TOWARDS 2030

University of Toronto
TASK FORCE ON INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION

Final Report

Presented on behalf of the Task Force on Institutional Organization by Task Force Co-Chairs:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity

and

Ms. B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Alumna Governor

28 March 2008

Table of Contents

Section 1   Mandate

In the spring of 2007, the document "Towards 2030: Planning for a Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto" was presented and widely circulated to the University community. As a result of the meetings and consultations held, and submissions received, five task forces were established to further study the questions and options that arose.

The Task Force on Institutional Organization was charged with six tasks:

1. Analyze the administrative and governance issues that are unique to the tri-campus structure, and the administrative challenges that are unique to the St George campus, given its complexity and the presence of the Colleges and the Federated Universities.

2. Consider a principled framework for disciplinary differentiation, especially for the East and West campuses.

3. Study program delivery options, including pedagogical approach, online delivery, delivery with other colleges and universities, etc.

4. Perform a "Who does what?" exercise.

5. Consider modularization of administrative functions across small divisions and the efficiency of large divisions on the St George campus.

6. Pay particular attention to the role of the Colleges and the Federated Universities.

While carrying out these tasks, we were to address the concerns of all stakeholders, most especially students, faculty and staff.

It was assumed that this Task Force would have cross-over with the Task Force on Enrolment, and the Task Force on Governance.

Section 2   Task Force Membership and Process

Task Force Membership:

As with all the Task Forces in the Towards 2030 planning exercise, all constituencies were represented: Faculty, Staff, Students, Alumni and Governors.

The members of the Task Force on Institutional Organization were:

Professor Angela Hildyard, Vice-President, Human Resources and Equity - Co-chair

Ms. B. Elizabeth Vosburgh, Alumna Governor - Co-chair

Professor Derek Allen, Dean of Arts, Trinity College

Mr. Horatio Bot, Assistant Dean, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing

Mr. Ken Davy, Student Governor

Professor Jonathan Freedman, Vice-Provost, Students

Mr. Corey Goldman, Associate Chair, Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

Professor William Gough, Associate Chair, Department of Physical & Environmental Sciences, and Faculty Governor

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, Chair, Department of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, and Faculty Governor

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga

Professor Doug Reeve, Chair, Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry, and Faculty Governor

Ms. Janice Draper, Senior HR Policy and Projects Specialist - Secretariat

Process:

The Task Force gathered input from the University community using various approaches.

First, in addition to the general call for submissions to the Towards 2030 Task Forces, given the broad scope of the Task Force on Institutional Organization, the Task Force developed a set of specific questions, which it used as the basis for gathering input from a number of individuals, groups and areas across the University, including senior administrators, student groups, unions and academic divisions. *(Please see Appendix I: Task Force on Institutional Organization Questions.)*

In some cases, recipients of the questions were invited to respond to specific questions; however, they were not restricted to responding only to those questions. In all cases, the Task Force welcomed any input whether it pertained specifically to the questions or not. *(Please see Appendix II: List of Individuals, Groups and Areas Invited to Respond to the Task Force Questions.)*

Second, the Task Force posted an open invitation on its website inviting any member of the University to provide input to the Task Force.

Third, the Task Force invited a number of individuals to meet with the Task Force.

Fourth, the Task Force conducted independent research.

Through a combination of these approaches, the Task Force amassed extensive information, which served as the basis for discussion and debate at its seventeen (17) meetings, spanning the period, November 5, 2007 to March 12, 2008 inclusive. *(Please see Appendix III: Submissions and Research.)*

Section 3   Overview

The key issues to be addressed by the Organizational Task Force can be captured as follows:

> **Will the current academic and administrative organization of the University of Toronto enable the University to achieve its highest aspirations and, if not, how might the academic and administrative organization be realigned?**

Task Force members were unanimous in their support for a vision of the University of Toronto that continues to place us as a leader amongst the best research and teaching public institutions in the world. Towards 2030 describes the challenges facing the University – including organizational challenges – and the initial consensus of the Task Force was that some degree of organizational realignment is necessary. We determined that our task was to articulate guiding principles that would lead to a model that incorporates our existing strengths into a revitalized organizational structure.

Towards 2030 also notes the unique financial resource challenges we face in Ontario and Canada. In addressing organizational issues, therefore, the Task Force decided to make no assumptions about significant increases in revenue. Rather, we assumed that in 2030 we will be marginally better resourced than at present through provincial and federal support but with an expectation for additional resource bases via such sources as research and community partnerships, enhanced philanthropy and the like.

Our subsequent discussions focused upon five key questions:

(a)   Will the current tri-campus model meet the University's future needs? If not, what revisions to the current model should be contemplated, and what are the implications of such revisions for:

> Faculty and staff
>
> Undergraduate, professional and doctoral programs
>
> The Federated Universities and the Colleges
>
> Community, research and industrial partners?

(b)   What academic and administrative responsibilities should be assumed by the University as a whole and what should be assumed by each campus?

(c)   How might each campus be optimally organized, both academically and administratively?

(d)   How might we take greater advantage of technology to address our academic and administrative challenges?

(e)   And, most importantly, how do we ensure an outstanding experience for students, staff and faculty at each campus and in every program?

Section 4   State of the University

We propose to address status quo issues under three broad headings:

Tri-Campus relationships

Administrative challenges at St George

Creating communities for students

Tri-Campus Relationships

As predicted in the 2002 document, *Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses*, the enrolment expansion experienced by the University over the last five years has indeed enabled the University of Toronto Mississauga and the University of Toronto Scarborough "…to build and maintain critical masses of faculty across a range of disciplines and areas of study..". In terms of student enrolment, UTM and UTSC are now larger than Trent, Laurentian and Lakehead. They aspire to be equivalent in size to Wilfrid Laurier and Queens. It is not surprising, therefore, that with such development and revitalization comes a desire for greater autonomy.

The submissions from UTM and UTSC, as well as the lengthy discussions the Task Force had with members of those communities, documented a number of immediate frustrations with the current administrative structure as well as a clear sense that, in the long term, if UTM and UTSC are to attain their academic aspirations of enhanced excellence and differentiation, the current tri-campus model needs revision. This view was also noted in the submissions from the Faculty of Arts and Science, as well as in submissions from a number of individuals.

The academic leadership teams at UTM, UTSC and the Faculty of Arts and Science (the Faculty with the strongest links to both UTM and UTSC) have worked collaboratively and cooperatively on a framework that supports undergraduate programs across all three campuses. A small number of specialized professional master's programs are offered at UTM and UTSC (e.g., Master of Biotechnology at UTM; and Master of Environmental Science at UTSC) and more are planned. It is clear, however, that the process of creating and supporting doctoral programs is a more difficult challenge: The directors of graduate programs are currently primarily located on the St George campus and the majority of courses are also offered on the St George campus. UTM and UTSC argue that in order to recruit and retain outstanding scholars, they need to be able to recruit outstanding doctoral students and post doctoral fellows who will engage in their academic and research programs primarily on these campuses and not at St George.

UTM and UTSC also signaled frustration with administrative issues – both external and internal. For example, with respect to provincial and federal funding, the formulae for capacity building for graduate student expansion and for the allocation of research overheads are structured to advantage smaller institutions. UTM and UTSC are seen as

simply part of the large U of T and receive none of this advantage. UTM and UTSC are not "at the table", alongside their Ontario institutional counterparts at the Council of Ontario Universities, the Ontario Council for Academic Vice-Presidents or other similar organizations. Internal administrative frustrations include a governance approval process that is long and arduous. Presently, for example, UTM and UTSC run processes for the approval of capital projects and ancillary budgets that are parallel but secondary to the central processes.

UTM and UTSC report that some central administrative services with a three campus mandate do not provide comparable service and support across those campuses. For example, training and development opportunities have been primarily offered at St George; central resources are made available for first entry recruitment activities for St George applicants, but not for UTM and UTSC applicants.

Senior administrative staff at UTM and UTSC are viewed as "less senior" by their St George counterparts and are rarely "at the table" when strategic institutional issues are being discussed. These senior staff are also generally excluded from institutional representation on provincial and national professional bodies and yet they are responsible for operations larger than those in many other Ontario and Canadian Universities.

Administrative Challenges at St George

The size and complexity of the St George campus creates some interesting and unique organizational challenges. The memorandum of agreement between the University and the three Federated Universities relates to the St George campus – indeed the three Federated Universities as well as the four Constituent Colleges are co-located within the St George footprint.

Our Faculty of Arts and Science is larger than many mid-sized Universities. The Faculty of Medicine is intricately related, through detailed agreements, with ten fully affiliated hospitals and their research institutes. Collectively the University of Toronto Health Science faculties and the affiliated hospitals constitute one of the largest academic health science networks in North America. We have single departments in Arts and Science, Medicine, Engineering and Education that are many times larger in terms of faculty and student numbers than some single department Faculties. The Deans of Arts and Science and Medicine are responsible for huge physical infrastructures with the associated deferred maintenance problems as well as the challenges associated with new capital projects – without having the "asset value" credited to them.

The complexity of the St George campus coupled with the extreme variability of scale between the largest and the smallest faculties, and a requirement to provide strategic academic leadership at the same time as responding to immediate crises have led to a provostial office that is overloaded. Therefore, in addition to considering revisions to the tri-campus relationship, the Task Force was urged to consider recommending revisions to the current administrative structure on the St George campus so as to enhance effectiveness and efficiency. [In this regard, please note that no written or oral

submissions to the Task Force suggested revising the organizational structures of UTM and UTSC.]

Creating Communities for Students

The Task Force heard about numerous programs – across all three campuses – in support of creating communities for students.   The Federated and Constituent Colleges have created a number of innovative programs over the past several years, including the enhancement of academic support programs and outreach to commuter students. We have also seen innovative programs created around other commonalities – for example, First Year Learning Communities and the sense of community created within professional undergraduate programs (e.g., TrackOne, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering).

The submissions we received all point to a need to create increased opportunities to support students – undergraduate, professional and graduate, both those who reside on campus and those who commute. Strategies should be broad and diverse and include social and academic events that will attract students from different levels of study and from diverse disciplines (and, as noted by the GSU, include the offer of free food and/or food with student friendly prices!) Such initiatives will require closer collaboration between the student life professionals on all three campuses, closer links with student leaders, and creative use of technology.

We were also reminded that several of our peer institutions have focused energy on building communities for graduate students, both within and across academic disciplines, involving opportunities for interaction with fellow students and academics. Similarly, professional communities could provide for interaction between graduate students and professionals in the field.

Finally we note that the undergraduate student experience at UTM and UTSC is markedly different from the experiences of the St George campus students. Consolidation of student satisfaction survey data across all three campuses is neither helpful nor appropriate for all measures; indeed, comparisons across the campuses are useful. Similarly, initiatives to address student needs will be more successful if they are campus developed and delivered.

Post script

This brief summary represents a synthesis of the range of issues outlined in the various oral and written submissions we received. In general, there was overall agreement as to the challenges…what differed across submissions was the significance assigned to those challenges as well as the suggested solutions! In the next sections of this report, we expand upon the issues and offer some solutions.

Section 5   Principles

We present our deliberations within three broad areas: tri-campus organizational structure; organizational structures specific to St George; and, creating and supporting communities for students. Throughout, our report is informed by the following principles:

> ***The University of Toronto, as a whole, should be greater than the sum of the constituent parts.***
>
> ***Organizational structures and processes should***
>
>> ***serve the highest aspirations of the University.***
>>
>> ***enhance student, faculty and staff experiences, acknowledging the distinct concerns of each group.***
>>
>> ***support innovative and timely academic initiatives, consistent with principles of good governance.***
>>
>> ***enhance effectiveness and efficiency in academic and administrative decision making.***
>>
>> ***enable each campus to make its own academic and administrative decisions.***
>>
>> ***facilitate student learning and faculty research and teaching across academic and administrative boundaries.***

Section 6   Considerations, Deliberations & Recommendations with respect to the Tri-Campus Model

Will the current tri-campus model meet the University's future academic and administrative needs? If not, what revisions to the current model should be contemplated?

The Task Force heard no support for the creation of additional campuses within the current fiscal environment. Similarly we heard no support for the elimination of any campus. With respect to the separation of UTM and/or UTSC to become fully autonomous universities, the Task Force was of the firm view that this was not appropriate at this time: not only do we see significant academic synergy in retaining three campuses, but we were also of the opinion that UTM and UTSC need additional time to strengthen their graduate programs and become fully comprehensive campuses. Separation of UTM and UTSC might better be contemplated once they have attained this state. Thus we have assumed that ***the organizational structure of the University will include the three existing campuses.***

The consensus of the Task Force is that the University of Toronto Mississauga and the University of Toronto Scarborough have matured sufficiently to justify a commitment to the development of an organizational structure within the University of Toronto such that over time each campus will be able to engage in significantly greater independent decision making than at present.

It is our assumption that the organizational structure will include three *differentiated*, campuses: UT St George, UTM and UTSC. Each campus will offer a wide range of undergraduate programs. Each campus will offer professional masters programs and doctoral programs, some of which may be campus based, and some of which may include two or three campuses. There will be some programmatic specialization at each level on each campus, building on current programs such as the co-op program at UTSC and the Medical Academy at UTM. Each campus will retain the opportunity to develop unique academic relationships within the immediate community – as is already the case with UTM/Sheridan, UTSC/Centennial, and the Faculty of Medicine/Michener Institute. Each campus will also retain the opportunity to develop unique research and development relationships with the local community – as for example currently exists between the Health Sciences and MaRS, UTM and the City of Mississauga. Similarly, each campus should be provided the opportunity to develop unique relationships with international partners – as for example, occurs for the Green Path program at UTSC. This "differentiation" will require an administrative structure to suit the unique academic structures of the three campuses.

What organizational model would be optimal for the University of Toronto?

First, we need to consider size: we heard compelling arguments for an overall decrease in the size of the student body on St George – a significant decrease in the number of undergraduates but coupled with an increase in the number of graduate students so as to provide a ratio of graduates to undergraduates commensurate with ratios at some of our peers. At the same time we heard arguments in favour of some increase to undergraduate student numbers at UTM and UTSC, along with increases in the numbers of masters and doctoral students – that is, undergraduate to graduate student ratios that would be appropriate for small, comprehensive institutions. Even with these changes to enrolments, the St George campus would remain more than twice the size of UTM and UTSC.

Second, we see value in promoting differentiation across the three campuses, exemplified by the development of specialized and niche programs. While we expect that all three campuses will offer a wide range of undergraduate programs, as is the case now, not all programs will necessarily be available on every campus. The organizational structure has to be such that students can still access courses at each campus, not just their home campus. The organizational structure must also ensure that TAs are available at each campus. While to date, most of the undergraduate programs at UTM and UTSC have involved Arts and Science, Commerce and Management, relationships with other first entry faculties can and should be supported (an objective also contemplated in the 2002 Report, *Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three*

Campuses.). UTM, UTSC and UT St George should each recruit outstanding undergraduate students and those students should select their campus of choice based upon campus environment and upon the availability of specific programs.

Third, the desire to increase the numbers of professional graduate and doctoral stream students at UTM and UTSC and to enable those students to engage in their academic programs at UTM and UTSC carries with it complex implications regarding the location of the academic responsibility for graduate programs. Before outlining those implications, it is useful to note some aspects of the current structure at the University.

All doctoral programs are administered by a Graduate Department, headed by a Graduate Chair. All tenure stream and tenured faculty must be members of graduate departments. Although in a limited number of areas, faculty at UTM or UTSC do engage in their research and graduate teaching at UTM or UTSC, at the present time graduate chairs and graduate teaching are primarily located on the St George campus. That is, a faculty member may be appointed to a Department at UTM or at UTSC but hold his or her graduate appointment in a graduate department in which much or all of the graduate teaching and supervision is carried out at UT St George.

The Task Force heard a number of views regarding doctoral programs, including the view that **all** doctoral programs should be associated with **one** tri-campus graduate department. The Task Force is of the view, however, that this model will not enable UTM and UTSC to achieve their aspirations and, recommends that a range of options be available: specifically, where the strength and excellence of a graduate program clearly calls for the involvement of faculty from more than one campus, then the structure must allow for bi- or tri-campus program delivery and decision making; where there is sufficient scholarly interest and strength on one campus for a doctoral program, then that campus should be entitled to house the graduate department and deliver the program.

The Task Force does not support the duplication of entire graduate programs across the three campuses – indeed, we would see the resulting competition for faculty and students to be divisive and to detract from the University of Toronto as a whole. However, we are very supportive of specific program specializations within one graduate department being offered primarily on one specific campus, e.g., Clinical Psychology within the Graduate Department of Psychology could be offered at UTSC; Forensic Psychology within the Graduate Department of Psychology could be offered at UTM. *Each campus must be able to recruit outstanding doctoral students who can expect to fulfill their program requirements primarily on that campus.*

Fourth, the University of Toronto recruits and retains outstanding faculty. Any revised organizational model must ensure that the University as a whole maintains that ability. However, *each campus must be able to recruit and retain outstanding faculty, the majority of whom will fulfill their primary teaching, research and service commitments on that campus. At the same time, the facilitation of multidisciplinary and collaborative relationships across all three campuses must be continued.* The Task Force heard that some faculty express concerns about the establishment of single campus

doctoral programs – particularly if this would decrease their ability to interact with graduate colleagues on another campus. Similarly, we heard concerns expressed by UTM and UTSC that a tri-campus graduate model, especially where the graduate teaching and supervision is located at UT St George, encourages UTM and UTSC faculty to spend significant amounts of time away from the home campus – and the undergraduate students at that campus. Clearly these are complex issues and the solutions to address them will challenge deeply held views.

Fifth, the University of Toronto also recruits and retains outstanding administrative staff. Movement of staff across the three campuses is quite common and is frequently the result of promotional opportunities. The Task Force is of the view that such mobility should be retained. In addition, the Task Force was advised that many administrative staff at UTM and at UTSC would welcome the increased responsibilities that are associated with enhanced administrative independence. ***Each campus must continue to recruit outstanding staff and provide these staff opportunities for growth and development; however, opportunities for mobility across the three campuses should be retained***.

Sixth, it is essential that the University of Toronto maintain excellent relationships with the Provincial and Federal governments - the source of much of our revenue base. The Task Force is of the view that all such relationships must be coordinated by and through the University as a whole. However, we are also mindful of the fact that it is not always to the advantage of UTM and UTSC to be viewed as satellite campuses of "The University of Toronto". There are many situations – access to capital funding, access to various specialized research funding programs, government support for students, endowment matching funds - in which being "part of The University of Toronto" is to the detriment of UTM and UTSC. Discussion with both levels of government on this issue should be initiated with a goal of resourcing UTM and UTSC in a manner similar to their Ontario and Canadian institutional counterparts.

At the municipal level we believe that the local campus should "own" the relationship, whether that is with the City of Toronto (where UT St George would take ownership of downtown issues and UTSC would take ownership of issues to the East), Peel region (where UTM would take ownership) or other municipalities within the GTA. Similarly, with respect to community partnerships the development of such relationships should be under the leadership and direction of a specific campus.

The Task Force did not engage in substantive discussion regarding International Partnerships/Relationships, nor was the matter raised in the submissions we received. Our view is that local determination is optimal, conducted in accordance with a University of Toronto strategy. We suggest a similar approach for Advancement (so as to preclude divisive competition between the three campuses). Research and Industrial Partnerships would follow a comparable model – that is, local decision making but in accordance with an overall institutional strategy.

In sum, ***relationships with the federal and provincial governments should be the responsibility of The University; The University should develop institutional strategies***

for International Relations, Research and Advancement that support significant local autonomy; Local municipal relationships and community partnerships should be led by a campus.

Seventh, the Task Force heard quite passionate statements about the frustrations encountered by faculty, staff and students who must move back and forth between the campuses on a daily basis. Indeed, members of the Task Force experienced such frustrations themselves! Clearly improved public transportation would assist in this regard and, indeed, UTSC is engaged in discussions on this matter with local municipal representatives. It is also abundantly clear, however, that institutionally we have made minimal use of technology to facilitate tri-campus program delivery, tri-campus academic relationships, tri-campus administrative relationships. Too often colleagues on St George simply assume that colleagues from Mississauga and Scarborough will commute to meetings on the downtown campus. While we are seeing an increased use of telephone conferencing, in many situations a visual presence is also desirable. ***The University must implement state of the art communications technology so as to facilitate academic and administrative interactions and reduce the need to commute between campuses***.

Recommendations Regarding the Tri-Campus Model

In summary, respecting the Principles noted on page 7, the Task Force recommends that by 2030

Academic Relationships:

1.   The three campuses should be viewed as "partners" in the academic enterprise, with jurisdictional autonomy in terms of their undergraduate programs and professional graduate programs, and with doctoral programs that might be offered by faculty on one campus or that might be bi/tri-campus (that is, offered by faculty from two or three campuses);

2.   Faculty should have a primary commitment to their home campus although they will continue to engage with colleagues on each campus;

3.   Undergraduate and professional graduate students should be recruited to specific campus based programs;

4.   Doctoral stream students should be recruited by each campus. Although a doctoral stream student will be primarily located on a specific campus, access to faculty on other campuses should be facilitated;

Administrative Relationships:

5.   Responsibility for administrative decision making for a specific campus should, to the greatest extent possible, reside on that campus;

6. *Administrative staff should retain mobility across the three campuses;*

External Relationships:

7. *Provincial and federal relationships will be developed and maintained on behalf of the University of Toronto as a whole; at the same time, attention to and support for the unique needs of each campus must be explicit;*

8. *The University should develop institutional strategies for International Relations, Research and Advancement that contemplate and support significant local autonomy;*

9. *Each campus should develop and maintain its own municipal, community and industrial relationships;*

Inter campus Communications:

10. *The University must implement and maintain state of the art communications technology so as to facilitate academic and administrative interactions and reduce the need to commute between campuses.*

The Task Force reviewed a number of system models (including the University of California; the University of Texas; the University of Michigan; the University of Wisconsin; Cornell; Rutgers) and also engaged in discussion with Dr Robert Berdahl who has worked in three different systems. Each of the existing university systems has been shaped by a long history. They include two year, four year, comprehensive and research intensive institutions; several include campuses that are primarily for Health Sciences; most have campuses that are distant from one another. All models appear to provide full campus autonomy with respect to undergraduate program development; several also provide full autonomy with respect to master's level programming but restrict doctoral programs to one or two members of the system. Arguably, the University of California represents the best known system with the greatest number of "star" campuses, each of which has autonomy to develop a comprehensive range of fully independent (and fully competitive) undergraduate, masters and doctoral programs.

The Task Force was not able to identify an existing University System model that is responsive, in a comprehensive manner, to each of the recommendations noted above. Therefore, we have focused on the key administrative areas and proposed an allocation of responsibilities between The University of Toronto and its three campuses. Specifically, we envision a "system office" for The University of Toronto with responsibility for strategic academic and administrative policies and practices that will support U of T standards of quality and excellence. The U of T "system office" will also be responsible for institutional policies regarding undergraduate and graduate students, library, research, advancement, international relations, institutional relations, budget, planning, real estate and IT, contractual employment relationships, government relations, audit and financial reporting, institutional compliance.

The three campuses, UT St George, UT Mississauga and UT Scarborough will operate independently – with full responsibility for their academic programs, financial operations, student life, employment relations, advancement, facilities and services, academic and library resources, and so on. While each campus will hold responsibility for its academic programs, tri-campus relationships must be organized so as to accommodate a variety of doctoral program arrangements.

It is important to note that in our efforts to disentangle institutional responsibilities from campus responsibilities, separation of roles and symmetry across the three campuses should not outweigh or trump efficiency. Therefore, it may continue to be most efficient for some system responsibilities to be assumed within positions that are primarily campus based and vice versa. Two possible examples are leadership for the system of U of T Libraries as well as Robarts Library; leadership of the Faculty of Medicine as well as Relations with Health Care Institutions. In addition, it may be appropriate for the School of Continuing Studies to be a system office since their programs are offered on all three campuses.

The proposed allocation of responsibilities is shown in Figure 1.

Finally, we note that in order to ensure separation of system from campus responsibilities, some university systems have chosen to locate the system office away from the "main" campus. The Task Force is of the view that in order to implement the recommendations in this report fully, the University of Toronto system office should not be located on the St George campus.

Section 7   Considerations, Deliberations & Recommendations with respect to the Organizational Structure for the University of Toronto St George

The St George campus is large, administratively complex and, in the view of several members of the current and former academic/administrative leadership, in need of organizational reorganization. *Indeed, the majority of the written and oral submissions we received outlined frustration with existing organizational and administrative structures and relationships, and noted that changes are urgently needed, certainly well before 2030.*

The challenges on the St George campus can be related to four key, interrelated issues (note, we do not assume that these are the only issues; rather, in terms of organization, we see these as the four most important).

First, there is no identifiable "CEO" for the St George campus, in contrast to UTM and UTSC. Those members of the senior leadership team, including the President, who are physically located on the St George campus, play a dual role: providing leadership across all three campuses at the same time as dealing with St George specific issues. In particular, oversight of the day to day operations of the St George campus is primarily

Figure 1: Proposed Structural Model for the University of Toronto

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Strategic Leadership for the Institution	President
Oversight for Academic Standards and Quality & Institutional Relations	Exec VP & System Provost
Policies specific to all U of T undergraduate students	
Policies specific to all U of T Graduate Studies	
Library	
Relations with Health Care Institutions	
Informational Systems	CIO
Faculty and Staff Employment Policies/CBAs/Equity/H&S	VP HR & Equity
Provincial/Federal/International Relations	VP Ext Rel
Strategic Communications	
Institutional Budget/Planning/Operations	VP Operations
Finance	CFO
Institutional Research Policies	VP Research
Advancement Strategy & Alumni Relations	VP Advancement
Institutional Compliance (EHS, FIPPA, Human Rights)	Sr Legal Counsel

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO	**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**	**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**
Mississauga Division	**St George Divisions**	**Scarborough Division**
Provost – UTM	**Provosts – UT St George Divisions**	**Provost - UTSC**
Strategic/Academic Leadership for UTM	Strategic/Academic Leadership for UT St George	Strategic/Academic Leadership for UTSC
Academic and Research Programs	Academic and Research Programs	Academic and Research Programs
Budget/Finances/Capital Projects	Budget/Finances/Capital Projects	Budget/Finances/Capital Projects
Employee Relations	Employee Relations	Employee Relations
Advancement/Alumni Relations	Advancement/Alumni Relations	Advancement/Alumni Relations
Facilities/Services/Campus Safety	Facilities/Services/Campus Safety	Facilities/Services/Campus Safety
Student Life	Student Life	Student Life
International/Municipal/Community relations	International//Municipal/Community relations	International/Municipal/Community relations
Library and Academic Resources	Library and Academic Resources	Library and Academic Resources

provided by the Provost, the Vice-President, Human Resources & Equity and the Vice-President, Business Affairs. Several of the senior staff reporting to them similarly play a dual role - for example the AVP HR and the AVP Facilities and Services. This duality of role can result in a perception that a St George solution is a U of T wide solution; it also leads to perceptions at UTM and UTSC that their issues are secondary to those at UT St George. ***The organizational structure should provide identifiable leadership for UT St George, with a clear separation of University versus campus responsibilities.***

Second, the current organizational structure was established at a time when the University was far smaller. While Deans and Principals may jokingly refer to the "Big Deans" and the "Mini Deans" it is now the case that the Deans of the largest Faculties have responsibility for operations similar in size to small universities. Within the current structure it is not easy for the Provost to balance the issues faced by Deans of smaller Faculties with the same degree of consideration and attention as is given to the larger Faculties. Conversely, the responsibilities assigned to a Dean of a large Faculty are no different than those assigned to a Dean of a small Faculty – and the expectations of them in terms of leadership and communication are similar. However, in reality, their roles are quite different. ***The organizational structure must address variability of scale of academic units.***

Third, during our discussions it became very apparent that duality of role coupled with complexity and variability of scale have a specific impact upon the Provostial position. In any given day, the Provost is called upon to provide strategic academic leadership for the University as a whole, provide advice and support to any one of the 22 Deans and Principals, and determine whether to cancel classes on the St George campus due to inclement weather. ***The organizational structure must enable the development of senior positions that are coherent and that permit the incumbent to focus the majority of his or her attention on strategic institutional issues.***

Fourth, as noted in the submission from the Faculty of Medicine, the University is evolving to an organizational model "… where all student- and faculty-related activities are supported by advanced IT systems, skilled senior administrative staff and senior academic leaders that assume oversight responsibility for detailed enrolment planning, strategic faculty recruitment, space, facilities, human resource management." The largest faculties have the resources to recruit senior administrative staff with appropriate skill and expertise in IT, enrolment planning and so on, and these faculties have the capability of managing their own academic and administrative matters with minimal - if any - support from the central administrative offices. Smaller Faculties simply do not have the resources to hire the same range of administrative expertise and even though there is currently some sharing of services, there is also greater involvement of the central administrative offices. While it is entirely appropriate to have a variety of administrative arrangements in place, those arrangements should be established in a coherent and planned way. Several of our senior divisional administrative staff also noted that while our current organization provides opportunities for the senior staff in the central offices and VP portfolios to take part in discussions pertaining to administrative strategy, divisional staff do not have that opportunity. This hinders their ability to support their

Deans and Chairs. ***The organizational structure must enable and facilitate effective and efficient academic and administrative support across all divisions, regardless of size.***

What options should be considered for the St George campus?

The Task Force took a similar approach to this question as was taken for the Tri-Campus discussion earlier. First, we reviewed the Principles set out on page 7 and determined that those same Principles should inform our recommendations. Specifically,

> ***Organizational structures and processes should***
>
> > ***serve the highest aspirations of the University of Toronto St George.***
> >
> > ***enhance student, faculty and staff experiences, acknowledging the distinct concerns of each group.***
> >
> > ***support innovative and timely academic initiatives, consistent with principles of good governance.***
> >
> > ***enhance effectiveness and efficiency in academic and administrative decision making.***

Recommendations regarding the Organizational Structure of St George

Respecting the Principles noted above, the Task Force recommends that

1.   ***The organizational structure should identify leadership for the St George campus that is distinct from the leadership of the University as a whole.***

2.   ***The organizational structure should address variability of scale within academic divisions so as to ensure that the concerns of the largest divisions and the smallest divisions are given appropriate voice.***

3.   ***The organizational structure should facilitate effective and efficient academic and administrative program support and decision making.***

4.   ***Finally, although the Task Force was charged with developing recommendations with a 2030 perspective, changes to the organizational structure of the St George campus should occur on a rapid timeline.***

Obviously the organizational structure for St George is intimately related to the tri-campus organizational structure. Therefore our discussion of options was informed by our earlier recommendation to move to a University of Toronto "system". However, we also took into account the desirability for some change to occur prior to 2030.

Review of the academic and administrative organization of peer institutions reveals a variety of models *(Please see Appendix IV: Summary of U.S. System Models.)*: indeed there are as many models as there are peer institutions. The California, Texas and Wisconsin systems, for example, maintain a distinct separation between the administration of each campus and the system as a whole. At Minnesota, Ohio State and Michigan, on the other hand, the President of the University and the chief academic and operating officers provide leadership for the main campus as well as serving as system wide administrators. It is not unusual for institutions with extensive health science divisions to create a senior position at the level of a Vice-President to whom all Deans of Health Science faculties report. Some institutions group smaller faculties into "Schools" or "Colleges"; others separate Arts, Science, and Social Sciences into three distinct units. It will come as no surprise to note that the Task Force was unable to identify any existing model that meets the specific circumstances of St George. The Task Force determined, therefore, that a "Made in Toronto" approach would be necessary.

(a) Strategic Academic Leadership

The University of Toronto system model that we have proposed (see Figure 1) assumes a System President and a System Provost; therefore the Executive Leadership of the St George campus will report to one or both of these positions. Taking into account the problems of size, complexity and variability of divisional scale, the Task Force discussed whether the leadership for St George should be vested in one position or distributed across several positions. The Task Force was of the view that in order to ensure nimbleness and boldness of strategic action, that UT St George should be divided into smaller, more manageable units, each having a mandate for its own strategic direction and execution of programs.

During the course of our deliberations it became evident to Task Force members that the use of specific titles for various positions (Provost, Vice-President, Vice-Provost and so on) creates the potential for confusion. Perceptions of status are inextricably linked to position title and titles are intimately related to organizational structure; thus the authority accorded to **current** positions can interfere with the exploration of new and alternative models. The Task Force considered using generic titles – such as "Leader" for the report but subsequently determined that this was not helpful either. Therefore, for the purposes of this Report, we have elected to refer to the senior provostial position for the system as the Executive Vice-President and System Provost. [We would emphasize that we are adopting this term just for the purposes of this report; we are not proposing its adoption by the University.] This then enables us to use the title Vice-President and Provost for the campus leadership positions – on the St George campus as well as at UTM and UTSC – and the incumbents will maintain a dual reporting relationship to the President and to the Executive Vice-President and System Provost.

Another matter to which we returned repeatedly was the question of resources – specifically, under our current budget model, how would Faculties access what is now called the "University Fund". This is an issue that will require full examination once the

structural models have been identified; however, the Task Force assumed that there could be a (small) System University Fund to permit the System Provost to support initiatives that clearly impact the University of Toronto as a whole; and, that each campus would have a Campus Fund to address academic initiatives that are campus specific.

Possible Models
As the Task Force discussed a range of structural options we found that again terminology created some barriers – academic units can variously be called Faculties, Divisions, Schools, Colleges and so on. Each of these terms already has specific meaning at the University of Toronto. For the purposes of this report, we have elected to refer to groupings of academic units or Faculties as DIVISIONS.

Model A
Given that many of our peer institutions have created a senior position with responsibility for the Health Sciences faculties, a minimalist approach to reorganization would be to create two DIVISIONS each headed by a Vice-President & Provost: a Vice-President & Provost Health Sciences to whom the Deans of Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Physical Education and Health, and Social Work report, and a Vice-President & Provost Arts/Social Sciences/Sciences & Professional Faculties to whom all other Deans as well as Principals report. These two Vice-Presidents & Provosts would assume responsibility for the academic and administrative decision making within their respective DIVISIONS, respecting the autonomy and independence of each Faculty and allocating funds within their DIVISION from their respective portion of the Campus Fund (see above).

More specifically, the Vice-President & Provost for each DIVISION would assume oversight responsibility for enrolment planning, strategic faculty recruitment and retention, space, facilities, human resource management, IT systems and so on. They would also cooperate, as appropriate, on issues of concern to the campus as a whole and provide joint direction to senior staff focused on campus wide matters, such as Student Life, Community and Municipal Relationships and shared services, such as Campus Safety.

Model B
The Task Force subsequently discussed further disaggregation in an attempt to better address variability of scale – although always mindful that the approaches being proposed will generate very significant and heated debate within the St George community! For example, one model would be to create three DIVISIONS: Health Sciences, Professional Faculties (for Architecture, Education, Engineering, Law, Management,) and Arts/Social Sciences/Sciences (Arts & Science, Forestry, Music, Information Studies and the Colleges).

Model C
An even bolder approach could involve reconfiguring existing Faculties into four DIVISIONS: for example, the Life Sciences and Health Sciences; Engineering and the Physical Sciences; Education, Law, Management, and Architecture; and, Social Sciences and Humanities. While some members of the Task Force found this alternative to be the

most interesting, and to provide the greatest opportunities for innovation, we fully acknowledge that this represents a major change in organizational culture for the University that warrants significant consultation with academic colleagues.

Regardless of whether there are two, three or four DIVISIONS on the St George campus, it is understood that while each Vice-President & Provost has a particular responsibility to the Faculties within his or her DIVISION, the Vice-Presidents & Provosts are expected to collaborate and cooperate on issues that are of concern and relevance to the St George campus as a whole, **as well as** to work collaboratively and collegially with the leadership at UTM and UTSC. To accomplish this, we have assumed that the Vice-Presidents & Provosts will form a Council, with a rotating Chair (an appropriate model to consider is that in place for the Council for First Entry Deans, which brings together Deans from Arts and Science, Engineering, Physical Education & Health, Music, UTM and UTSC to discuss issues of mutual interest and concern).

(b) Administrative Leadership

As we have outlined earlier, several of the larger Faculties indicated support for a change to the relationship between the central administrative offices and the services provided at the divisional level. To assist in its discussions, the Task Force reviewed existing organizational charts in the context of a System Model which led to the identification of three broad classes of administrative offices and services (as differentiated from Policies that guide the implementation of those services): those offices/services that support University wide issues; those offices/services that should support campus issues; and, on the St George campus, those offices/services that should support DIVISIONAL issues.

To illustrate, government relations, research ethics, technology transfer, the management of information, institutional planning and budget, negotiation of collective agreements, pensions and benefits, audit, oversight of financial matters, insurance, and so on are all examples of services that should be provided for the University as a whole. Student life, academic resources and library, community relations, international relations, equity offices, and shared services such as campus safety, campus environmental health and safety, utilities, maintenance, grounds keeping are examples of services that should be provided at the campus level. Finally, employee (HR) relations, enrolment planning, IT systems, alumni relations and advancement, building services, capital projects, divisional finances are examples of services that should be housed within a DIVISION.

Although the Task Force did discuss a variety of models for the administrative support to St George - and we provide an example of a possible model in Figure 2 - we decided that further discussion on our part was premature: The exploration of alternative administrative arrangements is best accomplished when the macro structure has been identified. In addition, the disaggregation of University versus campus versus DIVISIONAL services must be accomplished incrementally. We recommend, therefore, that issues pertaining to the administrative infrastructure be discussed once both the short term and the long term academic infrastructure for the St George campus has been determined.

Figure 2: Proposed Structural Model for the University of Toronto

ST GEORGE CAMPUS
(Model B)

Division 1 **Health Sciences**	**Division 2** **Professional Faculties**	**Division 3** **Arts, Social Sciences, Sciences**
Provost - Health Sciences Strategic/Academic Leadership Academic and Research Programs Budget/Finances/Capital Projects Employee Relations Advancement/Alumni Relations IT & Telecommunications	**Provost - Professional Faculties** Strategic/Academic Leadership Academic and Research Programs Budget/Finances/Capital Projects Employee Relations Advancement/Alumni Relations IT & Telecommunications	**Provost - Arts, Social Sciences, Sciences** Strategic/Academic Leadership Academic and Research Programs Budget/Finances/Capital Projects Employee Relations Advancement/Alumni Relations IT & Telecommunications

St George Campus Shared Services

Facilities/Services/Campus Safety/EHS
Student Life
International/Municipal/Community Relations
Library and Academic Resources
Strategic Communications

A post script: Although the Task Force members have tabled a number of options, we are extremely mindful that what we are proposing is very different from the status quo. We urge the University community to engage in further discussion to explore these and other options with a view to creating a structure that fully addresses our institutional aspirations.

Section 8   Considerations, Deliberations & Recommendations with respect to Creating and Supporting Communities for Students

Over the past several years, the University has placed ever increasing emphasis on supporting student learning, development and success. Indeed, one of the University's priority objectives is that "Every student will have the opportunity for an outstanding and unique experience at the University of Toronto" (*Performance Indicators for Governance, 2007: Measuring Up)*. Today's student life professionals have a far deeper understanding of how to engage undergraduates within the post secondary context; our understanding of the teaching and learning process is far more sophisticated than even ten years ago; and, we acknowledge that very diverse students require a range of very diverse strategies for engagement.

On the St George campus, the Federated and Constituent Colleges have taken a leadership role vis-à-vis creating communities for undergraduate arts and science students. The Colleges all have residences and endeavour to develop and maintain vibrant residence communities. All Colleges provide access to highly skilled faculty and professionals who can assist with writing, study skills and the like. The Colleges offer access to highly acclaimed specialist courses - for example the College 199 seminars, Vic One, Trinity One. The Colleges also reach out to their commuter students, providing study and activity space. In addition, they work with their student leaders to develop co- and extra-curricular programming for commuter and resident students alike.

More recently, in line with many peer institutions the University has focused on the development of other forms of communities for students, in particular, communities that are more closely linked to specific academic programs. Key examples include the First Year Learning Communities (FLCs) that provide first-year students with the opportunity to meet classmates, develop friendships, form study groups, and develop academic and personal skills. Another innovative program is *utmONE*, in which first-year management students are subdivided into small groups and then scheduled to take classes at common times, thereby facilitating a sense of cohesiveness and mutual support. Indeed, this core-course loading is used at UTM for many of its programs in year one. The Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering has focused on leadership within the profession, creating a student leadership development program "Leaders of Tomorrow" that provides leadership workshops, programming for women in engineering and other innovations to address the specific needs of their undergraduate students. UTSC is developing an e-portfolio learning system to enable students to track their personal and career-related achievements.

Although the University can point to a number of highly successful initiatives in support of student learning and development, including programs that utilize "student friendly" technology, the Task Force received a number of oral and written submissions noting the need for additional innovation. Such initiatives could include programs that link directly to the students' academic studies as well as programs that create and support not only undergraduate students but also communities of professional graduate and doctoral students. Student life professionals are also pointing to the important role that faculty can play by being involved with students in activities/communities outside the classroom. The Task force was also urged to address the 'information overload' reported by students: while a goal of broad and comprehensive communication is desirable, it is also important to provide the information at the time it is needed and in ways that are student friendly. In addition, we were urged to think not just about supporting "local" communities but also about ways to link our students to the larger University.

Principles

As was done for the earlier sections of this report, the Task Force elected first to develop a set of principles, informed by the submissions received, to guide the discussion and subsequent recommendations. In addition to the principles on page 7, we were guided by the following:

> *Just as the University of Toronto, as a whole, should be greater than the sum of its parts, a student's total experience at the University should be greater than the individual components that create that experience.*
>
> *Strategies to create communities for students should be expansive and diverse, reaching out to all undergraduate and graduate students - resident, commuter and international - and should acknowledge students' perspectives, needs, interests and challenges.*
>
> *Organizational structures and processes should support the development of academic communities for students at all levels.*
>
> *The benefits of technology to build and sustain communities should be balanced against the experience and value of personal interactions.*
>
> *Strategies to create communities for students should build upon existing innovation and should be advised by leading research and practice.*

What strategies might be adopted by the University?

First, with respect to the Federated and Constituent Colleges, while the Task Force received clear support for the continuation of the activities of the Colleges, *there was no support for the creation of additional Colleges on the St George campus or for creating*

Colleges at UTM or UTSC. The Task Force did hear support for broadening access to the Colleges to all first entry students, however, the submission from the St George College Principals stated that given current enrolments, it is not possible to "align" every first entry St George student with a College if this means granting full College membership to every such student. The Task Force is sympathetic to the view that without a significant decrease to the Faculty of Arts and Science undergraduate enrolment and/or significant increases to College resources, College affiliation for every first entry student is not feasible.

The College Principals did note, however, that affiliation with a College for students other than those in Arts and Science need not necessarily include access to specialized registrarial or academic counseling services since these are often more appropriately offered through the relevant departments and Faculties. The same may also hold true for academic support services. What could be contemplated, assuming appropriate enrolments/resources, would be a College affiliation for students in non Faculty of Arts and Science first entry Faculties that enabled them to participate in the College's extra-curricular activities and live in residence. The Task Force believes it would be highly desirable to provide such opportunities to all first entry students. (Note: Innis College and New College currently offer significant residence spaces to Engineering students; New College has, since its opening offered 50% of its residence space to students from professional faculties.) Assuming appropriate enrolment levels and resources, ***the Task Force is of the view that greater opportunities for College membership should be provided for undergraduates in all first entry programs***.

Second, as noted above, exemplary practice as well as leading research points to the desirability of establishing discipline and program based communities for undergraduate students. While many innovative programs are organized by students themselves – for example, mentoring, study groups - we also heard of a desire to enhance the opportunities for undergraduate students to interact with faculty, graduate students and post doctoral fellows. Such interactions can, and should, be supported by the relevant academic units and Colleges can play an active role in this regard. For many students, interactions with faculty are limited to their specific program – and the courses are often large. ***The Task Force would support steps to increase faculty presence in the Colleges*** – for example through the provision of Offices on a permanent or "fixed-term" basis – so that students have an opportunity to meet informally with faculty from a range of disciplines.

Another possibility is to enhance the academic programming offered by the Colleges on behalf of the Faculty of Arts and Science. ***Colleges could house Centres, Institutes and other EDUs***, where such arrangements would be mutually advantageous. The Colleges might also be an appropriate home for an undergraduate program offered by a Centre/Institute that does not have an undergraduate "department". ***The Colleges could act as incubators for new interdisciplinary programs***, creating opportunities that may not be available through departments. College libraries also play a significant role in supporting student learning. The Task Force agrees that ***college libraries should continue to support learning*** – through the provision of study space, access to IT, writing centres and the like.

Third, in terms of residence opportunities, the Task Force did not undertake a comprehensive analysis of the current and future need for additional residence space. *We do recommend, however, that the University maintain a 'watching brief' on the desirability for increased residence capacity for graduate students as well as international students; also, the residence needs of UTM and UTSC deserve further analysis*. We also concur with the College Principals that the University's recruitment strategy should be more closely aligned with first year residence offers.

Fourth, leaders within the field of student learning, student development and instructional theory have, in recent years, focused on developing instructional methods that assume more active participation in their own learning and development by the students themselves. The FLCs are one example, as are *utmOne,* the UTSC e-portfolios, Vic One as well as the student to student mentoring programs common for many courses. The Task Force would certainly support the expansion of such programs to ensure that all first year students have an opportunity to access these or equivalent programs. Once this is achieved, we would support expansion of these programs into the upper years, as appropriate.

A different initiative involves the Centre for Community Partnerships, a Centre established to promote and support partnerships with community organizations that are defined, sustainable and action oriented. Through the establishment of collaborative academic and co-curricular service-learning opportunities, students engage their academic knowledge with the social, cultural, ethical, and political dimensions of civic life. *Such initiatives also provide important opportunities for faculty to engage with students outside the classroom.*

The Task Force was encouraged to support the increased involvement of undergraduate students in ongoing research activities. The University celebrates its contributions to research and development and our undergraduate students have indicated a desire for greater involvement. Such involvement does not have to be restricted to participation in faculty research activities but might also include doctoral research and research led by post doctoral fellows.

Finally, alumni often express an interest in contributing to student engagement and development. Alumni frequently play a proactive role in student recruitment; they act as positive ambassadors of the University; many agree to serve as mentors and role models – an especially important contribution for those students who do not see themselves reflected in the faculty.

Clearly, building upon existing initiatives as well as developing new and innovative programs for undergraduate students will require close collaboration between academic divisions, the Colleges, student life professionals and student leaders themselves.

Fifth, the Task Force was reminded that the University of Toronto offers an experience that is unique; just as close to 90% of our faculty and staff report that they are proud to be a member of this community (*Speaking UP Employee Experience Survey, October 2006*),

so too should our students. Yet we have few ways to celebrate the "Institutional" experience with our students or to instill pride in being members of this University. While we may never have a football team that will draw a weekend audience of 40 to 50,000 spectators – as some of our peers to the South are able to do - the University should explore ways of creating an *institutional spirit and culture* within our diverse student body.

Sixth, with respect to supporting *communities for professional graduate students*, the professional faculties themselves play a very active role. Indeed, supporting graduates for entry into the professional field is a critical component of the Health Science Programs, as it is for Education, Engineering, Law, Management etc., and should continue to be so. The situation is somewhat different for doctoral students. As noted by the Dean of SGS, as well as the UTM submission, several of our peer institutions are actively exploring ways of creating communities for doctoral students that extend beyond discipline boundaries. Examples include the provision of social and community spaces, access to child and family care supports, the availability of quiet space to reflect – a commodity often in short supply to those of our graduate students with family responsibilities and no access to a private office on a regular basis. The Task Force is very supportive of such initiatives.

Seventh, in terms of communication, all members of this community dislike being bombarded constantly with information on issues about which they care little and/or have little or no time to attend to. We all prefer easily accessible information, provided on a "Just in Time" basis and via media with which we are most comfortable. The Task Force concurs that *greater attention should be placed on developing optimal ways to communicate with the vast student body at the University.* Such optimization should build upon the excellent practices already underway in several departments and divisions.

Summary of Recommendations regarding communities for students

The University of Toronto demonstrates increasing willingness to engage in the development of exemplary, innovative communities for students at all levels and across all disciplines. The University has also demonstrated a commitment to extending and supporting scholarship on student learning, student development and student success. As well, the University has demonstrated a commitment to establishing community partnerships in support of students. In light of this, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

1.   *The organizational structure of the University must enable and facilitate continued innovation regarding undergraduate, professional graduate and doctoral student engagement.*

2.   *Distinct campus, college, faculty/division and student cultures should be balanced against increased collaboration and enhanced communication both within and across faculties/ divisions as well as the university as a whole.*

3.   *Adequate and suitable space to accommodate individual and group study, social events, faculty-student interaction external to the classroom, for undergraduate and graduate students, should be factored into the University's space and facilities planning.*

4.   *Where appropriate, alumni should be encouraged and welcomed to engage with students.*

5.   *To facilitate the development of a greater sense of community, academic and non-academic events that bring together students of different levels of study and from different disciplines and programs should be encouraged.*

6.   *The Federated and Constituent Colleges should be supported and encouraged to increase faculty and graduate student presence and to provide opportunities for College membership to St George campus students in all first entry programs.*

Appendix I
Task Force on Institutional Organization Questions

A.   Academic and Administrative Relationships

There are a variety of ways in which the three campuses could be organized – on a continuum from complete autonomy to greater integration than at present. Your view of where the University should rest on that continuum will, of course, have implications for programmatic, administrative, financial, and human resource structures and services etc. Alternatively, your preferred vision with respect to the academic relationship between the 3 campuses for example, or administrative relationships, may imply a different organizational model.

In responding to the questions below please indicate if you are assuming the status quo in terms of the overall organizational model. If you are assuming a change, please describe your alternative structure.

Regardless of the model you select, the goal should be to ensure that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

A1   Academic Relationships

1.   What is the preferred relationship between UTM/UTSC/St George with respect to undergraduate, professional, graduate and doctoral stream academic programs?

        What configuration will optimize and promote collegiality, fairness, flexibility and quality?

2.   What differentiation of undergraduate, professional, graduate and doctoral stream academic programs across the 3 campuses should be achieved?

3.   For each campus, what is the optimal mix of graduate students to undergraduates?

4.   What differentiation of pedagogy/program delivery should be encouraged across the 3 campuses?

5.   Should U of T consider establishing additional campuses and if so under what conditions and for what reasons? Are three campuses sufficient to meet the current and future needs of the University?

6.   What partnerships with other post secondary institutions might be synergistic for the delivery, quality and variety of programs?

A2   Administrative Relationships

7.   Are the current Vice-Presidential, central service and administrative
        responsibilities and authority appropriately distributed across St George, UTM,
        UTSC? If not, what changes should be considered in order to better meet the
        needs of faculty, staff and students?

8.   What administrative/structural improvements would optimize flexibility, agility,
        and facilitate speedy decision making in each campus and across the University as
        a whole?

9.   How might we optimize the use of technology for administrative purposes?

10.   How might consolidation/sharing of services to small divisions enhance
        effectiveness and efficiency? How might a revised consolidation/sharing of
        services across the three campuses enhance effectiveness and efficiency?

11.   What *administrative structure* would optimize the support the University could
        provide for teaching and research - within the current financial parameters; within
        an enhanced financial environment?

B.   Creating Communities for Students

**The responsibility for creating communities for students currently rests with
multiple divisions – Faculties; Federated and Constituent Colleges; St George, UTM
and UTSC Central Student Services – and they create those communities in a
variety of ways, from residences to first year learning communities, to special
College programs and so on.**

1.   In your view, what are the optimal ways to create communities
                for undergraduate students?
                for professional students?
                for graduate students?

        What is the role of technology in creating/supporting communities?

        How should the needs of commuter students best be addressed?

        What is the optimal mix of commuter/residence students? How would additional
        residences be funded? Is this sustainable over 30 years?

2.   How should the colleges evolve by 2030? This question should be considered
        with reference to such factors as the following: faculty members and colleges;
        academic programming; libraries; residences; organizational relations with the
        Faculty of Arts & Science and other divisions of the University. In addition, the
        following questions in "Towards 2030" should be considered:

(a) How can the federated universities and colleges be empowered so as to contribute even more successfully to the undergraduate student experience? How can this occur without creating gridlock in academic planning at the departmental or divisional level?

(b) Should college admissions be more sensitive to students' programs, allowing greater differentiation of student profiles across colleges? Or, if greater alignment is deemed to narrow the student experience through a more homogeneous peer group in each college, then what is our vision of the ideal mix of disciplines to promote a diverse environment for undergraduate student life?

(c) Currently, the college system is associated primarily with the Faculty of Arts & Science. Should we ensure that first-entry students on the St. George campus from all faculties are aligned with colleges and the associated residence opportunities?

3.   Should additional Colleges be created on the St. George campus for students not currently served by the existing colleges? (This category of students should be interpreted broadly, as including not only students who are not members of colleges, but also those students who are members of colleges but who are nevertheless not currently "served" by their colleges.)

Should Colleges be established at UTM and UTSC?

4.   What broad principles should govern the allocation of resources among colleges, divisions, and the University's central administration?

What administrative structure would ensure that there is a seamless transition between the various offices and units?

C.   Research Institutions & Industry Partners

The University has developed a number of partnerships with external research institutes, including of course, highly productive relationships with the research and teaching hospitals. The University also has a number of industrial partners.

1.   What should be the goal of establishing these partnerships?

2.   How might the University's relationships with the external research institutions and industry partners be further enhanced?

3.   To what extent should such partnerships include national and global relationships?

Appendix II

**List of Individuals, Groups and Areas Invited to Respond to
the Task Force Questions**

Dr. Richard Alway, President, St. Michael's College

Dean Christina Amon, Faculty of Applied Science & Engineering

Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU)

Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS)

Alfred Cheng, Chief Administrative Officer, University of Toronto Library

Council of Health Science Deans c/o Dean David Mock, Faculty of Dentistry

Louise Cowin, Warden, Hart House

CUPE 1230 (Library Workers full-time and part-time)

CUPE 3261 (Service Workers full-time & part-time)

CUPE 3902 (Teaching Assistants and Sessional Lecturers)

Catherine Gagne, Chief Administrative Officer, Faculty of Applied Science &
Engineering

Dean Jane Gaskell, OISE/UT

Professor Paul Gooch, President, Victoria University

Graduate Students' Union (GSU)

Dean Roger Martin, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

Carole Moore, Chief Librarian

Professor Andy Orchard, Provost, Trinity College

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga
(UTM)

Dean Susan Pfeiffer, School of Graduate Studies

Ramune Pleinys, Chief Administrative Officer, Faculty of Medicine

Principals of the St George Colleges c/o Professor Derek Allen, Dean of Arts, Trinity College

Professional Faculties c/o Dean George Baird, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape & Design

Registrars c/o Karel Swift, University Registrar and Director, Admissions and Awards

Scarborough Campus Students' Union (SCSU)

Dean Pekka Sinervo, Faculty of Arts & Science

Union Stewards for the Skilled Trades Bargaining Units

United Steelworkers of America (USW)

University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA)

U of T Mississauga Student Union (UTMSU)

University of Toronto Students' Union (U.T.S.U.)

Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President & Principal, University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC)

Joe Weinberg, Chief Administrative Officer, OISE/UT

Dean Catharine Whiteside, Faculty of Medicine

Mary-Ellen Yeomans, Assistant Dean, Administration & CAO, Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

Appendix III
Submissions and Research

The Task Force would like to acknowledge the following individuals, divisions and groups who provided written submissions:

Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design c/o Professor George Baird, Dean (General Submission)

Faculty of Arts & Science Council (General Submission)

Graduate Students' Union (GSU)

Faculty of Medicine c/o Dr. Catharine Whiteside, Dean of Medicine and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions

Dean Sioban Nelson, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing; Dean David Mock, Faculty of Dentistry; Dean Wayne Hindmarsh, Lesley Dan Faculty of Pharmacy (Joint General Submission)

Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-Provost, Graduate Education

Faculty of Physical Education and Health (General Submission)

Principals of the St George Colleges c/o Professor Derek Allen, Dean of Arts, Trinity College

Retired Academics and Librarians (RALUT) (General Submission)

School of Continuing Studies (General Submission)

Single Department Faculties c/o Professor George Baird, Chair, Deans of Single Department Faculties (General Submission)

Student Life Professionals Group (General Submission)

University of Toronto Library c/o Carole Moore, Chief Librarian

University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) c/o Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal (General Submission)

University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) c/o Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal

The Task Force would like also to acknowledge the following individuals who met with the Task Force and generously shared their knowledge, experiences and opinions:

Professor Derek Allen, Dean of Arts, Trinity College

Professor Gage Averill, Vice-Principal & Dean, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)

Professor Robert Berdahl, previous Chancellor of the University of California Berkeley

Professor Tony Chambers, Associate Vice-Provost, Students

Diane Crocker, Registrar and Director of Enrolment Management, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)

Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life

Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President & Provost

Graham Kemp, Director, Administrative Management Systems (AMS)

Professor Ulrich Krull, Vice-Principal Research and Vice Dean Graduate, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)

Professor George Luste, President, University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA) and Eric Comartin, Executive Director, UTFA

Tim McTiernan, Assistant Vice-President, Research and Executive Director, TIG

President David Naylor

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)

Mark Overton, Dean of Student Affairs, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)

Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-Provost, Graduate Education

Angela Regnier, Executive Director and Dave Scrivener, Vice-President, External, University of Toronto Students' Union (U.T.S.U.)

Christina Sass-Kortsak, Assistant Vice-President, Human Resources

Professor Pekka Sinervo, Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science

Elizabeth Sisam, Assistant Vice-President, Campus and Facilities Planning

Jane Stirling, Director, Marketing and Communications, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)

Professor Franco Vaccarino, Vice-President and Principal, University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) and staff, faculty, and student representatives of the UTSC community

Dr. Catharine Whiteside, Dean of Medicine and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions

Professor Safwat Zaky, Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget

The Task Force undertook the following research:

Internal Publications Reviewed:

2006 NSSE Survey Results

A Framework for Graduate Expansion 2004-05 to 2009-10

Enrolment Report 2006-07: Actual and Projected Enrolment

Facts and Figures, University of Toronto, 2006

Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses, May 21, 2002

Leaders *of* Tomorrow, Engineering Student Leadership Development Program, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, Fall Report 2007

Outline of the Organization of the University of Toronto, Information Manual for the Governing Council of the University of Toronto, November, 2007

Policies and Procedures on Academic Appointments, October 30, 2003, *Policies for Academic Staff and Librarians*

The Bulletin, University of Toronto (various issues)

the VARSITY, University of Toronto (various issues)

External Publications Reviewed:

Facts and Figures: A Compendium of Statistics on Ontario Universities, Council of Ontario Universities, 2006

Websites Reviewed:

University of Toronto:

2006 NSSE Survey Results:
http://www.utoronto.ca/aboutuoft/accountabilityreports.htm

A Framework for Graduate Expansion 2004-05 to 2009-10:
http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/Assets/publication/Reports/grad/ep05.pdf

Enrolment Report 2006-07: Actual and Projected Enrolment:
http://www.utoronto.ca/aboutuoft/accountabilityreports.htm

Office of the Governing Council:
http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/site3.aspx

School of Graduate Studies:
http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/

External:

Arizona, The University of:
http://www.arizona.edu

California System, The University of:
    http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/aboutuc/welcome.html
    http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/aboutuc/masterplan.html
    http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/future/

City University of New York, The (CUNY):
http://portal.cuny.edu

Cornell University:
http://www.cornell.edu

Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of:
http://www.publicaffairs.uiuc.edu/facts/facts.html

Michigan, University of:
http://www.umich.edu

Minnesota, University of:
http://www1.umn.edu

Ohio State University, The:
http://www.osu.edu

Pittsburgh, University of:
http://www.pitt.edu

Rutgers University:
http://ruweb.rutgers.edu/about-the-university.shtml

Texas System, The University of:
http://www.utsystem.edu/about/

Washington, University of:
http://www.washington.edu

Wisconsin System, The University of:
http://www.wisconsin.edu/about/

<div align="center">

Appendix IV

Summary of U.S. System Models

</div>

There appear to be two (2) models – A) systems with autonomous campuses; and, B) systems in which the system office also runs the flag ship campus(es):

A: System Office runs system only

California (10 campuses)

> System President
        Provost and Exec VP Academic and Health Affairs
        Exec VPs – CFO, Business Ops, University Affairs
> 10 Chancellors plus the Director of the National Lab

Illinois (3 main campuses)

> System President
        VPs Ac Affairs, Admin, and Economic Dev
> 3 Chancellors

Texas (9 campuses + 6 Health Science Centres)

> System Chancellor
        Exec VC Academic Affairs
        Exec VC Health Affairs
        Exec VC Bus Affairs
        VCs Strategic Management, Administration
> 9 Presidents report to Exec VC Academic Affairs
> 6 Presidents report to Exec VC Health Affairs

Wisconsin (26 campuses – 2 offer doctoral programs; 13 offer masters; 11 offer 2 year degrees)

> System President
> 26 Chancellors

B: System Office runs main campus and system

Arizona (3 campuses)

> System President
        Exec VP and Provost
> Branch campus undergrad only (to upgrade college degrees)
> New campus for Medical faculties

Ohio State (5 campuses)

> System President
>   Exec VP and Provost
>   All Deans etc report to Exec VP and Prov
> 4 Deans (regional campuses) report to Exec VP and Provost

Michigan (3 campuses)

> System President
>   Prov and Exec VP
> 2 Chancellors who report to System President

Minnesota (4 campuses)

> System President
>   Senior VP Academic & Prov
>   Senior VP Health Sciences
>   Senior VP System Academic Administration
> 3 Chancellors who report to the President

Washington (3 campuses)

> System President
>   Provost and Exec VP
>   Exec VP Medical Affairs
>   All other VPs report to the President/Provost's office
> 2 Chancellors (satellite campuses) – very limited program offerings at each. They
report to the System Pres/Prov