

# **Faculty of Arts & Science Towards 2030 Task Force Submission**

26 November 2007

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this brief introduction is to highlight those issues raised by the Towards 2030 document that are key from the Faculty of Arts and Science perspective. The submission then proceeds to address the five sets of questions raised in the Towards 2030 document directly.

As the Faculty of Arts & Science looks to the future in responding to Towards 2030, we do so from the perspective of our long tradition as a leader in the generation and dissemination of knowledge. Our principles that drive changes in the Faculty and our approach to the future rest firmly on our belief that both generating knowledge through research and disseminating knowledge through educating our students are done best when they are closely integrated.

Our faculty have led the country in the shaping of their disciplines since the earliest days of the University. We have in the past quarter century understood more clearly how our students benefit from the research-intensive nature of our academic mission: contact with the leading minds in the field creates the most stimulating environment for graduate and undergraduate education. We see no reason to alter this dimension of what we do so well and what has made us strong.

Keeping this in mind, we have identified the student experience as our top priority. This has not always been possible given the decentralized nature of the Faculty and University. In the last 10 years, however, we have made the student experience a deliberate priority and viewed all planning and implementation for change through that lens. Our strategic deployment of teaching-stream faculty hires have allowed us to put creative teaching staff where students would benefit most. And our recent curriculum renewal exercise is just the latest instance: every recommendation was designed to provide our students with a better undergraduate education and a better experience overall during their time with us.

With a division as large, complex and established as Arts & Science, change to a more student-centered focus takes time. The year 2030 may seem a long way off, but we expect that the full effects of these changes may not be felt until we are much closer to that date, even as we press hard on implementing those changes we have recently identified. We are fully committed to this campaign. We wish to understand better the expectations and hopes our students bring into the Faculty, confident they align well with our own institutional ideals, and work out fully how our curricular and co-curricular interactions with our students can best meet our mutual aspirations.

A key component of this effort is our plan to reduce the size of our undergraduate enrolment. Everything we do, everything our students experience, and everything we hope to do has been put at risk by the sheer pressure of undergraduate student numbers in recent years. We recognize our public responsibilities as an Ontario university; however, we also insist that we have a responsibility to provide a superlative educational experience as a part of the province's and the nation's premier university. As part of that responsibility, we plan continued growth in our graduate enrolment, as that will increase both our research capacity and teaching capacity for our undergraduates.

The colleges are an important element of the Faculty's future as we look toward 2030. We see in them an invaluable asset to our mission and essential partners in addressing our top priorities. Evolution and deliberate effort have both helped to clarify our respective roles and mutual expectations. But we have only started to tap the potential benefits to our students that close,

coordinated cooperation can make possible. We see the colleges as a vital part of an engaging student experience in the year 2030.

We support the maintenance of a three-campus arrangement. Differentiation at the undergraduate and masters level partnered with the strength of a combined graduate professoriate is an effective combination. We are at the early stages of coordination and differentiation given the recent three-campus realignment, but we believe that a well-planned arrangement of three campuses for undergraduate and graduate arts and science education, ensuring that quality of education continues to improve, is the most effective configuration for the University.

As we plan for the University's future, the Faculty remains committed to fairness and equity in all its dealings – addressing the diverse needs of our students, respecting a vigorous interchange of diverse ideas, recruiting a diverse professoriate, and especially maintaining access to our rich educational resources on the basis of intellectual and academic merit rather than social or economic advantage. All these goals should underpin the University's planning for the future as they will the Faculty's.

With these Faculty priorities identified at the outset, we turn now to addressing the specific questions posed by Towards 2030 that appear most relevant to the Faculty.

## **Section 1 Questions**

1. Given the current constraints on per-student grants and our focus on optimizing the undergraduate student experience, should we maintain our current emphasis on scholarship, or tilt the institutional balance towards more investment in undergraduate education?
2. Are there novel and cost-effective ways to create a better pedagogic environment for undergraduates that have not been fully explored? Examples include increasing the number of teaching-stream faculty, recruiting alumni mentors, augmenting work-study and co-operative programs, better deploying e-learning technologies, modularizing curricula, and relying more on half-courses or three-semester programs.
3. If we believe that research-intensiveness is indeed one of the University's defining features, how can we leverage our research strength to create a more powerful and engaging experience for first- and second-entry undergraduates and professional master's candidates?
4. Are we investing appropriately in information technology and information resources, including libraries?
5. Are there core competencies that we believe all our undergraduates should acquire before receiving a baccalaureate degree from the University of Toronto?
6. Are there courses or themes that can serve to unify or define our varied degree offerings in undergraduate education? If so, how can they be taught so as to draw on our comparative strengths in scholarship?
7. Are there emerging disciplines or global challenges where the University has research strengths and could do more to establish an educational presence?

8. Independent of absolute enrolment targets, what is the most appropriate balance of undergraduate, professional and research-stream graduate programs? What is the appropriate balance between domestic and international students?
9. What are the barriers to international student enrolment growth and how can we surmount them?
10. Given current constraints in federal research funding, how can we foster the optimum environment for graduate studies in the doctoral stream?
11. Given the federal and provincial governments' emphasis on knowledge translation and commercialization of university research, how do we maintain basic research while creating the structures, culture, and incentives that will promote the transfer and uptake of new ideas?

## Section 1: An Arts & Science Response

The issues thoughtfully raised in this section are at the core of the Faculty's mission: undergraduate education. Question #1 raises the question of whether the University's priorities are properly aligned with the dual missions of education and knowledge creation. Our culture, as evidenced in the priority traditionally given to research accomplishments in the hiring of our tenure-stream staff, in our tenure and promotions review and how departments evaluate themselves with respect to similar units in peer institutions and in the Towards 2030 discussion, is tilted toward scholarship. **The current emphasis and focus on the quality of teaching and learning and on the overall undergraduate student experience has started a shift in culture that, in the view of the Faculty, is an important evolutionary step.** The introduction of new programs and structures that support this shift – for example, First-Year Learning Communities, the Teaching Academy and the Student Experience Fund – are indicative of this change.

At the same time, the Faculty believes that there is much more to do here. We are still working to fully understand why our students assess the overall experience in the Faculty as being less favourable than peer institutions (as demonstrated in the NSSE scores). Some of our undergraduates are not provided the consistently high-quality learning environment we strive for in all of our programs. We are limited in the number of significant research and international experiences we can provide our students. And we need to develop a better understanding of the nature of the student experience – perhaps focusing as much on improving existing programs that under-perform from the perspective of our students, as creating more of the outstanding experiences that we give priority to. **In sum, we must continue to make strategic investments in undergraduate education as we move toward 2030.**

Questions #2, 3 and 4 all relate to strategies by which we can improve the overall learning experience for our students. In many respects, Arts & Science has taken a lead in making some of the changes suggested here. **We have increased our teaching-stream staff over the last ten years, both proportionately and in absolute numbers, with the increases targeted to those areas where there are strong curricular benefits.** Examples include lecturers taking leadership roles in undergraduate science education and in coordinating our language programs. However, we have not made use of alumni to the extent possible, given the Faculty has over 300,000 living alumni with the majority residing in the GTA. The Faculty has strategically not given priority to work-study and co-op programs for two reasons. We have recognized that such programs require dedicated resources to mount. We have also recognized that such programs have been a priority for UTSC, becoming one of the ways that UTSC has differentiated from the Faculty and UTM.

We do see that the research-intensiveness of the Faculty and the University is one of the ways we differentiate the Arts & Science undergraduate experience from that of other institutions. In 2006-07, approximately 2,000 students participated in one of the significant research experiences offered to our students. While a large number, it still is not a majority of our students. **We must continue to invest here to provide an intensely engaging experience for our students and to press our strategic institutional advantage.**

The Faculty affirms our need for more investment in information technology and other information resources. Information literacy is one of the competencies we have identified in our Curriculum Renewal as a key degree goal. Our students must be able to use the most up-to-date technology in order to be able to develop this competency. In that regard, the Faculty is strongly supportive of the investments in the central library system.

Question #5 relates directly to the results of the recent Faculty Curriculum Renewal process. **The Faculty has identified five core competencies as being essential degree goals: critical and creative thinking, communication skills, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and ethical thinking and decision-making.** The Faculty is currently engaged in the implementation of these degree outcomes in a systematic manner. At the moment, some of these goals are being achieved for all students. The Faculty is committed to ensuring that all students meet our standard in each of these areas.

Question #6 and 7 ask, in different ways, whether there are specific themes or curricular areas we could or should emphasize to unify what we are doing at the undergraduate level. **The broad discussion in the Faculty's recent curriculum review determined that, when searching for unifying principles, we should focus on cognitive and intellectual competencies and a broad range of subject areas rather than on identifying common area of subject content that all students should share.** Hence, besides learning in a research-intensive context, our students are provided a unique experience because of the breadth of programs of study they have to choose from, encouraging them to consider a broad-based approach to their undergraduate education. That our students share this approach is reflected in the fact that a majority of them choose to complete their honours degrees with either two independent major programs, or a major and two minor programs. They are acting on the curricular flexibility they have available.

The Faculty has already identified specific areas where curricular investment is necessary – examples include the study of Asia and the biological sciences. However, these are best defined by consistent and disciplined multi-year planning, as has been the practice for the last decade, as opposed to attempting to anticipate changes in the 2030 timeframe.

Question #8 asks a critical question regarding what we believe would be the appropriate balance of undergraduate, professional masters and doctoral stream students. The Faculty currently has approximately 22,000 full-time undergraduate students, 130 professional masters students and 3,100 doctoral-stream students. Presuming that we are able to meet our current enrolment plans, in 2011/2012 the Faculty will consist of approximately 20,000 undergraduates, perhaps 200 professional masters students and 3,700 doctoral-stream students. **This results in an increase in the proportion of graduate enrolment from 12.8% in 2007/2008 to 16.3% in 2011/2012.** The Faculty sees this as a very positive development. The decreased undergraduate enrolment would improve engagement between the teaching staff and students. The increased doctoral-stream enrolment will increase our research capacity, and will increase the teaching resources available to the undergraduate program.

Is this the right balance? **If given the opportunity, the Faculty would prefer to have even a higher proportion of graduate enrolment, to ease our high overall student-faculty ratios.** However, the Faculty has concerns regarding supervisory capacity in specific areas, and these would have to be addressed in order to support such a shift.

Question #9 focuses on an issue that the Faculty has had some experience with – the increase in international undergraduate enrolment. The Faculty has seen a large increase in international students over the last six years. Since we admit both domestic and international applicants to the same academic standard, this rise has been driven by the academic quality of the international applicants relative to the domestic applicant pool: **Between 2001/2002 and 2005/2006, the number of international students admitted annually to the Faculty rose from 433 to 860 students. This has been a welcome development, given that these academically-gifted students assist us to internationalize the Faculty and strengthen our international reputation.** With this increase, we have been increasingly concerned about the experience unique to the international student. A working group within the Faculty has met over the last several years to identify ways we can improve the transition experience for these students, as well as the support they receive on campus. The Faculty is aware that international student recruitment is a critical activity if we are to increase – or even maintain – existing international enrolments, and has put its own resources into this. It will be essential that these recruitment efforts remain well-coordinated across the University.

Question #10 is a critical one for the Faculty as well as UTM and UTSC, given that the three divisions have taken a leadership role in the University to implement a historic funding guarantee for our doctoral and doctoral-stream graduate students starting in 2001/2002. However, this funding guarantee depends on external sources such as federal granting council funding. Of the \$63 million provided to Arts & Science graduate students in 2005/2006, almost one-third is external (\$10 million from research grants held by principal investigators and over \$10 million from granting council or Ontario government scholarships). **Our ability to maintain graduate student support at current levels – or increase it to levels comparable to our American peers – will depend on increased research grant support. This is a fundamental constraint on our ability to increase graduate enrolment and support our graduate students.**

Our ability to improve our graduate programs in this environment is indeed challenged. However, the Faculty believes that much can be done to improve the graduate research environment that does not rely on grant support. Improving the consistency of supervision, graduate student space and support for professionalization of our graduate students are all efforts that depend less on external funding and more on how we prioritize our resources. Assessment of the quality of the academic experience and student life using tools such as the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (GPSS) assist in these efforts, as they provide measures that we can use to focus attention and resources.

Question #11 suggests there is a conflict between the creation of knowledge and its dissemination. **Although there are cultural issues that tend to give priority to scholarship, we have clear examples of departments that have been able to give priority to both knowledge creation and translation without compromise to either.** One of our departments – chemistry – has the largest number of invention disclosures in the University and has one of the highest publication rates. Our Institute of Optical Sciences pioneered Entrepreneurship 101, a unique graduate course now offered by MarS that attracts several hundred students each year who are interested in how to translate discoveries into inventions that benefit society. More can be done here, especially around defining the appropriate accountability measures for such activity, and the Faculty supports the efforts already underway to better align central services to the needs of the inventors and the investor community. Better communication of the positive effects of successful innovation is one strategy that hasn't been widely employed, but would assist in adjusting the traditional culture.

## Section 2 Questions

1. What is the optimum student enrolment for the University overall, and for each of the three campuses?
2. From a system-wide standpoint, there are a number of options the University might consider when reflecting on its participation in the Greater Toronto Area during a period of increasing participation rates and enrolment growth. They are not mutually exclusive and include:
  1. Limit further undergraduate enrolment increases, assuming that students will move out of region to other universities in the 'Golden Horseshoe' and beyond
  2. Develop a fourth University of Toronto campus in a region of the GTA with high population growth
  3. Increase enrolment across one or more of the three campuses to the greatest extent possible
  4. Develop partnerships with one or more colleges to facilitate transfers to degree programs, or with other universities outside the GTA to assist their entry into the GTA market
  5. Work collaboratively with government, colleges, and university partners to create another university in the GTA.

In light of the long-term position of the University, which of these (or other) options should be advanced?

3. Assuming a particular enrolment or growth scenario, what is the optimum blend of domestic and international students? Do absolute growth targets alter our institutional views about the optimum balance of undergraduate and graduate students?
4. The University of Toronto's enrolment has been described as 'two Gs' (GTA and Global). What type of students are we seeking to enrol and from what geographic areas? Given those goals, do we have the right methods of recruitment and selection?

## **Section 2: An Arts & Science Response**

The Faculty of Arts & Science has focused attention in its planning efforts on how to manage enrolment. As outlined in *Towards 2030*, the University has had to accommodate over 2002-2007 the increase in undergraduate enrolment arising from the "double cohort." The original strategy, adopted in 2002, was to allow for significant increases in admissions in all divisions strategically. In the case of the three arts & science divisions, the plan was to temporarily increase admissions in the Faculty of Arts & Science with slower increases at UTM and UTSC, and then reduce admissions in the Faculty and maintain admissions levels on the other two campuses.

Enrolment planning was made more complex by the Faculty's decision in 1999 to eliminate the 15-course degree. This had the ultimate effect of increasing enrolments in 4<sup>th</sup>-year by over 1,000 students, given constant admissions. Hence, the overall enrolment of the Faculty was expected to rise independent of a change in admissions. The Faculty's total enrolment did indeed peak at approximately 23,000 full-time students in 2005/2006, and has now started to decrease somewhat with the graduation of the double cohort.

This surge in enrolment has placed an unprecedented stress on all the Faculty's resources. Where the stress was perhaps most evident was in upper-year life science courses with laboratory components in the 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 years. The relevant departments successfully made

additional course sections available, but primarily through employing sessional lecturers and senior graduate students. However, departments such as Political Science and Economics also experienced unprecedented undergraduate teaching demands.

Given this recent history, the Faculty's own view on Question #1 is that we now have undergraduate enrolments that exceed any reasonable relation to our optimal capacity. Our effective undergraduate student-faculty ratio is approximately 25, and this limits what we can do to provide the critical student-faculty engagement for developing the critical thinking and communication skills that form part of our degree goals. If we were to keep our overall teaching staff levels as they currently are, we would need a reduction in enrolment from 22,000 to approximately 17,000 to achieve a student-faculty ratio of 20, commensurate with our peers and comparable to levels in the Faculty twenty years ago. This would require a 25% decrease in undergraduate enrolment from current levels – would also require a \$60-70 million annual increase in Faculty revenue to offset the drop in revenue from undergraduate sources.

Given this perspective, we can definitively respond to Question #2: **The Faculty recommends decreases in undergraduate enrolment as we move toward 2030.**

Questions #3 and 4 have already been addressed in part in our response to Question #9 of Section 1. The broader issue of our admissions practice is one that the Faculty has only recently started to address, as we work to create a student body that is most likely to achieve the learning outcomes we have identified as central to undergraduate education. **As we clarify our degree goals through Curriculum Renewal, we can examine how we can align our recruitment and admissions practices to best create a student body most able to meet these educational goals.**

### Section 3 Questions

1. Are we maximizing all our current sources of revenue? If not, which ones can be enhanced without adversely affecting the institution in other respects?
2. What advocacy strategies should be put in place to address those areas where federal and provincial support is failing to cover our costs, or insufficient to ensure that we can give our students the quality of education that they deserve?
3. What funding blend (as between enhanced per-student grants and increased tuition revenues) would be the most sustainable to support the University's long-term position as a leading publicly-assisted research university? Have we got the right mix of students in relation to our complement and staff so as to maximize net revenues while sustaining our core mission?
4. Given the likelihood of ongoing constraints on per-student grants, how can we strengthen the quality of education for our students and improve the quality of the working life of faculty and staff?
5. Can accessibility be sustained or even enhanced in the context of a more flexible tuition policy based on earned autonomy? Should more programs be fully self-funded? If so, how do we ensure that student debt-loads and part-time work activities are constrained rather than increased?
6. Should we change our approach to fund-raising so as to put more emphasis on expendable gifts and capital projects?

7. Have we put in place the right structures and processes to facilitate commercialization of university-based research? Have we built an effective commercialization enterprise with our research hospital partners? How can we ensure that knowledge translation for better public policy and successful communities receives attention alongside traditional market-facing commercialization activities?
8. Have we taken the right steps in anticipating the future costs of utilities and utilities-related infrastructure at U of T? Do we have the right financial model for our pension plan, or should employer and employee contributions be raised?
9. Are we containing all unnecessary expenses? If not, which expenses can be reduced without adversely affecting our mission?

### **Section 3: An Arts & Science Response**

The Faculty of Arts & Science appreciates the need to have effective strategies to increase the revenues for the institution overall, and the undergraduate and graduate teaching missions that are central to the work of the Faculty. This is made even more pressing by the fact that the current model for funding domestic undergraduate enrolment is not sustainable, even in the relatively short term. Hence, most of the questions in this section are relevant to the Faculty, though perhaps the issue of revenue generation is the most critical.

The Faculty's primary revenue source comes from its undergraduate teaching activities: government grant for domestic students, domestic student tuition and international student tuition, in order of size. While domestic and international tuitions can be increased by 4-5% per annum, the single largest source – government grant funding – has been essentially frozen on a per-student basis for a number of years. **While overall costs are rising at a rate of between 4 to 5% per year – over \$10 million per year – our total revenue from undergraduate tuition is only rising at approximately half that rate.**

The Faculty agrees that the University should give priority to maximizing all possible sources of revenue consistent with its mission. In this regard, the Faculty has given specific attention over the last five years to increasing revenue from a) summer teaching, b) international enrolment and c) advancement. We have had modest success in increasing the number of student-courses delivered during the summer period by selecting to deliver an increasing number of high-demand courses that have low per-student incremental costs. However, our ability to increase summer teaching has been limited by increased competition from other universities and our own capacity for curriculum delivery. As mentioned earlier, we have increased both international enrolment and international tuition over the last five years, and believe that this remains a viable strategy for several more years. However, that is ultimately limited by our commitments to domestic undergraduate students as a publicly-funded institution. Advancement has been a successful strategy for fundraising, with the Faculty raising in excess of \$10 million per year over the last five years (not taking into account funds raised by the constituent and federated colleges). However, almost all of these funds are for targetted priorities such as student scholarships, needs-based aid, teaching programs and capital projects, and they cannot bridge the increasing gap between total revenues and total expenses arising from increased personnel and operating costs that support core activities.

**The Faculty therefore recommends that advocacy with both levels of government – provincial and federal – must continue to give priority to reversing the relative decline in per-student funding that is currently government policy, and argue for additional resources to improve the quality of undergraduate education.** To be most effective, the Faculty recommends the University undertake a multi-year, grass-roots campaign in collaboration with



other Ontario Universities to create an understanding with the Ontario electorate of the importance of a properly funded higher education system as we move toward 2030.

An area that has not received focused attention in the Faculty has been the development of professional masters programs. **Given the investment in both undergraduate and doctoral programs in a broad set of areas, it may be possible to mount professional masters programs with relatively low marginal costs.** However, such initiatives will have to be carefully planned in order not to lead to further compromise in our ability deliver our existing programs. Of particular concern are supervisory capacity, administrative support and space, given the current graduate expansion plans.

A key issue raised in Question #5 is financial accessibility. **At the undergraduate level, the Faculty is confident that it has increased financial accessibility over the last decade (based on the amount of needs-based aid available and our data on the low per-student family income of our students).** That this has occurred in a context where tuitions have risen speaks to the effectiveness of the UTAPS approach for grants-based financial support. Tuition levels clearly have an impact on financial accessibility and student debt-loads. At the same time, they also have an impact on the quality of education we are able to provide. The tension inherent in this discussion has to be managed such that our students and teaching staff work together to ensure that the quality of education continues to be improved.

The issue raised in Question #6 is one that the Faculty does not believe has a single right answer. Its experience with major gift fundraising in the current climate has been that expendable gifts, especially for capital projects, have been attractive to some of our donors. At the same time, the long-term benefits and commitments that come with endowed gifts provide powerful incentives for some donors and the Faculty. What has been clear is that donors do expect gifts to be leveraged, and opportunities to provide such leveraging must continue to be created.

The issues raised in Question #7 have already been addressed in the response to Question #11 in Section 1.

Questions #8 and 9 speak to the urgent need to find ways of containing our expenditures and increasing efficiencies. **Although the Faculty has worked to eliminate duplication of administrative and technical services, there remains some work to be done by integrating more fully service provision across the Faculty, if not the University.** The Faculty is currently creating a unified structure to provide research services and is looking at ways of improving the coordination of other technical and IT support.

## Section 4 Questions

1. Considering the three campus system, is greater integration or greater autonomy required? What is the balance? How should enrolment growth or reduction be distributed across the three campuses in the years ahead?
2. Should the University of Toronto develop a unique regional variant of longer-distance models that are successful in some US jurisdictions?
3. Some performance indicators for external reporting (e.g. per-capita availability of student aid, per- faculty research funding, ratio of graduate to undergraduate students) are skewed by the aggregation of data across the three campuses. To what extent should campus-specific profiles be established for external reporting?

4. What academic and administrative functions should be integrated and which should be separate across the three campuses? Can or should the integration of all graduate programs be maintained?
5. To what extent should the academic offerings of the three campuses be deliberately differentiated?
6. In what dimensions can the University's partnership with Toronto's research hospitals be further enhanced to mutual benefit?
7. 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?
8. What broad principles should govern the allocation of resources among colleges, divisions, and the University's central administration?
9. 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 homogenous 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?
10. Currently, the college system is associated primarily with the Faculty of Arts and 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?

#### **Section 4: An Arts & Science Response**

The Faculty of Arts & Science has historically had close relationships with UTSC and UTM. The Faculty teaches the equivalent of 1,000 undergraduates from the two other campuses and shares with UTSC and UTM a unitary, three-campus doctoral program. Over the last decade, there has been significant evolution in the relationships, with the three divisions developing increasingly distinct undergraduate offerings and campus environments.

The three divisions have also developed mechanisms to improve the coordination and communication between them, with perhaps the most obvious being the creation of the Tricampus Deans Committee that meets every other week and coordinates graduate and undergraduate program delivery and academic planning, the creation of the Three-Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee to review and approve graduate curriculum, and the continued support of the guaranteed funding program for our doctoral students. Under the new budget model, the Faculty has taken responsibility for administering the graduate funding program and distributing the funding support to the graduate units and campuses arising from graduate enrolment expansion. Finally, the Council of First-Entry Deans provides a more formal framework in which the Faculty, UTM and UTSC collaborate with the other three first-entry divisions to develop coherent approaches to issues such as undergraduate degree expectations, enrolment planning, recruitment and assessment of student experience.

These mechanisms have been created to allow each division greater autonomy in academic priority-setting and planning, while providing mechanisms for consultation and collaboration. One feature of this system is that it has given each division significant autonomy to develop its

own professional masters programs, which has resulted in the creation of a number of exciting new masters programs at UTM and UTSC. At the same time, the Faculty does not see the benefit of moving away from the unitary doctoral graduate program model, given the very effective way it brings supervisory and other resources together across the three campuses.

Given that this framework is in place, the Faculty believes that the answers to Questions #1 through 5 are not constrained by inter-dependencies and administrative structures, but in fact can be answered, at least in part, through coherent academic planning and priority-setting across all three campuses. At an administrative level, increasing autonomy has the benefit of reducing or eliminating barriers to develop stronger programs. **At an academic level, there has been clearly increasing autonomy between the Faculty, UTM and UTSC over the last decade, creating undergraduate environments with distinctive approaches and identities. The Faculty believes this has been on the whole a positive development, and is supportive of even greater differentiation of programs and campus life.** Given the importance of assessment in our commitment to quality and accountability, this suggests that we should avoid measures that aggregate activities across the three campuses.

Several cautionary notes should be sounded: **First, as the three campuses increasingly offer differentiated undergraduate programs, it will continue to be important to streamline and make more transparent the campus boundaries to our students.** Approximately 5% of the courses taken by UTM and UTSC students are still delivered by the Faculty, and so having consistent approaches to semester calendaring, examination scheduling and grading policies will be important to mitigate the challenge for our students of taking courses on multiple campuses. **Second, it will be important to continue to maintain the alignment and academic standards of our programs across the three campuses where appropriate.** There are some program offerings on one campus that do not have true analogues on the others, and this is appropriate in a context where we are encouraging increasing differentiation. At the same time, there are other programs – especially those in the core disciplines in arts & science – that one would expect should remain closely aligned in both curricular content and learning outcomes. Consultation must continue to be a priority, using bodies like the Tricampus Deans Committee and the Council of First-Entry Deans. **Finally, we must recognize that the tension inherent in autonomous undergraduate divisions linked through a unitary doctoral program requires communication and transparency if we are to maintain collegial relations across the three campuses.**

Questions #7 through 10 relate to what is part of the core of the Faculty of Arts & Science identity, the college system. **The leadership of the Faculty and colleges has been working increasingly closely over the last decade, resulting in an emerging new model for the colleges within the Faculty of Arts & Science and the University more broadly.** Several colleges have developed, in collaboration with the Faculty, unique first-year experiences – Vic One and Trin One – that appear to be very successful innovations and have improved measurably the experience of our first-year students participating in these programs. The colleges collectively have developed a stronger presence within the Faculty through the fostering of strong interdisciplinary undergraduate programs that offer our students unparalleled choice in concentrations. And the colleges have increasingly been taking the lead in improving the overall first-year student experience, being partners in the creation of the First-Year Learning Communities, improving the support for our commuter students and enhancing the on-campus residence life of our students.

With respect to Question #9, the Faculty has as a principle that college affiliation should not create barriers for a student's academic choice of program of study. This is founded on the recognition that a student will enter the Faculty in first-year not being expected to select a program of study until the end of that period. The ability to develop a more informed decision

over the course of the first-year is considered an essential feature of our undergraduate offerings. Restricting access to certain programs to students from a given college conflicts with this principle. **At the same time, the Faculty has supported the right of a college, enshrined in the Memorandum of Agreement between the federated Universities and the University of Toronto, to give first preference for enrolment purposes to its own students into courses that it sponsors that do not count for program-of-study credit.** That being said, the Faculty does support the use of student profiles to make decisions regarding college and program admission, so long as the goals of such an admissions process are transparent and the methods used to gather and assess these profiles are robust. The Faculty recognizes that this is an area where there is likely to be even more evolution, and will continue to support the differentiation of the colleges.

The recent review of the Memorandum of Agreement has provided an opportunity to assess the structure and functioning of the Faculty and college relationships. **Although it identified a number of areas where we must continue to improve – the coordination of teaching resources in support of college-based programs is one key area, as well as developing common standards for delivery of academic support services – this relationship appears quite sound and, in the view of the Faculty, does not need a major overhaul.** Consultation must continue to be a priority, with active engagement of the principals of the colleges, department chairs and centre directors in all aspects of Faculty administration, planning and governance. Resources should flow based on priorities set through clear and comprehensive academic planning.

Finally, the Faculty is supportive of colleges developing relationships and academic programs with other divisions. Appropriate consultation should occur so that resource issues are identified well in advance and any necessary accommodations can be made.

## Section 5 Questions

1. Is the distribution of revenues and responsibilities across the three campuses equitable and sustainable? If not, what changes are fair and feasible?
2. Do we have an optimal distribution of administrative responsibilities across divisions on the St. George campus? Or should there be a re-thinking of the current configuration as regards academic or administrative functions?
3. Should the University's budgeting and planning processes be oriented to facilitate more inter-divisional or institution-wide perspectives?
4. In the light of current best practices, is the University's current governance model optimally structured to:
  1. facilitate inclusive debate and decisions on issues of importance to the long-term interests of the institution?
  2. ensure accountability at the appropriate levels within the University while providing efficient assessments and approvals of key initiatives?
  3. provide the appropriate linkages with relevant internal constituencies and external communities?
  4. address the unique governance and oversight needs of a three-campus institution?

5. Is the distribution of responsibility among the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees appropriately balanced? Is the division of responsibility between the central governing bodies and the divisional governing councils appropriately balanced?
6. If there are concerns about our current governance, what changes to the structures and processes would improve efficiency and responsiveness in decision-making, while building on current strengths and sustaining our standards of transparency and accountability?

## Section 5: An Arts & Science Response

The Faculty recognizes the challenge of determining the appropriate distribution of scarce resources across the three campuses. The new budget model has helped to clarify how revenue generated by each division is then used to support the teaching and research activities of the division that generated the revenue, both through University-wide costs and division-specific expenses. **The Faculty believes that it will be essential to make available to those divisions that are responsible for teaching our students the incremental resources they need to improve on how they fulfill their goals.** The new budget model provides a framework to do this, allowing for a long-term alignment of the revenues and expenses of each division. The Faculty is in strong support of that strategy.

At the same time, the Faculty does not believe there are short-term solutions to this problem, absent a significant infusion of new revenues to the University. It will be important to avoid creating any further imbalances in resource flow, and the use of any surpluses from the University Fund to make incremental adjustments would be welcome.

Question #2 raises the question of whether we have most efficiently aligned responsibilities and resources within the University. Perhaps one of the most significant changes over the last decade in the responsibilities of the Faculty have been in the area of capital and information technology (IT) projects. The Faculty has had to develop an in-house capability to design and provide project management assistance for a large number of initiatives, and to take responsibility for identifying the resources for each project. In fact, this may be an appropriate realignment given the need to prioritize such projects as part of the academic priority setting process. **However, it is not clear that we have established the most cost-effective or productive sharing of responsibilities, as the Faculty has had to significantly enlarge its own capital and facilities planning effort.** For example, the failure to meet project schedules, despite significant planning effort and consultation, has created challenges within the Faculty to adjust academic programs with short notice.

The Faculty has had to recognize the need to develop a more coherent and responsive IT infrastructure, reflecting a similar need at the University level. **The creation of a Chief Information Officer for the University is a welcome development, and will assist the Faculty in providing IT support at the divisional level given the need to coordinate activities across the institution.**

Question #3 raises the question of what exactly is being fixed. Although the University has given interdisciplinary initiatives significant priority for incremental resources over the last several years using instruments like the Academic Initiatives Fund, the Faculty is also very much aware that interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary activities can only thrive in a context where they are based on strong disciplinary foundations, usually resourced through divisional planning and priority-setting. The Faculty is also sensitive to the fact that the large fraction of the resources

needed to teach our students must flow through discipline-based departments, given the demand by students for the curricula these units mount. **Based on the current level of interdisciplinary activity, the models used to date appear to have effectively reduced the inherent barriers to interdivisional efforts.** The Faculty recognizes that these do require additional effort and overall greater sensitivity to eliminating historic barriers, but doesn't believe that an alternative resourcing model is necessarily appropriate.

At the same time, the Faculty is aware that the institution must be able to assert University-wide priorities in its budget-setting process, and these would seem to be most effectively exercised by the Provost and Chief Budget Officer through consultation and planning mechanisms, and largely resourced as University-wide expenses.

Question #4 addresses what would appear to be a significant issue of concern institution-wide. **The perception of the Faculty is that the current governance model, although resulting in decisions and accountability that appear robust, is very unwieldy. Most issues are scrutinized by numerous bodies, with very limited benefits arising from the multiple levels of review.** An example in point would be undergraduate curriculum program proposals in the Faculty: These are developed at the unit-level by a Curriculum Committee and approved by a department-level council. They are then reviewed by a sector-specific curriculum committee (in some cases two committees where there are interdivisional links) before they are presented to Arts & Science Council. If approved at that level, they are then brought forward for consideration by the Academic Programs and Priorities Committee of Academic Board – a total of four or five levels of approval. The approval process for capital projects requires a similar number of approvals. The Faculty would support streamlining of governance.

**Given this perspective, the Faculty would respond to Questions #5 and 6 by first recommending that the University review its governance procedures, identify what decisions can be delegated to subsidiary committees while maintaining accountability, and reduce the number of issues that must rise to be addressed by numerous Governing Council and Academic Board committees.** Second, the Faculty would recommend a review of the delegation of responsibilities between divisional councils and University-wide committees, with the goal of reducing the number of levels of review for most decisions. Maintaining true accountability will be a key constraint to any streamlining.