UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE  

ARTS AND SCIENCE COUNCIL MEETING  

MINUTES OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCE COUNCIL held on Wednesday, November 4, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. in the Governing Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall  

Present  
David Cameron (Dean)  
Derek Allen (Chair)  
Donald Ainslie  
Joshua Barker  
Nishaant Bhambra  
Hilary Cunningham  
Danyal Damroodi  
Suzan Dobrobolsky  
John DiMarco  
John Duncan  
Beth Fischer  
Adam Fox  
Harry Fox  
Lloyd Gerson  
Clare Gilderdale  
Elaine Gold  
Corey Goldman  
Daphne Goring  
Gillian Hamilton  
Deborah Knott  
Christine Lehleiter  
Poppy Lockwood  
Douglas Macdonald  
Geoff MacDonald  
Douglas Macdonald  
Tirzah Meacham  
Teresa Nicoletti  
Giancarla Periti  
Ana Perez-Leroux  
François Pitt  
Mary Pugh  
Jane Seto  
Cesare Schotzko  
Cheryl Shook  
Matti Siemiatycki  
Tatiana Smolyarova  
Cheryl Suzack  
Nathan Taback  
Yinuo Zhang  
Jerry Zhu  
Wayne Zhu  

Call to Order  

The meeting was called to order at 3:15 p.m.  

1. Approval of the minutes of the October 7, 2015 Arts & Science Council meeting  
   
   Approved  

2. Business Arising  
   
   No business arising
3. **Report from the Dean**

Dean Cameron advised that this agenda item could be skipped as he would be speaking to agenda item #4: Strategic Planning in the Faculty of Arts & Science at length and would not need to provide a second report.

4. **Strategic Planning in the Faculty of Arts & Science**

Dean Cameron reminded Council that at the last Council meeting of October 7 he spoke of his priorities and at this Council meeting he would take the opportunity to speak to the Faculty’s thoughts on academic planning and how this would manifest itself in the Dean’s Office. The last academic planning process encompassed the years 2010 to 2015 and this process has been used to help identify the priorities for the Dean’s Office. With the introduction of the UTQAP (University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process), the Faculty has an additional tool to help with the planning process. As part of the UTQAP, programs are required to be reviewed every 8 years and this is a formal procedure, requiring a self-study prepared by units and reviewers to provide their recommendations. The Dean informed Council that as part of the academic planning process, these reviews and their outcomes will now be incorporated into the planning process. The Dean also discussed the various committees the Faculty currently has as advisory groups to the planning process, such as the Faculty Complement Committee and the Budget Committee.

As part of the planning process, the Dean mentioned that the Faculty is required to prepare an ABR and submit this document to the Provost. The ABR is a document which presents the Faculty’s budget and expenses, for example the renovation of labs.

The Dean also spoke of the possible creation of a new vice decanal position within the Dean’s Office. This new position would be responsible for planning and strategic sources and would take the lead for the review of programs, thereby removing the UTQAP process from the Vice Dean, Graduate Education and Program Review portfolio. The review process is complex and this move would allow for the attention required to follow-up with units, which is currently not done as well as it should be.

Professor Allen opened the floor to questions.

1. Dean Cameron was asked whether it wouldn’t be a better idea to keep the reviews of programs separate from the planning process as this may cause tensions within units. Dean Cameron responded that the review of a program is a requirement and by using the consultation that needs to take place within units during this process would allow all department members to contribute.

2. Dean Cameron was then asked about the amount of work at a divisional level the preparing of a self-study is and how he saw this as part of the planning process. The
Dean responded by stating that the self-study would eliminate the need to duplicate unnecessarily. The self-study would replace the academic plan currently required by all units. The only question is how to deal with the length of time between reviews (8 years), what process should be in place.

3. Dean Cameron was asked whether the creation of a new vice dean position would only generate numerous unrelated items under one umbrella and wouldn’t allow the individual to address any one item fully. Dean Cameron responded by stating that the planning and strategic process encompasses various areas, such as the UQTAP, academic planning and special initiatives. The position would begin the process of reviewing these ideas and get them going and would then look to see which current decanal portfolio would be best at addressing the issues.

5. **Course Syllabus Update**

   Prof. Paul Gries was absent from the meeting due to illness and could not speak to this agenda item as scheduled. This item would be brought forward to the next Faculty Council meeting (December 2, 2015).

6. **Future Meeting Agendas**

   Prof. Allen informed Council that the Agenda Committee welcomes suggestions from all members of Council for new agenda items. He reminded Council that its primary responsibility is the approval of academic policies that determine the principles for the priorities of the teaching and research activities of the Faculty. Prof. Allen mentioned that the Council may play an advisory role to the administration of the Faculty, for example in considering the possibility of a fall reading week, but would have no authority in matters dealing with budget, hiring, promotion and tenure. He asked Council to bring forward any agenda items to the Secretary of the Faculty Council, Deborah Robinson, and they will be brought forward to the Agenda Committee for consideration.

7. **Other Business and Adjournment of Meeting**

   No further business. Meeting was adjourned at 3:56 p.m.