



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

CPAD #17, 2013-14

Memorandum

Date: December 17, 2013

From: David Cameron, Interim Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science

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

Re: Faculty of Arts & Science External Review Report

I am very pleased to forward to you the External Review Report for the Faculty. The reviewers have presented their findings in relation to Arts & Science undergraduate and graduate education, research, planning, organization and resources, our relationships with other University units as well as our social impact. The Report, along with the Self-Study and related documents, is posted at <http://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/main/about/reports/review>.

The external reviewers visited the Faculty in October, during which time they met with students, faculty and staff, academic administrators within the Faculty as well as senior university administrators and cognate deans. The reviewers commented that their discussions were 'lively' and that they felt 'people felt comfortable being frank and open.' I thank all the members of the Arts & Science community and colleagues across the University who met with the reviewers during their visit.

The Report highlights our strengths and challenges as well as recommending opportunities where we might further improve our Faculty. The reviewers were impressed with our progress and accomplishments since the last external review, noting our strong, undergraduate and graduate programs, the quality of our faculty, staff and students, and our research initiatives. They concluded that 'there is no question about the overall excellence of the Faculty of Arts & Science at the University of Toronto' and that we have 'excellent faculty, staff, and students that are energetically committed to conducting world-class research and scholarship.' Arts & Science 'remains committed to providing a high quality education to their students, even in these times of fiscal constraint, and they are looking for ways to add breadth and depth to the student experience.'

In terms of next steps, I look forward to discussions regarding the Report and the reviewers' recommendations at meetings of CPAD, CASD, Faculty Council, with student representatives, and with members of the Arts & Science and University community over the course of the winter term. These discussions will inform my administrative response to the Report. The Report, along with the administrative response, will then be presented to university governance in the spring.

University of Toronto - Faculty of Arts & Science
External Review 2013-14

December 6 2013

Ana Mari Cauce, Provost and Executive Vice President, University of Washington

Simon M. Peacock, Dean of Science, University of British Columbia

Scott L. Waugh, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, University of California, Los Angeles

The three member review committee visited the University of Toronto's Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) on Oct 28, 29, and 30, 2013 at the invitation of the Vice President and Provost Cheryl Regehr. We were provided with Terms of Reference to guide our review and engaged in a full schedule of interviews with senior administrators at the University and in the Faculty of Arts and Science, with FAS faculty members, with College Principals, FAS Council members, undergraduate and graduate students, and representatives of cognate divisions. Discussions were lively and we believe that people felt comfortable being frank and open in talking about both strengths and problem areas – indeed, perhaps because of the confidence they have in the overall quality of the University and the Faculty, they easily jumped into discussions of problem areas.

Before directly addressing the terms of reference it is important to acknowledge that two factors dominated our discussions, overshadowing all other issues. The first was the extreme budgetary constraints at the University and within the Faculty. Every meeting included at least a passing reference to the budget's structural deficit, to the debt, or both. It was the factor most often cited as not only constraining the Faculty's ability to take on new initiatives, but there seemed to be a great deal of concern about whether quality, in both graduate and undergraduate programs, could be maintained, especially given recent cutbacks in hiring, that some described as at least a soft hiring "freeze." While the "new" budget model was supposed to ensure transparency in budgeting at the University level, that transparency is not that obvious to department chairs or EDU directors at the Faculty level.

A second issue that permeated our discussions was the complexity and extreme decentralization of the organizational structure. While the majority of teaching and research necessarily takes place within the departments, and chairs praised the work of the Vice-Deans, chairs only met with the Dean and vice deans individually on an "as needed" basis. They did meet with the Dean in various other configurations, but it wasn't clear to us that these addressed the specific needs of chairs, as opposed to directors. (The exception was the science chairs who seemed to use the Vice-Dean for Research & Infrastructure in a manner similar to a "Divisional" Dean of Science – in this case we are using "division" to refer to one of the major Arts and Science groupings - the Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). There did appear to be at least loose affiliation groups, by "divisions" of Chairs, Principals, and Unit Heads and, interestingly, we met with them during our review in these groupings. But, while some of these

groups met fairly regularly, they did not come across, to us, as especially cohesive groupings that participated in shared strategic planning and initiatives.

These two factors – budgetary constraints and extreme decentralization – were ever present in our discussions and form a backdrop for our review of the terms of reference.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

- 1. The consistency of the Faculty’s academic plan with the University’s long-range plan. In particular the faculty’s commitment to excellence in teaching and research.**
- 2. Progress towards the Faculty’s academic priorities, including the capacity to meet opportunities and challenges ahead successfully.** *(We believe 1 and 2 are best addressed together)*

A deep appreciation for the value and excellence of teaching and research at the University of Toronto, and the responsibility that the Faculty of Arts and Science have for maintaining excellence was another backdrop for all our conversations. Whether we were talking to faculty, graduate or undergraduate students, or staff, and even when discussing serious issues and problems, individuals were very engaged with their work or studies, and were fully committed to upholding the highest standards of excellence.

All the relevant rankings indicate that University of Toronto is an absolutely world class institution, one of the very best in North America, and the Faculty of Arts and Science is a big factor in that success. They are both a teaching and a research powerhouse. Despite long-standing fiscal constraints and an uncertain fiscal future, there was little doubt in our minds but that through their dedication, ingenuity, and entrepreneurial spirit, the faculty, staff, and students in Arts and Science will continue to create pathways to excellence. *In order to sustain that excellence, they will need more support from the university’s central administration, especially in terms of physical infrastructure, and from the province, in terms of funding and/or tuition flexibility.*

In conformity with the University planning framework, long range planning by the Faculty appears to primarily take place around the appointment of a new Dean. When Dean Gertler was appointed, he worked with Principals, Chairs, and Directors to develop a five year strategic plan, in line with the University’s long range plan, which became the foundation for departmental and unit-level planning. These plans form the basis for yearly resource allocation, most especially so in terms of complement allotment. Faculty members in FAS are assuming a similar exercise will take place again when a new Dean is hired.

There was good evidence presented in the self-study that there has been appreciable progress made toward meeting priorities identified in this planning process, even in the face of fiscal challenges. New programming has been developed for undergraduates, such as the integration of quantitative reasoning in the humanities, which was part of what appears to be a highly successful curriculum renewal effort and at present there is a move toward providing a more

centralized system of support for IT in the dean's office. There is also real effort going into expanding graduate education, especially professional master's programs, to meet goals identified by the planning process and/or the province and toward improving the undergraduate experience. In addition, despite a downturn in faculty hiring which has now ended, research funding remains strong, in part, because faculty have been able to work across departmental and campus structures to put forward innovative, interdisciplinary proposals, often drawing from faculty in the Mississauga (UTM) and Scarborough (UTSC) campuses. (More specific comments about teaching and research are provided in subsequent sections).

While planning clearly takes place, and progress toward priorities has been achieved, we were not presented with evidence of ongoing, coherent, comprehensive planning that cuts across departments, colleges, campuses and EDUs. For example, the Dean's annual "Request for Faculty Searches" memo solicits hiring proposals based on the unit's academic plan, but does not appear to require them to be tied into some larger plan. We did not see a clear mechanism or process that was being consistently used, at least during this period of interim leadership, to tie these plans together. That is not to say that such planning doesn't occur – there was quite a bit of evidence that it does. But, this appears to be done in a piecemeal fashion by groups of faculty. Those plans appear to often to result in new EDUs, which may not always be the best or most streamlined solution to carrying out new interdisciplinary efforts. Indeed, while there are wonderful EDUs in the Colleges and in the Faculty, and they provide both faculty and students smaller, more human scale, niches that feel more home-like, we were concerned that the sheer number of EDUs might be detracting from energy and effort that might be better directed toward departmental units or to work across departments.

Vice-Deans also do planning in their areas; indeed, we were very impressed by the amount of planning they did, and by the energy and knowledge that each brought to their enterprise. Faculty Chairs had nothing but praise for the Vice-Deans, who were uniformly described as knowledgeable, responsive, and service-oriented. Indeed, we were very impressed by the creativity and seriousness they brought to their positions. In many ways, they are the glue that holds together this very complicated administrative system.

Still, it was not always clear to us whether the planning at the Vice-Dean level was looked at as a whole and cut across their areas of responsibility. Because of the extreme decentralization in this Faculty, we are somewhat concerned that new Faculty (and University) initiatives, like STEP Forward, do not always get the buy-in at the departmental level that is needed to make them truly successful. Some financial incentives are provided to create buy-in at the start, but the Chairs raised questions as to whether these resources would remain after implementation and they seemed increasingly reluctant to enact change based on one-time money. In addition, this decentralization does not seem to allow for initiatives such as cluster hiring across departments, which might help to strength the interdisciplinary and breadth which is a hallmark of this Faculty/Division.

In sum, the dense FAS structure with its College Principals, Departmental Chairs, and EDU

Directors, and with its functional Vice Dean structure did not appear to us to work in theory. As a biologist might conclude when looking at a bumblebee, this is not an insect created for flight. Yet, bees do fly, and in practice this structure works, and has done so magnificently. Still, we worry that like the bumblebee, it is not built for nimbleness or speed, characteristics that are increasingly necessary in the rapidly changing landscape of higher education. *The question for the new dean may be less about how to re-structure, since there is clearly little appetite to do this, but rather how to increase communication across the structures so that sustained, integrative planning can occur and how to halt the further proliferation of yet more structures. Interestingly, we note that these same two recommendations were made in 2008, and the first was also made in 2004, leading us to wonder what stands in the way of more meaningful implementation.*

3. The appropriateness of the Faculty's approach to undergraduate and graduate education and its enhancement to support students' academic experience, including the role played by the Colleges.

3A. Undergraduate Education

Consistent with being one of the best universities in North America, the University of Toronto attracts very high quality undergraduate students from Ontario, across Canada, and around the world. The vast majority of these undergraduate students enter the University of Toronto's Faculty of Arts and Science.

With roots in some cases extending back to the founding of the University of Toronto, the seven Colleges play a fundamental role in the advising and support of undergraduate students, and helping connect students to the larger university. The Colleges provide extensive academic advising through their Registrar offices. They support academic success through their writing centres, ONE programs, peer-to-peer tutoring, and many other initiatives. The Colleges also house many interdisciplinary education programs. The students we met with expressed strong support for the Colleges, and the important role they play in helping students deal with academic pressures. Similarly, Chairs and Vice Deans expressed strong support for UT's seven Colleges. The Colleges seem well connected to the Faculty through their Registrars, and through monthly meetings between the Principals Chairs, and the Dean. Because Faculty-level advising takes place in the seven Colleges, we are concerned about possible inefficiencies, but we recognize that the Colleges are an integral part of UT's history and culture and are doing an excellent job overall.

Led by the Dean's office, the Faculty has successfully undergone major curriculum renewal, instituting a set of core competencies in all programs, encouraging breadth and exploration of new subjects by reducing program requirements, and requiring an integrative, inquiry-based activity. In addition, there have been a number of innovative programs that have been undertaken by individual programs or sets of programs including the Philosophy Department's "Socrates Project," and the Writing Instruction for TA's (WIT) program, which allows for more

significant writing assignments in large classes. In addition, FAS appears to be very involved in the MOOC space, and a number of instructors and courses appear to be experimenting with online and “inverted” or “flipped” classes, although this isn’t something we heard about much during our visit.

While these innovations are praiseworthy, we heard from several Chairs that some large-enrolment programs are struggling to sustain these initiatives with the winding down of Faculty transitional funds. The development and implementation of the STEP (Successful Transition for Engaged Planning) program is appreciated by the students and students expressed the opinion that the Dean’s office listens to their concerns. The Faculty’s Vice Deans are committed to developing and implementing important Faculty initiatives, but Department Chairs seem not always to understand what is driving these initiatives and how they are developed. Many Chairs are worried about meeting student enrollment needs, but expressed concerns about hiring teaching-stream faculty at the expense of professorial-stream faculty.

All FAS undergraduate students are enrolled in four year Honours programs. This sounds a little bit like saying “all students are above average”, but we recognize that what is meant by an honours degree is driven in part by Ontario Quality Assurance and the need to distinguish the academic rigour of UT degrees from those offered by other Ontario higher education institutions. Students appreciated the ability to tailor their degree to reflect the focused and diverse interests through specializations and various combinations of majors and minors.

Large undergraduate classes are a reality of all major public research universities in North America. Student/faculty ratios in UT’s FAS have increased dramatically, as they have at other large public universities, particularly in the social sciences. In Arts and Science, large classes dominate the first- and second-years academic experience and, in large enrollment programs, large classes form a significant part of the 3rd and 4th year experience too. We suggest that the very large lectures (>1,000 students) in Convocation Hall are a very challenging learning environment, especially for those students seated in the back rows and balconies.

*We strongly recommend that a plan be developed to improve student learning and the student experience in the Faculty’s large lecture classes. The current practice of assigning the Faculty’s best instructors to teach these very large classes is laudable, but what more might be done? Are all large lectures being recorded? We think that they should. To what extent are active engagement techniques being employed in your large classes? Can on-line technologies, such as e-learning communities and interactive simulations, be harnessed to improve both learning and the student learning experience? We have no doubt that such approaches are being used in classes throughout the Faculty, but *we suggest that a concerted analysis and effort to do so across all large classes would be very beneficial*. The Dean’s office can provide leadership and seed money, but at the end of the day the academic Departments must accept and own this challenge.*

Other concerns we heard, include:

Students felt the UT calendar does not reflect reality, with many attractive courses they

had hoped to take not being offered for several years and therefore inaccessible to large student cohorts. To some extent, the existence of the “Dean’s guarantee” is a recognition that not all courses are offered as regularly as required. It is not possible for us to assess whether students are having difficulty accessing “required” versus “highly desired” courses, but we heard of courses, such as in Human Biology, filling within minutes of registration lines being open, so clearly there is very high demand for select courses.

Undergraduate students expressed concern about high variable TA quality including faculty and TAs giving conflicting instructions and marking for the same course assignment. We understand that the evaluation of TAs is not uniform across Arts and Science, and if this is correct *we recommend that a formal evaluation system be developed, including feedback mechanisms, for all TAs in all courses.*

We heard from undergraduate students about the common reliance by students on external tutoring services, which to be fair appears to be common across Canada. To what extent is student learning being taken on by non-university organizations of highly variable quality? We recognize that students may choose to use external tutoring services for a variety of reasons, but if external tutoring services are sought after because students are unable to get adequate learning support from FAS and the university, then this is cause for concern.

We were surprised to learn that the undergraduate co-op program has been assigned to the UTSC campus (although we were also told that there is an academic division on the St. George campus that does co-op). *We suggest the Faculty consider including undergraduate co-op on all UT campuses, including St. George’s, with the goal of increasing the number of undergraduate students involved in co-op (see section 7).*

3B. Graduate Education

The University of Toronto’s Faculty of Arts and Science offers a full range of excellent disciplinary and interdisciplinary academic and professional graduate programs that attract high quality students. There has been a concerted and successful effort to increase graduate student enrolments, consistent with the Ontario’s goal of increasing the number of highly qualified personnel, and UT’s position as Ontario’s (and Canada’s) leading research university.

Across North America there are relatively few tenure-track positions opening up in academia. As Ph.D. enrolments increase, it is increasingly important that graduate students (and faculty members) be made aware of and prepared for rewarding career opportunities in non-academic sectors including industry, government, and NGOs. *Increasing graduate student enrolments might be best achieved by focusing on specific professional Masters programs that are well aligned with employment opportunities in non-academic sectors.*

A distinguishing feature of many FAS graduate programs is that they are tri-campus programs, leveraging the collective strength of the tri-campus professoriate. Based on our discussions with Department Chairs, the tri-campus collective works well for certain programs, like Philosophy, that have a strong commitment to tri-campus integration. For other graduate programs, where program faculty research laboratories are housed on different campuses, it is less clear how much interaction occurs among program faculty. We note that the Computer

Science graduate program appears to be working well, in part because all of the faculty member's labs are located on the St. George campus. *As the UTM and UTSC campuses continue to grow and evolve, attention will need to be paid to continue to leverage the strengths of the tri-campus approach to graduate programs.*

The average times to complete graduate degrees in FAS appear comparable to North American norms, but we note that average data can mask problems in specific units and non-completion rates. We understand that number of students taking 7-9 years to complete their PhD is increasing, but the forces driving this undesirable trend were difficult to grasp.

Graduate students expressed very strong opinions about the level of financial support (e.g., "below the poverty line, by any measure"; needing to hold non-academic jobs to make ends meet). We understand that graduate students must be guaranteed a minimum financial package of \$15,000/year plus tuition. After our review, we were provided with the following average graduate student stipends (net of tuition and fees) for UT Arts and Science students: SOCSOCI = \$27,283; HUM = \$24,640; PhySci = \$23,612; LifeSci: \$23,591. There is a major discrepancy between these numbers and the concerns expressed by the graduate students with whom we met. Significant problems can be hidden by "averages". *We recommend examining in detail the actual range of graduate student support (e.g., using histograms to look at the distribution of support amounts) as a function of year and discipline.* We note that providing adequate financial support for graduate students is a problem at many large universities, and that solving this problem given the constraints of federal funding, provincial funding, and union agreements is challenging.

We heard concerns about the extent to which TAs were adequately prepared for teaching assignments, which appears linked in part to the TA union agreement that sets a minimum number of training hours and requires any training must be paid. *In our view, the opportunity to serve as a teaching assistant needs to be viewed as an opportunity for both professional development and employment.*

The need to construct competitive financial offers to attract the best international graduate students was raised in many discussions. *This problem needs to be addressed either through lowering the tuition for international graduate students, increasing the funding available to support these students, or both.*

Very negative views were expressed by St. George-based graduate students about being assigned TA-ships at UTM and UTSC, which require long commutes to/from these campuses.

4. The effectiveness of the Faculty's efforts to foster a culture of excellence and achievement in research, including the effectiveness of support structures.

As noted earlier, UT and its Faculty of Arts and Science is a research powerhouse. All indicators, whether prestigious awards and honours, annual funding from Canadian research councils, number of Canada Research Chairs, or national and international rankings point to highly

research-active and productive faculty.

The Dean's office is well structured to support such activity, with the Vice Dean Research & Infrastructure serving as a hub for research in the sciences, and the Vice-Dean Graduate Education & Program Reviews playing a key role for the other sectors, as well as for the sciences when it comes to ensuring program quality. Both are energetic, knowledgeable and readily available to help when units are putting together initiatives. They play a key role in developing a culture of excellence and achievement in research.

Nonetheless, and not surprisingly, excellence comes from the grass roots and the strong research portfolio of this Faculty rests on the efforts and entrepreneurial passions of its faculty. The faculty is able to draw from the very best across the world, and all evidence suggests that they hire and promote well.

Arts and Science faculty involvement was evident in every theme identified in UT's Strategic Research Plan, with FAS faculty members often playing a lead role. It is important to note, the research excellence and productivity occurs across the full breadth of the Faculty – sciences, humanities, and social sciences.

The strong research performance of the Faculty is commendable, especially in light of the fiscal challenges UT has faced, and continues to face. However, it is clear that we are heading toward a future where the world's most pressing problems, and the most productive and important research areas are best tackled through interdisciplinary efforts. The FAS faculty are well poised to take advantage of this – its breadth can provide a point for leverage. The formation of the School of the Environment is a good example of how that can happen. Many other examples could be noted. However, the extreme de-centralization can prove challenging. While the science units seemed to work together and come together often, it was less clear how large scale initiatives or proposals which spanned the sciences and social sciences, or social sciences and humanities came together. They do, but *we recommend assessing the extent to which large-scale initiatives that span the sciences, social sciences, and humanities could be better facilitated and encouraged.*

Finally, we would be remiss if we did not mention that for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to remain competitive, especially in the sciences, there is an urgent need for new facilities. No new buildings have been built and only two building-scale renovations of significance have occurred over the past 5+ years. A substantial number of present spaces are antiquated and not capable of supporting cutting-edge research – especially, but perhaps not only, in the life sciences. *It is imperative that the Provost/President's office partner with the new Dean to find creative ways to finance at least one major new project and to furbish some of the existing space.* Otherwise, space will constrain the energy, good ideas, and ambitions of this world class faculty.

5. The effectiveness of the Faculty's internal organizational and financial structure including the appropriateness of resource allocation with respect to budget, faculty and staff

complement, and infrastructure.

As has been mentioned, the organization of the University of Toronto and the FAS in particular is extremely complex and, at a casual glance, impractical. In practice, however, the administrative structure of FAS appears to be practical and effective in carrying out the academic mission of the Faculty. Led by the Dean of the Faculty, to whom all the units in the faculty report either directly or indirectly, the administration is responsible for the financial health of the Faculty, maintaining the academic and administrative infrastructure, and supporting the teaching and research of the faculty members and students.

The Dean's office consists of the immediate support staff for the Dean, including a Chief Administrative Officer and five Assistant Deans, four functional Vice-Deans, an Associate Dean, and a senior advisor to the Dean for International and Academic Initiatives. In addition, the Chairs or Directors of 39 academic units in FAS report the Dean. The Principals of the seven colleges report to the Vice President and Provost and also report on behalf of their programs to the Dean of FAS. This structure, as the last review noted, would be unwieldy and untenable if the Dean actually met one on one with each of these direct reports on a regular basis. In practice, however, Principals, Chairs and Directors work primarily with the Vice-Deans, Associate Dean and Assistant Deans to handle administrative issues as they arise and reported to the review team that they are all highly responsive to their needs.

The problem of reporting lines is further mitigated by regular meetings of groups of academic leaders: the College Principals, the Coalition of Chairs, Principals and Directors, and the Council of Arts and Science Directors. The large Arts and Science Council serves as a comprehensive governing body responsible for curriculum, admissions, degrees, and other matters relating to the academic program of the Faculty. Meetings of these groups provide opportunities for communication and feedback between the Dean the Principals, Chairs, and Directors as well as opportunities to discuss administrative and academic issues among themselves. We were generally impressed by the camaraderie and commitment to the Faculty and UT that these academic leaders displayed, though they also betrayed some of the inevitable internal rivalries and misunderstandings to which academic institutions are prone.

An important step in bringing financial and administrative stability to the Faculty was the appointment of a Chief Administrative Officer in the last few years. The CAO has undertaken a thorough review of the Faculty finances in an effort to control costs and bring about administrative efficiencies, especially in computing and infrastructure. While the finances of the Faculty appear stable and have recovered from the deep cuts of recent years, the Faculty faces significant challenges in paying down its accumulated debt and meeting other costs, such as pension payments. The direction appears to be healthy and should permit some building back of faculty positions in some areas. With the end of mandatory retirement, however, faculty appointments must be highly selective. As a side note, we were impressed by a number of people with whom we met expressing extremely positive comments about the Faculty's HR support group. At most universities, faculty and staff complain about HR support, so the Faculty's HR group is clearly doing an exemplary job.

The creation of the Faculty Appointments Committee in 2011 was another significant step in giving the Faculty greater coherence. The Committee appears to be widely respected if not embraced and gives the Dean and Faculty an important tool for bringing units into alignment with the overall academic plan and priorities of the Faculty.

We were surprised to learn that the tenure process, although organized and overseen by the Faculty, did not include an assessment and recommendation by a committee of the whole Faculty. We recommend the tenure review process be rethought. Just as the allocation of appointments and promotions to full professor are reviewed by a committee of the Faculty, we believe all tenure decisions should be thoroughly reviewed at the Faculty level. A Faculty-level tenure committee would help ensure that local decisions, while acknowledging the particular standards of different disciplines, were consistent with the broader academic standards of the Faculty as a whole and would provide the President with important information regarding the understanding of faculty members about the qualities necessary for tenure in the Faculty. For the dean, who is at present represented on all tenure committees, a Faculty personnel committee would provide a deeper understanding of the large body of faculty members for whom he or she is responsible.

The administrative organization of the Faculty of Arts and Science gives the academic leaders a high degree of independence. Since they are not regularly reporting to a single official, they have wide latitude in running their organizations. Departments seem to cherish their relative autonomy and have used it in many cases to foster strong teaching and research programs despite adverse financial conditions. At the same time, this independence places considerable responsibility on their shoulders for managing their units effectively, whether in terms of finances, academic appointments, and promotions. By-and-large this organization appears to be serving the faculty well, though *it will be critical for an incoming Dean to communicate often and clearly with these leaders as well as the faculty at large to ensure that they not only understand the actions taken by the Dean but the context in which decisions are being made.*

6. The scope and nature of the Faculty's relationships with other University of Toronto campuses and divisions.

UT is an amazingly large and rich institution, consisting of multiple divisions and the St. George, Mississauga and Scarborough campuses. The size and diversity of UT offer both opportunities and challenges to the FAS.

In recent years, UT has grown by increasing undergraduate enrollments at its UTM and UTSC campuses. To meet the enrollment increases, UT has added faculty at the UTM and UTSC campuses and undertaken an ambitious construction program. Faculty members from all three campuses participate in the hiring of new faculty in a given discipline. By design, most graduate programs span all three campuses, while there are distinct undergraduate programs on each campus. The departments on each campus have a chair, and there is a graduate chair of the graduate programs that span multiple campuses. The graduate chair is usually one of the

department chairs. Relations among the campuses seem to be cordial and there is a sense of disciplinary commonality despite the distance between them.

We did, however, detect some problems with the way the tri-campus model has developed. New faculty members have joined the FAS, but in complex and not always satisfying ways to the faculty at the St. George campus. To begin with, the UTM and UTSC campuses have been hiring faculty just at a time that hiring slowed at the St. George campus because of the budget shortfalls and deficit. This has meant that in some departments, faculty renewal has largely occurred at the UTM and UTSC campus, leaving an older and more senior faculty on the St. George campus. As the number of faculty in FAS has shrunk, moreover, the undergraduate student/faculty ratio has worsened. In addition, facilities at the St. George campus have not been expanded or improved, at a time when expansion has occurred at the UTM and UTSC campuses. These disparities between the St. George, UTM, and UTSC campuses pose significant challenges to the mission of the FAS.

Departments have tried to cope with these challenges in different ways, and different disciplines have different models for integrating the tri-campus graduate programs. Some, such as philosophy and computer science, have created close bonds among their tri-campus faculty despite the commute. In such cases, disciplines have used the expansion of the UTM and UTSC campuses to enhance the overall quality of the faculty. In other cases, particularly some of the lab-based sciences other than computer science, integration has proved to be much more difficult. Efforts at integration have been made more difficult by the limited space at the St. George campus to provide UTM and UTSC members with offices close to their department or program.

On the basis of our interviews, it does not appear that the central administration at UT has planned for how better to integrate the Tri-campus graduate programs in the FAS. Nor is it clear whether these issues are restricted to the FAS or whether they have been experienced in other Divisions at UT. If UT is to take full advantage of the tri-campus model, *we recommend investing the time to explore best practices to enable faculty to create robust cross-campus relations and funding to provide space where tri-campus faculty members can interact on a regular basis.* It is a great opportunity for UT as a whole.

The sheer size of UT and the number of Divisions also offers remarkable opportunities for academic development, though it is not clear how easy it is to develop programs across the Divisions that take advantage of the combined strengths of UT. In some areas there has been significant collaboration, for example in human development, sustainable energy and optical studies predicated on a model of cross divisional collaborations. On the other hand, there is a concern about how such ventures will be funded while the new funding model has triggered some wariness among the Divisions.

Both Engineering and Medicine, for example, participate in undergraduate education in the FAS. Engineering students take some of their core courses in the FAS, while some of the basic

bioscience courses taken by FAS students are delivered by Medicine faculty. All three expressed uneasiness about the terms of trade in this teaching and whether the funding model adequately takes this teaching transfer into account. The “University Fund” was intended to smooth out such issues, but from accounts we heard, it will be fully allocated in the foreseeable future. As a result, Divisions appear to be somewhat wary about entering into teaching or research collaborations out of concern for the financial implications. At this point it is no more than a worry and does not represent an obstacle to cross divisional initiatives, but *we recommend the central administration clarify some of these cross-Divisional issues which seem to be especially acute when it comes to teaching across Divisions*. The new budget model is widely accepted and seems to be working well, so that now is an opportune time to work with the Divisions to modify the model in ways that will encourage robust collaborations.

This would also be a good time to explore new academic initiatives involving the entire campus. The FAS would be a prime driver in such explorations because of its size and disciplinary breadth. At the same time, there is an expectation outside the FAS that it needs to undertake more rigorous planning of its own to focus its academic strengths.

7. The scope and nature of the Faculty’s societal impact in terms of outreach to local, national, and international organizations and communities.

The University of Toronto is located in a diverse, rich, urban environment and the faculty and students in the Faculty of A&S make the most of this location to create a learning laboratory for its students and rich connections between students and faculty with the community. They strive to make an impact on the world by educating their students to be responsible and engaged global citizens, to facilitate the transfer of their research into patents or applications that will have an impact on the world, and by encouraging their faculty to become engaged in public policy debates. In addition, they host a range of relevant public events through their departments, interdisciplinary units, and through the College structure.

Although the numbers are still relatively small, they have increased the number of courses they offer that have a service learning component working closely with the UT Centre for Community Partnerships and they used CRIF funds to hire a Service Learning Coordinator. They have also increased the number of professional master’s programs that they offer and the number of internships in government, industry, and not-for-profit organizations associated with these.

Although we did not get a good sense of the scope of participation in activities of this nature, in our meeting with students – who were admittedly not a representative cross-sample of the student body at large, but a good representation of the most involved students – it was clear that almost every one of them was involved in some activity that had community impact, including participation in international conferences, working with local community groups, and being involved in policy debates on issues ranging from fishing rights to poverty alleviation. It is

clear that in most cases they are working with faculty on such issues, and the Faculty of Arts and Science is in a good position to bring evidence-based direction and advice to a host of social problems and issues, at the local, national, and international levels.

Over the last five years the Faculty of Arts and Science had also stepped up its involvement in technology transfer as evidenced by patent applications and disclosures. They account for an impressive 20-35% share of these activities in the university.

We applaud the Faculty's commitment to community involvement, globalization, and conducting research that will matter in the world through service learning, study abroad and commercialization/technology transfer activities, especially during these times of fiscal constraint. These are good directions to be pursuing and we believe that such initiatives will bear fruit in the form of both improved education and research, and more support and understanding from the public-at-large and provincial government. *We strongly recommend that the Dean's office engage in peer bench-marking in these areas.*

To conclude, there is no question about the overall excellence of the Faculty of Arts and Science at the University of Toronto. A new Dean will be leading an exceptionally strong Faculty with excellent faculty, staff, and student that are energetically committed to conducting world-class research and scholarship. The Division also remains committed to providing a high quality education to their students, even in these times of fiscal constraint, and they are looking for ways to add depth and breadth to the student experience.

Although we were not asked to make recommendations per se, we have embedded some throughout the report and those sections are italicized. It is, of course, important to consider these within the context that despite a very thorough self-study report and an extremely informative and extensive three-day visit, FAS is a large and complex organization. We greatly enjoyed our time with the past and interim FAS Deans, and with the Dean's extremely strong team of Vice Deans and administrative staff; we also enjoyed our lively conversations with chairs, principals, and with graduate and undergraduate students. The future looks bright!