



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE

This memorandum is also available online at:  
[www.artsci.utoronto.ca/main/faculty/cpad](http://www.artsci.utoronto.ca/main/faculty/cpad)

**CPAD #24-2009-10**

---

## Memorandum

Date: 10 November 2009

To: Council of Chairs, Principals, and Academic Directors  
Coalition of Arts and Science Directors

From: Meric S. Gertler, FRSC  
Dean and Professor of Geography and Planning  
Goldring Chair in Canadian Studies

Re: **Indicators for Academic Planning in Arts and Science**

---

The Provost's recent document *University of Toronto: Academic Planning in the Context of Towards 2030* emphasizes the importance of divisions and their constituent academic units being able to measure and benchmark their achievements relative to Faculty and unit goals. The document notes (p. 8) that "While some of these benchmarks may be qualitative ..., it is important that we also include quantitative metrics among our benchmarks." Accordingly, for the current academic planning exercise in the Faculty, the plans that are being generated by each unit will also be supplemented by data on key indicators. The Provost's Office has urged each division to "select metrics that are relevant to it and its constituent units".

The Faculty's Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) has been deliberating on this issue for the past several weeks, with the goal of selecting and refining those metrics that will capture most appropriately the nature and range of our teaching and research activities. This builds on the work undertaken last year by the Budget Strategy Subcommittee to articulate a set of indicators to guide strategic planning. The appendix to the Provost's academic planning document provides a list of 112 potential benchmarks. The Budget Strategy Subcommittee had drawn up its own list of nearly 70 potential indicators, many of which were similar to those on the Provost's list.

.../3

The SPC has reviewed both of the above lists with the goal of reducing the number to a more manageable level while maintaining sufficient breadth and comprehensiveness to inform academic planning at the unit level. The list includes 21 indicators shown below, organized into groups corresponding to our major activity areas. While this list represents our initial selection of indicators, the SPC may subsequently consider other indicators to inform its work as appropriate.

It is important to keep in mind the following principles that will guide the design and use of these metrics by the SPC:

- These quantitative measures will inform but not dictate decisions made by the SPC
- Data for these indicators will, for the most part, be supplied by my office
- Units will be measured only on those indicators that are appropriate to their mission (e.g. if they are a graduate-only unit, metrics pertaining to undergraduate teaching will have little or no relevance to them)
- Units will be free to supplement the SPC list with indicators of their own choosing, to round out the analysis in their academic plans, where appropriate
- Units will be compared primarily to other similar units (e.g. humanities departments will be compared to other humanities departments, science departments to other science departments, and so on)
- Wherever possible and sensible, indicators will be based on multi-year averages to dampen the effects of spurious year-to-year variation
- The analysis of these data by the SPC will be designed to minimize the effect of small, insignificant differences between individual units on any individual indicator

The initial selected indicators are listed below. Details on their definition and method of calculation will be forthcoming soon.

A. Faculty and Staff Resources

1. Total undergraduate FCEs relative to continuing faculty FTEs
2. Continuing faculty FTEs relative to administrative and technical FTEs
3. Total undergraduate FCEs relative to administrative and technical FTEs
4. Ratio of female continuing faculty to total continuing faculty

B. Undergraduate Teaching and Learning

1. Proportion of course offerings taught by faculty with continuing appointments
2. Proportion of faculty who have won Faculty/University/external teaching awards
3. Average score on Question 11 of course evaluations for all courses offered
4. Proportion of large-lecture courses that include a small-group learning opportunity
5. Number of small-group learning opportunities relative to total teaching activity
6. Number of students in Research Opportunities courses relative to tenure-stream faculty
7. Number of students in summer research projects (USRA, UTEA) relative to tenure-stream faculty

### C. Graduate Education

1. Total FTE enrolment relative to three-campus supervisory capacity
2. PhD degrees awarded relative to three-campus supervisory capacity
3. Masters degrees awarded relative to three-campus supervisory capacity
4. Average time to completion (PhDs)
5. Proportion of domestic students with major external scholarships
6. CGPSS<sup>1</sup>: quality of academic experience (proportion of responses indicating 'Excellent' + 'Very Good')

### D. Research and Scholarship

1. Proportion of full professors with major honours (FRSC, major international honours)
2. Proportion of tenure-stream faculty with a Tri-Council (SSHRC, NSERC, CIHR) research grant (operating grant)
3. Success rate in Tri-Council research grant applications (operating grant)
4. Total research funding relative to tenure-stream faculty FTEs

Later this month you will be receiving a draft version of the indicators data for your unit,. This will also include a detailed description of the definition of each indicator and how it was calculated. We shall ask you to review these figures for accuracy, keeping in mind the definitions used to generate them. Following this, my office will distribute a complete set of data for all units in Arts & Science.

---

<sup>1</sup> Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (2007)