

UTQAP Cyclical Review: Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan

1 Review Summary

Program(s) Reviewed:	Art History (HBA): Specialist, Major, Minor Art History: MA, PhD
Unit Reviewed:	Department of Art History
Commissioning Officer:	Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Reviewers (Name, Affiliation):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tim Barringer, Paul Mellon Professor in the History of Art, Department of the History of Art, Yale University • Iftikhar Dadi, John H. Burris Professor of History of Art, Chair, Department of History of Art, Cornell University • Christine Mehring, Mary L. Block Professor, Department of Art History and the College, Associate Faculty, Department of Visual Arts, University of Chicago
Date of Review Visit:	February 28-29, 2024
Review Report Received by VPAP:	September 13, 2024
Administrative Response(s) Received by VPAP:	March 6, 2025
Date Reported to AP&P:	April 10, 2025

Previous UTQAP Review

Date: October 20-21, 2015

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Significant Program Strengths

- Highly selective Ph.D. program, considered the best in Canada
- Exceptional time-to-completion of five years for Ph.D. students
- Unique undergraduate conference organized by students each year
- Broad, encyclopaedic coverage of artistic fields and epochs in courses offered
- First-rate, very productive, internationally-recognized faculty

Opportunities for Program Enhancement

- Developing experiential learning, international, and research opportunities for both graduate and undergraduate students
- Addressing the quality, structure, and delivery of the M.A. program
- Better coordinating advising and support for undergraduate students between the colleges and the department
- Fostering more of a sense of community and increasing communication with graduate students
- Revisiting the funding structure for Ph.D. students to better reflect students' trajectories through the program
- Improving facilities to better support program delivery

Current Review: Documentation and Consultation

Documentation Provided to Reviewers

Terms of reference; Self-study; Appendices; Previous review report including the administrative response; Access to all course descriptions; Access to the curricula vitae of faculty.

Consultation Process

Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science; Vice-Dean, Academic Planning, Interim Associate Dean, Unit-Level Reviews, Faculty of Arts & Science; undergraduate and graduate chairs; undergraduate and graduate associate chairs; faculty; tri-campus graduate faculty; undergraduate and graduate students, administrative staff; and senior program administrators as well as members of relevant cognate units (East Asian Studies; Classics; Cinema Studies Institute; Department for the Study of Religion).

Current Review: Findings and Recommendations

1. Undergraduate Program(s)

Unless otherwise noted, all bulleted comments apply to all programs reviewed.

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Overall quality
 - ▶ The undergraduate program is thriving, and notable for significant increases in course and program enrolments
 - ▶ Undergraduate program is one the largest of its kind in North America
 - ▶ Undergraduate program offers a range of courses, and occupies a distinguished national and international position
 - ▶ Undergraduate program distinguishes itself in a landscape of strong North American art history programs through its “unique combination of quantity and quality”
 - ▶ Specialists receive a good art historical education, as well as related professional training
- Objectives
 - ▶ Reviewers commend the ways in which institutional priorities “weave through the curricular and extracurricular fabric of the Undergraduate Program”
- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Department has a significant number of undergraduate courses focused on experiential learning
- Accessibility and diversity
 - ▶ Reviewers note “admirable” economic diversity among undergraduate art history students
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Students enthusiastically endorse the undergraduate program

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ “We are puzzled by the apparent absence of substantive discussions about the curriculum, both in the UTSG Undergraduate Program and in the Graduate Program”

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Need identified for departmental committees to explore the noted absence of substantive discussions about curriculum
 - ▶ Undergraduate curriculum committee should be chaired by the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and work to ensure that every term offers a balanced set of course offerings

- ▶ Department encouraged to pursue its plans to further increase the quality of the undergraduate curriculum
- ▶ Consider a required methods course, more clearly articulated capstones, and more faculty advising to position specialist students to be more competitive in their pursuit of graduate studies and/or museum careers
- ▶ A potential capstone offering should be “flexible but substantive”
- ▶ Planned enhancements to the undergraduate curriculum would involve increased workload; reviewers note this could be offset by sharing advising between staff and the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and by exploring increased involvement of graduate students and teaching stream faculty
- ▶ The unit should ensure that its many courses with an experiential learning focus are meaningfully different from one another, of the highest intellectual quality, and art historical in nature
- Accessibility and diversity
 - ▶ Given the size and relative affordability of the undergraduate program, reviewers note an important opportunity to provide pathways for diversifying the discipline
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Internship offerings should be “pedagogically and art historically substantial and students should not receive course credit for doing a (paid) internship”
 - ▶ “[We] do not think it is advisable to mix (course) credit and (research assistant) work (though we would encourage more than the current six faculty to hire work-study research assistants)”

2. Graduate Program(s)

Unless otherwise noted, all bulleted comments apply to all programs reviewed.

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Overall quality
 - ▶ The graduate program is notable for attracting high quality students whose innovative work is widely admired on campus and beyond
- Admissions requirements
 - ▶ PhD program admits 6-7 students per year
 - ▶ PhD has recently seen a large number of international applications
- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ A recent overhaul of the PhD Methods course has addressed concerns that it was entirely Western in content
 - ▶ “Works-in-Progress” seminar allows faculty and graduate students to come together and discuss their research across subfield specializations, which is helpful for building community among students, and intellectual exchange among faculty
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Graduate student association helps to organize campus events related to research and professional development
 - ▶ PhD students appreciate linkages with the Royal Ontario Museum, including internship opportunities, and courses taught by ROM curators

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Admissions requirements
 - ▶ Due to lack of available funding for international students, many outstanding applicants cannot be admitted
- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ “We are puzzled by the apparent absence of substantive discussions about the curriculum, both in the UTSG Undergraduate Program and in the Graduate Program”
 - ▶ There is no option in the master’s program for a track that incorporates an MA thesis
 - ▶ PhD course requirements are much lower than at peer US institutions
 - ▶ PhD students studying ancient art appear to have their own Methods seminar, which could lead to fragmentation among the PhD cohort
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Differences among faculty hinder the formation of doctoral committees, negatively impacting PhD students
 - ▶ TA assignments are not incorporated into the offer letter that PhD students receive upon admission
- Student funding
 - ▶ Despite large number of international PhD applications, very few are eligible for funding
 - ▶ PhD students note concerns, stress and negative impacts on their progress related to the lack of available funding in the 6th and 7th years and the high cost of living in Toronto

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Need identified for departmental committees to explore the noted absence of substantive discussions about curriculum
 - ▶ A graduate curriculum committee should be constituted under the tri-campus Graduate Chair with membership of faculty from all three campuses, and would ensure that every term offers a balanced set of course offerings
 - ▶ Consider an MA option that includes a thesis, to position students more advantageously should they wish to pursue doctoral studies
 - ▶ Consider a mandatory methods course for the MA
 - ▶ Consider whether the number of course requirements in the PhD might be adjusted
 - ▶ Graduate faculty urged to participate in and build on the collaborative “Works-in-Progress” seminar format
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Graduate students voice desire for greater coverage of non-Western areas of art history
 - ▶ With greater support from all three campuses, the graduate student association could become more active in organizing events such as a speaker series

- ▶ Graduate students might consider collaborating with faculty mentors to organize an EDI lecture series
- ▶ The negative impacts of differences among the faculty that hinder the formation of doctoral committees and faculty climate issues on PhD students is “a very serious issue and needs to be addressed”
- ▶ Faculty are urged to support new research areas and methodologies that are of interest to students, ensuring that they are pursued in a rigorous, scholarly manner
- ▶ Consider the feasibility of adjusting PhD offer letters to include funding details and specific TA assignments and responsibilities
- Student funding
 - ▶ University leadership is urged to explore funding possibilities to increase the number of packages allocated for international PhD students
 - ▶ University administration urged to review PhD packages while remaining mindful that “an art history PhD in North America may require 6 years of guaranteed funding”, and that “University of Toronto funding needs to be at a level that is adequate given the cost of living in contemporary Toronto”

3. Faculty/Research

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Overall quality
 - ▶ In terms of research and teaching, the faculty across all three campuses is of stellar quality
- Faculty
 - ▶ Excellent, impressive faculty hires have been made in the past 10-15 years, which reflect a timely response to ongoing changes in the field and in humanities more broadly
 - ▶ Department to be commended for recent hires in the areas of Islamic art, Indigenous art and Black Diaspora art

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Faculty
 - ▶ Concerns noted regarding tenure and promotion decisions, which are managed separately at the three campuses; particularly that faculty on other campuses are not routinely consulted during these processes, even if they have relevant disciplinary expertise
 - ▶ Many otherwise mid-career and senior faculty are still at the associate professor level; “Unlike most Tier-1 institutions in the US, the University of Toronto evidently provides no incentive (such as a meaningful salary increase) for attaining the level of ‘full professor.’”
 - ▶ Junior faculty report not feeling adequately supported institutionally, and note a lack of clarity regarding tenure requirements
 - ▶ Despite recent hires and U of T’s emphasis on global engagement, departmental faculty expertise remains heavily weighted towards Western art

- ▶ Gaps noted in coverage of African and Latin American art

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Faculty
 - ▶ Explore the feasibility of introducing or strengthening financial and other incentives for faculty to pursue promotion to Full Professor
 - ▶ Reviewers strongly recommend increasing supports for junior faculty, via approaches such as mentorship programs, guidance and resources for monograph development, and clear guidelines around tenure requirements
 - ▶ Unit is strongly encouraged to pursue significant moves towards embracing the opportunities and challenges of global art history in its complement planning
 - ▶ Reviewers recommend the development of a 5-10 year strategic complement plan to broaden geographic and cultural faculty expertise
 - ▶ Opportunities noted to develop strengths in Southeast Asian, South Asian, Japanese, African, and Latin American art, as well as “newer aspects of the discipline” such as new media, ecology, disability studies, decoloniality, materiality, queer and feminist approaches; reviewers note that such directions are especially important given the diversity and multiculturalism of Toronto and Canada
 - ▶ Department encouraged to provide teaching and research leadership in settler-colonial Canadian art, in addition to its important offerings in Indigenous Art
 - ▶ The St. George campus is urged to include faculty from UTM and UTSC in its search committees; UTM and UTSC are urged to reciprocate accordingly for art history hires
 - ▶ Unit urged to engage in a principled discussion to define when and why it pursues hires in the teaching stream; reviewers note that teaching stream hires should be pursued primarily to enhance undergraduate student learning, and “never at the expense of hiring ‘tenure stream’ faculty”

4. Administration

Note: Issues that are addressed through specific University processes and therefore considered out of scope for UTQAP reviews (e.g., individual Human Resources issues, specific health and safety concerns) are routed to proper University offices to be addressed, and are therefore not included in the Review Summary component of the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan.

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ Unit has been successful in preparing undergraduate and graduate students for the job market, with a range of internships and productive collaborations, most notably with the Royal Ontario Museum
 - ▶ Departmental staff are competent, knowledgeable and professional; greatly respected and appreciated by faculty and students; and crucial for maintaining departmental processes and a sense of community

- Organizational and financial structure
 - ▶ The UTSG Department of Art History constitutes a singular and legible administrative unit
 - ▶ The Chair currently delegates all graduate funds and restricted accounts to the Graduate Chair, which appears to be a reasonable arrangement
 - ▶ Department to be commended for its enterprising spirit and success in obtaining internal and external gifts and grants beyond individual research funding; the University of Toronto - France Art History Partnership or 'France gift' and the 'Canada Constructed grant' effectively align with all three Presidential priorities
 - ▶ The 'Canada Constructed grant' has supported a number of students, provided a range of research and professional experiences, and built institutional relationships; reviewers heartened to see that its continuity appears assured
 - ▶ The 'France Gift' noted as a welcome addition to the Department's budget to support PhD students, travel, and speaker series
 - ▶ Departmental spaces have been effectively renovated, and should be maintained
 - ▶ The integration of the art library into the unit's space is noted as "special," providing a study space, sense of belonging and shared identity centred on research and teaching in the midst of a very large community of students
 - ▶ Faculty with undergraduate appointments at UTM and UTSC have a shared office to meet with graduate students, which is reasonable given current space constraints
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ Reviewers found much to admire at both the undergraduate and graduate levels
 - ▶ Some significant moves have been made to diversify the curriculum

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ Reviewers highlight very significant departmental climate concerns, noting tensions among department members that were "apparent in every area: structural, budgetary, intellectual and interpersonal"; these issues significantly impede the department from achieving its full potential
 - ▶ "The fundamental problem facing the Graduate Program is that the functioning of such a collaborative enterprise relies on collegiality and good will; these in turn rely on a sense of equity and mutual respect across the entire faculty that (it was reported) is currently lacking"
 - ▶ Graduate Faculty meetings are noted to be "rare, inhospitable, and not well attended", with some faculty reporting decorum issues at both
 - ▶ Reviewers note "unresolved organizational issues", observing that there seems to be disagreement among faculty about the name and status of the tri-campus graduate program and unit
 - ▶ Reviewers note an apparent lack of coordination between relevant Deans, related to the tri-campus graduate program
 - ▶ The University of Toronto Art Museum is "notably absent in the life, teaching and research of the Department" unlike at many North American peers, where university

- art museums play a critical role in supporting the teaching of art history, and providing experiential learning opportunities
- ▶ Reviewers highlight the “strangely absent” relationship between the unit and the Master of Visual Studies in Curatorial Studies offered by the Daniels Faculty, noting that curators are typically trained as art historians
 - Organizational and financial structure
 - ▶ “The complex structure, with separate undergraduate programs organized around adjacent but different disciplinary emphases, but a shared graduate program across three campuses, raises significant problems of leadership and governance”
 - ▶ Difficulties noted related to the collaborative operation of the graduate program; some faculty members, particularly those located at UTM and UTSC expressed concerns that the graduate faculty is not constituted effectively as a single entity
 - ▶ Issues noted related to the definition of the role and powers of the Graduate Chair position; historically the Chair of the UTSG Department of Art History has also served as the Graduate Chair, and this can cause resentment among UTM and UTSC faculty
 - ▶ “[T]he nomenclature of the ‘Graduate Chair’ suggests parallel roles when, in fact, the role of the Graduate Chair appears to carry significantly less authority than that of the Department Chair”
 - ▶ Reviewers observe that the ‘Separate Chair’ model results in a lack of clarity and guidance for staff, and this “has created an awkward work environment”
 - ▶ A Memorandum of Agreement related to the tri-campus graduate program was planned in conjunction with the introduction of the ‘Separate Chair’ model, but the document has not yet been finalized
 - ▶ Reviewers note concern that they were not provided with budgetary information to assist in their understanding of departmental resources, particularly since the use of endowment and grant funds are a “major source of friction, disagreements, and mistrust” in the tri-campus graduate program
 - ▶ Lack of clarity noted around whether the established process of delegating operational control of graduate funds to the Graduate Chair, as described in the self-study, is being followed; “severe discontent” noted regarding access to funding for the graduate program
 - ▶ Apparent “misgivings” noted among some faculty in relation to the ‘France Gift’
 - ▶ Staff job descriptions have not been updated in a timely manner, and do not appear to be accurate to the work being performed and skill sets required
 - ▶ Significant physical separation between UTSG, UTM and UTSC exacerbates challenges of creating a shared intellectual culture and graduate program
 - Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ Reviewers observe that review data compiled for the undergraduate and graduate programs were “spotty”
 - ▶ Reviewers note some apparent lack of clarity regarding the scope of the review in relation to the tri-campus graduate department
 - ▶ Reviewers highlight concerns that while some faculty acknowledge the need for curricular change and other initiatives to “decolonize the discipline,” there was

deep-seated resistance to changes that were considered by some to raise “fundamental questions of academic freedom”

- ▶ Some faculty report “consistent elision of queer and trans issues” in discussions of curricula, and in the intellectual life of the graduate program
- ▶ Some faculty report that Indigenous arts and identities are marginalized in departmental discourse and curricula
- ▶ Equity, Diversity and Inclusion engagement overall appears to be a source of significant departmental friction and division, and several faculty members reported “‘racialized’ ‘toxic’ and ‘abusive’ language in faculty meetings, particularly those devoted to discussing the tri-campus graduate program MoA.”
- ▶ “We found that the Department’s problems are too complex and deep-seated to be addressed comprehensively on the basis of a two-day campus visit”

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ Significant tensions and climate concerns among departmental community need to be urgently addressed at the decanal as well as departmental levels
 - ▶ Deans must be cognizant of climate concerns within the department, particularly those related to EDI, and offer support, advice and best practices
 - ▶ “The mission of the graduate ‘program’ or ‘department’ must be identified and agreed upon, and we urge the Dean’s office to play a proactive role in this process, by holding retreats and workshops facilitated by mediators in order for the faculty of all three campuses to be fully and clearly invested in supporting graduate study within a shared intellectual and organizational framework.”
 - ▶ “We urge mutual respect among all faculty, and the need to recognize that art history as a discipline is not static but continues to evolve in terms of its methodology and its subject matter”
 - ▶ Department is urged to adopt a confidential voting process in faculty meetings, “in order to protect dissenting votes, especially of the junior faculty”
 - ▶ Opportunities noted to improve communications between the Department Chair and Graduate Chair
 - ▶ Continue to strengthen linkages with institutions such as the ROM, assuring that these relationships further scholarly objectives
 - ▶ “We urge conversations and long-term planning to expand the Art Museum’s role on campus beyond the curatorial studies curriculum at the Daniels School and to consider the museum’s relationship to the undergraduate and graduate programs in art history”
 - ▶ Absence of a relationship with the Master of Visual Studies in Curatorial Studies warrants some assessment and attention
 - ▶ Departmental website requires substantial enhancements to offer more information about the department, and become “a central means to attract even better graduate students, allow undergraduate students to identify and connect effectively with faculty in their areas of interest, and appeal to potential funders and collaborators.”

- ▶ Consider more regular updates to online faculty profiles; and more comprehensive, consolidated and current information about departmental events and activities
- ▶ Prioritize support for departmental lecture series
- ▶ Consider posting information about student outcomes and careers on website and social media; reviewers note that strengthening communications and engagement with alumni could help with experiential learning opportunities and fundraising
- Organizational and financial structure
 - ▶ “Deans should work with faculty to resolve the question of nomenclature for ‘Graduate Chair’ and the name and status of the Graduate Program/department”
 - ▶ “When faculty assume leadership roles, their jobs and authorities should be negotiated as appropriate, and described in writing with clarity and transparency”
 - ▶ The review team “supports the concept that the leadership of the Graduate Program should be drawn from across the entire University of Toronto Tri-Campus faculty” (though note that this model does not yet appear to have yielded a successful outcome)
 - ▶ “Leading up to the beginning of a new fiscal year, the Department Chair and relevant staff should establish, then follow, annual budgets with clear budget lines, with appropriate delegation to the Graduate Chair for dedicated graduate funds”
 - ▶ Given noted discontent related to funding for the graduate program, the Chair and Graduate chair might consider establishing separate committees related to funding; these might include a graduate affairs committee, and a dedicated program or events committee, both of which should have an appropriate range of representatives
 - ▶ Reviewers suggest earmarking dedicated funds for lecture and events programming, noting that all three departments participating in the graduate program should make contributions proportionate to their sizes and resources
 - ▶ Department and deans are encouraged to work together to identify and track measures of success related to new initiatives, and potentially develop plans to make such initiatives sustainable beyond spend-down gifts and grants
 - ▶ Substantial gifts should be communicated to the entire community in a manner that is positive and transparent, and explain specifically what the funding will and will not support
 - ▶ Department and deans are urged to work with the donor of the ‘France Gift’ to conceive of it more broadly, “including working on collections of art in France that may be from Africa, Polynesia, Southeast Asia, and North Africa, diaspora practices, and on the art of the Francophone world that encompasses areas of Africa, the Caribbean, and other regions across the world”
 - ▶ Departmental colleagues encouraged to identify and pursue funding opportunities that might benefit the unit in areas beyond France; reviewers note that the ‘France Gift’ does not appear to prevent obtaining funding in other research and teaching areas
 - ▶ Explore making budgetary information available for next external review of the department

- ▶ Leadership encouraged to create a university committee to assess the role of and opportunities related to the University of Toronto Art Museum
- ▶ Institutional and divisional leadership encouraged to consider a review of the University of Toronto Art Museum and its relationships with the Department of Art History, as well as other cognate units and offerings; in the meantime, consider smaller steps to encourage greater collaboration between the museum and department
- ▶ “In order to lift morale and retain its excellent staff”, departmental and divisional leadership are encouraged to evaluate staff job descriptions and salary brackets, and consider updates as appropriate
- ▶ Staff workload would benefit from the addition of a general office assistant position
- ▶ Some lecture halls would benefit from larger screens to effectively teach visual material to the significant number of students that the undergraduate program attracts
- ▶ Department and division are urged to prioritize maintaining the current Art History Library location when addressing any issues arising from structural capacity limits
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ The discipline of art history is noted as uniquely positioned to help University leadership advance its vision; Deans are urged to continue to support the unit’s related initiatives such as travelling seminars, study abroad opportunities, undergraduate internships and courses taught by local curators and/or in local museums; some of these initiatives might benefit from central assistance in establishing formal MOUs
 - ▶ “Department and Deans might work together to comprehensively and systematically...track relevant data, including time to degree, attrition, external awards for graduate students and faculty, job placement, alumni, course enrollments, majors and minors, faculty advising, field distribution”, particularly for the PhD program; reviewers note that this is standard practice in North American programs and could aid with student and faculty recruitment, and fundraising
 - ▶ Undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees should advise relevant Chairs at all three campuses “regarding arriving at a judicious balance between undergraduate and graduate courses, geographic and methodological breadth, and premodern and modern offerings”
 - ▶ UTSG Department might benefit from a retreat; agenda items could include developing a mission statement, and identifying unique strengths and opportunities
 - ▶ Tri-campus graduate program would also benefit from a retreat; agenda items might include developing a mission statement; identifying strengths and opportunities; new directions in the discipline; discussions of “how to achieve equity and excellence”; development of an MoA that “forms an agreement of shared intellectual and organizational frameworks”
 - ▶ Departmental EDI committee should be reinstated or maintained, with membership drawn from faculty and students, and ensuring that service burdens do not fall primarily on BIPOC community members

- ▶ Reviewers strongly assert that the Dean's office must play a much more active role in facilitating progress in the unit; many structural challenges faced by the graduate program require intervention and resolution at the decanal level; where applicable, ensure consultation and coordination between the Deans of FAS, UTM and UTSC
- ▶ "We recommend that the Department should be reviewed again in 5 years, with more time, a more carefully defined charge and mandate, and ideally including the three campuses and museum."
- ▶ Consider potential opportunities to better align review practices for the Department and cognate units across the three campuses going forward



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

March 5, 2025

Professor Nick Rule
Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
University of Toronto

RE: UTQAP cyclical review of the Department of Art History

Dear Professor Rule,

I write in response to your letter of December 19, 2024 regarding the February 28-29, 2024, UTQAP cyclical review of the Department of Art History and requesting our Administrative Responses. The programs reviewed were: Art History, HBA (Specialist, Major, Minor) Art History: MA, PhD.

On behalf of the Faculty of Arts & Science, we would first like to thank the reviewers: Professor Tim Barringer, Yale University, Iftikhar Dadi, Cornell University, and Professor Christine Mehring, University of Chicago for their very comprehensive review of the Department of Art History. We would also like to thank the chairs, faculty, administrative staff, and all those who contributed to the preparation of the self-study. We also wish to thank the many staff, students, and faculty members who met with the external reviewers and provided thoughtful feedback. The UTQAP cyclical review process is an invaluable exercise that affords us the opportunity to take stock of our academic units and programs, to recognize achievement, and identify areas for improvement.

The review report was finalized on August 27, 2024, after which the chairs shared it widely with faculty, staff, and students in the Department of Art History. We are extremely pleased with the reviewers' positive assessment of the overall strength of the Department of Art History and its outstanding, productive faculty. The review report noted the undergraduate program is "thriving" and is distinguished amongst its peers through its "unique combination of quantity and quality." They noted that the graduate program is "notable for attracting high quality students whose innovative work is widely admired." The review report also raised several issues and challenges and identified areas for enhancement, including providing pathways for diversifying the discipline in the undergraduate program, noting that departmental faculty expertise remains heavily weighted towards Western art, and highlighting significant departmental climate concerns.

Each of these recommendations has been addressed in the attached Review Recommendations Table that outlines the unit's response, the Dean's response, and an Implementation Plan identifying action items and timelines for each recommendation. My Administrative Response and Implementation Plan was developed in consultation with the chairs and with the Associate-Dean, Unit-Level Reviews, and senior leadership within my office. The Implementation Plan provided identifies timeframes of immediate- (six months), medium- (one to two years), and

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

Sidney Smith Hall, 100 St. George Street, Suite 2005, Toronto, ON M5S 3G3 Canada

Tel: +1 416-978-3383 • Fax: +1 416-978-3887 • officeofthedean@artsci.utoronto.ca • www.artsci.utoronto.ca

longer- (three to five years) term actions and who (Faculty, Dean, unit) will take the lead in each area. I also identified any necessary changes in organization, policy, or governance where appropriate, as well as any resources, financial or otherwise, that will be provided, and who will provide them.

The next UTQAP cyclical review of Department of Art History will take place no later than the **2031-32** review cycle. My office monitors progress on Implementation Plans through periodic meetings with chairs and through the unit's five-year unit-level academic planning process, which will begin at the conclusion of the cyclical review. I also acknowledge that your office will request a brief Interim Monitoring Report midway between the February 2024 UTQAP cyclical review and the year of the next site visit in 2031-32 to report on progress made on the Implementation Plan as outlined in the accompanying Review Recommendations Table.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to respond to the review report. The reviewers' comments and recommendations will help inform the future priorities of the Department of Art History and its undergraduate and graduate programs.

Sincerely,



Melanie Woodin
Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science
Professor, Department of Cell & Systems Biology

cc.

Joseph Clarke, Chair, Department of Art History, Faculty of Arts & Science
Kajri Jain, TriCampus Graduate Chair, Department of Art History, Faculty of Arts & Science
Gillian Hamilton, Vice-Dean, Academic Planning, Faculty of Arts & Science
Caitlin Burton, Senior Manager, Curriculum, Change & Reviews, Office of the Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science
Lachmi Singh, Director, Academic Programs, Planning & Quality Assurance, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Andrea Benoit, Academic Planning & Review Officer, Office of the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science

2023-24 UTQAP Review of the FAS Department of Art History - Review Recommendations

Please do the following for each recommendation in the table:

- If you **intend** to act on a recommendation, please provide an **Implementation Plan** identifying actions to be taken, the time frame (short, medium, long term) for each, and who will take the lead in each area. If appropriate, please identify any necessary changes in organization, policy or governance; and any resources, financial and otherwise, that will be provided, and who will provide them.
- If you **do not** intend to act on a recommendation, please briefly explain why the actions recommended have not been prioritized.
- In accordance with the UTQAP and Ontario's Quality Assurance Framework, "it is important to note that, while the external reviewers' report may include **commentary** on issues such as faculty complement and/or space requirements when related to the quality of the program under review, **recommendations** on these or any other elements that are within the purview of the university's internal budgetary decision-making processes must be tied directly to issues of program quality or sustainability" (emphasis added)
- You may wish to refer to the [sample table](#) provided by the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

Request Prompt <i>verbatim from the request</i>	Rec. #	Recommendations from Review Report <i>verbatim from the review report</i>	Unit Response	Dean's Response
The reviewers were “puzzled by the apparent absence of substantive discussions about the curriculum, both in the UTSG Undergraduate Program and in the Graduate Program”. They recommended developing mechanisms such as departmental committees to engage in more fulsome curriculum discussions and planning.	1.	“We are puzzled by the apparent absence of substantive discussions about the curriculum, both in the UTSG Undergraduate Program and in the Graduate Program. There is a need for department committees to explore this, both at the undergraduate and the graduate levels. The undergraduate curriculum committee should be chaired by the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and the graduate curriculum committee needs to be constituted under the tri-Campus Graduate Chair, with membership of faculty from all three campuses. These committees would provide guidance to faculty to ensure that every term offers a balanced set of course offerings at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. These committees can advise Chairs of all three campuses regarding arriving at a judicious balance between undergraduate and graduate courses, geographic and methodological breadth, and premodern and modern offerings.”	<p>Undergraduate: The UTSG undergraduate program committee (see https://arthistory.utoronto.ca/about-us/departments-art-history-st-george/departmental-committees) meets regularly to discuss curricular issues. In 2019, UTSG held a retreat which included a comprehensive discussion of undergraduate curriculum (Self-Study, p. 72). Since then, our ongoing discussion of curriculum has yielded several updates, including adding new faculty lines (pp. 125–26) and renumbering an undergraduate course on Black art to remove barriers for Black students (pp. 40–41). The committee is currently exploring issues around the methods course and capstone offerings (see responses #3–6).</p> <p>Graduate: The substantive discussions recommended by the reviewers cannot be left to a committee in the first instance but require broad consultation with the department to develop a curriculum that</p>	Immediate term: The Dean’s office is pleased to offer funding (up to \$5000 every 3 years) to support the unit’s plans for faculty retreats.

			<p>fulfils our mission statement. However, that statement has yet to be formulated (see 22, 32, and 42 below). To agree on a shared vision, we first need to create a climate for conversation (see 33 below). We therefore propose the following steps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. (short-term): Full-day faculty workshop addressing interpersonal and/or intercampus issues, to enable constructive conversation towards a shared mission statement and program objectives. B. (medium-term): 1–2-day faculty retreat, with graduate student representation, to finalize a mission statement and program objectives and discuss the graduate curriculum in that light. We will pay particular attention to recommendations 2, 8, 9, 10, 31, and 42, as well as 18-20 (these pertain to hiring, which are budgetary unit matters, but also need to consider graduate needs and priorities). This will also provide an opportunity to rethink aspects of the program in response to the new FAS budget model. <p>Faculty have requested that any workshops and retreats be held on or near campus and during working hours. The graduate department will require additional funds to implement these recommendations; there is no scope for this within the graduate budget.</p>	
	2.	“Formation of Curriculum Committees for the Undergraduate Program and for the Graduate Program; the graduate version	<p>Undergraduate: See #1.</p>	See above, #1.

		could be folded into the graduate affairs committee concerned with funding allocations noted below.”	Graduate: Currently, graduate curriculum matters are overseen by a graduate committee that also handles admissions. Whether a separate Graduate Curriculum Committee is needed, and its remit vis-à-vis student funding, particularly in light of the new FAS budget model, will be discussed at the faculty curriculum retreat outlined in 1B above.	
The reviewers suggested several enhancements to the undergraduate programs, including assessing program requirements and enhancing student advising to better position learners for graduate studies or museum careers; and examining experiential learning offerings to ensure that they are varied and of high-quality.	3.	“Create a methods course required for specialists.”	<p>Short term (1–2 years): We are currently piloting a new undergraduate methods course. An experimental version is being taught in Winter 2025 as a Special Topics course to explore student needs and interests. If it is successful, we will add it to the curriculum formally in the next two years.</p> <p>Medium term (3–4 years): We will consult with the UTSG Undergraduate Committee and UTSG faculty about making this course a requirement for specialists or relating it to capstones (see #4).</p>	Immediate-medium term: The ASDO supports the unit’s plans for a new undergraduate methods course, and should it become a requirement for the specialist program, can support this major modification to program requirements.
	4.	“Develop more coherent and more clearly articulated forms of capstones.”	<p>While we currently offer multiple capstones courses/experiences, including internships, independent study courses, and Summer Abroad courses, we agree these could be better articulated.</p> <p>Short term (1–2 years): We will formulate program language to be approved through governance identifying current offerings as capstone experiences. Our working model for revising program language is that used by</p>	Immediate-long term: The ASDO is available to support the unit as it clarifies program offerings.

			<p>UCLA, which similarly offers multiple types of capstone experience.</p> <p>Medium term (3–4 years): We will consult with students and faculty to assess whether a BA thesis option should be added to department capstone offerings. If our consultations indicate interest in a BA thesis option, we will implement this option, with a coherent relationship to the methods course (see #3).</p>	
	5.	<p>“To position the specialist students to pursue graduate studies and/or museum careers in the most competitive ways, there should indeed be a required methods course, more coherent and more clearly articulated forms of capstones, and more faculty advising—matching the high bar set by the required 2.0 credits of language study”</p>	<p>See #3 and #4.</p> <p>We currently have a robust ecology of student advising that combines many types of undergraduate student advising as found in our publicly-funded peer institutions. These include college advisors, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, and peer mentoring through our undergraduate student association.</p> <p>Short term (1–2 years): The DUS and Undergraduate Committee will explore avenues for faculty advising that enhance student experience.</p> <p>Medium term (3–4 years): To the extent possible within workload policy, we will implement strategies for enhancing faculty advising of specialist students, perhaps through the methods and capstone courses.</p>	<p>Immediate term: The ASDO supports the unit’s plans to strengthen internal advising of its students.</p>
	6.	<p>“Assess substance and relationships of internship and other experiential learning courses.”</p>	<p>Medium term (3–4 years): The FAS Office of Experiential Learning and Outreach Support (ELOS) has agreed to help us develop a system for evaluating students’ internships and related experiential learning experiences.</p>	<p>Immediate-long term: The ASDO’s ELOS office is already working with the unit on strengthening experiential learning opportunities.</p>

			With the help of these data, the DUS, the Undergraduate Committee, and other relevant faculty members will annually assess internships and experiential learning offerings and outcomes across the curriculum.	
	7.	“Explore creating graduate student or teaching faculty positions to support [undergraduate program recommendations] above.”	<p>Shortly after the external review site visit, the Department hired a new teaching stream faculty member who is responsible for coordinating our undergraduate internship program and other experiential learning offerings.</p> <p>Medium term (3–4 years): We expect to propose two new faculty positions within this timeframe, building on our complement planning strategy (see #18). As part of the consultation process, we will explore whether teaching stream positions could be useful to support the recommendations raised here.</p>	<p>Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that the unit has already implemented this recommendation.</p> <p>Long term: Regarding future hires, the unit may submit a proposal to the Faculty Appointments Committee. All requests for new positions across the Faculty are submitted to the Faculty Appointments Committee (FAC), which includes representation across its sectors (Humanities, Social Sciences and Sciences) and from the Colleges. All FAC requests must include discussion of EDI. The FAC reviews all requests for new positions and makes recommendations to the Dean regarding which requests should be granted. In any given year, there are many more requests than available positions.</p> <p>Medium-long term: Longer-term complement planning is included as part of the A&S Unit-Level planning (ULP) exercise. Following a UTQAP review, each unit is asked to create a 5-year plan that includes goals for research, curriculum, faculty support, administrative staff support, and complement planning. As part of this process, the unit will be asked to outline their complement needs over the next five years. This plan, which will be commissioned in fall 2025 and is expected to</p>

				<p>be completed in winter 2026, will be reviewed by the Dean and Vice-Deans in line with the A&S ULP process. The ULP will inform the unit's requests to the FAC.</p> <p>The Unit-Level Academic Planning process will include faculty complement planning as a key feature and will facilitate clear articulation of the Department's complement plan over the five years of the plan.</p>
<p>The reviewers observed that PhD course requirements appear much lower than at peer US institutions, and that MA students might benefit from additional methods offerings; they recommended assessing requirements in both programs, and pursuing adjustments as appropriate. They also recommended exploring the development of an MA offering that could position students more advantageously for potential doctoral studies.</p>	8.	<p>"At present there is only a 4-seminar requirement for the PhD students (of which 2 can be from outside the Department), partly because the typical time to degree is 5 to 6 years. This course requirement is much lower than at peer institutions in the United States, and we wonder if this might be reconsidered."</p>	<p>Unlike peer institutions in the US, our current PhD admission requirements stipulate that incoming students already hold an MA, so the assumption is that they have already taken some graduate seminars. Nonetheless, we will revisit the 4-seminar requirement at the curriculum retreat in the light of our mission statement and program objectives (see #1B).</p>	<p>Immediate term: The ASDO supports the unit's plan to consider this recommendation.</p>
	9.	<p>"At present, a methods course is not mandatory for the MA degree, and we recommend that this be reconsidered."</p>	<p>We will discuss this at the curriculum retreat in the light of our mission statement and program objectives (see #1B).</p>	<p>Immediate term: The ASDO supports the unit's plan to consider this recommendation.</p>
	10.	<p>"At present there is no option for a track that incorporates an MA thesis. An option (such as an Honors MA) might be introduced that includes a thesis written over the summer and that would position these students more advantageously should they seek to continue on for a PhD."</p>	<p>This has been discussed many times over the years to no avail, but we will reconsider this at the curriculum retreat in the light of our mission statement, program objectives, and new FAS budget model (see #1B).</p>	<p>Immediate term: The ASDO supports the unit's plan to consider this recommendation.</p>
<p>The reviewers made several recommendations related to strengthening resources for and encouraging community-building among the Department's graduate student population.</p>	11.	<p>"A graduate affairs committee with appropriate representatives—meaning a range of subfields, methods, and campus homes—should deliberate and recommend decisions about individual graduate student funding."</p>	<p>The composition of the current Graduate Committee is already designed to reflect the range outlined by the reviewers. It has not been responsible for individual graduate student funding, which has so far been effectively, efficiently, and equitably allocated by the Graduate Chair in collaboration with the Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Assistant with the</p>	<p>Immediate term: The ASDO supports the unit's plan to consider the merits of this recommendation.</p>

			speed required to make competitive admissions offers. At present we see no reason to change this practice, but can reconsider along with the discussion of other graduate committees (see #2).	
	12.	“The graduate student association helps organize events on campus relating to research and professional development. We believe that with greater support the group could become more active. For example, the graduate student association might elect a committee to hold a speaker series of their own, and for which funding could be made available by all three departments/campuses. This series can be among the ensemble of talks and lectures offered by the Department and can be listed and advertised together. Graduate students, along with a faculty mentor, might also take the lead in organizing an EDI lecture series.”	The Art History graduate student association (GUSTa) is now closely involved in research and professional development activities funded by the FAS Milestones and Pathways program through regular consultations with the Graduate Office. The tricampus EDI committee, in consultation with GUSTa, is currently exploring possibilities for an EDI speaker series, including format and funding.	Immediate term: The ASDO supports the unit’s plan to carefully consider this recommendation.
	13.	“There is also a “Works-in-Progress” seminar where faculty and graduate students come together to discuss their research across subfield specializations,” which is helpful in building a cohort among the graduate students and intellectual exchange among the faculty. We urge the Department graduate faculty to participate and continue to build on this format.”	The Works in Progress seminar is currently inadequately attended by faculty, despite repeated encouragement. Some faculty have expressed that better refreshments would help increase attendance. However, this would require additional funds that the graduate department does not have.	Immediate term: Under the new budget model (NBM), Unit budgets will be determined primarily by their activity - the net revenue from their graduate enrolments, undergraduate teaching activity, and research overhead revenues. Unit budgets will be stable in transition – they will receive the same budget they would have received under the old methodology (and this will persist), so that their budgets will change under the NBM incrementally. Going forward, Units will have both the changes in revenues and responsibility for changes in costs. They will have greater budgetary clarity and agency as they will be well informed and able to pursue their own academic priorities and goals, such as funding better refreshments for seminar series.

	14.	“Review PhD offer letter to include funding details and specific TA assignments and responsibilities.”	The PhD offer letter already contains funding details. Starting with the current cohort, we have also introduced a comprehensive funding session in the PhD orientation program. Unlike in many US schools, specific TA assignments cannot be provided in the offer letter due to the complexities of tricampus scheduling and union stipulations.	Immediate term: The ASDO supports the unit’s response to this recommendation.
	15.	“The University administration should review PhD packages keeping in mind that an art history PhD in North America may require 6 years of guaranteed funding (a mixture of fellowships and TAs), and that University of Toronto funding needs to be at a level that is adequate given the cost of living in contemporary Toronto.”	The University is keenly aware of this issue. From this year, the base level of PhD funding has been raised to keep pace with rising costs of living in Toronto. The university and its departments are currently addressing the challenge of meeting this commitment for 5 years of guaranteed funding. At present, therefore, while we appreciate that our time to completion often exceeds that period, there is no plan to extend it to 6 years. However, we are doing our best to direct our limited resources towards supporting students in their 6 th year.	Medium-long term: Starting in 2025-26, incoming PhD students across A&S, and the University, will now receive a guaranteed funding package of \$40,000, a substantive increase over the current guarantee of \$28,000.
The reviewers noted opportunities to increase supports for faculty, particularly more junior members of the Department. They recommended strengthening faculty mentorship; enhancing clarity, communications, and coordination related to promotion and tenure processes; and bolstering resources to support faculty research and publication.	16.	“The faculty is generally of very high caliber, however many otherwise mid-career and senior faculty members are still at the “associate professor” level. Unlike most Tier-1 institutions in the US, the University of Toronto evidently provides no incentive (such as a meaningful salary increase) for attaining the level of ‘full professor.’ We recommend that such a reward be put in place, ideally a meaningful salary increase, or if that is not possible, a substantial one-time bonus.”	We acknowledge this concern. In accordance with University policy, we use the annual PTR process to recognize scholarly achievement. We encourage faculty to apply for promotion to professor at the appropriate time in their careers.	<p>Immediate-long term: The ASDO can support faculty development through the office of the Vice-Dean Faculty & Academic Life, which offers mentorship and other supports to faculty.</p> <p>The Faculty of Arts & Science is governed by University-wide policies regarding compensation as determined by the Provost and subject to negotiation with the Faculty Association. As per University policies, annual salary increases are determined by the PTR process which recognizes scholarly achievement in the year, but which does not recognize promotion as such as an element in</p>

				the assessment. One-time-bonuses for promotion are also not contemplated in the University's compensation system as the underlying academic achievements have already received recognition through the annual PTR process.
	17.	“We strongly recommend a mentorship program for all junior faculty, provision of funds towards a book manuscript workshop, availability of subvention funds towards the production of their first monograph, and clear guidelines towards tenure.”	<p>While each of our four hires since our last UTQAP review has received tens of thousands of dollars in startup funds and each has been assigned a faculty mentor, we welcome the reviewers’ suggestion that this mentorship can be enhanced.</p> <p>Short term (1–2 years): We will develop a unit-level mentorship plan aligned with the new Faculty of Arts & Science Mentorship Guidelines. We will make sure junior faculty are aware that startup funds may be used for book workshops and subventions.</p>	<p>Immediate-long term: The ASDO will be pleased to support the unit in mentorship, in alignment with the FAS Mentorship guidelines, and can offer support through the office of the Vice-Dean Faculty & Academic Life.</p> <p>The new Faculty of Arts & Science mentorship initiatives support the flourishing of faculty in their early academic careers, encourage faculty to develop personally meaningful mentorship networks, enhance new colleagues’ understanding of institutional policies, procedures, and unit-level practices, promote engagement, and foster a sense of community and belonging. It responds to the needs of a diverse faculty complement and provides four evidence-based recommendations that reflect the current academic landscape and feedback from the A&S community.</p>
The reviewers observed that, despite strong recent hires in Islamic art, Indigenous art, and Black Diaspora art, departmental faculty expertise remains heavily weighted towards Western art. They urged the unit to engage in strategic complement planning and, when hiring opportunities permit, to consider	18.	“Peer institutions such as the Ivy+ schools in the US have made significant moves to embrace the opportunities and challenges of a global art history, and we urge the Department to strongly prioritize moving in that direction. There are plans in the near future to hire in one Western and one non-western area. However, rather than thinking piecemeal about immediate needs, a strategic 5- to 10-year plan for broadening faculty expertise needs to be developed. This should include broadening the geographic and cultural expertise represented	In Winter 2025, the UTSG budgetary unit initiated a complement planning process, holding an open forum for faculty to propose strategic factors that should inform hiring over the next 5–10 years. Suggested factors include diversity in intellectual perspectives, academic training, and racial background; student interests and enrolment patterns; which subfields currently have a critical mass	It is good practice for the four chairs to discuss complement planning. Following consultation, the budgetary chair can submit requests for new complement to the Faculty Appointments Committee, which receives many more requests than positions. See above, # 7.

<p>developing strengths in areas such as Southeast Asian, South Asian, Japanese, African, and Latin American art; as well as new media, ecology, disability studies, decoloniality, materiality, and queer and feminist approaches. The reviewers also noted opportunities to strengthen strategic consultation among cognate tri-campus units related to faculty complement planning, and promotion and tenure processes.</p>		<p>in the Department (for example, Southeast Asia, South Asia, Japan, Africa, precontact and post-contact Latin America) as well as newer aspects of the discipline (for example, new media, ecology, disability studies, decoloniality, materiality, queer and feminist approaches).”</p>	<p>of top-tier scholars; alignment with international partnerships and initiatives; and academic strengths and priorities of the Department, the Faculty of Arts & Science, and the University of Toronto.</p> <p>Medium term (3–4 years): If budgetary conditions permit, we will request 2 new faculty positions informed by the factors we have identified. We will also explore how status-only and adjunct faculty may be deployed strategically to complement the expertise of budgetary faculty lines.</p> <p>Strategic consultation related to faculty complement planning and promotion processes among cognate tri-campus units will be carried out at biannual meetings between the graduate chair and the tricampus budgetary chairs, as proposed in the draft Tricampus Memorandum of Agreement.</p>	
	19.	<p>“Develop a strategic plan to broaden future faculty hiring in relation to geographic and cultural breadth and innovative art-historical methods; include consideration of teaching stream hiring and provide reasons for making such a future hire.”</p>	<p>See #18. We will consider the hiring of teaching stream faculty as part of this plan.</p>	<p>See above, # 7.</p>
	20.	<p>“...we also note the need for the Department to provide teaching and research leadership in settler-colonial Canadian art in addition to the important offerings in Indigenous Art.”</p>	<p>We currently have one tenure stream faculty member who works on Indigenous art and two tenure stream faculty members who work on (settler) Canadian art. Shortly after the external review site visit, the Department hired a new teaching stream colleague in the latter area as well. As part of our complement planning process (see #18), we will consider whether additional positions are needed.</p>	<p>See above, # 7.</p>

	21.	“As a matter of professional inclusion, we urge the St. George campus to include a faculty member from the other campuses in the search committees and urge the other campuses to reciprocate accordingly when hiring in art history. This is because tenure stream faculty members in each campus also serve as faculty members in the Tri-Campus Graduate Program.”	When conducting tenure stream searches, we will invite input from all graduate Art History faculty. The committee composition will depend on the nature and circumstances of each search and may draw on faculty expertise across the three campuses. As a matter of university policy, the tri-campus graduate program is formally represented on tenure stream Art History searches across all three campuses by the graduate chair.	Immediate term: The Dean’s office supports the unit’s response to this recommendation.
The reviewers made several recommendations related to enhancing the Department’s profile and visibility, particularly by strengthening its online presence.	22.	“The Department website needs substantial work. It should be a central means to attract even better graduate students, allow undergraduate students to identify and connect effectively with faculty in their areas of interest, and appeal to potential funders and collaborators. The limitations of the University’s template notwithstanding, the website could offer more information about the Department. Specifically, the overall goals, objectives, mission, and scope of the Department’s undergraduate and Graduate Programs is totally absent.”	Undergraduate: We have begun to streamline our website’s navigational structure and to remove outdated materials, to make this information https://arthistory.utoronto.ca/undergraduate/about-undergraduate-studies easier to find. Graduate: The “overall goals, objectives, mission, and scope” of the graduate programs are absent from the website because these have yet to be agreed upon. Short- and medium-term plans to accomplish this are outlined in #1.	Immediate term: The Dean’s office notes that the unit has begun responding to this recommendation.
	23.	“Faculty profiles should be updated every year to represent current research interests and ongoing projects in addition to recent publications.”	We will invite faculty annually to submit updates to their online profiles. This has been the department’s longstanding practice, but it lapsed for several years due to staff leaves of absence.	Immediate term: The Dean’s office supports the unit’s response to this recommendation and notes that the Discover Research website is another valuable forum for faculty research profiles. The Research Services Office within the Dean’s Office will connect with the Unit to ensure widespread awareness and support robust adoption of this resource.
	24.	“Separate News from Events on website and update both at least each semester.”	When the reviewers visited, some updates to the website were deferred. Since then, we have brought the site up to date.	Immediate term: The Dean’s office supports the unit’s response to this recommendation.

			Short term (1–2 years): We will further streamline our online news and events listings and ensure they are updated regularly.	
	25.	“Consolidate all lectures in a single list for publicity purposes; events should be downloadable on calendars.”	Short term (1–2 years): We will create a single online list of major lectures each semester and implement a registration system to help us obtain a more accurate headcount for each event. Events are already downloadable on calendars.	Immediate term: The Dean’s office supports the unit’s response to this recommendation.
	26.	“Change description of Instagram page so that it can be found easily in a search.”	We have updated the Instagram description as recommended.	Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that the unit has already responded to this recommendation.
	27.	“The Department and Deans might work together to comprehensively and systematically, rather than merely anecdotally or selectively, track relevant data, including time to degree, attrition, external awards for graduate students and faculty, job placement, alumni, course enrollments, majors and minors, faculty advising, field distribution. This should especially be possible for the doctoral program. Posting certain data and measures of success—especially time to degree, outside fellowships won, and job placement for PhD students—has become standard practice in North American programs and will help with student and faculty recruitment as well as fundraising.”	We agree that this is a valuable recommendation. The graduate department is participating in SGS and FAS initiatives to track alumni as well as maintaining its own informal database to track graduates of the doctoral program. However, we would welcome decanal support to make this more systematic. We would also appreciate help with navigating privacy issues around posting data as well as sorting out staff roles and responsibilities for this task (see #40).	Immediate term: The Dean’s office supports the unit’s response to this recommendation. The Director of Administrative Human Resources is available to the unit to discuss the HR components of workflow and responsibilities for staff roles. The unit has access to information on their external awards, course enrolments, majors and minors, faculty advising and field distribution. The Dean's Office is working on developing a more systematic and consistent set of data around the time to degree that can be used by the unit's graduate program leadership; the office of the Vice-Dean, Graduate Education would be very pleased to work with them to think through how best to enhance the program's online presence and use of these data.

	28.	“Regular communication with alumni could help with experiential learning opportunities and fundraising.”	Short term (1–2 years): This year, we have begun regular communications with alumni, inviting their attendance at art history lectures. We will continue working with FAS to determine the most effective means of regular communication with alumni.	Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that the unit has already responded to this recommendation. See also above, #27.
The reviewers highlighted opportunities to strategically strengthen connections and collaborations with the University of Toronto Art Museum, observing that university art museums play a critical role in supporting the teaching of art history and providing experiential learning opportunities at many North American peer institutions. They also noted opportunities to strengthen ties with the Master of Visual Studies in Curatorial Studies, offered by the Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design.	29.	“Create a university committee to assess the role and opportunities of the University Museum.”	This recommendation exceeds the scope of the review. The Art Museum is part of University College and has no administrative relationship with the Department of Art History.	The ASDO agrees that this reviewer recommendation is beyond the scope of the UTQAP cyclical review and a divisional response.
	30.	“Good first decanal steps might be an external review of the museum by a committee of university museum professionals and art history faculty engaged in curatorial teaching and research (common practice at leading university museums), and/or an internal university committee assessing existing relationships (between the museum, the curatorial studies program, and the Department of Art History) and possible new opportunities.”	See #29. While the Art Museum is outside the scope of this review, the graduate programs would benefit from a holistic, university-level review of relationships between Art History, the Daniels Faculty, and the Art Museum.	Medium term: The ASDO will consider the merits of this type of review, which is beyond the parameters of the UTQAP cyclical review. Such a review would require the cooperation of another divisional Dean’s office and the office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs.
	31.	“...consider the museum’s relationship to the undergraduate and graduate programs in art history. This might include assessing the, to us, strangely absent relationship between the Department of Art History and the ‘Master in Visual Studies in Curatorial Studies,’ since curators are typically trained as art historians. Substantial university resources spent on a university art museum—whether budget lines, art acquisitions, exhibitions, or staff—should benefit the university’s art history department, not least one of UTSG’s overall caliber and excellent emphasis on experiential learning. Aligning the museum with the academic and pedagogical mission of the Department of Art History, not at the expense of but in addition to the curatorial studies program, is critical and ‘low hanging fruit.’”	Undergraduate: The Department of Art History would welcome more opportunities to utilize the University of Toronto’s notable art collection in undergraduate teaching. The current orientation of the Art Museum, which does not prioritize the exhibition of historical art, makes it difficult to realize the possibilities of collaboration fully. We would be happy to recommend ways to align the museum with the Department’s mission if requested.	Immediate-medium term: The ASDO supports the unit’s discussions regarding a potential graduate Collaborative Specialization and the Vice-Dean Graduate Education is available for consultation on this. All new program proposals are required to be submitted to the Dean’s Action Committee on Academic Change, comprised of members across A&S sectors, to discuss the merits of new programmatic initiatives. We encourage the unit to submit a proposal to DACAC at an early stage, after consultation with the VDGE on this initiative.

			<p>Graduate: We agree that it is critical for our graduate programs to have close links to the Daniels Faculty's curatorial and studio art programs and to the University's Art Museum, although we would submit that these links are not entirely absent. Currently, one of our graduate faculty members has a joint appointment with the Art Museum; a faculty representative from Art History and a graduate student from the department serve on its Advisory Board; the Director of the Art Museum serves on graduate student committees; and visits to the museum are routinely integrated into graduate seminars. Graduate students from the Daniels Faculty (including the MVS program) attend our graduate seminars and vice-versa, with some entering our PhD program; faculty members reciprocally serve on committees across our programs.</p> <p>We are presently in discussion with the Director of the PhD program in Architecture, Landscape, and Design to initiate a collaborative specialization in "History of Architecture and Constructed Environments." Further, in response to this recommendation, in the short term, the Graduate Chair has initiated a conversation with the Director of the Art Museum to explore forging closer links. In the medium term, we will explore further initiatives that align with our academic and pedagogical mission at the curriculum retreat (see #1) once these have been outlined.</p>	<p>The Dean's Office noted the reviewers' broader recommendation about the benefits of a closer relationship between the Department and the Art Museum; we urge the Department to consider how this might strengthen both teaching and research in the Department and would be pleased to be a support as the Department builds those connections.</p>
The reviewers repeatedly highlighted very significant faculty	32.	"The mission of the graduate 'program' or 'department; must be identified and agreed upon, and we urge the Dean's office	We wholeheartedly agree with the reviewers that we need to develop a mission and	Immediate term: See above, #1. The ASDO can offer guidance from Academic Human

<p>climate concerns, particularly in relation to the tri-campus graduate program. They emphasized that tensions between Department members were “apparent in every area: structural, budgetary, intellectual and interpersonal,” and considerably impede the department from achieving its full potential. They strongly asserted that the Dean’s office must play a much more active role in addressing challenges and facilitating progress in the unit. They also stressed the importance of resolving issues and increasing clarity regarding the structure and resources of the tri-campus graduate program, and of ensuring consultation and coordination between the Deans of FAS, UTM and UTSC where appropriate (in developing your response, you are encouraged to work with the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life).</p>		<p>to play a proactive role in this process, by holding retreats and workshops facilitated by mediators in order for the faculty of all three campuses to be fully and clearly invested in supporting graduate study within a shared intellectual and organizational framework.”</p>	<p>priorities for the graduate programs that fully and equitably encompass faculty from all three campuses. We also agree that due to issues of climate (see 33 below) this will require mediation and decanal support for retreats and workshops as outlined in 1 above.</p>	<p>Resources and the Vice-Dean Faculty & Academic Life, to coordinate mediation on internal matters.</p>
	33.	<p>“Climate is an issue, both in UTSG and Graduate Faculty meetings. The latter, some faculty reported, were rare, inhospitable, and not well attended. Some faculty reported a lack of decorum and a breakdown of trust evident at times in both UTSG and Graduate Faculty meetings. We urge mutual respect among all faculty, and the need to recognize that art history as a discipline is not static but continues to evolve in terms of its methodology and its subject matter. We also urge the Department to adopt a voting process in faculty meetings that is confidential, in order to protect dissenting votes, especially of the junior faculty.</p>	<p>Undergraduate: We will ensure that when the chair puts a question to a vote in a faculty meeting, it may be taken confidentially upon request. We will also ensure faculty are aware of university policies on academic freedom, which cover participation in faculty meetings and other types of academic service.</p> <p>Graduate: We thank the reviewers for identifying this longstanding issue, as a first step towards addressing it. The next step, a mediated retreat for the graduate faculty, is necessary in the short term, with decanal support as outlined in #1. We are hopeful that this will result in a recognition of shared values and priorities as well as strategies to manage differences. Meanwhile, we are committed to adopting a confidential voting process in graduate faculty meetings.</p>	<p>See above, #32.</p>
	34.	<p>“Deans should work with faculty to resolve the question of nomenclature for “Graduate Chair” and the name and status of the Graduate Program/department.”</p>	<p>We are grateful to the reviewers for highlighting the need for decanal resolution of these issues, which go beyond nomenclature.</p>	<p>Immediate term: The Vice-Dean Graduate is currently working with the Dean of Graduate Studies on clearer definition and articulation of Graduate Chair role and responsibilities and will, in turn, work with the unit to facilitate clearer communications and alignment with tri-campus graduate chair structure.</p>

	35.	“Deans need to be aware of concerns about climate in the Department, notably over questions of diversity and inclusion, and to offer advice on best practices.”	<p>On the advice of the Dean’s office, the UTSG chair has notified all tricampus faculty about university policies, guidelines, and processes relevant to these issues, including the Policy with Respect to Workplace Harassment, the Human Resources Guideline on Workplace Harassment and Civil Conduct (“Civility Guideline”), and the University of Toronto Guideline for Employees on Concerns and Complaints Regarding Prohibited Discrimination and Discriminatory Harassment. Faculty have also been advised that the Faculty of Arts & Science Office of Equity, Diversity & Inclusion provides support to community members in respect of these matters.</p> <p>The Graduate Chair has reinstated the EDI committee (see #36 below). The chair and the graduate chair jointly held a meeting with graduate students to hear their concerns on this front and others. The Graduate Chair will also ensure that EDI concerns are addressed in the action points on climate and curriculum outlined in #1 above.</p>	Immediate term: The Dean’s office is pleased to note that the unit has already begun to address the recommendation. The ASDO notes that the A&S Director, Equity, Diversity & Inclusion is available to assist the unit, as well as Academic and Administrative HR. The Vice-Dean Faculty & Academic Life can offer guidance in these areas. Such guidance includes assistance in designing and implementing restorative measures to repair a divided community.
	36.	“The EDI committee should be reinstated or maintained (not all faculty members were clear as to whether or not this committee had met), with membership drawn from faculty and students across the Department; this should not be populated primarily by BIPOC faculty and students.”	The EDI committee has been reinstated as of last year, with reporting of its activities at graduate faculty meetings. The composition of this year’s committee conforms to the reviewers’ recommendations.	Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that the unit has already acted upon this recommendation.
	37.	“Begin to or continue to delegate authority over all dedicated graduate funds to the faculty member overseeing the Graduate Program (not all faculty members were clear if this was currently the case).”	The chair is accountable to FAS for the entire department budget. The chair currently delegates signing authority over graduate funds to the graduate chair.	Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that this recommendation has been resolved.

	38.	“Establish a budget for events including all related endowments for named lectures.”	Departmental lectures are supported by a variety of funding sources, including restricted accounts whose usage is conditioned by donor agreements. For each endowed lecture, a budget is established to ensure that expenses for speaker travel, accommodations, hospitality, and honorarium remain within the scope of expendable funds.	Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that this recommendation has been resolved.
	39.	“Create events committee to make decisions how to spend funding allocated for these purposes.”	For endowed lectures, each speaker is chosen by a committee of expert faculty in the relevant subfield along with student representatives. This selection is made from nominations solicited from all tri-campus faculty and graduate students. Following the external review, we have added undergraduate student representation alongside the existing committee composition of faculty and graduate students.	Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that this recommendation has been resolved.
	40.	“Clarify in writing staff roles and reporting in accordance with either the separate chair or integrated chair model.”	Short term (1–2 years): The chair, as the manager of all department staff, will work with FAS Administrative HR to ensure that staff have up-to-date written explanations of their roles and reporting expectations.	Immediate term: The ASDO Director of Administrative HR is available to discuss these issues with the unit when it is ready.
	41.	“A retreat for the UTSG Department; agenda items might include formulating mission statement(s) and identifying the unique strengths and opportunities.”	Medium term (3–4 years): The UTSG unit held a productive retreat in 2019. We will consult with faculty about the need for a follow-up retreat.	See #1, above.
	42.	“A retreat for the Graduate Program; agenda items here too might include formulating mission statement(s), identifying the unique strengths and opportunities, discussion of new directions (plural) in art and architectural history as a discipline, discussion of how to achieve equity and excellence;	Please see responses to 1 and 32 above. We will plan a retreat for the Graduate Programs to address this recommendation in the medium term; however, this must be	Please see #1, and #32, above.

		the retreat has to discuss a skeleton for a MoA that forms an agreement of shared intellectual and organizational frameworks.”	preceded in the short term by a workshop to create the climate for this conversation.	
Finally, the reviewers broadly observed that “the Department’s problems are too complex and deep-seated to be addressed comprehensively on the basis of a two-day campus visit.” They recommended that the Dean’s office consider commissioning the next review of the Department on an accelerated timeline and noted opportunities to work with colleagues across the three campuses to strategically and collaboratively determine the optimal structure of subsequent reviews.	43.	“It needs to be noted above all that our External Review committee’s charge was unclear: our review was of the Department of Art History on the St. George campus only, plus the full Graduate Program faculty, but the Graduate Program draws from three departments and three campuses; a more appropriate review would be of all three together, or the Graduate Program only on its own.”	This recommendation appears to be beyond the scope of our unit.	Immediate term: The ASDO thanks the reviewers for this observation and recommendation. The current configuration of the UTQAP cyclical review of the Department of Art History and its undergraduate and graduate programs is consistent with University and provincial protocols for external reviews of programs. See also above, #34.
	44.	“We recommend that the Department should be reviewed again in 5 years, with more time, a more carefully defined charge and mandate, and ideally including the three campuses and museum.”	We appreciate the suggestion to align reviews of all related budgetary units across the three campuses, but this does not seem feasible. Among other impediments, the UTM and UTSC departments are multidisciplinary (i.e., they send faculty to other graduate units besides Art History). The Art Museum is an entirely separate entity.	Immediate term: The ASDO thanks the reviewers for this observation and recommendation. The current review schedule of the UTQAP cyclical review of the Department of Art History and its undergraduate and graduate programs follows provincial guidelines of external review no longer than every 8 years. The ASDO notes, however, that it is the Dean’s prerogative to commission a review at any time within that 8-year period. As well, we note that the schedule for UTQAP cyclical reviews is a divisional matter and that reviews commissioned by other divisions are under the purview of that division’s commissioning officer, usually the Dean.
Other recommendations not prioritized in the Request for Administrative Response	45.	“Make budgets available for next external review.”	The Department will follow university policy and applicable best practices around financial transparency and sharing of sensitive or confidential information.	Immediate term: We thank the reviewers for this recommendation and note that review of and recommendations for divisional and unit budgets is outside the scope of UTQAP cyclical review, which is primarily a review of programs.

	46.	“We urge the Department and Deans to work with the donor to try to conceive of [the France gift] more broadly, including working on collections of art in France that may be from Africa, Polynesia, Southeast Asia, and North Africa, diaspora practices, and on the art of the Francophone world that encompasses areas of Africa, the Caribbean, and other regions across the world.”	Use of these funds is constrained by a signed gift agreement with the donor, a private foundation whose mission is to support exchange between Canada and France. We welcome future fundraising opportunities that might embrace the wider Francophone world.	Immediate-medium term: The ASDO confirms the terms of the donor agreement and supports the unit in identifying advancement priorities that align with the unit’s academic priorities.
	47.	“We encourage all colleagues to identify and pursue similar funding opportunities that might benefit the Department in other areas; the University of Toronto - France Art History Partnership does not seem to stand in the way of obtaining funding for numerous other research and teaching areas.”	The Department welcomes any fundraising leads colleagues may suggest and will work with Advancement to pursue them.	Immediate term: All advancement priorities must be initiated by the chair of the department and go to the Dean for approval. Once they are approved Advancement will work with the appropriate Faculty member(s) as identified by the Department Chair. The ASDO is pleased to work with the budgetary Chair to explore funding opportunities.
	48.	“Job descriptions—for the financial officer, the graduate assistant, and especially for the Visual Resources Curator—have not been updated in a timely manner and consistent with the jobs being performed and with the relevant skill sets required. In order to lift morale and retain its excellent staff, the Department and university administration should prioritize completing these updates and evaluating salary brackets accordingly.”	We are working with Administrative HR to review and, where applicable, to update current staff job descriptions.	Immediate-medium term: The Director of Administrative HR will work with the unit on reviewing and, where applicable, updating current job descriptions, consistent with existing collective agreements where applicable.
	49.	“Explore adding an office assistant position.”	Given current budgetary constraints, it does not appear feasible to hire additional full-time staff.	See also above, #48.
	50.	“Install larger screens in large classrooms.”	We acknowledge this recommendation and agree that large screens are helpful for art history courses.	Medium-term: We thank the reviewers for this observation and note that current infrastructure needs can be assessed by the relevant University or Divisional team if deemed necessary.

	51.	“The spatial integration of the art library into the Department’s space is special: amidst a very large community with hundreds of students, it provides a study space, sense of belonging, and shared identity centered on research and teaching. For this reason, the problems arising from structural capacity limits should be solved while keeping the current library location.”	We agree that the Art History Library’s spatial integration in the department is vital. Now that the renovation is complete and the library collection has been modestly reduced, the structural issues appear to have been successfully mitigated.	Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that this problem appears to have been resolved to the unit’s satisfaction.
	52.	“Renew lapsed lecture series”	Some of our endowments yield only enough funds to hold the lecture every few years, depending on investment performance. We will explore ways to make this legible on our website so the series do not come across as lapsed.	Immediate term: The ASDO is pleased to note that the unit has begun to address this recommendation.

3 Committee on Academic Policy & Programs (AP&P) Findings

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that the review summary had accurately reflected the full review. The reading group reported that the Dean's administrative response had adequately addressed the issues identified by the review, however, asked the Department to further address the concerns around enhanced faculty advising and student experience, short term deliverables regarding mentorship, specific timelines for reporting on program and student outcomes, tracking and engagement of faculty participation at the Works-in-Progress seminar, EDI outcomes and supports, clarifying specific task timelines and identifying success criteria to evaluate positive impacts.

Dean Melanie Woodin responded that there was ongoing work to navigate climate challenges, and that unit leadership was committed to collaborating with the Dean's office to ensure that the department and the graduate program thrived.

Regarding the mentorship concerns, Dean Woodin reported that the Faculty had recently launched new mentorship guidelines. Prior to this, departments had a range of formal and informal mentorship programs, with various levels of success. In consultation with units, a set of guidelines was developed to foster uniformity of expectations about mentorship, and offer flexibility for chairs and directors to tailor the program to best suit their needs. The mentorship guidelines preserved best practices, which included clarity around the mentor role, affirming confidentiality, and engagement.

Regarding transparent reporting on program and student outcomes, Dean Woodin reported that SGS had unveiled an extensive data dashboard on their website which was valuable to FAS. The dashboard included detailed items such as time to completion, attrition for PhDs at the unit level, and specific information on job outcomes.

Regarding EDI outcomes and supports, Dean Woodin reported on recent developments in the Faculty. The FAS EDI Office recently launched the Arts and Science Equity Practitioners Community of Practice. Developed for departmental staff members supporting EDI initiatives, the Community of Practice provided professional development, opportunities for shared EDI knowledge and resources, and awareness for successful initiatives in other units. A second initiative was also launched to support academic colleagues that chaired EDI committees and foster collaborations. The Department would also leverage resources from The Institutional Equity offices. Chairs of EDI committees developed an EDI plan that included internal processes for implementation and progress tracking. The Chairs of the Undergraduate and Graduate Programs jointly worked together to advance the engagement of the EDI plan and availability of resources.

Dean Woodin confirmed that a faculty workshop, addressing interpersonal and inter-campus issues to enable constructive conversations, had been scheduled for Sept. 5.

Joseph Clarke, Department Chair, Art History reported that enhancing student advising was a priority for the department. Over the past five years, program enrolments increased by 54% and staff FTEs increased by only 39%; thus the challenge was to ensure that all students were supported and received the advising needed. There were planned initiatives to enhance student experience, such as the creation of a thesis option for undergraduate students. The faculty advised students on subject matter and potential graduate studies. There was continued work on formalizing the internship program with supports from the experiential learning and outreach support office around areas of professional and career development.

Professor Clarke stated they were developing a codified plan regarding mentorship expectations, and collaborating with the Dean's office to ensure its alignment with the newly launched mentorship guidelines.

Kajri Jain, Tri-Campus Graduate Chair, Art History reported that tracking faculty engagement in the Works-in-Progress seminar was a simple matter of noting the number of participants at a given event. This program, where students and faculty present works-in-progress, was noted as a positive initiative, however it had been better attended by students than faculty. One of the ways they measured faculty engagement in the graduate unit was the quarterly Tri-Campus graduate faculty meetings, and they would try to find resources to provide better refreshments based on the feedback they received.

Considering that there were several matters of concern and complex issues to address, the reading group requested a one-year follow-up to report on progress following the upcoming curriculum retreat(s) and mediated faculty retreat.

4 Institutional Executive Summary

The reviewers found much to admire in the Department's offerings at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, noting that significant moves have been made by the Department to diversify the curriculum. They observed that the undergraduate program is thriving, and is one of the largest of its kind in North America. The graduate program attracts high quality students whose innovative work is well-regarded on campus and beyond. The Department has been successful in preparing students at all levels for the job market with a range of internships and productive collaborations, most notably with the Royal Ontario Museum. The faculty across all three campuses are of stellar quality in terms of research and teaching; and impressive hires have been made in the past 10-15 years, reflecting a timely response to ongoing changes in the field and in humanities more broadly. Department staff are competent, knowledgeable, and professional, and greatly respected and appreciated by faculty and students; and the unit is to be commended for its enterprising spirit and success in obtaining internal and external donations and grants beyond individual research funding. Finally, departmental spaces have been effectively renovated, and the integration of the art library into the unit's space is noted as special, providing a study space, sense of belonging, and shared identity centred on research and teaching within a very large community of students.

The reviewers recommended that the following issues be addressed: developing mechanisms to engage in more fulsome curriculum discussions and planning at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; assessing undergraduate program requirements and enhancing student advising to better position learners for graduate studies and/or museum careers, and examining experiential learning offerings to ensure that they are varied and of high-quality; assessing MA and PhD course requirements and pursuing adjustments as appropriate; exploring the development of an MA offering that could position students more advantageously for potential doctoral studies; strengthening resources for and encouraging community building among graduate students; increasing supports for faculty, particularly more junior members of the Department; engaging in strategic complement planning, and strengthening strategic consultations among cognate tri-campus units related to faculty hiring, promotion and tenure processes; enhancing the department's profile and visibility; strategically strengthening connections and collaborations with the University of Toronto Art Museum and the DFALD Master of Visual Studies in Curatorial Studies; addressing very significant faculty climate concerns, resolving issues and increasing clarity regarding the structure and resources of the tri-campus graduate program, and ensuring consultation and coordination between the Deans of FAS, UTM and UTSC where appropriate; and commissioning the next review of the Department on an accelerated timeline, working with colleagues across the three campuses to strategically and collaboratively determine the optimal structure of subsequent reviews.

The Dean's Administrative Response describes the Faculty and unit's responses to the reviewers' recommendations, including an implementation plan for any changes necessary as a result.

5 Monitoring and Date of Next Review

The Arts & Science Dean's office monitors progress on Implementation Plans through periodic meetings with chairs and directors and through regular governance and curricular oversight.

The Dean will provide an interim report to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs no later than midway between the February 2024 UTQAP cyclical review and the year of the next site visit in 2031-32 on the status of the implementation plans.

The next review will be commissioned no later than 2031-32.

6 Distribution

On August 15th 2025, the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan was posted to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs website and the link provided by email to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Secretaries of AP&P, Academic Board and Governing Council, and the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. The Dean provided the link to unit/program leadership.