocation. Space is currently available to accommodate the three proposed new administrative staff. However, the need for contiguous space for these departments, as well as for the Department of Humanities, will be an important priority in the planning for secondary space needs arising from the construction of the new Instructional Centre, which is slated for completion in mid-2011. There are needs for additional academic and administrative staff, and the Dean of UTSC has outlined a plan to provide funding for these positions, an academic administrative stipend for each academic unit and the costs for additional administrative offices.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning and Budget Committee recommends for approval that:

1. The University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) Department of English be established, effective July 1, 2010; and

2. The UTSC Department of Philosophy be established, effective July 1, 2010.

OMNIBUS PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH TWO NEW DEPARTMENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO SCARBOROUGH:

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

April 5, 2010

Contents PAGE

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

After a self-study and an external review with administrative response, as well as extensive consultations within and outside of the Department of Humanities, we are proposing that the disciplines of English and Philosophy be moved from the Department of Humanities to form two independent units at the University of Toronto Scarborough: the Department of English and Department of Philosophy. These disciplines and their faculty are currently housed in the Department of Humanities, and comprise approximately one third of the faculty complement and one third of the program and course enrollments. The reorganization of the Department of Humanities responds to a long-held desire on the part of English and Philosophy for departmental autonomy.

This reorganization will not affect the curriculum or the delivery of academic programs, although it will result in the relocation of the English and Philosophy programs to the new departments.

The graduate departments currently assigned to faculty in English and Philosophy will remain unchanged. The tri-campus graduate Department of English will remain the graduate home of the English faculty and the tri-campus graduate Department of Philosophy will remain the home of the Philosophy faculty.

The reorganization will have no immediate implications for space allocation. However, the need for contiguous space for these departments, as well as for the Department of Humanities, will be an important priority in the planning for secondary space needs arising from the construction of the new Instructional Centre, which is slated for completion in mid-2011. The UTSC Human Resource Services department has analyzed the administrative needs for the new Departments. We are committed to meeting these needs.

2. INTRODUCTION

The Department (formerly Division) of Humanities has existed at UTSC since its inception in 1964. It is the largest, most complex department at UT Scarborough. It houses disciplines in the humanities, including English, French, History, Linguistics, and Philosophy. Currently, the Department is comprised of a wide array of programs, including African Studies, Classical Studies, English, French, Global Asia Studies, History, Intersections, Exchanges and Encounters in the Humanities, Languages, Linguistics and Psycholinguistics, Media Studies, Philosophy, Religion, Women's and Gender Studies, and Visual and Performing Arts. This last program includes Art History, Arts Management, Drama, Music, and Studio. The Department of Humanities is also engaged in Co-op, combining academic studies with work experience, and in joint programs in Journalism and New Media Studies with Centennial College. The Department of Humanities is unusual not only in the number and range of its programs, but also in including a

theatre (Leigha Lee Browne Theatre), two galleries (Doris McCarthy Gallery and the student's Gallery 1265) that were brought into the department since 2005, and a recently created Office of Arts and Events Programming.

Faculty members in the Department are appointed to ten arts and science graduate departments, OISE/UT, and the Faculty of Music. There are 76.40 full-time equivalent faculty (FTE), with 50.21 FTEs in the tenure stream and 26.19 FTEs in the teaching stream. Of these, there are 12 tenure-stream faculty and 2 teaching stream faculty in English and 8 tenure-stream faculty in Philosophy.

There are approximately 2,600 students enrolled in the Department of Humanities' programs, with 700 enrolled in English programs and 254 in Philosophy programs. There are about 10,500 FCE enrolments in courses offered by the Department of Humanities, with 2,500 enrolled in English courses and 1,000 in Philosophy courses.

The current form of the Department of Humanities was developed at a time when all academic programs on the campus were organized in three large Divisions – Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities. Subsequently, the Division of Sciences subdivided into four departments (Biological Sciences, Computer and Mathematical Sciences, Physical and Environmental Sciences and Psychology) and Economics separated from Social Sciences to form the Department of Management.

In the fall of 2009, the Dean commissioned an external review of the Department of Humanities. This first involved an extensive departmental Self-Study, prepared by a departmental committee with input from the Chair, Associate Chairs, Program Directors, faculty members, staff and students. The external review comprised a two-day campus visit by Professor Jessie Ann Owens (Dean of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies, University of California, Davis), Professor Caroline Levander (Director, Humanities Research Centre, Rice University) and Professor Robert Gibbs (Director, Jackman Humanities Institute, University of Toronto) in late December. In early January 2010, the reviewers submitted a thoughtful and compelling report that identified and commended a number of very creative accomplishments in the articulation of new interdisciplinary programs in the humanities, but also highlighted some debilitating problems in governance and collegial relations. Their report made a strong case for vibrant and self-confident disciplines as the necessary basis for new interdisciplinary initiatives. The report was adamant that given the seriousness of the situation and the breakdown of collegial relations in the department that the Dean's Office needed to act quickly and decisively to remedy the situation. The 2009 external review report echoed similar themes raised in the 2005 external review of the Department.

The external reviewers' report was supported by an administrative response from the Dean in February 2010, which was taken to divisional governance (UTSC Academic Committee) on 23 February 2010 and to university governance (Committee on Academic Policy and Programs) on 2 March 2010. There have been extensive discussions with faculty, staff, and students in the Department and well as discussions with other Departmental Chairs and at UTSC governance tables. There has been general agreement with the report of the external reviewers and support for the creation of the Departments of English and Philosophy.

3. REVIEW AND CONSULTATION PROCESS

3.1 Overall Context

Over the past few years some faculty members, including those in English and Philosophy, have grown increasingly uncomfortable with the size and complexity of the Department. They believe that the present administrative structure is no longer functional and that Chair, even with advice from a senior member of their own discipline and the appropriate Graduate Chair, to make decisions about the merit of individuals in such a wide range of disciplines. Because of the complexity of the Department, communication and consultation is inadequate. A significant part of the Department has a vision of the future of the humanities, which English and Philosophy do not believe aligns well with the culture of their disciplines. The recent creation of several new interdisciplinary programs in the Department sharpened these differences in vision and orientation, and confirmed in the minds of many English and Philosophy colleagues the imperative of departmentalization.

3.2 Self-Study and External Review

During the preparation of the Self Study document, Program Directors and Supervisors in the Department of Humanities conducted reviews of each of their programs, including an analysis of their curricula to ensure compliance with the UTSC *Undergraduate Degree Learning Expectations* approved in 2008. The departmental committee prepared the Self-Study with input from the Chair, Associate Chairs, Program Directors, faculty members, staff and students.

The Self Study was distributed to the external reviewers who then conducted an extensive site visit to UTSC, which included meetings with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and the Dean, SGS; the Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic) at UTSC; the Chair of Humanities; Chairs of graduate departments associated with Humanities; and faculty, students, administrative staff from the department. The reviewers were given a thorough tour of the UTSC campus and relevant departmental facilities.

The external reviewers submitted their findings in January 2010 and their report (see Appendix A) was distributed to all members of the Department. An administrative response was prepared, which was subsequently tabled both at the UTSC Academic Committee and at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

In January 2010, the Dean began a series of consultative meetings with each of the discipline and program groups within the Department, with members of the Teaching Stream and administrative staff, and with students. Further consultations, focusing on academic programs, were undertaken by the Vice-Dean, Undergraduate and Assistant Dean with the Program Directors of every program in the Department. The Dean's Office has been in close communication with members the Provost's Office.

3.3 Departmental Visions

External Reviewers

The reviewers noted the campus goal to be a mid-sized comprehensive research university, with a distinctive identity within the University of Toronto system. Among the key features of this new identity are the creation of an environment to house and support the growth of new and emerging fields of scholarship and the creation of viable academic homes for new undergraduate and graduate programs. They further noted the alignment of this vision with the University goals articulated in *Towards 2030*.

Measured against these goals, the reviewers noted an impressive string of bold and important innovations undertaken by the Department of Humanities in the last few years. They noted the numerous strengths of the Department including new academic ventures, the quality of the intersections of teaching and research, the quality of the student body, the very high quality of recent faculty appointments, the successful creation of the Office of Arts and Events Programming, and incorporation of the Doris McCarthy Gallery into the Department.

While commending the department for these innovations, the reviewers were concerned by evidence of competing visions for the humanities and the extreme conflict over governance that they found within the Department. There was significant conflict about the basic functioning of the department, which was exacerbated by its sheer size. The size and complexity of the Department meant, for some faculty, that it would be impossible to construct a unifying vision for it as it moved ahead. Further, the reviewers noted that few of our peer institutions retain a construct such as "Department of Humanities," and that this structure was now regarded by some as an outmoded artifact of UTSC's early years.

The reviewers concluded that the department was too faction-driven and divided to articulate a coherent long-term prospectus and stressed the need for immediate action to address these problems. The reviewers urged the Dean to respond in a timely and dramatic fashion and to make every effort possible to have a new structure in place by the beginning of the next academic year. Upon receipt of the review the Dean and other senior leadership at UTSC concurred and resolved to take immediate action.

Departmental Visions

Following receipt of the external reviewers' report and the extensive consultations that subsequently took place, we have concluded that the establishment of the two new departments and the careful cultivation of a new vision for the Department of Humanities (and the crafting of new departmental governance and communication protocols) will offer a brighter future for all the disciplines and programs. It will put faculty and academic programs with common affinities together that thus will be able to grow together. It will alleviate the structural problems caused by the size and complexity of the current Department of Humanities.

The desire of English and Philosophy to form their own departments continues the practice of departmentalization as disciplines mature and as the scale and complexity of UTSC grows. The new departmental structures will support the exciting interdisciplinary vision that has emerged in recent years while allowing English and Philosophy to pursue their own distinct visions and academic goals. The new structures will serve as a basis for reinvigorated discussions among these and other units over shared interests.

A rich array of disciplines and programs will remain in the Department of Humanities, including African Studies, Classical Studies, Global Asia Studies, History, Intersections, Exchanges, Encounters in the Humanities, French, Journalism, Linguistics, New Media Studies, Religion, Visual & Performing Arts (including Arts Management, Drama, Music and Studio) and Women's & Gender Studies.

The Dean's Office has begun, and will continue over the coming year, to work closely with colleagues in the Humanities to develop an academic plan and governance structures that will enable the Department to move forward with a clear academic plan and sense of collegiality and common purpose. Colleagues in the Department plan to continue to build strong connections between disciplines, both within and outside of the Department, through the development or strengthening of interdisciplinary programs, research collaboration, and co-curricular initiatives. There are many colleagues who also share a vision for the future that embraces a holistic and integrative approach to the humanities itself.

4. PROPOSED NEW DEPARTMENTS

4.1 Department of English

As a stand-alone department, English will formulate an academic plan for areas where it wishes to develop strength in scholarship and research and to consider how this can support and enrich its programs. It will consider new directions for its own programs and interdisciplinary collaborations with other disciplinary groups at UTSC.

A core value of English is to deliver programs that give students methodological as well as historical and geographical breadth. Faculty research covers a range of critical approaches both intrinsic and extrinsic relative to the objects of study: historicist, new historicist, formalist, Marxist, feminist, postcolonial, ecological, phenomenological, deconstructive, psychoanalytic, and poststructuralist. All courses in English model critical approaches and therefore make visible what faculty do as teachers and scholars. Students are taught to be *bricoleurs*—and the programs in English have been designed to give them a critical toolbox. A mark of success is when students know which tool will open up a particular text, whether specifically literary or more broadly cultural.

English endeavors to teach two streams of students, those going on to graduate school in English literature and those who will utilize their English degrees in pursuit of other careers. The English programs have been erected on the strongest intellectual foundations: critical writing and critical thinking. The structures of literary language and thought form the gateway through which students enter the specialist, major, and minor programs. Once inside the program architecture, students discover five main divisions: 1) cinema studies, 2) creative writing, 3) historical studies of literature, 4) themes, genres, and backgrounds of literature, and 5) the diverse literatures of places and nations. Students move through the large gateway and introductory courses in each division (the B-levels) into a wide range of C- and D-level offerings. There is a coherent progression from breadth to depth. All five divisions have faculty and curricular commitment; all five will be stronger in the future.

In the short term, English envisions the creation of a Cinema studies minor. Eventually, English hopes to add a comparative perspective to the already rich offerings in Cinema with the addition of a tenure-stream colleague in postcolonial world cinemas. Further, English envisions enabling Creative Writing students to move through the same three-stages as already exist for the other programs. This would also enable the introduction of a Certificate Program in Creative Writing. In time the already strong complement in literary historical studies will become stronger with the proposed addition of tenure-stream colleagues in Medieval and Romantic literature. Similarly, the study of themes and genres will be enhanced with the proposed hire of a specialist in drama.

English at UTSC will embody in microcosm the larger goals both of humanities and the university as a whole: interdisciplinarity in teaching and research; study of the humanities in a global context; experiential learning; and involvement in emerging areas of scholarship.

The Department of English would contain all the English programs currently housed in the Department of Humanities, namely the Specialist and Major programs in English and a Minor program in English Literature. As the programs were not thoroughly reviewed in 2009, they will be scheduled for external review within the next two years. The move of the English programs to the new Department would have no resource implications with regard to faculty complement or infrastructure. The Department would have a faculty complement of 14 FTEs, composed of permanent faculty members in English. Augmented administrative resources will be provided as discussed below.

The new Department will operate under the leadership of a Chair who will carry out the functions that are normally assigned to such academic administrators and who will serve as a member of the PDAD&C and the UTSC Chairs Group. The Chair will appoint the necessary committees (e.g., Curriculum Committee, a Progress Through the Ranks Committee, etc.) in order to conduct its business. It is likely that this department will need to draw members for some of its Committees from cognate departments in light of its comparatively small numbers.

It is proposed that the Department of English at the University of Toronto Scarborough be established effective 1 July 2010.

4.2 Department of Philosophy

Philosophy has a distinctive place on a university campus. On the one hand, it shares much with the humanities: in particular, it proceeds dialectically, in the form of disputations among members of the field and its history. On the other hand, Philosophy has strong ties to the social and physical sciences: Many philosophers consider their primary cognate disciplines to be among Political Science, Sociology, Psychology, Cognitive and Information Science, Linguistics, Mathematics, or Physics. The history of Philosophy manifests these connections: Hobbes and Political Theory, Descartes and Analytic Geometry, Leibniz and Calculus, Marx and Political Theory, Frege and the Foundations of Mathematics, Carnap and the Foundations of Physics. And finally and most importantly, Philosophy has its distinctive questions and methods, which are of the most general and abstract kind.

Philosophy wishes to pursue complementary educational and scholarly missions,

to the advantage of UTSC undergraduate students, Philosophy graduate students at U of T, and the academic community at large. Our educational mission is two-fold: to produce the best possible philosophical education for UTSC undergraduates, and to fully participate in the tricampus graduate department of Philosophy, of which UTSC is one of three contribution divisions at U of T. Our scholarly mission is clear: to continue to produce outstanding research both in Philosophy and at the boundary of Philosophy and its cognate disciplines. We believe that the best way to achieve our educational and scholarly mission is to establish ourselves as a self-standing Philosophy department that offers to undergraduates a comprehensive set of courses both in the rich history of the discipline, and in contemporary issues such as metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of mind, philosophy of language, logic, philosophy of science, ethics, social-political philosophy, and philosophy of art.

There are many advantages to Philosophy being a department. Its increased visibility will enhance undergraduates' access to and experience of Philosophy at UTSC; it will provide Philosophy with an autonomy that enables independent development of research and teaching strengths, leadership in career advancement for its faculty, and provides flexibility in planning curricula, managing courses, etc., in a way that is responsive to students' needs. In addition, departmentalization will enhance Philosophy's ability to engage in interdisciplinary projects with others, not only in the Humanities but also across disciplines, and it will put Philosophy at UTSC on an equal basis with departments at UTM and FAS in tri-campus planning. This greater integration in tricampus planning largely concerns graduate education: we will thus have greater flexibility in exploring ways to increase graduate presence at UTSC.

The Department of Philosophy would contain all the Philosophy programs currently housed in the Department of Humanities, namely the Specialist, Major and Minor programs in Philosophy. As the programs were not thoroughly reviewed in 2009, they will be scheduled for external review within the next two years. The move of the Philosophy programs to the new Department would have no resource implications with regard to faculty complement or infrastructure. The Department would have a faculty complement of 8 FTEs, composed of permanent faculty members in Philosophy. Augmented administrative resources will be provided as discussed below.

The new Department will operate under the leadership of a Chair who will carry out the functions that are normally assigned to such academic administrators and who will serve as a member of the PDAD&C and the UTSC Chairs Group. The Chair will appoint the necessary committees (e.g., Curriculum Committee, a Progress Through the Ranks Committee, etc.) in order to conduct its business. It is likely that this department will need to draw members for some of its

Committees from cognate departments in light of its comparatively small numbers.

It is proposed that the Department of Philosophy at the University of Toronto Scarborough be established effective 1 July 2010.

5. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND MILESTONES

In consultation with appropriate program directors and UTSC's Office of the Dean, a detailed schedule of the milestones for implementation of this plan has been developed. The most recent version of this schedule is provided in Appendix D.

5.1 Governance

We will be seeking formal governance approval of this reorganization, as outlined in this proposal. This proposal is being taken forward for discussion to the divisional Planning and Budget Committee, Academic Committee, and has been approval to the UTSC Council on March 30, 2010. Subsequently it will enter the university wide governance (Planning and Budget Committee, Academic Board and Governing Council).

5.2 Communication with Students

The Dean's Office has begun to communicate with students both through formal memoranda to all members of the Humanities, including students, and through a meeting with the SHADO, the departmental student association. In the coming weeks, the Dean will be communicating with students, both via written and oral means about the creation of the two new departments and the changes to the Department of Humanities and its programs. All students will be notified as soon as these changes are approved through the Governing Council process. Academic counselors will work with students in each of the programs on their options and on their plans to complete their programs. These changes will be reflected in the online Academic Calendar, and the Registrar's Office will recruit and advise students accordingly.

5.3 Program Administration

All English and Philosophy undergraduate programs will continue to be offered after their administrative home is moved to the respective new department. Newly enrolled students in fall 2010 will join the new Department. Programs in the two departments (as well as in the Department of Humanities) will be scheduled for external review within the next two years.

5.4 Academic Complement

Pending governance approval, as a first step, it is likely that Interim Chairs of the Departments of English and Philosophy will be appointed. These appointments will be made in accordance with the process outlined in the *Policy on the Appointment of Academic Administrators.*

All current English and Philosophy faculty will be reassigned to the Departments of English and Philosophy respectively. The plans for re-assignment are being developed with faculty and teaching staff members, in co-ordination with UTSC Human Resources and the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life.

5.5 Administrative Staff

All staff currently employed in the Department of Humanities will remain in that department. Their roles and job descriptions will remain the same. Three new full-time administrative staff positions will be created to support the Department of English and the Department of Philosophy. It is expected that some back office functions, particularly with regard to business operations, will be shared. The administrative staff plans have been developed with staff members, in co-ordination with UTSC Human Resources.

5.6 Space Reorganization

In the immediate future there will be no reorganization of space or allocation of new space; however, the need for contiguous space for these departments, as well as for the Department of Humanities, will be an important focus of the planning for secondary space needs arising from the construction of the new Instructional Centre, which is slated for completion in the Fall of 2011.

5.7 Department of Humanities
Further planning regarding the Department will need to be undertaken in the medium term. As the programs were not thoroughly reviewed in 2009, they will be scheduled for external review within the next two years. The program structure and scope of the programs will be considered.

6. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS AND BUDGETARY IMPACTS

The Dean's Office has worked closely with Financial Services at UTSC to separate out the budgets of English and Philosophy from the Humanities budget, including TA budgets and sessional instruction budgets, under the principle that these will follow the reallocation of programs and courses into their new administrative homes. There are sufficient funds to support the current activities of all three

departments. UTSC funds will be provided to fund the three new administrative positions created to support the Departments of English and Philosophy and the two new chairs.

The establishment of two new academic units will not result in any changes in ongoing funding resources at a University level. The funding to support the two new departments will be allocated from existing operating resources or through appropriate mechanisms within UTSC.

APPENDIX A: EXTERNAL REVIEW FINAL REPORT

Program Review of the Department of Humanities, University of Toronto Scarborough

By: Professor Robert Gibbs (University of Toronto), Professor Caroline Levander (Rice University), Professor Jessie Ann Owens (University of California, Davis)

January 4, 2010

1. INTRODUCTION: THE REVIEW PROCESS

The review team consisted of three senior faculty from AAU institutions (Rice University, University of California, Davis, and University of Toronto), all of whom also hold administrative appointments (two humanities center directors and a dean) and belong to disciplines that are represented in the Department of Humanities at UTSC (Philosophy, English and Music).

Prior to our arrival, we were provided with several documents, including "From Siege to Synergy: UTSC Humanities 1999-2005," the self-study for the 2005 review written by Chair Cowper; the report of the external review team (2005) as well as a review summary that includes a synopsis of the 2000 review; the 2008 draft of the Department of Humanities strategic plan, "Department of Humanities Academic Plan: Engaging Communities, Applying Humanities"; the "Department of Humanities Self Study (9 December 2009)"; and relevant calendars. Prior to our arrival, we were given access to a website with faculty CVs, program reviews (21), and other reports (21). While on campus, we were given the 2008 UTSC strategic plan, "Strategic Plan: Setting the course for a new kind of campus"; and the UT strategic plan, "Towards 2030: A Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto." A number of additional documents written by individual faculty or groups of faculty were added to the website shortly before our visit. The program reviews and other reports were especially helpful: we were able to gain a sense of the issues before meeting with faculty and staff.

We were on campus from December 16 to December 18, 2009, and held numerous meetings with administrators, faculty, students and staff. Our work was governed by the "Terms of Reference," which were further elaborated first by Dean Halpern and then by Vice Provost Regehr and Dean Corman.

We met with Chair Bowen (via Skype), students, groups of faculty organized according to individual programs or groups of programs (research as well as teaching stream faculty), groups of faculty according to rank (research stream full, associate, and assistant professors respectively [this latter meeting included newly hired lecturers as well]), the staff of various administrative units, and two newly appointed associate chairs. (We are grateful to the Chair's staff for providing names of people attending these meetings.) We met with six Humanities Graduate Chairs from the St. George campus on Wednesday evening. We also had a tour of the facilities at UTSC. By rough counting, we had meetings with 15 students, approximately 17 group meetings with 120 faculty at UTSC

(overlapping in various groups), meetings with 8 administrators from UTSC, as well as with 2 staff. The final schedule, which underwent numerous changes during the visit, is attached as Appendix A. Special thanks to Annette Knott for making all arrangements and assisting us during our visit.

Summary: We found a unit riven by competing visions for the humanities and in extreme conflict about governance. The complexity of these issues demanded most of our attention, leaving little time for activities normally the purview of such reviews (for example, detailed comments on the curriculum of individual programs). We also did not address existing (downtown) graduate programs, to which most research stream faculty contribute, since our focus was on UTSC itself.

We begin by describing the institutional context for the Department of Humanities, and then we outline some of the strengths we identified. We then address issues of structure and governance. We provide comments on the curriculum, the workforce, and experiential learning. We conclude with suggestions for implementation and timeline.

2. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

The University of Toronto has experienced vast growth in the past decade, both in the undergraduate and graduate level, which has led to a marked attempt to help define the task and vision of the U of T for the next twenty years (Towards 2030). While it is easy to see that UTSC is undergoing growing pains, doubling its student body from 5,000 to 10,000 since 2002 (and with plans for additional modest growth), it is important to see that the new vision of UTSC is not to just be bulkier but to define a distinctive and leading role for its programs and campus.

At present primarily an undergraduate institution, UTSC has ambitions to be a mid-sized comprehensive research university, with a distinctive identity within the UT system. As outlined in the U of T plan "Towards 2030", "the east and west campuses have aspirations that reflect the research-intensive culture of the University as a whole." Therefore recent task forces have recommended that east and west campuses "initiate and lead new doctoral-stream offerings" in the future (17). The recent growth of student population, distinctive academic structures, and
degree programs, as well as the recent hiring of outstanding researchers collectively signal UTSC's belief that, in the words of "Towards 2030", it "must move forward." The "Fall 2008 UTSC Strategic Plan: Setting the Course for a New Kind of Campus", rearticulated these goals with a strong statement of the need for a clear identity. Among the key features of that new identity is "an environment to house and support the growth of new and emerging fields of scholarship" (p.15), including additional resources for these new areas and "creation of viable academic homes for these new programs." Moreover, in the strategic direction of enhanced graduate training, there is provision for "the creation of extra-departmental units to support PhD level programs in emerging new disciplines." (p. 17).

The department's own self-study affirmed these goals, but noted the resistance of some

faculty members who questioned the creation of new programs and opposed the strategies that seem to us to pursue goals and directions that are affirmed in the other documents. Indeed, while there is an obvious crisis, we believe that it is crucial for the new initiatives and the new hires to be supported in relation to the goals both of “Toward 2030” and the UTSC Strategic Plan. Measured against those goals, there has been a truly impressive string of bold and important innovations in the last few years.

Given the institution’s commitment to enhance its research profile and teaching excellence at the undergraduate and graduate levels, our recommendations are made with the intent to provide the “incremental steps that are decidedly unglamorous but utterly essential” (“Toward 2030”) to the process of realizing UTSC’s considerable ambitions.

It is obvious that there are varying levels of faculty enthusiasm for UTSC’s growing differentiation, autonomy and ambition. Our attempts to engage faculty about their dreams for this important long-range institutional vision were not productive: the department is simply too faction-riven and divided to articulate a coherent long-term prospectus. Today's problems must be addressed in order to realize tomorrow's vision.

3. STRENGTHS

We would like to draw attention to particular strengths of the Department of Humanities, with a focus on recent initiatives:

a) Quality of the intersections of teaching and research:
Students and faculty were articulate about the work of education in the humanities. We were struck by their identification of the classroom as the research laboratory for the humanities, a testing ground for new ideas that modeled humanistic scholarship. This kind of synergy is a clear area of distinction for UTSC: it derives partly from the relatively manageable size of UTSC, and partly from a historic and ongoing commitment to undergraduate education. Even though the undergraduate population has increased, students seem aware of faculty research and enjoy the personal interactions. Faculty commented that they got to know students. Faculty and students both were eager to have new classes driven by faculty research interests.

b) Quality of the student body:
The students we met with showed an energetic and authentic engagement with the humanities curriculum, and a lively interest in their own academic progress both in and out of the classroom. They were critical in a thoughtful way about things that could be improved.

c) Very high quality cohort of recent hires:
We found the faculty hired in the past five years, 18 in all, an impressive group. As a group they seemed academically ambitious and adventurous, trying to navigate between disciplinary and interdisciplinary interests. Many reported that they see UTSC as a particularly appealing community precisely because of its combination of interdisciplinary humanities teaching coupled with deep engagement in the tri-campus

graduate enterprise. Many of these hires are cross appointed, engaging in discipline-based as well as interdisciplinary teaching.

d) Successful new administrative ventures:
The creation of the new office, Arts and Events Programming (AEP), developed from Cultural Affairs, was a remarkably successful and economical way of developing co-curricular events and opportunities and fostering a vital community of faculty, students and community members. This initiative has created a greater sense of belonging and ownership for students, and provided appropriate staff support to enable faculty initiatives such as performances, lectures, and conferences. Bringing the Doris McCarthy Gallery under the purview of the Department of Humanities and changing the curator's responsibilities to include teaching (as a lecturer) was an inspired decision that solves the typical problem of galleries in an academic setting, namely, that they are not sufficiently imbedded in the curriculum. The renovation and better integration of the theatre is another positive example of administrative change. The staff engaged in these enterprises report a very positive sense of momentum, innovation, collaboration: as they say, "we're on a roll."

e) New academic ventures:
Responding to the mandate to develop the humanities vision for the Department of Humanities, Chair Bowen led the development of several new initiatives, including Global Asian Studies (GAS), Media Studies () as well as the Intersections, Exchanges and Encounters program (IEE) as a bridge for advanced undergraduates for research. Other developments were faculty-led, for example, African Studies. Though there is resistance to these initiatives from some quarters, they seem to us to reflect important new areas of growth and potential ways of creating synergies across disciplinary boundaries. In some cases they respond to the particular interests of the UTSC student population.

These administrative and academic ventures reflect Chair Bowen's ability to communicate a vision for the Department of Humanities across a substantial segment of the community. They also indicate his willingness to grow new infrastructure around faculty-generated initiatives. Bowen is regarded by many as accessible, willing to talk with individual faculty, and compassionate as a leader. Others have resisted the new programs and vision and have chosen to pursue their research programs within traditional disciplines.

4. STRUCTURE/GOVERNANCE

Despite these positive developments, it is clear that there is significant conflict about the basic functioning of the department. There is sharp disagreement about the ability of the current chair to manage the business of the department, with many faculty feeling that the job itself is now too large. No single chair can adequately perform the extensive duties required of a chair in the UT governance structure (the chair alone has budget and signature authority and must represent the department at many sorts of meetings). The size of the department makes transparent and timely communication difficult or

impossible. Even the new structure instituted by Bowen of monthly meetings of program directors and supervisors was not entirely successful. The expansion of the staff and the creation of two associate chairs has come more recently and has not yet resolved the work and reporting overload. Some faculty conclude that it is not possible to construct a vision across such a broad spectrum of disciplines. Few peer institutions retain a construct such as "Department of Humanities," regarded now by some as an artifact of UTSC's early years. Morale has suffered for some of the faculty.

We propose that the Dean institute a new structure as quickly as possible. The Dean must act swiftly and decisively with some degree of unilateralism, given the rancor and the divisions within the unit. We propose several possible models.

MODEL 1 - Create Five Departments:

In this model, the current Department of Humanities is divided into five departments: a) Philosophy, b) English, c) Language Studies, d) History and Area Studies (or Interdisciplinary Studies), and e) Visual and Performing Arts.

It is clear that Philosophy regards itself as standing apart from the rest of the humanities. (One of the documents submitted to us quotes the 2008 review of the Philosophy graduate program in suggesting that Philosophy could become part of Psychology.) English is certainly large and comprehensive enough to stand on its own. Language Studies might include Linguistics, French and Foreign Languages. History could become the home for some of the new interdisciplinary initiatives such as African Studies, Global Asian Studies, IEE, Women and Gender Studies. Visual and Performing Arts is already a large interdisciplinary unit that could also house Media Studies and Journalism.

In this model, each department is headed by a chair, drawn exclusively from the research faculty, and reports directly to the Dean. Each department will need a range of administrative staff: business, undergraduate administration, etc., but for smaller departments this could be partial FTE's. Similarly, we recommend that the teaching release for Chairs be on a sliding scale reflecting the size of the department. While this model might be welcomed by some members of the faculty, it is not a model that we favor. It creates an unbalanced large set of new reports for the dean, and, as significantly, it obscures the considerable success of recent interdisciplinary initiatives outlined above. We feel that these initiatives are a significant distinguishing feature of UTSC humanities, that this model has the potential to be punitive for several of the newer hires and that successful future hiring and teaching excellence depend on continuing to grow the interdisciplinary initiatives that have come to set UTSC humanities apart.

MODEL 2 - Create Five Departments and the New Humanities Institute:

Model 2 retains the departments outlined above with their chairs and staff, except that the interdisciplinary programs as well as the distinctive administrative and educational programs are now housed in an EDU, the New Humanities Institute.

The Institute is headed by a director drawn from the research faculty. Like the departments, the director reports to the Dean and has responsibility for budget and hiring. In this model, the Institute shares current and future faculty appointments with the departments, negotiating with the departments and with the Dean as arbiter. It could also be the home of future interdisciplinary graduate programs and could enable future collaborations with Social Sciences.

This model creates six new reports for the Dean. It has the advantage of putting vital interdisciplinary work on the same footing as departments, assures that future faculty hires can cross disciplinary lines, and positions UTSC to further develop distinctive interdisciplinary ventures.

MODEL 3 - Create Five Departments and the New Humanities Institute under the umbrella of the School of Humanities:

In this model, a director of the School of Humanities becomes the leader for the six units outlined in model 2. Chairs of the departments and the Director of the institute report to the Director of the School of Humanities rather than to the Dean. This model creates seven administrative positions but reduces the direct reports to the Dean. In both model 2 and 3, the institute director can function as an associate director/chair for research.

MODEL 4 - Create Five Departments and the New Humanities Institute under the umbrella of the School of Humanities, but with the director of the school functioning as the director of the institute:

This model, a version of model 3, reduces the number of administrative positions from seven to six, while maintaining a single report to the Dean. It highlights the values of the school-wide humanities initiatives, both academic and administrative. Chairs would report to the director of the school.

We endorse either model 3 or 4 because both streamline reporting to the Dean while creating a clear umbrella for critical new initiatives in the humanities and can overcome the potential problems of departmentalization. (We note that future deans may not have experience with the humanities.) In effect, models 1 and 2 create a structure commonly found in smaller institutions (for example, liberal arts colleges in the United States), in which department chairs report directly to the chief academic officer; models 3 and 4 more closely resemble the divisional or school structures found at universities, in which chairs report to a “director” (or dean of a school or division), who in turn reports to the chief academic officer (provost). We recognize that the leadership will need to assess whether UTSC is ready, in terms of size and complexity, for the structure implied by models 3 and 4, both of which would fundamentally alter the role of the current Dean, creating in effect a provost position at UTSC as well as divisions headed by a director or dean. These changes would extend beyond the current Department of Humanities and enable possibly beneficial changes in governance in other areas at UTSC.

A few other points are worth noting. We are extremely concerned that junior faculty may

be used in the conflicts over governance and over the departmental-based versus interdisciplinary approaches. Nothing can be more destructive to an academic community. Models 3 and 4 have the benefit of creating a check-and-balance between departments and the emerging fields and methods of the New Humanities Institute, a conflict we feel may well be generational, in some instances, at least.

In Models 2, 3 and 4, we would suggest that space be created in a new building for the New Humanities Institute, and that faculty appointed to it would be able to locate their offices in that space.

In these models we also recommend that the complement planning match departmental appointments with Institute appointments: two cross-appointed positions being equivalent to one appointment restricted to a single department. While it may be important for a given department to hire on an exclusive line from time-to-time, the interest of the UTSC is to encourage crossappointments.

Departments will need to balance the incentives to recruit and build in collaboration with the Institute against the exclusive link to a single discipline and traditional graduate program.

5. CURRICULUM

One of our charges was to pay particular attention to the Department's curricular offerings. Students were upset that the calendar did not match reality. Offerings were intermittent and unpredictable, creating significant difficulties in achieving timely graduation. Students repeatedly commented on the need to do coursework at the downtown campus in order to finish degree requirements in four years. They also commented on the difficulty in creating coherent intellectual tracks through their chosen discipline given this unpredictability. It is clear from our conversations and from reviewing the department reports that some areas have been quite strategic in structuring their curricula, such as history, English, and women and gender studies. There are still far too many course offerings on the books and far too great a use of sessional teaching staff.

The first task of the newly-formed departments must be to streamline and rationalize their course offerings, reducing reliance on stipendiary staff. While the ultimate goal should be to reduce the total number of courses from the current over 500 courses offered, this goal needs to be achieved while recognizing the unique teaching contexts and needs of humanities classes. Courses with smaller enrollments (such as in VPA or language classes) should be protected from any blanket minimal registration rule. A better control of the curriculum will create resources crucial for helping departments achieve their academic vision. A carefully designed and efficient curriculum should be a prerequisite for any future growth in the complement.

Particularly in VPA, the space needed for studio instruction, appropriately equipped, is as essential as a proper lab in the sciences. Therefore space is an urgent issue for successful

instruction in the arts. Without rectifying the space issue, the arts program will not be able to recruit students effectively. We refer you to the discussions of facilities in the 2008 draft plan. We are concerned at the proliferation of course offerings that are designed to be taught by teaching stream faculty (HUM A01, history skills courses, etc.). The faculty should pay careful attention to where teaching stream faculty can best contribute (e.g., some areas of the arts and languages). Reluctance to cross-number and cross-register courses needs to be addressed and resolved to ensure better use of faculty resources and to reduce the costs of implementing new interdisciplinary programs.

6. WORKFORCE

We have a number of observations and recommendations about the teaching workforce at UTSC.

a) We are concerned that, in an institution that aspires to become research intensive, such a high proportion of the workforce consists of faculty in the teaching stream and sessional appointments. This reality runs counter to the stated aspirations of UTSC undergraduate education and will make more difficult any potential expansion of the graduate mission. In order to rectify this disparity, we recommend that UTSC reduce the current percentage of sessional appointments.

b) UTSC's current extensive reliance on teaching-stream faculty undermines the stated institutional ambitions to become a campus that boasts many "programs that are nationally preeminent and internationally competitive" (p.19). We are concerned about the recent expansion in the number of teaching stream appointments, particularly in disciplines and fields customarily staffed by research faculty at research universities.

c) It will be important for research faculty to follow a reasonable workload comprised of a large lecture course as well as a medium sized course and two smaller courses during a typical academic year.

d) We recognize the significant benefits of UTSC faculty teaching in graduate programs, for now mostly housed on St George. That said, this represents a significant redirection of UTSC research faculty teaching resources to the St George campus. Exploring the housing of some graduate programs on the east and west campuses or finding ways to expand the presence of graduate students on the UTSC campus is desirable.

e) We are concerned that current UT regulations may make it difficult for artist faculty with terminal degrees (for example, the MFA) to be counted as research faculty. It is common practice elsewhere in academe to recognize artistic practice as the equivalent of research.

f) It is crucial to develop better ways of informing faculty (and indeed, the entire workforce) about progress through the ranks. They should receive better mentoring as well as models for successful preparation of dossiers. In order to assure effective senior leadership in the coming years, faculty need opportunities to develop administrative

experience.

g) We note with concern that many key academic administrative jobs are currently filled with teaching stream faculty, thereby reducing the number of research faculty in leadership positions within the department. All of the models that we recommend will generate new administrative roles, potentially exacerbating the problem. We strongly recommend that research stream faculty assume all administrative positions and that teaching stream faculty be considered ineligible to take on administrative roles.

7. EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

UTSC prides itself on its co-op program, and indeed a significant number of the students we met identified it as a reason for choosing UTSC. Almost to a person, they reported that the program did not meet its promises. Attrition would appear to be high. We recommend that co-op be rethought, perhaps by exploring other forms of experiential learning such as internships. Indeed, it may be that in the humanities, internships are a more appropriate model of pre-professional training. The Arts Management program seems worth refining and improving, although placements there were also less successful.

In addition the journalism program with Centennial College is only marginally effective at this time. A new task force on experiential learning will need to re-examine all of these programs to renew and improve the hallmark UTSC commitment in the context of the humanities.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION

We found a community sharply divided, and, sadly, unable to engage in civil and productive discourse. One example can stand for the tenor of written and verbal communication we encountered frequently. A document submitted by a faculty member in the Philosophy program provides a Swiftian commentary on the terms of reference and includes the following statement: “Some well-designed programs there may be, but if so this is occurring in many cases despite the efforts of the central management of the Department, which instead busies itself with pushing its new, exciting and pointless interdisciplinary vision: meddling in disciplines that allow it and asphyxiating disciplines that do not.” The discourse in some instances amounts to potentially slanderous attacks on Bowen himself (we note that other documents also include very positive assessments of his accomplishments). In our view, he was courageous in trying to implement an ambitious agenda for the humanities (and there are significant successes). Unfortunately, his efforts could not but run into difficulties given the impossible governance structure (caused in part by the method of selecting program directors, in part by the extreme centralization of authority in one person), the severely inadequate level of staff support, and administrative changes at the level of dean and principal, unsettling in the best of times. In our view, no chair could succeed in this situation: Bowen should take satisfaction from his many accomplishments. Much good has happened during his tenure: the conflicts now afflicting the department are longstanding, but they have been

exacerbated both by growth and by the possibility of new resources.

We therefore recommend that the Dean set forth a new governance plan at the earliest possible time for faculty consideration. In the present circumstances, normal academic procedures (committees, work groups, etc.) are not possible. The Dean may need to consider an interim Chair of Humanities to oversee the implementation, and possibly initiate external recruitment for one or two of the chairs. If possible, the new structure should be in place by the beginning of the next academic year.

We feel strongly that dramatic and timely action as well as strong intervention by the Dean is needed. We encourage the Dean and the new leadership to find ways to provide incentives for collegial and constructive work on behalf of UTSC.

It is crucial that the UTSC humanities community embrace the standards of civil discourse. It should be a hallmark of an academic community that different points of view be debated without recourse to personal attack. In the interest of ensuring that greater professionalism and collegiality are built into the new governance structure, it is in the best interest of UTSC to create guidelines or best practices for civil debate.

We encourage the new departments to have regular meetings, to institute clear governance structures, making the setting of priorities as transparent a process as possible within each department, and to create clear lines of two-way communication between the faculty members and the administration.

9. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, UTSC was established in the 1960s as an undergraduate college, with the understanding that it would evolve towards greater autonomy over time. “Towards 2030” suggests that new universities usually take about 40 years to attain strong academic capacity, and UTSC has made significant and important steps along this pathway of excellence. At this key juncture in the institution’s development, decisive and courageous strategic adjustments are necessary to ensure that UTSC realize its laudable and appropriate intellectual ambitions. We end by reiterating our recommendation that Dean Halpern to take swift and conclusive steps at this precarious time for the Department of Humanities.

APPENDIX B: SCHEDULE OF EXTERNAL REVIEW VISIT
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES
University of Toronto Scarborough

LOCATION	TIME	DETAILS	ARRANGED BY
Wednesday December 16, 2009			
AA401	8:00am	Meeting with the Dean Rick Halpern, Robert Gibbs, Caroline Levander, Jessie Ann Owens	Dean's Office
AA401	9:15am	Meeting with Chair – William Bowen	Dean's Office
AA401	10:15am	Meeting with Cheryl Regher and Brian Corman (confirmed)	Dean's Office
	11:00am (approx.)	Campus and Departmental Tour, Tour conducted by John Mayo, Program Director, Art & Culture o Arts & Admin: 3rd floor; AEP office, Studios o DMG o LLBT; Sculpture Studio; Gallery 1265 o H-wing offices; HRTC; Language lab; TA office	Department
AA160	12:45pm	Lunch with Students • Attendees: students from SHADO	Dean's Office and Department
AA160	2:00 pm	Meeting with Faculty – English (2:00-2:40); African Studies (2:40-2:55); Philosophy (2:55-3:35)	Department
AA160	3:35pm	Meeting with Lecturers	Department
AA160	4:15pm	Meeting with Co-op and Associate Chair, Karen McCrindle Re: Experiential Learning	Department
Asian Legend Restaurant, 418 Dundas St. West (downtown Toronto)	5:00pm	Dinner with Graduate Chairs Hosted by John Scherk, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate External Reviewers: Robert Gibbs, Caroline Levander, Jessie Ann Owens Graduate Chairs: • Stephen Johnson, Director, Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama • Donald Ainslie, Chair, Dept of Philosophy • Alan Bewell, Chair, Dept of English • Elan Drescher, Chair, Dept of Linguistics • Doris Bergen, Associate Chair, Dept of History • Robin Elliott, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Music	Dean's Office

LOCATION	TIME	DETAILS	ARRANGED BY
Thursday December 17, 2009			
SY205	9:00am	Meeting with Senior Faculty	Department
SY205	9:45am	Meeting with Faculty – Humanities (faculty teaching "HUM" courses: Petit, Helwig, King) and Associate Chair, Garry Leonard	Department
SY205	10:15am	Coffee Break	Dean's Office
SY205	10:30am	Meeting with Faculty: Languages (10:30-10:50); French (10:55-11:15); History (11:20-11:40); Linguistics (11:45-12:05)	Department
SY205	12:10pm	Lunch with Pre-tenure/New Faculty	Dean's Office and Department
SY205	1:15pm	Meeting with Associate Professors	
AA160	2:00pm	Meeting with Faculty – Classics; Religion; Women's and Gender Studies (2:00-2:40) Global Asian Studies; Intersections, Exchanges, and Encounters; Media Studies (Journalism & New Media) (2:45-3:25)	Department
AA160	3:30pm	Coffee Break	Dean's Office
AA160	3:45pm	Meeting with Administrative Staff	Department
AA160	4:30pm	Meeting with Arts & Events Programming Staff	Department

Friday December 18, 2009			
AA160	9:00am	Meetings with Faculty – Visual and Performing Arts: Art & Culture, Art History, Arts Management, Drama, Music, Studio	Department
AA160	10:15am	Meeting with DMG; LLBT; Gallery 1265 staff	Department
AA401	11:30am	Debriefing meeting and lunch with Dean Rick Halpern, Robert Gibbs, Caroline Levander, Jessie Ann Owens	Dean's Office
AA401	1:00pm (approx.)	Review Report • Reviewers to work on draft of Review Report	Dean's Office
	1.45 pm (latest)	Park Lane Livery to pick up Caroline Levander and Jessie Ann Owens at UTSC and deliver to Pearson Int'l Airport; Robert Gibbs has transportation	Dean's Office

APPENDIX C: UTSC DEAN'S ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE

5 February 2010

Professor Cheryl Regehr
Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Simcoe Hall
University of Toronto

Dear Cheryl,

Administrative Response: External Review of the Department of Humanities

Thank you for your letter of 18 January 2010 requesting my administrative response to the external review of the Department of Humanities. Although the external reviewers had limited time to explore such a complex academic unit as the Department of Humanities, their observations point to several issues of great importance to the future of humanities at the University of Toronto Scarborough. I am very grateful for the reviewers' careful consideration of the Department and for their candid assessment of its strengths and challenges. I have taken their recommendations seriously and already have begun to act upon them.

I was very pleased with the reviewers' clear engagement with our campus trajectory and aspirations, their identification of some very creative accomplishments in the articulation of new interdisciplinary programs in the humanities, and with the strong case made for vibrant and self-confident disciplines as the necessary basis for new interdisciplinary initiatives. It was gratifying to see that the reviewers noted the many strengths of the Department. We are particularly proud of humanities faculty members' commitment to the integration of research into teaching, the excellent young faculty hired in recent years, and the successful new academic and administrative ventures (particularly the Arts and Events programming and the Doris McCarthy Gallery both of which serve the entire campus). Despite the Department's strengths, it was clear to the reviewers that there was significant conflict among the colleagues about the basic functioning of the department and about the ability of the current Chair to manage the business of the unit. Because of these sharp divisions and the breakdown of civil discourse and collegiality, the reviewers recommended that I begin working immediately to institute new structures for the department. The reviewers proposed four possible structural models, including dividing Humanities into separate departments.

It is my belief that the future direction of the Department must be determined in a collaborative and consultative manner. The active participation of all members of the Department is crucial if we are to find solutions that are meaningful and inspire enthusiasm and commitment. Immediately following receipt of the external review, I consulted with the UTSC Senior Executive, the Provost's Office, my counterparts at St. George Arts and Science and UTM, and my team in the Dean's Office. The external review was also sent to all members of the Department. On 15 January I met with faculty, students, and staff of the Department to initiate a discussion about its future direction. This meeting was very well attended and feedback indicated that colleagues saw it as a constructive first step in the process of determining a future trajectory that most parties could buy into. I was very pleased to hear a commitment from all groups to work together to find meaningful solutions. Subsequently, my vice deans and I have been meeting individually with the disciplines and programs, with members of the Departmental Student Association (SHADO), and with the department's administrative staff. To date we have held some twenty meetings.

From the beginning, colleagues in both English and Philosophy stated their desire to become their own departments. My office, together with Financial Services and Human Resource Services, has begun to work with them to achieve this vision. Our aim is to prepare proposals for the establishment of both departments for consideration by UTSC and University Governance in the sixth cycle of governance this academic year. Many other colleagues in the Humanities Department have expressed a strong desire to remain in single unit multi-disciplinary department, but we still have to develop a clear way forward. Professor Wayne Dowler, a widely respected senior faculty member nearing retirement, has volunteered to moderate discussions with the remaining members of the department. It is my intention to attach a decanal assessor to this working group to facilitate discussion and act as a conduit of information to and from the Office of the Dean. It is possible that, as a transitional phase, these disciplines and programs will remain in the current Department of Humanities during the 2010-11 academic year, with an interim chair in place.

It is unfortunate that these complex matters prevented the reviewers from conducting a full review of the many programs offered in the Department of Humanities. We are committed to moving forward with these reviews as soon as possible. Our intention is to spend the coming months further refining the self-studies conducted by each program and to bring in external reviewers towards the end of the term. This process may have to continue into the 2010-11 academic year.

With regard to the statements made by the external reviewers about the workforce, I believe that that the reviewers do not a have a full appreciation of the role and responsibilities of teaching stream faculty at the University as set out in the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* or the way in which administrative responsibilities in relation to programs are assigned within units. In addition, I point out that this section of the review contains factual inaccuracies – understandable given the size and complexity of the unit – and that much of our consultation with colleagues has involved reassuring teaching steam faculty that UTSC values their contributions to our academic mission. Indeed in most units at UTSC teaching-stream faculty and tenure-stream faculty are well integrated and work together in a collegial fashion. It is my firm belief that the crucial issue of complement planning, including the articulation of the optimal blend of tenure-stream and teaching-stream faculty in each program, is best considered after we complete the review of individual academic programs. Moreover, these sorts of calculations and strategic decision-making can progress in a meaningful way only after the outcome of the consultative process regarding structural change is known.

Sincerely yours,

Professor Rick Halpern
Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic)

APPENDIX D: SCHEDULE OF MILESTONES

DATE	MILESTONE
6 Aug 2009	Dean sends Chair of Humanities letter notification that a review of the Department and Chair search are pending.
9 Nov 2009	Dean sends Chair of Humanities letter notification of the dates for the external reviewer visit to UTSC and the Department.
10 Dec 2009	The final Humanities Self Study is received by the Dean's Office and forwarded to the external reviewers.
Dec 16-18, 2009	External Reviewers visit the Department of Humanities.
4 Jan 2010	Dean receives the External Reviewers Report; report is sent to Chair to check for factual errors. External Reviewers Final Report is shared with Department of Humanities and with Provost's Office
16 Jan, 2010 – 5 April, 2010	UTSC Consultation: • Jan 16, 2010: Dean, Vice-Deans and Assistant Dean meet with Humanities Department as a group. • 18 Jan, 2010 to 31 March, 2010: additional consultation with the Chair of Humanities; Associate Chairs of Humanities; faculty in Linguistics, Languages, New Media Studies, Media Studies, and the Multidisciplinary group; the Director, Communications and Public Affairs; the Director, Human Resource Services; the Director, Financial Services. • Jan 25, 2010 to Feb 5, 2010: the Dean, Vice-Deans and Assistant Dean meet with each discipline group, teaching stream faculty, signatories of the Multidisciplinary Department proposal, Arts Programming staff, administrative staff and students. • 12 Feb, 2010 to 31 Mar 2010: the Vice-Dean, Undergraduate and Assistant Dean conduct follow-up meetings with each of the discipline groups: Linguistics, Media Studies, English, Religion, Philosophy, African Studies, IEE, VPA Art History, VPA Drama, VPA Arts Management, VPA Studio, VPA Music, Classical Studies, History, Women's and Gender Studies, French, GAS and Languages. • *29 March, 2010*: the Dean, Vice-Deans and Assistant Dean meet with SHADO and SCSU executive.* • *To be scheduled before April 2: the Dean, Vice-Deans, Assistant Dean, Chair of Humanities, Program Director for English and Program Director for Philosophy meet with Humanities students at "town hall" style meeting.** •

	U of T Consultation: • 20 Jan, 2010: Dean, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate and Assistant Dean meet with Vice-Provost, Academic Programs.; Consultation with the Office of the Provost • 4 Mar, 2010: Dean, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate and Assistant Dean meet with Provost's Office.
7 Feb 2010	Dean submits Administrative Response to External Reviewers Report to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs.
2 Mar 2010	Committee on Academic Policy and Planning (for information): • External Reviewers Report • Highlights of the 2005 review of Humanities • Dean's Administrative Response to 2009 External Review Report
16 Mar 2010	UTSC Planning and Budget Committee for information. The Committee signals unanimous support.
30 Mar 2010	UTSC Faculty Council Approval.
30 Mar 2010	Dean, Vice-Deans and Assistant Dean meet with Humanities students
12 Apr 2010	*U of T Planning and Budget Committee for Approval.**
21 Apr 2010	*Academic Board for Approval.**
13 May 2010	*U of T Governing Council for Final Approval.**
1 July 2010	*Effective date for new Departments.**

*Planned milestones.