



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

CPAD # 81-2007-08

Memorandum

Date: 22 May 2008

To: Council of Chairs, Principals and Academic Directors

From: Meric S. Gertler, FRSC

Interim Dean and Professor of Geography

Goldring Chair in Canadian Studies

Re: FAS External Review Report and Decanal Response

Attached, you will find the FAS External Review Report and, as a separate attachment, the Decanal Response.

The Provost requested that I circulate the report and my response to all FAS faculty, staff and students. My office will do so tomorrow, but I wanted to give you advance notice and a chance to read these materials before they are distributed more widely.

There will be an opportunity to discuss both documents at our May 30th CPAD meeting.

Review of the Faculty of Arts and Science

University of Toronto

March 26, 2008

BY

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.

Decanal Response to the Review of the Faculty of Arts and Science
15 May 2008

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 interim 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.¹ Nevertheless, we are committed to the objective of optimizing the operations of the Dean's Office and recognize that this could well be achieved by rethinking the structure of the vice-deanal portfolios. We are now in the process of studying the administrative structures of arts and science faculties within peer North American jurisdictions, including those referenced in the review report, and plan to borrow the best ideas as appropriate for our local context.

b) Add a chief-of-staff position:

The appointment of a chief-of-staff would help reduce the number of direct reports to the dean, while enhancing the administrative efficiency of the Office of the Dean, ensuring better responsiveness to departments and other units, and providing more support for strategic decision-making within the Faculty. For these reasons, the interim dean has already initiated the process of defining a new Chief Administrative Officer position, working closely with the Provost and Vice-President Human Resources and Equity. We expect to initiate the search for this new position shortly.

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 begun to move in this direction with the formation of a new budget strategy subcommittee in the Faculty.

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

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

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.

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”. 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.

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 departments 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.