

The Senate of York University

UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PLAN Academic Priorities 2005-2010

**As Approved by Senate
June 23, 2005**

Contents

York University's Mission Statement / Énoncé de Mandat de l'université York

University Academic Plan 2005-2010

Appendix A: Notes on York's Academic Planning Principles

Appendix B: A History of Academic Planning at York, 1985-2005

Published and Web versions also include

Appendix C: 2020 Vision: The Future of York University

Appendix D: Principles Guiding Research at York

YORK UNIVERSITY'S MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of York University is the pursuit, preservation, and dissemination of knowledge. We promise excellence in research and teaching in pure, applied and professional fields. We test the boundaries and structures of knowledge. We cultivate the critical intellect.

York University is part of Toronto: we are dynamic, metropolitan and multi-cultural. York University is part of Canada: we encourage bilingual study, we value tolerance and diversity. York University is open to the world: we explore global concerns.

A community of faculty, students and staff committed to academic freedom, social justice, accessible education, and collegial self-governance, York University makes innovation its tradition.

Tentanda Via: The way must be tried.

ÉNONCÉ DE MANDAT DE L'UNIVERSITÉ YORK

L'Université York a pour mandat d'accroître, de préserver et de diffuser le savoir. Nous nous engageons à ce que la recherche et l'enseignement, qu'ils soient purs, appliqués ou professionnels, se placent à un degré d'excellence élevé. Nous repoussons les limites et les structures du savoir. Nous cultivons le sens critique.

L'Université York partage avec la métropole de Toronto son caractère dynamique et multiculturel. L'Université York partage avec le Canada son encouragement aux études bilingues, son attachement à la tolérance et à la diversité. L'Université York s'ouvre sur le monde et s'interroge sur les grandes préoccupations internationales.

Composée d'enseignants, d'étudiants et de membres du personnel dévoués à la cause de la liberté, de la justice sociale, du libre accès à l'enseignement et de la direction démocratique, l'Université York a fait de l'innovation sa tradition.

Tentanda Via: Ouvrir des voies nouvelles.

Endorsed by Senate, January 28, 1999

Endorsed by the Board of Governors, February 22, 1999.

Preface to the 2005 Edition of the University Academic Plan

While forward planning has been a feature of academic governance since the University's founding, Senate approved its first comprehensive academic plan in 1986. The pioneering framework supplied by Senate's *University Academic Plan* two decades ago is one of the factors that has helped York to grow and develop, often through turbulent times, into a prestigious university. This legacy, together with the enduring academic values we embrace, now enables us to chart a more strategic course.

This iteration of Senate's *University Academic Plan* differs from previous versions in a number of respects. This document is far shorter than its predecessors. It is also more strategic and focused, with an accent on the identification and accomplishment of key planning objectives over a five-year period.

Since the early 1990s, the UAP has been constructed around a set of critical concepts. These concepts – which may also be called planning principles – actually point to the enduring values which York has embraced and will continue to pursue in its development. The UAP, together with the mission statement and other frameworks, emphasizes

- excellence in research and teaching;
- valuation of the special opportunities and responsibilities that arise from the University's setting in a uniquely dynamic, metropolitan and multi-cultural milieu;
- academic freedom and collegial self-governance;
- social justice and accessible education;
- equity;
- balance and diversity across a range of planning objectives;
- innovation and interdisciplinarity, together with diversification of academic activities.

These principles remain the essence of York University and the foundation for academic planning. Although this plan differs in format and focus, it reaffirms those principles.

Planning will continue to be an essential part of York's future. Academic planning should be ongoing, engaging, informed, responsive and responsible. Planning takes place – appropriately -- at many levels of a university. A university-wide plan emphasizes broad priorities, especially those that might not receive the attention they deserve from planners without agreed-upon guidance, but should not impede other processes. This document should be understood as a compass for planners and those who are engaged with the University rather than a blueprint.

The text of this document is divided into subjects that are interwoven. In this sense the division is somewhat artificial if not without logic. Each section concludes with a series of specific objectives related to each of the broader subjects to facilitate monitoring and reporting by the appropriate individuals and bodies.

Overarching Themes

I. Attaining the Highest Academic Quality

York's academic plans are based on attaining the highest quality across a full range of academic activities. "Quality" has many meanings, meanings which are themselves surrogates for differing visions of the University. Thus, some will seek to apply the term - not unfairly - to describe York's

improved institutional reputation, selectivity in admissions, success in competitions for research funding or pedagogic innovation or by reference to similar "objective" or external indicators. Others will insist that the only legitimate aspiration for a university is to develop the talents of its students and faculty to the fullest - an aspiration whose attainment defies measurement.

The focus on quality calls on all members of the University to develop, a capacity for rigorous self-criticism and to search constantly for new and higher levels of achievement.

II. Knowing Ourselves, and Seeing How We Are Seen

In the relatively short span of time beginning in 1959, York University has grown into a large and prestigious institution. This has been accomplished thanks to a sense of purpose forged around innovation, traditional disciplinary strengths, and interdisciplinarity. Together with an insistence on the inseparability of research and teaching, York's distinctiveness is expressed through this triad.

Yet, at a critical moment for higher education in the province and in a global context, we need to ask a simple but significant question: do we know ourselves well enough? The answer is, we do not. In particular, we do not know enough about:

- the hopes, expectations and preparation of our students, and their experience of university life;
- the intensity and impact of our research, relative to our own standards and measured against competitors at other universities;
- the pedagogies we employ that have an enduring worth;
- the pedagogies that are opening to us through new technologies and practices;
- the success of our graduates in academic and career placements.

Not having better answers to these questions will be costly. Without more information, we will not know if we are truly improving in line with our objectives and our commitment to the highest quality education unless we are willing to learn about ourselves and to learn from others. It is also imperative that we document our achievements as a research and teaching university. If we do not, there is a risk that those outside the University will make decisions about York based on incomplete and inappropriate information.

In many of the passages that follow, this plan calls for reflection, understanding and candor. It argues in favour of developing and utilizing self-defined indicators of our activities and accomplishments so that we can know ourselves better while projecting ourselves more authoritatively externally. In the current climate, with its increasing demand for "measurement" and accountability, we must develop a self-knowledge and project our accomplishments in diverse, meaningful ways.

Academic Priorities 2005-2010

I. Research Priorities

York University has a robust research culture, one that has intensified over time and has been enhanced in recent years as a result of various initiatives. At the same time, we take it as axiomatic that active researchers are active teachers, and we insist on the inseparability of research and pedagogy as part of this culture. Universities must teach in ways that reflect their culture and the unique learning opportunities that a rich research environment offers. Attaining the highest quality in both research and teaching represents a challenge, but it is one that is accepted willingly as part of York's mandate and make-up.

There are other factors that impact on our research. York has not always been properly recognized for its diverse, innovative, socially relevant and influential research. Among the additional challenges facing York are the following:

- the relatively high proportion of scholars at York eligible for SSHRC grants, and the relative impoverishment of SSHRC;
- the relatively low proportion of scholars at York eligible for NSERC and other science and health related grants, especially for very large research projects;
- the external emphasis placed on monetary measures of research achievement;
- the diversity of scholarly activities – many of them path breaking – as illustrated by the work of practicing artists, artist / researchers, community activists, and scholars specializing in research on teaching and learning.

It must be acknowledged that the research terrain at York is also uneven. A truly transforming strategy must cultivate increased research activity across the entire professoriate. All of our research objectives depend on making outstanding faculty appointments. In a competitive milieu, it is imperative that York recruit and retain the kind of faculty members who will increase research funding, attract high quality graduate students, enhance York's profile, and intensify the research culture.

Against this backdrop, the highest priority in this plan is the enhancement of the research culture at York. A strategic focus on research will help to overcome this gap over the next five years, allowing York to attract the very best faculty and students and to maximize our potential as a university community. The impact of our efforts must be felt by individual researchers, students, and the wider communities with which York is engaged.

Since we have a strong if uneven research culture, it is imperative that we consider new and better ways of increasing participation and as well as deepening the research culture. Advancing this goal will require broad institutional steps as well as locally designed initiatives at the level of academic and research units.

Measures to foster research will necessarily take diverse forms across the University. As an overarching principle, however, research needs and impacts must move into the foreground of academic and administrative planning. To this end governance structures should be reviewed to ensure that those with special responsibilities for research are directly involved in a wide range of planning matters that in the past may have been addressed primarily from the perspective of teaching needs (for example faculty complement and recruitment, libraries and information technology, space allocation and facilities improvement). Organized research units at the Faculty and University level

serve the University well, but reviews of individual centres consistently raise fundamental questions about their status that must be resolved.

The assessment of research at York and other universities is often conducted by means of crude monetary indicators. If we are to assert our rightful place among top-flight research universities, we will need to enhance our performance and ranking on these indices to avail ourselves of opportunities based on indicators that exist while developing instruments of measurement attuned to York's particular blend of research cultures. With these aids we will be able to present to ourselves and to those outside, a more accurate, complete and compelling picture. York is not alone in this regard, and the University should work with others, including granting agencies, in a concerted effort to devise better indices of research activity and impact.

The complement will change in profound ways over the next five years. York has made an abiding institutional commitment to the growth, greater diversity and renewal of the full-time faculty and librarian complement, and this commitment will be critical to sustaining the research culture and supporting other research objectives. At the same time, research goals must be closely related to Faculty and unit planning processes.

Funding

York has enjoyed dramatic growth in external research funding since the time of the last UAP, in part through stronger encouragement and better administrative support for individual faculty members to seek research grants, and due to enrichment of the available external funding. Further progress on this front will require close attention to how York can best position itself to seize emerging opportunities that fit well with our research strengths. A key priority will be to find ways of investing strongly in research infrastructure. This includes improving our research space, and investing in the library and information technology resources that are critical to research productivity and profile.

Productivity, Support and Integration

Research is conducted in different ways within the scholarly community. Strategies for encouraging productivity will vary across different types of research and among individual researchers and creators. For example, and depending on the context, it may require better administrative support, more opportunities to collaborate with like-minded faculty and graduate students, better access to seed funding, increased time to focus on research, more opportunities to travel to conferences and research sites abroad, more access to professional staff in the libraries, or intensified training in research methods and information literacy. New colleagues should be welcomed into the research culture through mentoring strategies, assisted in developing collaborative working relationships, and encouraged to integrate their teaching and research. At an institutional level York must continue to develop its vibrant internal research culture. In particular it should facilitate cross-unit collaboration especially in areas where we have significant, but dispersed, strength, so that all researchers are plugged in to the places that will most stimulate their work. The University should also find creative ways to recognize the accomplishments of its researchers.

Communications

A transforming research strategy must be accompanied by a sophisticated communications, government relations and outreach plan. It is essential that our manifold contributions to society, our role as a community of engaged public intellectuals, and our successes are described and celebrated in ways that situate York's research in a local, regional, national and international context. This includes finding new ways to communicate the value of our distinctive research activities, and the

profound impacts of that work that is less heavily grant funded. A coherent communications strategy depends on liaison and coordination involving researchers and the offices responsible for support and communication.

Libraries in Research

Central to fostering a research culture, libraries are critical to excellence in research and teaching. Technological changes have greatly improved access to a broader range of resources, and considerably eased library research, facilitating the work of researcher and teacher alike. Better communication between the libraries and Faculties and programs will enhance the Library's ability to be responsive to shifts in the University's research and programmatic directions, as well as to support individual researchers. Particularly noted are the need for stable funding to support strong research collections and information technology.

In the next five years the University will:

- intensify and widen the research culture at the University and invest in more research infrastructure
- develop the means – both quantitative and qualitative – to measure and document York's research successes
- complete a review of research structures and regulatory processes to ensure that they complement overall research priorities, and provide the resources to sustain the structures in place to realize research objectives
- foster cooperative research within the University and build cooperative partnerships outside York
- implement a communications plan in support of research
- provide the support needed for the Libraries to fulfill their mandates in support of teaching, learning and research in the context of evolving technology and with the goal of information literacy.

II. Overall Size and Enrolment Planning

For enrolment planners, the focus during the last five years fell on preparing for enrolment growth resulting from the double cohort, and ensuring that Faculties and programs met their targets. During the next planning cycle York should concentrate on a different set of equally important enrolment matters, and be especially attentive to quality.

Demographic forecasts for the Greater Toronto Area see a growing population and sustained demand for enrolments on the part of secondary school graduates and others. It is anticipated that there will be pressures on York to grow again, especially between 2010 and 2020 when a new surge is expected. Demand will be highest among direct-entry secondary school entrants (now called 101s) but there will also be demand from other segments of the population (including "105s" such as mature applicants, immigrant and diasporic communities, CAAT graduates and non-degree students).

York has already surpassed the enrolment levels forecast in *Vision 2020* (1992). Without additional facilities and funding, the University cannot grow beyond planned targets. Instead, the primary goals in 2005-2010 should revolve around:

- completing the adjustment to recent growth;
- adapting to changes resulting from reforms to secondary school education;
- maintaining and extending quality in terms of the student experience, admissions and academic standards;
- supporting selective rebalancing of enrolments into priority areas, including graduate studies and professional programs;
- retaining commitments to accessible education;
- improving support for students in need of additional support, and students for whom English and French are second languages;
- enhancing accommodations for students with disabilities;
- promoting learning through the use of technology where appropriate.

In the next five years the University will:

- manage enrolments to ensure that overall and Faculty-specific targets are met while focusing attention on high quality
- make the ongoing adjustments necessitated by changes in student preparation and experiences resulting from reforms to the Ontario secondary school curriculum
- monitor system and government developments carefully and adjust targets upwards *if* there are sufficient resources for doing so or if we conclude that there are significant drawbacks in not doing so.

III. Graduate Education

In the next five years, graduate enrolments will grow in absolute terms and in proportion to the overall total. Growth in graduate studies will be positive for York in many ways. It will contribute to York's research culture and support overall objectives related to academic excellence, innovation, diversification, balance and reputation. Although York's graduate enrolments are second in the province, in recent years they have not kept pace as a share of system-wide enrolments. The combination of double cohort flow-through, demographic growth, and increasing participation rates makes expansion of graduate programmes not only positive but essential. Growth must be targeted to specific areas, including the sciences and health, based on sophisticated planning and analysis. It must also reflect objectives such as equity and the commitment to training of scholars from diverse backgrounds to take their place in the professoriate.

Growth will require new resources (and thus, hard choices) and sophisticated planning across many dimensions: teaching, supervision (about which more is said below), offices, laboratories and studio space, libraries (collection, assistance, facilities) and infrastructure. The relative size of York's existing programs gives the University an unusual profile within the system, with a heavy emphasis on studies in business and at the Master's level. A target of approximately two thousand more students within five years also requires other significant choices:

- should growth be concentrated at the doctoral level, the Masters level or both?

- taking into account other planning objectives, what programs – existing or new – should grow?

Other planning objectives and observed trends must be factored into our growth scenario. In some disciplines, and with some exceptions, professorial energies expended on supervision are energies not invested in the professor's own research (this is not true of science and engineering disciplines). There are also unequal distributions of supervisory responsibility, attributable to the popularity and currency of fields and topics, the reputation of faculty members, the compatibility of student and supervisor, and access to grants.

Any plan to increase significantly the size of doctoral enrolments at York -- especially in Social Sciences and Humanities – must be done in an environment in which supervisory inequalities are acknowledged and compensated. Completion times have improved in recent years, and additional enrolments cannot be easily accommodated without ensuring that completion time improvements can be sustained through adequate supervision.

In the next five years the University will:

- increase the number and proportion of enrolments in graduate students, while maintaining high quality graduate education
- increase doctoral enrolments in selected areas
- address long-standing supervisory issues such as student needs and inequities of supervisory loads
- increase Masters levels enrolments in a manner that is consistent with other planning objectives and encourage the development of Masters programs that may or may not develop into doctoral programs.

IV. The Student Experience

The enhancement of student experiences is a priority for York. Yet the paucity of available data suggests nothing less than a pressing need to learn more about student experiences. Understanding student experiences will be critical during the life of this plan. We have not been as attentive as we should to understanding our students' lives, their needs, and their expectations. As a large university with a large population of students who commute daily, York faces a special challenge in engaging students and multiplying their opportunities to engage faculty and their peers in learning circumstance co-curriculum situations. Collecting the data and conducting other forms of research will help us sharpen other tools – not least communications – for enhancing York's reputation. Students themselves must be active participants in the process of consultation as we find ways to improve their experiences inside and outside of the classroom.

In the next five years the University will

- assign high priority to understanding student expectations and experiences, and to taking the steps necessary to enhancing the student experience throughout the University.

V. Strategic Priorities in Health

As evidenced by Faculty and unit plans, activities related to health continue to be a priority for the University. Along with the establishment and development of research hubs around health, Senate's approval in principle of a health-related Faculty in January 2005 is an important signal of York's intentions.

Further developments in health over the span of this plan would be in line with this priority. One possibility on the horizon is a medical school. The need for additional physicians and surgeons, the continued population growth of the GTA, the expanding number of hospitals in adjacent regions, the development of health networks by the University: all of these argue in favour of pursuing any opportunity to house a medical school at York. It should be stressed that any medical school would be separate and apart from a health-related Faculty, which is intended to have a unique mission emphasizing innovative multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary activities.

In the next five years the University will

- actively support initiatives in health, in particular the initiative to develop a health-related Faculty if such is approved by Senate and – separate and apart from a health Faculty – the articulation of a medical school proposal.

VI. Maintaining and Extending York's Distinctiveness

Innovation, Consolidating Strengths and Interdisciplinarity

The twinning of innovation and consolidation in areas of strength will continue to be a hallmark of academic planning across a full range of activities. Maintaining the right balance between the two is imperative. Innovation must lead to the development of programs that are authentically innovative and sustainable rather than merely faddish or transitory (indeed, claims to innovation that emerge in the future must be more forthright and compelling about the extent to which innovative aspects relate to student needs, changes in, between, or among disciplines, and the extent of collegial involvement and endorsement). Consolidation must not be allowed to prevent positive change within disciplines.

Interdisciplinarity is intrinsic to York's mission and make-up. This will not change. However, our unshakeable confidence in interdisciplinarity should not be taken for granted. The term "interdisciplinary" can be confusing to those inside as well as to those outside the University, including prospective students, employers, colleagues at other institutions, and the general public. Our best evidence is that students welcome the chance to explore interdisciplinary approaches after arriving at York, but that they are also aware that many careers require a degree of discipline-based credentials and that graduate programs elsewhere may require additional coursework prior to entry. For this reason, it would be appropriate and constructive to promote public understanding of interdisciplinary scholarship.

Internationalization

Internationalization – which can be conceived as building on Canada's future in a global context – has been prized at York since its inception. Much has been accomplished in the domain of internationalization, especially since a special task force submitted its recommendations in 2000-2001. These achievements include the creation of a dedicated Associate Vice-President portfolio,

joint programs with universities outside of Canada, a blossoming of exchanges, curriculum development throughout the university, and summer internships. There is a firm consensus around the desirability of expanding the concept and encouraging local, concrete expressions.

Community Education

Community education, broadly conceived, recognizes the world outside the walls of the academy as a source of education and research partnership, rather than only as an object of study. The Faculty of Education is at the forefront in developing a variety of ways to incorporate a range of community-based activities and requirements into its undergraduate teacher education program. Initiatives of this kind are designed to enable teacher candidates to understand the contexts of their students' lives, to learn from and appreciate local knowledge, and to enable dialogue with the communities outside the schools in which they will teach. Other Faculties, notably Atkinson and FES, are building on long-standing traditions in "experiential learning" (understood as acknowledgment and support of learning acquired outside the classroom, and contributing to course and/or program curriculum). In both teaching and learning and research, the University should expand its efforts to partner with communities through CURA and other joint research projects; develop internship, coop and practicum programs; implement Prior Learning Assessment; and seek and support innovative initiatives that further university-community partnerships, and acknowledge and integrate into curriculum learning acquired outside the classroom.

Capitalizing on and expanding these opportunities is desirable given the fit with the university's mission and values. Developing greater awareness of community involvements that do exist will also be necessary.

In the next five years the University will

- promote and expand community education initiatives
- promote further internationalization initiatives at the Faculty-level and pan-University with a view toward ensuring that every student has the opportunity to have a significant "international" component in their studies

VII. Identities and Reputations

Progress in the areas described above is a necessary but not sufficient condition for enhancing York's profile as a prestigious research and teaching university engaged with multiple communities.

We must also develop and execute plans to better understand how York is perceived – and how we would like to be perceived -- by different constituencies, to respond to those perceptions, and to project ourselves in ways that are consistent with our identify, missions, mandates and objectives.

York, like other universities, has multiple identities relevant to multiple constituencies:

- peer institutions, such as other universities from whom we recruit faculty and graduate students, and with whom we both compete and collaborate;
- secondary school applicants (along with their parents and families) and adult learners who together makes decisions about who will populate York's undergraduate programs;
- local communities, by which we mean both the local residents and the institutions that surround us;

- national and international communities;
- governments and granting agencies.

For some, such as peer institutions, granting agencies and to some extent public policy makers, we want to be known for the intensity and distinctiveness of our research -- with its emphasis on international perspectives, social justice and social responsibility, and community embeddedness -- and, in the case of Faculties or their constituent units, for research excellence in particular areas. Prospective and actual students are likely to be more interested in the quality of the student experience. Local communities will look to us for relevance and responsible involvement.

We need to foreground our distinctiveness, but in doing so we must generate more reliable data about our reputations. It must be a priority in the next planning cycle to gain a better understanding of how we are seen by our various audiences relative to how we would like to be seen by them.

Reputations are a matter of substance – what we do, and do well – *and* perception. By way of an illustration, the University community understands that we need to intensify our research before we can be recognized as research intensive. Knowledge of this kind is only a first step.

In the next five years the University will

- conduct and disseminate research on the University's reputations
- make warranted substantive changes to improve our reputations
- implement communications plans in support of reputation

VIII. Academic Governance Issues

Assessments and Actions

Academic planning requires processes that are collegial, sophisticated and reliable. They must also be supple, capable of responding quickly to external phenomena in a timely and appropriate manner.

During the exercise leading to the development of this plan, correspondents argued that mechanisms for assessing existing programs and proposals (such as unit and Faculty plans, Undergraduate Program Reviews and the like) have sometimes failed to produce desired outcomes. We need to pay much closer attention to the evaluation of existing and proposed programs, and develop agreed-upon principles and methods.

In the spring of 2004 the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Senate noted that it would be timely to take a candid, disinterested and broad-based view of structures to ensure that they support the realization of academic planning objectives.

Cooperation with Other Institutions

York has a long, largely successful and constructive relationship with other institutions (from the standpoint of mobility, enrolments, program development, inter-institutional relationships). It is expected that York will continue to pursue opportunities of this kind during the next five years. Program development and agreements with institutions in Ontario, Canada and abroad must continue to be based on York's planning objectives, and they must emphasize quality.

In the next five years the University will

- improve governance processes in support of academic planning
- develop more sophisticated means of assessing ongoing and proposed academic activities
- review academic programs and unit structures (Faculties, schools, departments, interdisciplinary programs, Colleges, ORUs, etc.) to achieve a structural array that is appropriate to York's overall mission and to the objectives set out in this plan
- pursue cooperation with other institutions on the basis of quality imperatives and consonance with other articulated objectives

APPENDIX A: Notes on York's Academic Planning Principles

Until this version of the University Academic Plan was approved, the document was organized around 5 core themes against which constituent objectives were set. As noted in the preface, these principles continue to have currency and are closely related to the University's mission and mandates. The preceding version of the UAP also contained more than one hundred and fifty specific recommendations. Senate committees have been asked to review these specific recommendations and advise APPC and Senate Executive on those that have continuing relevance to their mandates and processes even if they are not strategic academic planning objectives per se.

Quality: "Quality" has many meanings, meanings which are themselves surrogates for differing visions of the University. Thus, some will seek to apply the term - not unfairly - to describe York's improved institutional reputation, selectivity in admissions, success in competitions for research funding or pedagogic innovation or by reference to similar "objective" or external indicators. Others will insist that the only legitimate aspiration for a university is to develop the talents of its students and faculty to the fullest - an aspiration whose attainment defies measurement.

However, what is common to all these visions of quality is that they require that each member of the University conduct his or her activities with intelligence and learning, care and attention, effort and imagination, a capacity for rigorous self-criticism and a constant search for new and higher levels of achievement.

Equity: Academic quality and social equity are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, equitable treatment for all - irrespective of gender or sexual orientation, race or ethnicity, physical condition or social origin, creed or religion - is an indispensable means of assuring that excellence is served and that all members of the York community enjoy the opportunity to contribute fully and to the best of their ability to the common enterprise.

Although the University's academic mission impresses an inner logic upon the academic planning process, that logic must also be infused with a sense of social responsibility and a spirit of social justice. Accordingly, in judging present academic structures and programmes, as well as proposals for change, attention should focus on the extent to which, in their respective contexts, they help to eradicate systemic and structural discrimination and promote equity for students, staff and faculty.

Recent efforts at York have focused on equity for women. These efforts must be maintained, while increased attention is also paid to the other dimensions of equity enumerated above.

Balance and Diversity: As the Green Paper proposes, the University should support academic discourse in all of its accents and idioms, and promote interchange and exploration across the arbitrary boundaries of disciplines and faculties. In so doing, it will provide not only the best possible intellectual atmosphere for its scholars and researchers, but also the widest possible range of learning experiences for its students and the greatest diversity of service for the community.

In responding to the challenge of the Green Paper, over the long run, we must therefore strive to achieve greater balance and diversity among and within our academic programmes. But at the same time, we must keep in mind three considerations: our willingness to "try the way" - our commitment to innovation and interdisciplinarity; the claims of existing programmes not to be further impoverished in

order to support new programmes; and the interaction between the University's academic ambitions and the public policies which might make it possible to advance those ambitions.

Process: As the many challenges identified through the academic planning process materialize, the practical question arises of how to make things happen. Different injunctions of the UAP call on different actors to take action. Depending on the particular action required, responsibility may fall on "the university" as a collectivity, on Senate, Faculty Councils, or their committees, on central or local administrators, or on individual faculty members, staff or students. And the UAP speaks in different idioms, because it must respect the mandates and modes of operation of the actors, and because the nature of what they are asked to do varies so greatly.

In some cases, academic units are asked to translate the general principles of the UAP into more detailed operational plans whose local articulation and realization will in turn inform and influence the evolution of the UAP. In other cases, legislation is required. Such legislation can only be suggested in very general terms by a broad, forward-looking planning document such as the UAP: it must be enacted by Senate or Faculty Councils, acting on the advice of their committees. Yet again, the UAP may seek to achieve its ends by stimulating change in the academic or administrative culture, in attitudes and practices or simply in the way we perceive ourselves. Here the UAP may contain exhortations and practical suggestions but it is up to each and all of us to make these operational. And finally, the UAP may speak to academic administrators who must listen attentively, while integrating the UAP's message with other, equally authoritative, signals received from government, collective bargaining, the university financial officers and elsewhere.

Apart from all of these, there is a residue of matters in which prescriptive language in the UAP would be premature because APPC or other mandated bodies have not yet completed their analysis of the problem and exploration of the available options. Here, the UAP can most appropriately recommend further study and ensure that it does take place. In sum, despite the necessarily varied and vague range of recommendations, each section of the UAP seeks to respond to the stern question: "what is to be done?"

That question in turn leads to a further question: "to what extent have we achieved the goals identified by the UAP?" We still lack the capacity to answer this key "process" question, with the result that unsettling doubts persist concerning the efficacy of both local and university-wide academic planning. Accepting that planning and implementation are not mechanical operations, that causality cannot always be demonstrated, that disjunctures will always occur amongst actors at different levels, this question must nonetheless be attended to. In order to verify that an investment of energy and effort in planning is justified, we must ultimately be able to point to the positive contribution of the UAP and of local plans to making York a better university.

It is imperative that Senate develop ways to ensure that better evaluation and feedback procedures are available at all levels. Evaluation may be qualitative or quantitative, ongoing or periodic, self-administered or conducted by external auditors. But these procedures must not generate burdens which exceed the benefits. We want practical procedures so that useful feedback can be provided at all levels to planners, to those charged with implementation, and to the community at large.

Resources: Academic priorities ought to be a prime determinant - the prime determinant, so far as it can be managed - of resource allocation. However, we cannot be insensitive to pressures other than academic concerns which determine resource allocation: salary negotiations, market prices of goods and services, legislation, unforeseeable developments in public policy and community concern, and the complexities of trying to coordinate all of these and other priorities. By assigning an order of importance or urgency to particular academic planning proposals, the **Priorities** section of the UAP

will send a message to local and university-wide decision-makers and budget officers who have direct responsibility for allocating human, physical and financial resources. But this will only be possible if academic priorities are thoughtfully, realistically and explicitly articulated.

At the same time, there is something to be said for allowing resource allocation to be fine-tuned as close to the locus of activity as is practically possible. Thus, a good case may be made for allowing faculties to strike the right balance of expenditure amongst the several most important priorities defined by the UAP. This would permit a given faculty, say, to emphasize at any given moment considerations of quality rather than those of balance and diversity. But if a faculty's discretion is unfettered, there is a risk that some major concerns will never be addressed, while others will be responded to fully.

What seems inescapable, therefore, is a dialogue between central and local budget authorities, with the UAP supplying the rules of debate and the criteria for judging outcomes.

APPENDIX B

A HISTORY OF ACADEMIC PLANNING AT YORK: 1985-2005

The following is an overview of academic planning at York since 1985 with an emphasis on significant documents, initiatives and actors. A glossary of key terms can be found at the end of the table. The chronology was prepared by Robert Everett of the University Secretariat.

1985

December	Senate approves the report of the Task Force on Academic Planning at York, or APAY (as proposed by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee or APPC).	APAY describes the actors, principles and processes by which academic planning will unfold at York. The report sets out an annual planning cycle and defines the linkages between academic and budgetary planning. Senate APPC will play a key role in the "interactive" academic and budget planning processes.
----------	---	--

1986

May	Senate approves the first iteration of the <i>University Academic Plan</i> .	As is required under the new APAY framework approved the previous year, APPC recommended adoption of a comprehensive academic plan. York becomes one of the first Canadian universities to adopt an objective-oriented approach to the evolution of academic activities.
-----	--	--

November	APPC files a comprehensive report on UAP initiatives.	APPC reported on responses from other universities to York's planning initiative. APPC also noted that units had begun preparing their inaugural five-year plans and that APPC itself had launched a UAP initiative which focussed on defining York's priorities.
----------	---	---

1987

March	Senate approves interim procedures for Undergraduate Programme Reviews	As called for in the <i>University Academic Plan</i> York becomes one of the first Canadian universities to adopt criteria and process for regular reviews of undergraduate programmes.
-------	--	---

May	Senate approves <i>University Academic Plan II</i>	The changes approved by Senate applied to every section of the UAP:
-----	--	---

- York's mission
- Societal responsibilities
- Environmental constraints and opportunities
- Equity in appointments and a positive climate for women at York
- Expectations that faculty members will pursue teaching, research and service
- Enhanced support of teaching
- Enhanced support of research
- Commitment to part-time and mature students
- Emphasis on "selective accessibility" in admissions

- [Cautious] enrolment policy that is sensitive to staff and faculty resource availability
- Enhancement of libraries and computing support
- Greater flexibility in planning to pursue new opportunities as they arise
- Enrichment of undergraduate education

October On a recommendation from APPC, Senate approves amendments to planning processes (APAY II). Changes approved by Senate situate planning in a local-central dialectic. APPC is identified as Senate's leading committee for policy formulation and harmonization.

1988

May APPC submits a "summary report" on progress toward certain UAP objectives. Senate approves a series of recommendations involving new or substantially revised sections of the UAP. Senate approved the following new or substantially altered objectives to the UAP:

- Professional Studies
- Part-Time and Mature Students
- Scholarships and Student Assistance
- International Activities
- Enrolment

In addition, Senate approved a recommendation from the Committee on Academic Computing concerning the inclusion of text about computing objectives in the UAP.

1989

May At two meetings held this month, Senate approves University Academic Plan III. Changes approved by Senate involved the following sections of the UAP:

Libraries
Teaching
Academic Computing
Undergraduate Education
Enrolment Policy
Achieving Our Objectives
Environmental Constraints and Opportunities

The amendments proposed by APPC included the addition of an appendix on York's position in system-wide "corridor" negotiations (i.e., those leading to the creating of a funding formula for universities contingent on achieving enrolment within a negotiated parameter).

1990

May Senate approves revisions to numerous constituent sections of the University Academic Plan. Changes were developed by a number of working groups composed of Changes were approved to the following sections of the UAP:

- Graduate Education
- Research

members of APPC and others in the academic community.

- Other Academic Activities
- Professional Studies
- General Objectives
- Societal Responsibilities
- Undergraduate Education
- Part-Time and Mature Students
- Achieving Our Objectives (minor)

1991

June APPC reports to Senate on academic planning issues. Among APPC's goals in 1991-1992 was an effort to make the UAP a more strategic document.

1992

January Senate endorses 2020 Vision: The Future of York University. The "green paper" was produced by the Enrolment Working Group, established by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Senate in partnership with the Administration. The document comprised a set of working assumptions to guide academic, physical and other planning activities at York University over the next three decades. 2020 Vision introduced or extended themes such as "diversifying curriculum" and "re-balancing enrolments" (primarily expressed as a shift in the proportion of undergraduate and graduate students but also understood to entail more applied and professional study.) The green paper departed from the objective of situating York as a "comprehensive university" while mapping a path toward the development of new Faculties, programmes and campuses.

March The Board of Governors endorses "2020 Vision." The Board joined Senate in approving the plan given the attention to capital funding and other infrastructure in "2020 Vision."

May Senate approves changes to *University Academic Plan VI*. APPC proposed changes to various elements of the document with a view toward recasting the plan as a more strategic and coherent document which would enable the University to deal more systematically with planning issues. The plan attempted to reference planning more directly to the University's financial context with the addition of specific text on resources for each of the constituent sections of the UAP.

1993

May Senate approves a new section on Student Assistance for *University Academic Plan VII*. Changes to the UAP were based on recommendations made by a Working Group on Student Assistance. (This was the last time that the UAP was given a roman numeral heading.)

1994

January APPC establishes a working group to consider changes to the UAP section on "Part-Time, Mature and Non-Traditional Students" (Part IV,

C)

May 1995	Senate approves revisions to Part III of the <i>University Academic Plan</i>	Changes to the "Teaching and Learning" section of Part III included a new name B "Teaching."
April	Recommendations of the Working Group on Part-Time, Mature and Non-Traditional Students submitted to APPC	Working Group issues companion report entitled "Planning For a New Paradigm." (The recommendations did not result in changes to the text of the UAP.)
October	APPC issues the annual <i>Call for Plans</i> .	The Call B subtitled a "Message to the Community" B warned of the need for steep budget cuts Can all current programs be sustained? Are some degree programs no longer economically viable? How can academic units be restructured so as to support degree programs more efficiently? Can departments within Faculties be merged? Is there a way for cognate units to reorganize on a pan-University basis?
1996		
June	APPC's annual <i>Call for Plans</i> is issued.	APPC takes the opportunity to urge planners to bring planning objectives identified in the previous two years to fruition by devising legislative timetables and taking other steps. APPC itself discloses an ambitious academic planning agenda for 1996-1997 that involves a review of APAY and efforts, with Senate committees and others, to encourage greater harmony.

December	APPC issues an unprecedented addendum to the <i>Call for Plans</i> which was woven around the theme of “Academic Profile Indicators: Assessing and Discussion Programme Viability.”	<p>APPC’s addendum reiterated the need for attention to restructuring issues, and proposed a series of crude indicators of programme viability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall academic quality and prestige • Research activities • YUPR commentaries (especially on structure) • Range and adequacy of curriculum choice • Enrolments per class at each year level, especially at the 3000- and 4000-level • Distinctiveness of the offerings relative to similar programmes at York and elsewhere • Degree of specialization of curriculum offerings • Availability of comparable curriculum in other Faculties • Historic pattern of enrolments and projections of future demand • Relationship of a programme and its curriculum offerings to other units, the Faculty as a whole, other Faculties, the University as a whole, and to overall academic planning • Ratio of instruction by part-time faculty and full-time faculty
----------	---	---

1997

February	On a recommendation from the Committee on Curriculum and Academic Standards, Senate approves a Policy on Access to York Undergraduate Programme Review Student Surveys.	The policy sets out the terms under which survey data can be accessed. Student surveys had become a required element of YUPRs.
May	APPC presents Senate with an edited version of the UAP.	Revisions are intended to delete stale references while ensuring a more coherent, consistent document after changes to the UAP have been made over time
September	APPC commissions a background paper on Glendon in light of challenges facing the University as a result of enrolment shortfalls at the College.	The final report was submitted in November. Publication of the report lead to a call for proposals.
December	APPC calls for responses to the Glendon background paper and issues terms of reference for a process of consultation and development of recommendations.	

1998

May	Senate approves a planning framework for Glendon over a three- to five-year period.	The framework includes 11 specific points to guide planning at Glendon.
June	APPC issues an annual Call for	The Call contained a series of 21 questions ranging

Plans that is set against a forecast that York was poised to “see relative financial stability after nearly a decade of budget cuts. If this projection holds, academic planning in the next three-year cycle will be conducted in a new and welcome context.”

over the full span of academic activities.

November APPC sponsors a special planning forum on the topic of (Planning Processes in Special Circumstances: Case Studies and Issues.”

In the first of two special forums in 1998-1999, APPC posed a series of questions about planning processes in the context of trends in public policy and post-secondary funding:

Can internally-defined academic priorities be reconciled with external pressures, and if so how?

It is likely that many future funding opportunities must be assessed and pursued in a short span of time. Are current planning processes suitable in such circumstances? If not, how can processes be adapted without undermining academic planning principles?

How should York’s planning processes address issues associated with demographic, application and enrolment patterns?

These questions related to trends such as tiered funding (for research infrastructure), conditional funding and demographic growth.

APPC recommended that the Vice-President (Academic Affairs) provide funding to help identify and support the development of promising curriculum proposals, and concluded that it should accept responsibility for ensuring that the University responds in an appropriate, timely and efficient manner to funding opportunities that are contingent upon meeting explicit objectives or that must be addressed in a short span of time.

1999

January APPC reported to Senate on its analysis of the University’s “Fair Funding” proposal. Under the Fair Funding opportunity, funds must be used to (increase the total number of faculty and enhance instructional quality at the University. York’s share of the Fair Funding allocation was \$12.5 million.

APPC reported that it had endorsed the proposed division of revenue between innovation and consolidation (i.e., new programmes and existing programmes), and commented favourably on other aspects of the proposal, such as the accent on cooperative (inter-Faculty or inter-unit) planning.

February The second in a series of special planning forums is held, with the

In the second special forum of the year, APPC sought answers to these questions:

	focus on "Planning Processes in Special Circumstances: Inter-Faculty Initiatives."	<p>What are the formal policies and procedures for inter-Faculty planning that are now in place?</p> <p>What informal practices appear to be working well -- or poorly? In what specific cases?</p> <p>What can be done to facilitate the process? What role should APPC play?</p>
February	APPC establishes a Task Force on International Activities.	<p>The task force is asked to consider a wide range of issues which include, but are not limited to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • degree and non-degree curriculum; • the possibility of creating a School of International Studies • recruitment, enrolment support of international students • research activities and research centres • exchange programmes; • work study, coop programmes and internships.
April	APPC endorses, for the purpose of consultations at the annual planning forum, a document prepared by the Vice-President (Academic Affairs) entitled (Strategic Planning for the New Millennium.	The document, described as a work in progress, was prepared on the basis of longer-term discussions with APPC and its Technical Sub-Committee, Deans, the Long-Range Planning Committee (YUFA - Administration).
May	The annual planning forum focuses on "Strategic Planning for the New Millennium" with a view toward identifying and supporting concrete initiatives.	<p>The 1999 forum features discussions of key themes in the "Strategic Planning" document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International Activities' (Task Force Recommendations) • Issues in Distance Education • Directions for Health Studies • Directions for Applied Science and Engineering • Issues in Research • Anticipating Changes in the External Environment • Issues in Business Studies
June	APPC authorizes a series of initiatives coming out of the planning forum	
June	Senate approves comprehensive revisions to the Policy on Undergraduate Programme Reviews	Changes approved by Senate were based on recommendations emerging out of the Undergraduate Program Review Advisory Committee (UPRAC) formed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV).
June	APPC issues its annual <i>Call for Plans</i> , but, in a departure from	The Call posed two specific questions:

previous practice, does not require planners to file detailed or multi-year plans.

. What significant changes in the context for planning or Faculty priorities have occurred since responses to the *Call* were submitted in the spring of 1999? How will Faculties respond?

. Have there been impediments to realizing objectives since responses were submitted in the spring of 1999? If so, what are those impediments and how should they be overcome?

APPC chose this "experimental change in the customary planning mode" in order to "relieve planners of the burden of producing lengthy and elaborate documents on an annual basis." The Committee also cited the detailed nature of responses to the 1998 *Call* and the "strong possibility that universities will be asked to respond in short order to new government initiatives" and hence "benefit from some additional flexibility."

2000

March APPC receives the report of the Task Force on International Activities and launches a new wave of consultations.

The report, entitled "Moving Forward the Internationalization of York" becomes the focus of consultations with Senate committees (and others) and is the centrepiece of a dedicated forum that helps identify pilot projects.

May In an effort to restore transparency to planning processes, APPC's report to Senate this month provides an overview of responses to the *Call for Plans*.

APPC is "heartened" by the continuing, active interest in developing innovative curriculum but is worried by the repeated emphasis on the lack of resources to accomplish academic planning objectives.

June Senate approves revisions to the pivotal Part VI of the UAP.

Revisions to Part VI including the new name of "Strategic Priorities" are intended to update, contextualization, and concretize key planning objectives. The new text puts a premium on regular reporting on progress toward the attainment of objectives.

September APPC issues its annual *Call for Plans*.

The *Call* poses a single questions for planners, one which was informed by Senate's approval of revisions to the UAP and the impact of budget cuts:

What steps have been taken to limit the effect of budget cuts on the achievement of Faculty and unit planning objectives and on efforts to pursue strategic priorities reflected in Part VI of the *University Academic Plan*?

APPC agreed that it would not normally be necessary for Faculties to file elaborate (i.e., fully updated) plans on an annual basis.

2001

May	APPC reports on a planning agenda for 2001-2002 based on responses to the Call for Plans, meetings with Deans and Faculty Council representatives and discussion at the annual planning forum.	
May	The annual planning forum is set against the <i>Call for Plans</i> 2001-2002; possible revise and revisions of the <i>University Academic Plan</i> in 2001-2002; academic planning processes and the possibility of changes in 2001-2002; and academic planning priorities or initiatives that merit special attention or support.	The forum was built around three breakout sessions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Academic Implications of Changes in Ontario's Post-Secondary System from York's Perspective (eg, private programmes and institutions, cooperation with CAATs and other institutions, conditional and targeted funding)• Academic Implications of Technology Enhanced Learning (eg, Internet courses)• Academic Implications of Trends in Programme Funding (eg, fee de-regulation, cost recovery, revenue generation, non-degree curriculum)
June	Senate approves "Principles Guiding Research at York" as recommended by the Committee on Research with the concurrence of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee.	The five principles are accompanied by a strategic research plan developed by the Vice-President Research and Innovation in consultation with Senate committees. The plan sets out specific objectives and processes by which to measure and report on progress.
September	APPC issues its annual call for plans and in doing so highlights major challenges for planners in the context of ongoing budget cuts but with the possibility of greater budgetary stability.	It was decided that the annual call need not require elaborate responses from Faculty planners. Instead the call poses two questions: What steps have been taken to establish priorities (including pan-University and cross-disciplinary planning) for the recruitment of new faculty and replacement of retiring faculty, and how will appointments planning be calibrated with planning objectives as set out in the planning documents cited above? What steps have been taken to respond to challenges presented by the changing nature of the student population? The report documents successes, but also reports that enrolments had not reached their targets. In this light, the Committee receives Senate's approval to defer a final report until 2003-2004.
December	APPC reports to Senate on the planning framework for Glendon.	

2002

May	Annual planning forum dedicated to "Understanding and Responding to Secondary School Reform in	The topic emerged during the course of a review of Faculty plans and discussions with planners, and was intended to identify issues associated with enrolment
-----	--	---

Ontario.”

November APPC and the Vice-President Academic issue a report based on the planning forum.

2003

February The planning forum, held in mid-Winter for the first time, is dedicated to “Equity and Planning: Transforming Objectives into Action.” The forum is also part of a special meeting of Senate.

May APPC issues an action plan coming out of the forum.

September APPC issues a call for plans that focuses on Faculty accomplishments within their planning framework, and impediments to realizing objectives.

October APPC submits a major report to Senate on planning processes and priorities

2004

January APPC submits its final report on the Glendon planning framework approved in 1998.

April A traditional planning forum is not sponsored by APPC. Instead the Committee endorses an open forum under the auspices of the Senate Committee on Research and the Vice-President Research and Innovation.

May APPC submits an overview of planning issues based on its reading of responses to the call for plans.

growth and academic matters associated with the “double cohort” phenomenon.

Discussion at the forum pivots around the following questions:

- What does equity mean in your domain?
- How can equity be operationalized?
- What specific steps have been taken and should be taken to fulfil objectives?
- What specific bodies should be involved in transforming objectives into action?
- What constraints are there to realizing equity objectives?
- Should the UAP be amended? If so, how?

Recommendations in the APPC document are directed at planners across the spectrum of the University.

The call asks planners to respond to the following questions:

Thus far, what are your most significant achievements relating to your five year academic plan?

In the past year, what significant obstacles have you encountered in implementing that plan?

Noting that the “Strategic Priorities” section - which is both the culminating and pivotal section of the UAP - is due for review “no later than 2005,” APPC develops a schedule leading to major changes in the document in 2005.

APPC expressed satisfaction that planning for Glendon during the past five years – described as the “transition period for Glendon’s affirmation and renewal” – had been consistent with the framework approved by Senate in May 1998.

The forum’s sessions focussed on “Building York’s Research Culture,” and the discussions lead to an action plan for SCOR and the Vice-President.

The report to Senate highlights the following themes:

- Maintaining and extending quality and distinctiveness
- Program development and curriculum delivery

- Faculty recruitment, appointment, engagement and Support
- Student recruitment and enrolments
- Inter-Faculty cooperation
- Research

October APPC begins wider consultation process by issuing a document identifying possible themes in a streamlined, more strategic UAP.

The discussion paper takes it as axiomatic that planning will remain devoted to a set of planning principles:

- excellence in research and teaching;
- the special opportunities and responsibilities of an institution set in a uniquely dynamic, metropolitan and multi-cultural milieu;
- academic freedom, social justice, accessible education, and collegial self-governance;
- equity;
- the allocation of resources in line with academic objectives and the maximization of resources;
- balance and diversity;
- innovation and interdisciplinarity.

In other respects the paper invites reflections on the view that research should be paramount in the next iteration of the UAP, and on the prospect of giving emphasis to the following themes:

- academic unit structures overall enrolments.
- graduate studies
- enhancing the University's reputation
- further development health studies,
- clarifying York's elemental commitment to consolidation, innovation, interdisciplinarity
- collaboration
- teaching

2005

January-May APPC conducts focussed consultations with academic governing bodies, Deans and Principal, vice-presidents and other academic administrators, and with members of the community.

The process includes environmental scanning discussions geared toward providing context for planning at the University in the year 2005.

April APPC issues the first draft of a UAP spanning the period 2005-1000.

May Annual planning forum is devoted to draft changes to the University Academic Plan

Participants in all break-out sessions discuss a draft document in its entirety rather than discrete sections.

June Senate approves the 2005-2010 version of the UAP with minor amendments

Senate's consideration was informed by a background report prepared by a member and the Secretary.