COUNCIL

2015-2016 Session – 2nd Regular Meeting

REVISED AGENDA

Thursday November 26, 2015

4:00pm-6:00pm

Room 728, Claude Bissell Building

1) Call to order and acceptance of the Agenda

2) Approval of the Minutes of October 15, 2015 (attached)

3) Business arising from the Minutes

4) Dean’s report

5) Council Committees’ reports
   a) Executive Committee
      • Recommendations for changes to the Faculty of Information Bylaws and Constitution (attached)
   b) Standing Committees
      • Awards (attached)
      • Committee on Standing (attached)
      • Information Services
         • Update on 4th and 5th floor renovations
      • Programs (attached)
      • Recruitment and Admissions
         • Master’s (attached)
         • Doctoral (attached)

6) Reports from Institutes
   a.) Knowledge Media and Design Institute (KMDI) External reviewer report (attached)
   b.) Coach House Institute (CHI) External reviewer report (attached)

7) Other reports
   a) Careers (attached)
   b) Communications and Alumni Relations (attached)
   c) Development and Advancement Initiatives (attached)
d) Research report (attached)

8) iSchool Students
   a.) MISC (attached)
   b.) MUSSA
   c.) DSA

9) iSchool Alumni (attached)

10) Other Business
    • Update on Faculty response for the Truth and Reconciliation Summary of Evidence and Calls to Action regarding Museums and Archives (Prof. Krmpotich)
    • Appointment of the Chair of Council (effective Jan. 1, 2016)

11) Question period

12) Announcements

13) Adjournment
COUNCIL
2015-2016 Session – 1st Regular Meeting
MINUTES
Thursday October 15, 2015
4:00pm-6:00pm
Room 728, Claude Bissell Building

PRESENT:

Members (ex officio): Seamus Ross (Dean)

Teaching Staff: Wendy Duff (Council Chair), Christoph Becker, Matthew Brower, Nadia Caidi, Chun Wei Choo, Alan Galey, Jenna Hartel, Cara Krmpotich, Kelly Lyons, Irina D. Mihalache, David Phillips, Matt Ratto

Professional Librarians: Lari Langford, Elisa Sze

Senior Administrative Officers: Glenn Cumming, Audrey M. Johnson, Anna Pralat

Associated Instructor or Sessional Lecturer:

Administrative Staff: Kathleen O’Brien

Students:

Doctoral: Allen Kempton, Harrison Smith

Masters (MI): Stephanie Abba, Rotem Anna Diamant, Sari Gutman, Christopher Hogendoorn, Danielle Klein, Stephanie Pegg, Shevaun Ruby, Tristan Smyth

Masters (MMSt): Dylan Dammermann, Sanja Ljaskevic

Alumni/Alumnae:

External Members:

Assessors:

Observers: Isidora Petrovic

Recorder: Mary-Marta Briones-Bird

REGRETS: The President of the University of Toronto, Vice-President and Provost, Chief Librarian of the University, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, Angela Henshilwood, Nalini Singh.
ON LEAVE:  Costis Dallas, Lynne Howarth, Patrick Keilty, Kathleen Scheaffer, Leslie Shade


1) Call to order and acceptance of the Agenda
   Chair Prof. Wendy Duff welcomed the members of Council and called the meeting to order at 4:00pm. Prof. Wendy Duff noted that as decided at the June 2015 Council meeting that Council was moving towards a much reduced use of hard copies of Council packages.

2) Approval of the Minutes of June 12, 2015
   MOTION: A motion to accept the minutes was made by Ms. Stephanie Abba, seconded by Mr. Chris Hogendoorn, all were in favour and the motion was CARRIED.

3) Business arising from the Minutes
   No business arising.

4) Dean’s report
   Dean Ross provided background in the iSchool Institute, noted that the Director position is currently being filled by the Dean and that keeping the Institute allows for the ability to operate the Professional Leadership Program for Public Librarians program.

   MOTION #1: To remove the Director of the iSchool Institute from the Committees of Council, moved by Dean Seamus Ross, seconded by Prof. Nadia Caidi, all were in favour and the motion CARRIED.

   MOTION #2: To change the status of the Chair of Faculty Council from a member of all faculty council committees (counting towards quorum) to a right to attend all faculty council meetings. Dean Ross – we are withdrawing the second motion. The motion was WITHDRAWN.

   Mindfulness in the Classroom:  Dean Ross – highlighted the Prof. Hartel’s pioneering of starting each class with two minutes of mindfulness. Dean Ross attended one the class of Prof. Hartel’s classes and found the practice helped students relax and focus. Prof. Ross encouraged members of Council to speak with Prof. Hartel about the benefits of including mindfulness as part of the classroom experience.

   New appointments to the Faculty:  Dean Ross - Ms. Aleatha Cox will be starting at the Faculty on Oct. 26, 2015. She comes from the Faculty of Law and has helped with compiling many SSHRC grant applications. She will help the Faculty improve the success rate of research grant applications.

   Ms. Barbara Brown will be starting on November 9, 2015 as the Assistant Dean, Registrarial and Student Services. She has a long track record in higher education, recruitment and enrolment at Seneca College, York University and the Toronto District School Board. She has won numerous awards and has been very successful in enhancing recruitment with these institutions. The hiring
committees, Professors Seamus Ross, Kelly Lyons, Heather MacNeil, Wendy Duff and Mr. Glenn Cumming were all highly impressed and are pleased to have her join us. She will be meeting with faculty members to discuss priorities and initiatives.

Faculty Workload Policy: Dean Ross – noted that the Faculty needed to review the Faculty’s workload policy. The committee will meet in mid-November. The Workload Committee is comprised of Prof. Kelly Lyons, Prof. Matt Brower, Prof. Chun Wei Choo, and Prof. Irina Mihalache.

Visiting Fellow: Dean Ross noted that Mr. Jeffrey Peachey, who is a Patricia Fleming Visiting Fellow in Bibliography and Book History was on campus until Oct. 30, 2015.

McLuhan Institute: Dean Ross noted that the McLuhan Centenary Fellows were underway developing an exciting fall program, themed ‘City as Classroom’ the fall. Flyers to be available soon and the lectures promises to he be engaging.

Update on KMDI External Review: The review visit was completed and the Faculty is waiting to receive the external reviewer’s report.

Introduction of Academic Administrators: Prof. Duff noted that the establishment of the new governance structure, set out in the Faculty of Information’s Governance and Organization Structure Work Group Final Report 2015-2016 presented for information at the June 12, 2015 meeting.

Introduction of Academic Administrators: Prof. Duff noted that the establishment of the new governance structure, set out in the Faculty of Information’s Governance and Organization Structure Work Group Final Report 2015-2016 presented for information at the June 12, 2015 meeting.

http://current.ischool.utoronto.ca/system/files/user/1186/ischool_org_structure_wg_05_15.pdf resulted in the appointment of a number of Academic Administrators. The office will develop a ‘who does what’ document for the Academic Administrators to inform everyone of the new responsibilities of each administrator.

Prof. Duff asked the Academic Administrators appointed on July 1, 2015 to briefly outline their roles. Prof. Lyons, Associate Dean, Academic, chairs Programs and Committee on Standing, works with the Program Directors to develop programs and also deal with any issues that arise. Works on the teaching schedule, officially the Graduate Coordinator but currently delegated to the relevant Program Directors, Prof. Matt Brower for Museums Studies and Prof. Alan Galey for Information Studies.

Prof. Matt Brower is the Director of Museum Studies, and he also serves on the Programs and Awards Committees. Questions concerning the Museum Studies program should be sent to Prof. Brower. Prof. Galey is the Director of the Master of Information Program and will answer questions related to the MI program. Prof. Galey signs ethics approvals forms for MI Program; Prof. Lyons signs them for MSSt Program. Prof. MacNeil will review ethics approval for the Doctoral Program until Jan. 1, 2016, when Prof. Leslie Shade appointment as Associate Dean, Research begins. Prof. Cara Krmpotich is the Director of the CRO and Collaborative Programs and will answer questions about either program. Prof. Wendy Duff also can answer questions about the CRO program as she serves as Academic Advisor. Prof. David Phillips is the Director of Undergraduate Programing, he heads the joint IDM undergraduate program shared with ICCIT at UTM and is working on developing an undergraduate minor on the St. George campus.
Prof. Duff – noted that Prof. Siobhan Stevenson was the Director of the Master of Information’s Co-op Program and Prof. Heather MacNeil is the Director of The PhD Program.

5) **Council Committees’ reports**

a) **Executive Committee**

- Nominations for the 2015-2016 Executive Committee

Prof. Duff outlined the role of the Executive Committee and called for nominations for to the Committee for the 2015-16 Council year. The Executive Committee must Review the goals and objectives of the Faculty, the Constitution, and the By-Laws of Council at least every five years; (Faculty Bylaws, Art. 2, Sec. 1, b.) 3.). The committee will need to review the constitutions this year. One issue that the committee should consider is whether a Librarian needs to serve on every standing committee of Council.

Prof. Duff put out a call for nominations, as well as noting that the Chair of Council and the Dean having standing appointments on the Executive Committee. Student Council Presidents, Mr. Chris Hogendoorn (MISC), Ms. Dylan Dammerman (MUSSA) and Mr. Harrison Smith (DSA) self-nominated. Ms. Elisa Sze nominated Ms. Nalini Singh, Professional Librarian. Professors Matt Ratto, Nadia Caidi and David Phillips also self-nominated. There were no disputed positions.

**MOTION:** Members of Council voted in favour unanimously to accept as the 2015-2016 members of the Executive Committee. The motion **CARRIED**.

**2015-2016 Executive Committee Members**

- Dr. Seamus Ross, Dean and Professor
- Dr. Wendy Duff, Chair of Council and Professor
- Mr. Chris Hogendoorn, MISC President
- Ms. Dylan Dammerman, MUSSA President
- Mr. Harrison Smith, DSA President
- Ms. Nalini Singh, Professional Librarian
- Dr. Matt Ratto, Professor
- Dr. Nadia Caidi, Professor
- Dr. David Phillips, Professor

b) **Standing Committees**

- **Awards Committee**

  Prof. Ratto – reported that the Awards Committee was working hard reviewing awards applications. He noted s upcoming Award deadlines for NSERC, SHHRC and OGS. Prof. Ratto thanks Ms. Christine Chan and Ms. Carol Ng for their support of the Chair and the committee. He also noted that information about student awards could be found on the current iSchool website in the announcements section. http://current.ischool.utoronto.ca/

  Prof. Duff encouraged students to investigate internal awards, as many are going unfilled or have few applications.

  There is a Research Awards Coordinator for Faculty and Staff Awards for Single Department Faculties (SDFs), the contact is Ms. Kyle Wiscombe. Prof. Duff noted that the Master and Doctoral Recruitment and Admissions committees determine the Awards for
incoming students; the Awards committee primarily focusses on current students. Prof. Lyons suggested that the Executive Committee might consider expanding the Awards Committee role in working on awards beyond student awards.

- **Committee on Standing**
  Professor Lyons reported that the Committee on Standing had met twice and had held several e-votes. She thanked the Committee members as well as Ms. Mary-Marta Briones-Bird for their work on the committee. Activities of the Committee include approving course extensions as well as Masters and Doctoral Thesis Titles and Doctoral Committee compositions. Prof. Lyons also noted that Qualifying Exam Committees require Committee on Standing approval.

**Information Services Committee**

Prof. Krmpotich reported on the activities of the Information Services Committee. The committee had reviewed the bylaws and the scope of the ISC; they are supportive of Ms. Nalini Singh’s course repository model. The committee is also continuing to investigate how best to implement the Faculty’s Privacy guidelines. In particular they are developing ways to help students with issues of confidentiality and ensuring that the technology (iPads and laptops) on loan are wiped clean after use.

Prof. Krmpotich provided an update on the 4th and 5th floor renovations. Ms. Lari Langford, Mr. Glenn Cumming and Prof. Krmpotich have had numerous meetings over the summer. They plan to submit the proposal to Capital Project and Space Allocation Committee (CaPS) in October 2015. Pending approval, construction is expected to begin in April 2016 and she will ensure people are giving advance notice. She also indicated people should prepare for the inconvenience of the construction but we should focus on the final product. Mr. Glenn Cumming noted that the most intensive work will begin after classes finished in April with a view to completing the construction by August 30, 2016. Construction will be very concentrated.

- **Programs Committee**

Prof. Lyons – provided the report from Program committee. She pointed out that all minor program modifications can be approved by Programs Committee and send to Faculty Council for information only. The Committee is currently working on clarifying wording for the Master thesis oral exam, creating a shell course for the Museum Studies Program, and exploring revisions to the teaching evaluation framework.

Items pending include considering changing the Information Professional Practicum from Grades to Credit/Non-Credit, and reviewing new courses for the co-op program. Prof. Duff asked if a sub-committee of Programs for considering anew concentrations existed. Prof. Lyons replied that the Programs committee could look into those.

- **Recruitment and Admissions**

  - **Master’s Recruitment and Admissions Committee**

Prof. Hartel reported that the written report included most of information about the Committees work. She acknowledged the student members, Mr. David Mason and Ms. Kate
Seely, and stated she was glad to have them on the Committee. She thanked Mr. Adrien Berg who is hard at work on recruitment, attending 15 graduate fairs, a new tour program on Fridays, expanding the multimedia and look book.

Prof. Hartel reported that the Faculty would hold four Information Days that this year, the first is on Oct. 24th. She thanked to everyone involved in organizing the event. Prof. Lyons – Noted that Ms. Kimberly Silk and other alumni of the iSchool have volunteered to help with recruitment events and Prof Hartel should connect with alumni active in the iSchool.

- **Doctoral Recruitment and Admissions Committee**
  Prof. Duff presented for Prof. MacNeil who had sent regrets for the meeting. There is an upcoming Information session for PhD’s in early November, more information to come. Mr. Harrison Smith noted that current PhD students would participate in this event.

6) **Reports from Institutes**
   a) **Identity, Privacy and Security Institute**
      The IPSI activity report was presented.

7) **Other reports**
   a) **Careers**

   Ms. Isidora Petrovic presented an update on the Co-op program which will be launch for the 1st year in Winter 2016. Ms. Petrovic and Prof. Stevenson held an information session for 1st year students which were very well attended. The deadline for applications is Oct. 15, 2015. They have already received 40 applications. They will be conducting interviews with all applicants. They have also started reaching out to employers, and she encouraged everyone to please reach out to industry and organizational contacts. Leads are appreciated and can be forwarded to Ms. Isidora Petrovic and Prof. Stevenson. Workshop sessions will be offered in December, January and February.

   b) **Communications and Alumni Relations**

   Ms. Kathleen O’Brien reported on a number of initiatives underway. The recruitment video is 95% done. The alumni magazine will be coming out in a week. The faculty website has been updated with research focuses and the PhD profiles are being highlighted, Prof. Duff noted that The iSchool and the Faculty research had received a lot press coverage of late

   c) **Development and Advancement Initiatives**

   Ms. Audrey M. Johnson reported that $56,000 was raised for the Wendy Newman Award... A successful donor appreciation event was held recognizing donors who have given donations over the past 5 years. Some donors had given for the past 25-30 years, though this is the first time this type of event was held. Advancement is also launching a donor appreciation video, in which many have participated.

   The Faculty has already surpassed the goals of the previous 3 years. We are doing especially, well with major gifts and annual funds and legacy gifts. The primary donor base comes from
those in the library field. The Faculty has a partnership with UNESCO Paris, and advancement is working to find $26,000 to send two students to Paris next summer.

Dean Ross – thanked everyone for making the faculty work and acknowledged Ms. Audrey M. Johnson and Ms. Robin Kester for their contributions. The Dean noted that fundraising involves building long-term relationships over many years and that the momentum was building in this area.

8) iSchool Students

a.) Master of Information Student Council (MISC)

Mr. Chris Hogendoorn – outlined some of the activities of MISC.: holding a great event in orientation week, working with the MUSSA and Social Chairs. He noted that the first years attended the barbeque event and pub night. In addition MISC completed the fall council elections, but was still having nominations to fill a few more positions. MISC had also attended the plaque unveiling for Retired Librarian Ms. Wendy Newman and had completed the 2014-15 Student experience survey; the results of which can be found on the MISC website.

b.) Museum Studies Student Association (MUSSA)

Ms. Dylan Dammerman – Also noted that the barbeque with MISC and MUSSA students went very well. The student turnout for the election went well and MUSA had only one more committee spot to fill. Some activities include: holding a successful Information Session, organizing trips including to the Markham Region Museum, to museums in Niagara Region and a final trip to several museums in Hamilton.

c.) Doctoral Student Association (DSA)

Mr. Allen Kempton – introduced Mr. Harrison Smith as DSA President and himself as Vice-President. He thanked outgoing President Mr. Christopher Young and Vice-President Ms. Sarah Lubelski. Some activities of the DSA include: organizing skills workshops. The DSA elections went smoothly. Also noted that the DSA potluck held early in the year was successful and well attended.

9) iSchool Alumni

No report.

10) Other Business

Prof. Cara Krmpotich presented on the following motion:

**MOTION:** That the iSchool formally respond to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Summary of Evidence and Calls to Action regarding Museums and Archives. Moved by Prof. Cara Krmpotich, seconded by Prof. Matt Brower, all were in favour and the motion was CARRIED.

Prof. Krmpotich – reported that the focus of the response was to raise awareness and develop strategies using the recommendations of the Truth and Reconciliation Report in the classroom,
that student involvement was a key component of bringing the recommendations to light. Prof. Krmpotich will Chair an ad hoc committee and is seeking volunteers to join the committee.

Prof. Duff – Encouraged iSchool members to indicate their interest, work on a draft report, which will be circulated for comment and then returned to Faculty Council once completed.

11) Question period
No questions were raised.

12) Announcements

Prof. Wendy Duff – reported the Faculty was celebrating the career of Prof. Andrew Clement with a celebration on Oct. 16 2015 who has worked in the Faculty of Information for the past 26 years. The event will include a full day of lectures followed by a reception.

Prof. Matt Brower – Also reported on Oct. 16th Dr. Randi Korn, Founding Director of Randi Korn and Associates will be speaking at the Faculty.

Ms. Audrey Johnson reminded Council members to vote in the Federal Election on Oct. 19th.

Prof. Irina Mihalache announced the visit of the Director of the Aga Khan Museum, Mr. Henry Kim who will be coming to visit the iSchool. He is a distinguished speaker for the iSchool and members are encouraged to come out for the event.

Mr. Harrison Smith – The DSA is working on an upcoming faculty doctoral mixer, information to come shortly.

13) Adjournment

Prof. Phillips motioned to adjourn and the meeting adjourned at 5:30pm.
The Executive Committee met on Nov. 23, 2015 to review and discuss the Bylaws and Constitution of the Faculty of Information.

The Executive Committee has reviewed the Bylaws of the Faculty of Information and is making the following recommendations to Council:

- **Recommendations for changes to the Information Services Committee**

  **Recommendation No. 1:** To remove the iSchool Institute Director as a voting member of the Information Services Committee.

  **Recommendation No. 2:** To replace the member Director of Student Services with Assistant Dean, Registrarial and Student Services on the following Committees of Council: Awards Committee, Committee on Standing, Information Services Committee, Programs Committee, Recruitment and Admissions Committees.

- **Reviewing the terms of reference for Awards Committee**

  **Recommendation No. 3:** To increase the membership of the Awards Committee. To revise Article 2, Sec. 2, subsection a) from two full-time regular members of the Teaching Staff with at least one holding professorial rank; to **three full-time regular members of the Teaching Staff with at least two holding professorial rank**;

  **Recommendation No. 4:** To revised the mandate of the Awards Committee as follows: To revised Article 2, Sec. 2, subsection 4.) 4. Overseer annual awards event(s) that recognize outstanding student achievement; and to **promote the discovery and applications of internal and external awards for alumni, faculty, staff and students; and**

  **Recommendation No. 5:** To remove the Professional Librarian from the Awards Committee membership.
• Reviewing the role of School of Graduate Studies Dean’s representative as a member of the Program Committee.

Recommendation No. 6: Remove the SGS Dean’s Representative for all committees of Council.

Recommendation No. 7: To revised the mandate of the Program Committee as follows: To revised Article 2, Sec. 5, subsection b) point 8.) 8. For each degree program of the Faculty, either in the Committee as a whole or in a subcommittee established for that purpose, oversee the operations and procedures, accreditation and review of such degree program.

The Executive Committee has reviewed the Constitution of the Faculty of Information and is making the following recommendations to Council:

Recommendation No. 8: Replace the Provostial policy cited from Policy on Interdisciplinary Education and Research Planning (2007) to the revised policy, University of Toronto Guidelines for Extra-Departmental Units (January 2015) in Article 2, Section 2, Subsection O).
FACULTY ADVISORS

Faculty members serve as academic advisors for students in the MI and MMSt programs. The role of the Faculty Advisor is to help students with their progress through their academic programs by providing advice and guidance as needed. While Student Services staff helps with the more administrative aspects of the program, Faculty Advisors provide academic advice.

Faculty Advisors
Faculty Advisors assist students with establishing and achieving their academic plan while at the iSchool by:

• Helping students choose educational and career objectives consistent with their interests and abilities.
• Sharing career/discipline specific information with advisees. This may include information or opportunities in their intended career field (i.e., internships, volunteer opportunities, research assistantships, etc.)
• Working with the student to develop an academic plan or roadmap to achieve their educational goals.
• Serving as a mentor/coach to advisees as they pursue their academic plan and achieve their established goals.
• Being sensitive to the needs of a diverse pool of students.
• Explaining the iSchool grading policies
• Referring students with special needs (health services, financial aid, etc.)

Advising New Students
• Assist students with understanding the curriculum for their program. Course sequences found on the website may be guides to assisting students with course planning.
• Assist students in selecting electives. Be aware of course prerequisites.
• Inform students that 25% of their courses may be taken outside their degree program. These courses must be graduate courses. Then can be taken at iSchool, other departments at UofT, or at York, Ryerson or OCAD University (through the Ontario Visiting Graduate Student program).
• You may wish to let students know your weekly office hours, email address, phone number, office number, location, etc. Ask that students use Adviser as the subject header when emailing you.
• Let them know what your turnaround policy is re. email/phone messages.

Other things to keep in mind
• Handle situations for which you are qualified. Identify other faculty members who have the expertise to address other questions and suggest that students contact them.
• If you have any questions regarding referrals re academic matters, contact the MI Director or the MMSt Director.
• If you have any questions regarding administrative matters, contact Student Services.
• As students get to know other faculty members through their courses or other venues, they may find their interests match their own more closely. Whenever that happens, students are free to meet with those faculty members and discuss whether they would take them on as advisees. If the faculty member agrees, students must inform both their assigned Faculty Advisor and Student Services.
Services using the following form:  

For some excellent advice, you may visit Prof. Kelly Lyons’ blog or refer your advisees to it:  

Administrative Information that may be Helpful

Important Dates (http://current.ischool.utoronto.ca/studies/academic-dates)

- **Fall Session**
  - First and last day of classes: September 14, 2015 and December 14, 2015. Exam week (if applicable, as per instructors): December 15-18, 2015.
  - Fall Reading Week: November 9-13, 2015
  - Last day to **drop** September session full or half courses without academic penalty: November 2, 2015

- **Winter Session**
  - First and last day of classes: January 11, 2016 and April 8, 2016. Exam week (if applicable, as per instructors): April 11-15, 2016.
  - Family Day (University closed): February 15, 2016
  - Reading week: February 15-19, 2016
  - Last day to **drop** full-year or January session courses without academic penalty: March 1, 2016

**Academic Course load** (http://current.ischool.utoronto.ca/studies/registration-enrolment#course loads)

- Full-time Students can take a maximum of four (4) half-courses per term (plus 4 optionally in the summer), Part-time students a maximum of one (1) half-course per term (fall, winter, or summer) with a maximum of 3 total in all three sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Coordinator</td>
<td>Typically MI or MMSt Director but if in doubt, see Associate Dean Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean, Academic</td>
<td>Kelly Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, MI</td>
<td>Alan Galey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, MMSt</td>
<td>Matt Brower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Co-op</td>
<td>Siobhan Stevenson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Concurrent Registration Option</td>
<td>Cara Krmpotich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Collaborative Programs</td>
<td>Cara Krmpotich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty of Information Committee on Standing Report to Faculty Council

November 26, 2015

Since October 15, 2015, the Committee on Standing has:

1. Approved the Qualifying Exam Committee (QEC) for:
   **Student**: Karen Dewart McEwen
   **Committee**: Prof. Patrick Keilty (Supervisor); Prof. Michelle Murphy (Professor in History and Women & Gender Studies, holding a cross-appointment with the iSchool) (Member); Prof. Nicole Cohen (Member)

2. Approved a change in the Doctoral Committee membership for:
   **Student**: Steven Chuang
   **Supervisory Committee Change**: Prof. Anthony Wensley to replace Prof. Kelly Lyons
   **The rest of the Committee and thesis title remains the same**:
   **Title**: Strategic real estate foresight: A case study of Canada’s investment real estate industry
   **Supervisor**: Prof. Chun Wei Choo
   **Supervisory Committee**: Prof. Lynne Howarth; Prof. Anthony Wensley

The Chair thanks members of the Committee on Standing, and Mary-Marta Briones-Bird, Secretary to the Committee.

Respectfully submitted, Kelly Lyons, Associate Dean, Academic and Chair, Committee on Standing, 2015-2016
Faculty of Information Programs Committee Report to Faculty Council
November 26, 2015

The Programs Committee submits the following approved changes to Faculty Council for information:

- Approval four new course proposals for Co-op Program:
  1. INF(SRM)3900H Professional Preparation: Understanding the triad of knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) in today's workplace
  2. INF3901Y Cooperative Education Placement I
  3. INF3902H Cooperative Education Placement II
  4. INF3903H Cooperative Education Placement III

Students either take INF3901Y (for one 8-month Coop) or they take INF3902H + INF3903H (for two 4-month Coop’s)

The Programs Committee submits the following for approval by the Faculty Council:

- Updated: Faculty of Information Guidelines & Procedures for the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses (draft for review and approval attached).
- At the bottom of page 8 it states that changes require approval by Faculty Council.
- Changes are indicated using the track-changes feature of MS Word.
- Background: The Programs Committee has approved this updated policy which changes (only slightly) from our previous policy: for those instructors who do not opt out of sharing their course evaluation data with students, all quantitative institutional-level and divisional-level questions will be made available to all students on portal (previously our policy said only ischool students would have access). Restricting it to ischool students is resource intensive for us because we must identify all postcodes and make a list that will be shared with the IT team in CSTI who will then modify the course eval tool. Note that the institutional-level policy is currently under review and Seamus is on the committee that is revisiting that policy.

Kelly Lyons
Associate Dean, Academic
Chair of the Programs Committee
The Faculty of Information (iSchool) and the University of Toronto are committed to ensuring the quality of its academic programs, its teaching and the learning experiences of its students. An important component of this is the regular evaluation of courses by students. At the iSchool and the University of Toronto, course evaluations are conducted for the following reasons:

1. To provide formative data used by instructors for the continuous improvement of their teaching.
2. To provide members of the University community, including students, with information about teaching and courses at the institution.
3. To collect data used in the summative evaluation of teaching for administrative purposes such as annual merit, tenure and promotion review.
4. To provide data used by divisions for program and curriculum review.

Course evaluations are part of an overall teaching and program evaluation framework that includes regular peer review, instructor self-assessment, cyclical program review and other forms of assessment, as appropriate. As part of this framework, course evaluations are a particularly useful tool for providing students with an opportunity to provide feedback on their own learning experiences (from the Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses, University of Toronto, 2011).

This document outlines the various roles and responsibilities of the University, iSchool, and instructors in relation to the administration and use of course evaluations. In addition, this document provides information pertaining to the reporting of collected course evaluation data.

1. Administration of Course Evaluations

At the Faculty of Information all Masters-level courses will be evaluated as required by the University of Toronto’s Policy on the Evaluation of Teaching in Courses (2011).¹ The normal practice will be to utilize the University of Toronto’s centralized course evaluation framework and online delivery system for Masters courses. The institutional framework provides a customizable evaluation form with the following general format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of questions</th>
<th>Use of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional questions</td>
<td>These questions must appear on the forms for all courses across the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ See: [http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/Policy_Student_Evaluation_of_Teaching_in_Courses.htm](http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/Policy_Student_Evaluation_of_Teaching_in_Courses.htm)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iSchool divisional questions</th>
<th>These questions must appear on the forms for all courses (or relevant subset of courses) in the division.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor questions</td>
<td>These questions may be specified for each course offering taught by the instructor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibility for the administration of course evaluations will be as follows:

1.a. University Role and Responsibilities
- Provides and supports a centralized course evaluation framework and online delivery system that preserves student anonymity and supports various reporting options. This framework and system will be used for all courses across the university. The framework includes a common course evaluation form that is customizable by divisions, academic units, and instructors. The online course evaluation system will be managed centrally through the Office of the Vice-President & Provost and the Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation (CTSI).
- Specifies a set of institutional questions that reflect the overall teaching priorities of the University, and that must be included on all course evaluation forms.
- Provides staff support for course evaluation administration in CTSI through the Course Evaluation Service team, the Course Evaluation Support Officer (CESO) who is specifically designated to assist divisions, units, and instructors in all aspects of the evaluation process.
- Provides materials to support the interpretation and use of course evaluation data (available from the Course Evaluations tab in the Portal) at: [http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework.htm](http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework.htm)
- Manages communication to students, faculty, academic administrators, and staff information about the course evaluation system, with the assistance of the CSTI Course Evaluation Service team CESO and in consultation with the division.
- Advises divisions on appropriate evaluation processes for courses with enrolment under 10.

1.b. Faculty of Information Role and Responsibilities
- Oversees the course evaluation process for all of its courses.
- Engages the support of iSchool student associations to facilitate ongoing communication with students.
- In consultation with faculty and staff, identifies any courses that may require alternative means of evaluation (for example, low-enrolment courses, online courses, doctoral-level courses, etc.).
- Identifies divisional questions that reflect Masters-level teaching and learning priorities.
• Sets the time period for course evaluations. All evaluations will be administered at the end of each graduate term for a time period of at least two weeks duration. Students will have the opportunity to complete the evaluations online throughout the given time period.
• Contributes to regular reviews of the policies and procedures of the course evaluation process to identify any necessary changes to division-wide procedures.

1.c. Program Role and Responsibilities
The Programs Committee will have responsibility for setting and leading the review of all policies relating to Masters-level course evaluations. Program representatives are particularly tasked with:
- Ensuring divisional-level questions assess program learning and teaching priorities
- Where necessary, recommending strategies to align evaluation questions with program learning outcomes and objectives
- Co-operating with Student Services to identify any courses where ROSI information is incomplete or insufficient
- Co-operating with Student Services to identify any courses requiring special evaluation needs.

1.d. Student Services Role and Responsibilities
Student Services plays an essential role in effective implementation of the system each term because of their access to, and comfort with, ROSI, as well as administrative expertise and access levels required to:
- Ensure instructors are properly identified with courses,
- Ensure course codes and term designators are accurate,
- Ensure student enrollment is up-to-date, and
- With the help of Programs Committee, flag courses with less common parameters such as intensive courses, team-teaching / co-teaching, INF Workshops, year-long courses, etc.
- Provide wording on opt-out options for instructors to CTSI and designate a person who will receive opt-out requests
- Record instructors’ intentions to opt-out of Student Reports
- Provide names, UTorIDs and emails to CTSI for persons authorized to access summative reports (this is normally the Dean but may also include Chairs and/or Vice-Deans)
- Publish and maintain Student Reports on our website

1.e. Instructor Role and Responsibilities
• If desired, selects up to 3 additional questions from the University of Toronto item bank for the evaluation form for each offering of each course that they teach. Instructors may use these questions to assess specific teaching priorities and/or approaches not addressed elsewhere on the form. The data collected through the use of these questions are intended to provide formative feedback for the instructor and as such will only be reported to the instructor.
Each instructor teaching a course will receive an email invitation to add instructor-selected questions from the question-item bank to the course evaluation form. Directions, guidance, and deadlines for this process will be included with the email communication. There is no requirement for instructors to add questions to their evaluation forms.

Instructors may choose to share the results from instructor-selected questions with their chair or other academic administrators for review.

Instructors may choose to opt out of sharing data from institutional and divisional questions (see details below). Instructions for how to do so will be provided in an email at the same time the instructor is invited to select individual questions.

2. The Evaluation Form
The University of Toronto’s course evaluation framework includes a set of required core institutional questions, divisionally-selected questions, departmentally-selected questions and instructor-selected questions. The maximum number of questions permitted on the evaluation form is 20.

At the Faculty of Information, the standard format for course evaluations is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Responsibility</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Institutional (8)            | 1. I found the course intellectually stimulating.  
2. The course provided me with a deeper understanding of the subject matter.  
3. The instructor created a course atmosphere that was conducive to my learning.  
4. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams improved my understanding of the course material.  
5. Course projects, assignments, tests and/or exams provided opportunity for me to demonstrate an understanding of the course material.  
6. Overall, the quality of my learning experience in this course was: Poor >> Fair >> Good >> Very good >> Excellent | To appear on all forms.  
Scale for Questions 1-5:  
Not at all >> Somewhat >> Moderately >> Mostly >> A great deal |
7. Please comment on the overall quality of instruction in this course.

(Open-ended)

8. Please comment on any assistance that was available to support your learning in the course. (Open-ended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisional – iSchool questions (5)</th>
<th>1. The course instructor encouraged students to think about the subject matter from multiple perspectives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The course instructor encouraged me to explore alternative approaches when problem-solving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The course drew attention to ethical and social issues related to the field of study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The course instructor encouraged students to reflect critically on the course material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The course instructor explained how course topics contributed to an overall understanding of the field (i.e. Archives, Knowledge Management, Museum Studies).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To appear on all forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program (up to 4)</th>
<th>TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NB: 2 of these questions are being held for possible TA assessment at a future date. 2 of these questions are being held for future iSchool priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor (up to 3)</th>
<th>To be selected by the instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions chosen from the question bank or in co-operation consultation with CTSI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Reporting
Reports of the results of course evaluations will be available to various audiences, following the Provostial Guidelines on the Evaluation of Courses, which outline institutional requirements relating to the access of course evaluation data. Available reports include:

3.a. Summative Report
Purpose and Recipients
- Intended to be used for summative evaluation in support of assessment of an instructor’s teaching for PTR, tenure and promotion, awards, etc.
- **Note:** Student evaluation of teaching forms just one component of a thorough assessment of an instructor.
- Available to the instructor, as well as to their dean(s) and those responsible for program oversight.

Included Information (each course reported on separately)
- Quantitative and qualitative data from institutional, divisional, and (where applicable) program questions
- For each question, the following data will be provided:
  - Question text
  - Response set
  - Course enrolment
  - Number of responses
  - For quantitative questions only:
    - Frequency (the distribution of responses will be displayed as chart)
    - Mean
    - Median
    - Mode
    - Standard deviation
- A composite score will be provided for core institutional questions 1-5
  - The composite provides an average response for each question and reflects the extent to which each of the institutional priorities was part of a student’s learning experience in his/her course. The composite takes into account multiple factors relating to this experience and provides a comprehensive assessment of that experience.
- The following comparative data for quantitative questions will also be provided (when available):
  - From the division (for institutional and divisional questions):
    - Divisional mean for all Masters-level graduate courses, as relevant
    - Divisional mean for courses of similar size
    - Standard deviations for divisional means

---

2 Frequency includes number of responses received for each question; Mean provides an average; Median reflects the point at which half responses fall above, and half below; Mode represents the most frequently occurring response.
From the institution (for institutional questions):
  - Institutional mean (graduate)
  - Standard deviation for institutional mean
Additional comparative data reporting can be requested from CTSI.

**Note:** Data from instructor-selected questions will appear only on the formative report.

**Note:** For courses with response rates less than 5, qualitative data and only response distributions for each of the quantitative questions will be provided.

### 3.b. Formative Report

**Purpose and Recipients**
- Intended to be used for formative purposes – i.e., to inform an instructor in improvement of their teaching and course development.
- Available only to the instructor.
- Instructors may share this data with administrators for purposes of professional development, if they choose. It may *not* be shared with administrators or committees for promotion, tenure, 3rd year reviews or PTR/Merit.

**Included Information** (each course reported on separately)
- All the information from the summative report, plus:
  - Data from any and all instructor-selected questions, including:
    - Question text
    - Response set
    - Course enrolment
    - Number of responses
    - For quantitative questions only:
      - Frequency (displayed as chart)
      - Mean
      - Median
      - Mode
      - Standard deviation

### 4. Reports Available Upon Request

CTSI is developing additional reporting structures. Currently, the following reports or more customizable reports for the Dean, program Chairs and directors, or instructors can be generated *upon request* from CTSI.

#### 4.a. Student’s Report

**Purpose and Recipients**
- Intended to provide information to students helpful in course planning and selection.
- Provided to students *(anyone with access to the Portal with a UTorID) in the Faculty of Information through the Course Evals tab in the Portal.*
**Included Information** (each course reported on separately)

- Quantitative data from all institutional and divisional questions.
  - A composite score will be provided for core institutional questions 1-5, and quantitative divisional questions.
  - Frequency of responses (displayed as a chart) will be provided for quantitative institutional and divisional questions.

**Note:** The Faculty of Information intends to request and make available Student’s Reports on a termly basis. Instructors may opt out of having the information made available for each course offering they teach. Instructors will be asked to indicate their interest in doing so at the time that they select their course-specific questions. This must be specified separately for each course, each time it is taught.

4.b. Program Report (sample)

*Purpose and Recipients*

- Intended to provide information to academic programs helpful in curriculum design, planning, and assessment.
- Available to academic programs heads and associate chairs.

*Included Information* (each course reported on separately)

- Summative report for each course and instructor, **plus:**
- Academic programs may request customized reports reflecting aggregate or individual instructor data from institutional, divisional, or academic programs questions.

4.c. Dean’s Report (sample)

*Purpose and Recipients*

- Intended to provide information to the dean’s office helpful in assessing teaching and curriculum across the Faculty.
- Available to dean and designates.

*Included Information* (each course reported on separately)

- Summative report for each course and instructor, **plus:**
- The Dean’s office may request customized reports reflecting aggregate or individual instructor data from institutional, divisional, or academic unit questions.

5. Reviewing Guidelines and Procedures

The Programs Committee will review all policies, guidelines and procedures once annually to maintain and communicate best practices. It is expected that this review will occur with input from the iSchool community.

Changes require approval of Faculty Council.
The Committee is excited to welcome Assistant Dean, Barbara Brown, who brings extensive experience in recruiting and admissions to the iSchool.

Adrian Berg (Recruitment Officer) attended 17 recruitment events this fall; sent tailored marketing in advance to a wide range of academic departments on all campuses; and collected 200 emails from interested prospective students (up from 140 last year).

October 24 Info Day was attended by 70(MI) and 28(MMS) students. We oversubscribed and closed registration two weeks in advance due to room capacity issues. Attendee feedback was very positive.

Registration for November 28 Info Day is already closed with 160 MI and 65 MMS registered (including guests), greatly exceeding room capacity; registration remains open for January.

We have run regular Friday afternoon tours, led by our Senior Student Ambassador. To date, approx. 40 students have gone on these tours.

4 online chats held so far this term, with 2 more pending in November and December.

The Committee is poised to review applications starting in early December and to personally call accepted candidates.

We have no statistics to report at this moment but there is an overall sense that this will be a strong year for applications to both programs.

Thanks to all Faculty, Staff, and Students who help with Info Days!
The Committee has met twice this academic year (September 24, November 26).

An information session for potential doctoral applicants was held on November 5, 2015. Approximately 35 people were in attendance.

With the assistance of Laura Jantek and Adrian Berg, promotional materials to aid in doctoral recruitment for this year were prepared. These included digital flyers, plasma screens and power point slides advertising the doctoral program in general and the PhD Information Session in particular. PRAC members were invited to distribute these to interested colleagues both inside and outside the University of Toronto.

We are also advertising specific doctoral fellowship opportunities in the following areas:

- data-driven knowledge mobilization, translation and innovation
- Youth, social media, privacy, and equality

These fellowship opportunities have been made possible through the research grants of individual faculty members.

Applications for admissions opened on October 1, 2015. Complete applications are due January 15, 2016.

Submitted by: Heather MacNeil, Chair. With thanks to committee members Matt Brower, Nicole Cohen Sara Grimes, Laura Jantek, Matt Ratto, Mark Sedore.
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I. INTRODUCTION

KMDI IS A GEM. It should continue, thrive and grow at the university. It has a
community of excellent faculty who strongly identify with it, offers exciting graduate
courses and programs, and has had several spectacular successes. It represents
important and large ideas to the university and its larger communities. To thrive
and grow it needs some change, and such change is our focus in this report.

First, we frame our understanding of the KMDI and present evidence of and
argument for KMDI’s success to date.

KMDI’s avowed purpose states that it  ...is concerned with the ever-evolving
interaction between humans and technology. We live in a designed world where the
role of humans is constantly changing and will continue to change. The mission of the
Knowledge Media Design Institute is to carry out research and education that will
inform the design of devices, systems, and applications to enhance and ameliorate the
role of humans in a world of embedded, supporting, and sometimes controlling,
technologies. KMDI approaches this role from a multidisciplinary, collaborative, and
human-centred perspective, combining science, technology, arts and design in its
response to technological opportunity and change.

In short, we think with our tools and our tools shape our thinking. Our tools are
changing fast and all disciplines are affected. The KMDI is the main institute at the
university that studies this interplay.

KMDI has achieved some major successes.
  • Founded in 2001, the Collaborative Program (CP) involves several partners
departments within the university and has a well-connected and loyal alumni
group. The proposal for a Collaborative Program (CP) in KMD was submitted to
the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) in June 2001 and was officially
approved before year end. The CP began with five participating units:
    Architecture, Landscape, and Design; Computer Science; Information Studies;
Mechanical and Industrial Engineering; and Sociology, and has expanded to include Art (Visual Studies), OISE (Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development, Language and Literacies Education) Medical Science, Museum Studies, Urban Design, and Drama, Theatre, and Performance.

- In 2014 a new Knowledge Media Design (KMD) concentration was established within the Faculty of Information (FoI), one of seven concentrations within FoI. This new concentration has proved popular with about 20 (out of a total of about 150) FoI students per year concentrating in KMD. This is in line with or exceeds the other concentrations, with the exception of Library Science which attracts 70-90 students.

- In fall 2015 a new program in Translational Research in Medicine led by a KMDI alumnus and in which KMDI offers several of its courses including the flagship KMD 1001 course. It is expected that about 20 students from that program will take two KDMI courses each year. In the first class (fall 2015) there are 16 students.

- KMDI has been involved in three National Centers of Excellence (NCEs) since 2005 (Canadian Design Research Network, Graphics Animation and New Media and Age-Well).

- There have been major research projects over several years, including a spin-off company: Captual Technologies, which was acquired by Desire2Learn in 2011.

- KMDI played an implicit role in the founding and continued support of the Communication, Culture, Information and Technology (CCIT) program at UTM. UTM faculty identify strongly with KMDI with the Directory of CCIT, with Professor Anthony Wensley and Professor Rhonda McEwen serving on the KMDI executive committee. In addition, Professor Wensley is the Director of the KMD Collaborative Program. Several CCIT faculty identify with KMDI as the key university institute that relates to their research.

Currently, KMDI has several excellent qualities:

- Its program is vibrant and current.
- Its faculty identify with and care about the institute.
- Its current director is well-liked and has effectively fostered intellectual community.

But KMDI could be more. We see several possibilities for change, which we outline in the rest of this report.

First, we remark on the major challenges facing KMDI include:

- The move of the Institute from SGS to its new academic home in the Faculty of Information. Successes have resulted from this move, such as the addition of the KDM concentration to the Faculty of Information, but integration remains a challenge.
- Currently the main role of KMDI is educational. The research mission of KDMI has faded with the turnover of faculty involved and the conclusion of
some previously held large grants. Yet, KMDI-affiliated faculty undertake KMDI-related work, and express the desire for more collaboration.

- There is uncertainty amongst the involved faculty as to the continued viability of KMDI. While there is near unanimity amongst faculty, students, alumni, and industrial partners as to the need for an institute such as KMDI, the reduction of its research mission and the only partial integration in the Faculty of Information leaves faculty uncertain whether or not to commit resources and time to the institute.

We recommend a three phase plan for KMDI: (i) what to do “now”, (ii) what to do “next”, and (iii) what to do in the “future”. In the first phase we focus on stabilizing KMDI’s current position and offerings. In the second phase we seek to build partnerships and to set the foundations for growth. In the third phase we anticipate that KMDI will grow, expanding its offerings and the scope of its mission.

When detailing our recommendations for each of the three stages we break our recommendations down into five subcategories. The categories are logistical recommendations; undergraduate education; graduate education; research; and outreach. The first category, logistics, often concerns issues such as administration. The latter four categories form the essence of the academic mission and so we deal with each

During our visit, we asked a group of faculty to draft constructive ideas in writing. On 20 October 2015 we received a well-considered note from Anthony Wensley on behalf of the Executive Committee. We were pleased to see that the content of this note substantially concurs with our recommendations.

II. “NOW” -- STABILIZE

We see the “Now” recommendations as having an immediate impact, but being relatively simple and inexpensive to deploy. They include changes to the administration of KMDI and minor adjustments in its financial situation; a focus on stabilizing and growing graduate offerings and formal renewal of lasting contacts with industry.

1. Logistical Recommendations
   a. INTEGRATE KMDI ADMINISTRATION INTO THE iSCHOOL: Although KMDI has been part of the iSchool since 2009, its administration is not integrated into the iSchool. The KMDI administrator sits separate from the iSchool administrators and is not involved in iSchool administrative efforts. While the separate seating may be necessary, our first recommendation is to treat the KMDI administrator as part of the iSchool administration, e.g., by inviting the administrator to iSchool admin meetings. Our second recommendation is to offload some standard work such as managing student enrollment to the relevant iSchool administrator who knows how to manage that task efficiently. A former KMDI administrator estimated that 30% of her time was taken up by dealing with enrollment issues. While we anticipate this change will have
little budget impact it will allow the KMDI administrator to focus on KMDI's mission -- spending more time on alumni outreach, building industrial support and contacts, raising profile of KMDI in university and beyond, writing grants, etc.

b. **INCREASE KMDI FINANCIAL SUPPORT WITHIN ISCHOOL:** Some of the KMDI budget that came over from SGS was taken by the iSchool to deal with budget shortfalls. We heard different estimates of the amount. We learned from the Dean that it was $25k. We recommend reallocating that budget to KMDI to help it meet its mission. One possibility is to tie that budget increase to an expansion of KMDI1001, e.g., to 120 students.

c. **RENEGOTIATE STUDENT RATE FOR IMS PROGRAM:** The partnership between KMDI and the Translational Research in Medicine Program launched in fall 2015 was lauded both by the director of the program and the instructors of KDM1001. The 20 medical practitioners taking that call added significant richness in experience and viewpoint to class discussions. We also heard that the $500 per IMS student does not cover costs. We heard that the “right” level was somewhere between $735 and $1070. The director of the Program, Joseph Ferenbok, with whom we met, appeared to be open to discussing a sustainable rate.

2. Undergraduate Education: none

3. Graduate Education
   a. **MAKE KMDI RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF KMD CONCENTRATION:** We recommend the iSchool place administrative and teaching responsibilities of KDM concentration under KMDI so that KMDI “owns” the KDM concentration. This will permanently attach FoI faculty to KMDI and (we think) revenue also. It will help cement the role of KMDI within the iSchool. We recommend to start with the iSchool faculty that already have had a long relationship with KMDI.
   
   b. **CLARIFY NEED FOR CP AND KMD CONCENTRATION:** We observed that many iSchool faculty and students did not understand the tactical and strategic reasons for having both the KMD concentration and the KMDI CP. It would help to clarify this. For instance, the two programs serve different purposes. The first concerns service internal to the iSchool (teaching students in the KMD concentration) while the other serves an outreach purpose (CP). The two programs are not in competition with each other.
   
   c. **EXPAND TEACHING MISSION:** We recommend an immediate expansion in the teaching efforts of KDM1001 from the current 60 students (2 sections of 30 each in fall 2015) to 120 students. Some creative thinking is required to figure out how to scale classes without losing faculty contact. Ideas that were raised include combining lecture portions of the sections, adding great instructor support (TAs) to run break-out sessions, and/or running an inverted classroom model. A different classroom space may also be required, e.g., for combined lecture sessions.
d. ESTABLISH TEACHING CONTINUITY: It would help to establish teaching continuity by having KMD1001 and other classes taught by regular faculty. We anticipate that now that there is a KMD concentration such teaching would count towards the teaching load of iSchool faculty. Teaching is currently primarily done by sessionals – post-docs and PhD students.

e. MAINTAIN DIVERSITY IN CLASSES: Place a limit (possible a fixed percentage) on the number of slots for KMD1001 reserved for iSchool students. If the KMD concentration becomes popular and no limits are enforced, the program could lose the richness of multidisciplinary courses. We also don't want to limit only to FoI and IMS (i.e., students from the Translational Research Program in Medicine) for the same reasons. Furthermore it is imperative to avoid “Full-course turn-away” wherein students that want to participate in the CP are turned away due to enrollment caps / priority dedicated to iSchool students. If the message propagates to collaborating departments that the CP classes are full then future students may not bother to consider the program.

f. PREREQUISITES TO STUDENTS: Make it clear to students that they can petition to skip KMD1001 if they have this material in their undergraduate education. However, also make clear that there will be much great interdisciplinary richness in KMD1001 than what they might have experienced as undergraduates, which will make the learning different.

g. CLARIFY TA POOL: Clarify whether it important to have TAs from a diversity of disciplines or whether it is okay to draw all from the iSchool – i.e., since the idea is to draw in a diversity of students and disciplines, is it important to match that diversity with a diverse TA pool?

4. Research: none

5. Outreach:
   a. ADD INDUSTRIAL ADVISORS: We recommend adding industrial representation (from at least two corporations) to the KMDI advisory panel – from at least two corporations – Dean said not allowed to have on executive committee as those positions need to be filled by academics.
   b. GROW INDUSTRIAL AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT: Expand awareness of KMDI among alumni and industry, bring those players to classroom to build networks, expand hiring opportunities. Build upon existing successes (Open Source project, Design Jam, SPARK Challenge and GO Transit) and create new, active opportunities for engagement.
   c. PROVIDE FACULTY CROSS-APPOINTMENTS: Expand engagement with faculty that teach KMDI/KMDI courses in the CP by providing cross-appointments with the FoI. Governance issues for making such appointments would need to be carefully considered.
   d. IMPROVE ADVERTISING: KMDI courses and seminars need to be better advertised outside of the FoI. We anticipate that if admin time is freed up
per our earlier recommendation, the KMDI administrator will have time to improve on this.

III. “NEXT”: PARTNER AND SET FOUNDATION FOR GROWTH
Our recommendations for what to do “Next” focus largely on resolving structural issues of grant management, centre status within the university and renewal of CP partners. Two specific action items are to make KMDI a single point of contact for industry and to offer a university-wide research methods course for research involving people and technology.

1. Logistical Recommendations
   a. CLARIFY GRANT MANAGEMENT: Make clear how grants can be managed through KMDI, how overhead works, make set-up such that it is attractive to route grants through KMDI. Make sure that there is some incentive for participating faculty (from the iSchool and collaborating programs) to route their grants through KMDI.

2. Undergraduate Education
   a. CREATE AN EDU:B: There is a great opportunity for KMDI to partner with CCIT at UTM. CCIT is an EDU:A that focuses on undergraduate education. KMDI could become an EDU:B with a focus on graduate education that could serve as a natural partner for CCIT. Furthermore, CCIT is also connected to Sheridan, which could provide a pathway to funnel KMDI’s design thinking into the practice of design.

3. Graduate Education
   a. REEXAMINE CP PARTNERS: The Collaborative Program (CP) has 15 partner programs. Some (such as OISE) frequently sent students to participate. Others send student less frequently. KMDI should reexamine the partnerships in the light of the new KDM concentration. It’s not clear to the committee whether the current set of partners is the right set, if KMDI should refocus on a smaller number of more committed departments, or should expand its set of partners. In any case a reexamination will prove useful.
   b. INCLUDE STUDENTS IN CONCEPTUALIZING THE MISSION OF KMDI: Have a seminar on “what is knowledge design” – and what KMDI should be studying -- involve the students who are the main customers. Idea is to involve them in a discussion akin to the one Robert and David Modjeska had in one of our later meetings.

4. Research
   a. EVOLVE KMDI INTO AN UMBRELLA INSITUTION: To help expand its mission to include research, undergraduate teaching, and outreach, KMDI should evolve into an umbrella intuition.
i. SUPPORT RESEARCH: For instance, Semaphore is a research lab at the FoI, the research areas of which has significant overlap with KMDI. Currently Semaphore is considering EDU:C status (the same status as KMDI). One option discussed was for Semaphore to become part of a larger-scale KMDI. KMDI would benefit from Semaphore’s research mission, while Semaphore would gain from KMDI’s long history, current focus in education, and role as a multi-disciplinary center on campus. **We recommend that there be one and only one KMDI-cognate institute within FoI.**

ii. COORDINATE OUTREACH TO INDUSTRY: We heard actively from industrial participants during the visit that they value KMDI. However, KMDI can do a better job connecting to industry and serving a role that industry needs. In particular, we heard that industry wants a single point of contact at UofT. They want a neutral 3rd party (KMDI) to bring competing companies (e.g., Telus, Bell) into one space where they can discuss research and future directions. If KMDI invites them in there is no issue of anti-trust or collusion. Further, KMDI may be able to negotiate some sort of (limited) blanket approval for human-subject testing from UofTs IRB. One thought was that the SAVI (Smart Applications on Virtual Infrastructure) Network might be able to serve as a model.

5. Outreach
   a. TEACH A RESEARCH METHODS COURSE: It seems to the committee that KMDI is ideally situated intellectually to teach a broad research methods course as a large-scale service offering. Such a course is widely needed and could be taught at the graduate or at the undergraduate levels.

IV. “FUTURE”: GROW MISSION

Our “Grow” recommendations comprise actions that require sustained leadership and effort. Each presents new opportunities for KMDI and needs to be considered in context before committing. “Big Ideas’ courses, expansion into data analytics and data visualization, an NSERC Create application and an emphasis on entrepreneurship are synergistic potential major projects for KMDI.

1. Logistical Recommendations
   a. LEADERSHIP: KMDI needs a full-time evangelical and collegial leader who will tout the possibilities of KMDI, can develop a vision, get people on board, and realize the vision. This is not a criticism of the current Director’s impressive accomplishments, rather it describes what KMDI needs in the future. The full-time KMDI director should play a major role in KMDI’s course offerings and should regularly teach KMDI courses.

2. Undergraduate Education
BUILD A BIG IDEAS CLASS: KMDI should build a “big ideas” class focused on understanding technology users and user-centric design.

BIG IDEAS AND UNDERGRADUATES IN THE ISCHOOL: A big ideas course, and collaboration with CCIT at UTM, could provide the iSchool with some initial experience in undergraduate education. The committee learned on the visit that the iSchool has been thinking about whether or not to create an undergraduate degree offering. (It is now an all-graduate student faculty.) Collaboration with CCIT could provide some initial experience before fully committing.

3. Graduate Education
   a. INCLUDE DATA ANALYTICS / DATA VISUALIZATION IN THE CORE MISSION OF KMDI: Work in data analytics and visualization would fit nicely in KMDI and in the Faculty of Information. Currently there is not a clear home for this type of work on campus. While the FoI may not already have strength in all aspects of this type of research, KMDI’s Collaborative Program could provide a natural and easy way to bring into the school those missing areas of expertise. As mentioned earlier, faculty involved in such research could be cross-appointed to the Faculty of Information.

4. Research
   a. APPLY FOR AN NSERC CREATE: In time KDMI can be well positioned to submit a strong CREATE proposal. If, as this committee envisions is possible, KDMI is able to grow its educational impact (at both the graduate and undergraduate levels), rejuvenate its research mission, and improve its outreach then KDMI will be serving a unique role in the university and the proposal will be especially strong.

5. Outreach
   a. DEVELOP AN ENTREPRENEURSHIP ANGLE: While there are many entrepreneurship programs and incubators and contests, the opportunity at KMDI is different. KMDI provides a space where people from different disciplines can come together, work together, and invent together. It can provide an attractive space for people whose ideas don’t fit into, e.g., the mold of MARS (bio/health) or the Hatchery (engineering). The committee was impressed by one faculty member from the Drama school that participated in the visit and who spoke along these lines.

6. Space
   a. LOCATE AND HOUSE KMDI MORE EFFECTIVELY: The current KMDI facilities are spatially dispersed. The Institute could function more effectively with improved and co-located facilities.

V. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS
The simplest version of our summary is the leading two sentences of this report. **KMDI IS A GEM.** It should continue, thrive and grow at the university.
To thrive and grow, KMDI needs to make smart short, medium and long term changes. Should it do these well, it will have a bright and vital future as a key institute at the University of Toronto and in the larger Canadian research community. KMDI is the main proponent in the university of big ideas around the ever-evolving interaction between humans and technology. This crucial and lasting societal issue will be important to the university for many years to come and KMDI best-placed to be its champion and provide its needed scholarly community.
EXTERNAL REVIEW

Coach House Institute and the McLuhan Program in Culture and Technology

As set out in the External Review Terms of Reference, the purpose of this review and report is to inquire into all aspects of the Coach House Institute (CHI) and the McLuhan Program in Culture and Technology (MPCT), and – in the context of their history – to make comments and recommendations as appropriate with regard to the leadership, organisation, and plans of the CHI, as well as to address the challenges and opportunities and the best strategies for responding to them.

The Terms of Reference delineate eight areas of consideration: impact; leadership; governance; research programs; educational programs; infrastructure and resources; engagement; and future challenges. The report is organised accordingly, with discussion situated under each of the eight rubrics. Recommendations follow, with an Appendix of topics for “Irreverent Excellence” and potential guests and/or Fellows.

Preamble

The External Review Team consists of: Professor Joshua Meyrowitz, Department of Communication, University of New Hampshire; Professor Kevin Dowler, Chair, Department of Communications Studies, York University; and Professor Lisa Steele, Program Director Visual Studies, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, University of Toronto.

Prior to their site visits, the Review Team was provided with several key documents including:

- **External Review Terms of Reference** specific to this review: These terms asked the Review Team to review the history and profile of the MPCT and its relationship with the CHI, assess the CHI’s current leadership and organization and how best to respond to the challenges facing the CHI, and identify strategies for responding to these opportunities. This document asked that the Review Team consider several points: the impact of the CHI within both internal and external communities; the role and effectiveness of current leadership of the CHI; the governance and administration of the organization; the quality of research and educational programs; the availability of resources to support the current infrastructure; the effectiveness of CHI’s engagement with other institutions and constituencies; and, finally, to identify the challenges and opportunities facing the CHI and suggest possible changes.

- **Guidelines for Administrative Functions and Protocols of Extra-Departmental Units (EDU):** This document provided information specific to the definitions of the
different types of EDU designations available to interdisciplinary units at the University of Toronto.

- **Coach House Institute Self-Study 2008-2015**: This report constitutes a self-study of the Faculty of Information's Coach House Institute (CHI) and McLuhan Program in Culture and Technology (MPCT), from the launch of the CHI in 2008 as an "extradepartmental unit" (EDU) at the University of Toronto to the present. In addition to providing the backdrop and rationale for the creation of the CHI and an extensive documentation of activities in the period, the document describes extensive consultation leading to a renewal of relations with McLuhan constituencies and the envisioning of a future building on the legacy of McLuhan and the Toronto School by fashioning a space for developing sustained deliberations on the mediated reconfiguration of contemporary society.

In addition to reviewing the documents, the reviewers undertook a two-day site visit and met with a wide range of constituents, as well as visiting the Coach House itself and assessing the physical resources of the CHI and MPCT.

The reviewers met with the Dean of the Faculty of Information, Seamus Ross, and the Directors of the CHI & MPCT, Brian Cantwell Smith and Dominique Scheffel-Dunand. In addition, the reviewers met with two groups of faculty affiliated with the Faculty of Information; graduate students studying in the iSchool; representatives of the University of St. Michael's College and its Book and Media Studies program; the Directors of the Knowledge Media Design Institute, Jackman Humanities Institute, and the Justina M. Barnicke Gallery & University of Toronto Art Centre. The reviewers held consultations with current Marshall McLuhan Centenary Fellow David Nostbakken, Audrey Johnson, Senior Development Officer for the Faculty of Information, as well as external community members.

**Context**

Marshall McLuhan is now widely recognized as being a prophetic genius who perceived the contours (or the contour-less nature) of the digital era decades before others could imagine what was on the cultural horizons. As the CHI Self-Study document notes, McLuhan “gave prescient voice to issues of profound significance for emerging technological society. The provocative probes and prognostications of the most visible member of the Toronto School of Communication have since been widely heralded as having foretold the rise of ubiquitous media and the world-wide web thirty years before they arrived.”

Yet, we cannot forget that McLuhan was far from universally appreciated in his own time. He was widely seen as a dangerous denigrator of literacy, a mindless embracer of TV, dismissive of academic disciplinarity that was the foundation of university learning, and so on. McLuhan was a disrupter, a provocateur who challenged conventional wisdom, asked...
big questions, and offered provocative (sometimes wild and baffling, but more commonly brilliant and prescient) answers.

Despite being one of the most well-known academics and famous University of Toronto personages, McLuhan has been viewed “differentially,” as the Self-Study put it, within the University. Consequently, his legacy has arguably remained unexplored within the University itself. Nevertheless, the McLuhan name and the profile of the Coach House have remained prominent, and have perhaps even grown over the years as the shifts in society brought about by so-called “new media” have led to an increasing interest in returning to the work of McLuhan for inspiration.

With the transformations underway both within the academy and externally in society as a whole, it became increasingly apparent that the continued importance and profile of McLuhan could represent an opportunity for the University to capitalise on the legacy and develop an innovative approach that would build on its potential and serve as a platform for inquiry going forward. The University, the city of Toronto, Canada, and the world could benefit from having others follow in his general footsteps in exploring technology and culture. The University of Toronto would be a natural centre for such an enterprise, given that McLuhan spent the majority of his academic career at the University of Toronto and resisted offers to move elsewhere. Moreover, there are indications that potential wealthy donors would be more interested in contributing to an activity connected to the McLuhan “brand” than to a conventional university activity. Yet such external contributions (as well as potential grants) would be more likely forthcoming if there were greater signs of internal financial and moral support from the University of Toronto.

However, the MPCT, as the Self-Study notes, “had a vexed history at the University in the decades following [McLuhan’s] death, receiving neither prominence nor funding proportional to its visibility and international renown. In spite of its name carrying the word ‘program,’ a U. of T. technical term for a teaching unit, the MPCT had remained largely outside any regular pedagogical program; more generally, its formal status in the University remained somewhat obscure.”

The general neglect of the McLuhan legacy thus far has been evidenced in: the run-down condition of the famous Coach House (even after minor renovations for the McLuhan centenary); the lack of full-time staff to run the Coach House Institute (CHI) and the McLuhan Program in Culture and Technology (MPCT); how the University and the city of Toronto lagged behind other major world cities in organizing and embracing celebrations of various recent McLuhan anniversaries (though as detailed in the Self-Study document, the close-to-volunteer level Centre staff managed some major catch-up activities for five anniversaries, including McLuhan’s centenary in 2011, the 50th anniversary of the Coach House in 2013, the 50th anniversary of the publication of McLuhan’s iconic Understanding Media in 2014, etc.); the lack of updated digital technology for the Coach House; the lack of another appropriate facility dedicated for McLuhan Fellow offices and meetings and seminars; the lack of staff to establish and maintain a vibrant and up-to-date web site for the MPCT and the CHI; the only sporadic recent holding of current manifestations of the
legendary Monday Night Seminars; no consistent in-print or online publications about activities and research emanating from the CHI and MPCT; no visible, organized collection of McLuhan’s writings at the Coach House or other campus location for perusal, inspiration, and simple historical documentation; almost losing McLuhan’s personal library (the books he read and annotated) to York University (though the personal library now resides in the U. of T.'s Fisher Rare Book Library); unnecessarily alienating the McLuhan family and local and distant McLuhan devotees as well as of those who want to build on McLuhan’s legacy in new and innovative ways; and lack of clear coordination of activities that have taken place (including the activities of the McLuhan Fellows) with each other, with St. Michael’s College, and with an array of scholars in multiple related fields in and beyond the University of Toronto; and lack of engagement with the public in the tradition of McLuhan.

In this context, the “Coach House Institute Self-Study 2008-2015” was undertaken to take stock, as it were, of these prevailing conditions and offer a vision that would seek to in its words “redress a history, forge a vision, and create an institutional platform” that builds on McLuhan's inquiries into the “reciprocal intersection of culture and technology;” proposes exploration and debate “in light of the transformation of the material substrates of expression and creativity from marks on paper to digital configurations;” and delineates “who we are, what matters, what is going to be significant in the coming age.”

Particularly important for situating this review are the outcomes of the Self-Study, as they constitute the most recent assessment of the conditions and prospects of the CHI & MPCT and represent the views of a wide consultation with constituents and stakeholders. Addressing many of the concerns raised over the years of the existence of the MPCT and subsequent creation of the CHI, the Self-Study provides an extensive documentation of aspects of the history and present situation, and on that basis develops a comprehensive vision for the future structure, goals, and activities of the CHI & MPCT.

As the study notes, three important goals have been accomplished: the creation of an Extra-Departmental Unit Type C to provide the Institute and Program with a recognised institutional framework; the renewal of relations with constituents of McLuhan communities locally, nationally, and abroad; and thirdly, the development of a framework for sustained and deep intellectual and analysis of key issues arising from the reconfigurations of contemporary society occurring in the context of media transformation. This latter goal represents the formulation of a vision for the future, which looks to encapsulate the themes arising from consultations and a series of recommendations from stakeholders. These led to the envisioning of a three-stage process, ensuring firstly a secure operating basis; secondly the establishment of a vigorous research and teaching program; and thirdly, a public program that would engage the public sphere with expertise in relation to critical issues.

The main thrust of the current review is to assess, in light of further consultations, the challenges and prospects for the CHI & MPCT and to make further recommendations based on the outcomes of both the Self-Study (which will be considered in further detail below in relation to the different areas of consideration within the scope of the mandate for this
report) and with respect to the discussions and thematic concerns arising from the consultations undertaken by the reviewers.

a) IMPACT

The MPCT has a long history, which, under the stewardship of Derrick de Kerckhove, and despite minimal internal support, maintained a highly prominent international profile, particularly through the visiting McLuhan Fellows. The subsequent period from 2008 onwards is notable for the number and wide variety of activities undertaken, including lecture series, conferences, and the numerous events organised around the various anniversaries celebrating McLuhan milestones:

- 2010—30th anniversary of McLuhan’s death;
- 2011—100th anniversary of McLuhan’s birth;
- 2012—50th anniversary of the publication of *The Gutenberg Galaxy*;
- 2013—50th anniversary of the opening of U. of T.’s McLuhan Centre for Culture & Technology;
- 2014—50th anniversary of the publication of *Understanding Media*.

In addition to these activities, the program became somewhat regularised as a component of the Faculty of Information (FI) in the 1990s, leading eventually to the establishment of the CHI as an EDU type C with an Executive Committee, and the development of a Culture & Technology concentration offered through the FI Master’s of Information degree program.

It is clear through the documents and discussion that intensive efforts have been made in most recent years to capitalise on the value of the McLuhan legacy and look to means by which this could be mobilised by the CHI, FI, and University in the development of a high-profile, impactful program of research activity drawing on the legacy work as a template for analysing issues related to emerging media in the present and beyond.

The reviewers noted the extent to which discussion with stakeholders pointed already to the manner in which the CHI has had and continues to have a significant impact. It was iterated many times in our meetings with others that the McLuhan name continued to be widely recognised, and moreover that the prescience of some of his insights respecting our current situation indicated the importance of renewing the trajectory of research in application to contemporary emergent issues.

At the same time, however, one of the consistent themes that emerged with discussion amongst constituents and in the documents was the sense of neglect of the McLuhan “brand.” It therefore seemed that there was widespread agreement that the McLuhan name has had a sustained profile over the years, but that the University had not made significant
efforts to make good on the potential impact that developing the CHI & MPCT might represent in terms of the profile of the University and contribution to intellectual debate.

Nevertheless, it is evident that in the last decade in particular there has been renewed interest in preserving and developing the CHI & MPCT, notably in the establishment of the CHI itself and the various changes in status within the FI, as well as the contribution and support at the Provost level. Despite reservations in some quarters of the University, a consensus has emerged that with an appropriate structure and leadership, the CHI & MPCT can increase its already substantial impact.

It is also evident that the current leadership, in the context of FI, has undertaken an extraordinary amount of labour in developing the foundations for renewal, in terms of re-establishing and fostering links with the internal, local, national, and international communities, and formulating a framework for re-establishing a comprehensive research and teaching program.

b) LEADERSHIP

It is abundantly clear that in the years following McLuhan's passing, the MPCT was maintained in the absence of almost any resources beyond that of the fortitude of the skeletal leadership. The circumstances have changed somewhat in the last decade in a symbolic manner, but scant resources have continued to hinder the effectiveness of the Directors.

It must be remarked, however, that despite this lack, the leadership has shown remarkable energy, fortitude, and commitment to the maintenance of the CHI/MPCT, all without anything but the most modest—if any—compensation, and in the absence of substantial administrative support.

The Self-Study document and appendices contain extensive documentation of activities undertaken by Brian Cantwell Smith and Dominique Scheffel-Dunand, over the last decade, including the Self-Study itself. The anniversary events noted above consisted of numerous activities including lectures, workshops, and exhibitions – the McLuhan 100 project alone had more than two dozen events.

In addition to coordinating the many public events, Prof. Scheffel-Dunand also worked extensively behind the scenes with various constituents of the McLuhan community to garner support for the CHI & MPCT, as well as forging partnerships and generating funding for a myriad of activities.

Brian Cantwell Smith, beginning with the “Skunkworks” document, also undertook a significant number of projects during this period, creating the CHI itself; developing the Culture and Technology Concentration and creating syllabi for courses; securing funding for the CHI & MPCT; creating a CFI proposal for the CHI; and, working with Dominique
Scheffel-Dunand, undertaking the extensive consultation process leading to the vision and plans outlined in the Self-Study.

Space does not permit enumerating more than a small portion of the activities and events initiated, undertaken, or overseen by the two Directors, but their extent is shown in the documentation, and gives evidence of the substantial work accomplished by the CHI & MPCT and its leadership despite limited resources.

Consistent throughout discussions with the reviewers was the need for a dedicated director who had adequate resources in terms of time and support to properly administer the Institute and Program. In particular, there was agreement that this should be a full-time faculty member and someone of sufficient scholarly standing to bring prestige to the CHI and attract other high-calibre scholars.

One of the central impediments, then, to the future success of the CHI is the lack of appropriate resources for the Director. Further, there is a lack of clarity in the relationship between the CHI and the MPCT. At present there are two Directors, one for the CHI and one for the MPCT, and although this has been a successful relationship because of the positive collaboration of two individuals, it is not clear moving forward with the long-term future in mind whether these should be consolidated into one position, or whether the two roles should remain separate. In part, this might be clarified with a more explicit delineation of the areas of responsibility of the Director(s) in a manner that provides more transparency.

The reviewers note that there was clear consensus for the creation of and support for a full-time Director of the CHI & MPCT, and that this should be someone with relevant academic training and professional standing, with faculty rank in the FI or another college, and with significant release from teaching to run the activities of the Coach House Institute and the McLuhan Program in Culture and Technology.

c) GOVERNANCE, ORGANISATION, AND ADMINISTRATION

Following on the agreement in 1994, the McLuhan Program was integrated within the administrative structure of the Faculty of Information. The Coach House Institute was established in 2008 as an EDU type D, and subsequently converted to an EDU type C, with a structure whereby the Director of the CHI is appointed by and reports to the Dean; the Dean and Director in turn obtain advice and oversight from the Executive Committee consisting of faculty members drawn from the University community and appointed by the Dean, as well as an Advisory Board drawn both from within the University and the broader community.

At present, the governance of the CHI & MPCT consists of two Directors, Brian Cantwell Smith (CHI) and Dominique Scheffel-Dunand (MPCT), and the Coach House Executive Committee, consisting of the Dean of the Faculty of Information, the two Directors, and...
members drawn from other areas of the University. The website also indicates an Advisory Board, but this appears not to be implemented at this time.

In discussion with constituents, there were no direct concerns raised about the current governance structure per se, but some questioned the “ownership,” as it were, of the CHI by FI, given that the mandate of the CHI could be seen to reach in scope beyond the disciplinary concerns of the FI proper. This question appeared to be prompted by the inter- and multi-disciplinary character of research arising from the legacy of McLuhan, and the need to develop some sort of framework that would reach out to and be inclusive of a wide range of partners and constituencies both within and external to the University.

As noted above, over time, the bulk of the work of the CHI & MPCT has fallen to the Directors, who have maintained operations with little to no administrative support or resources. It was not clear to the reviewers whether any administrative support was available to the Directors, either through FI or other facilities.

The reviewers, in light of discussion of relations with other faculties and units in the University and beyond, considered that the implementation of the Advisory Board may provide an opportunity to be inclusive of stakeholders beyond the current members of the Executive Committee, and provide a conduit to partners outside the FI and the University.

Consideration also needs to be given to appropriate administrative support for the Director(s). Potentially, a portion of the Provost’s funds could be allocated to such a support position.

**d) RESEARCH PROGRAMS**

The last few years have seen the CHI step back from an active role in research in order to undertake a sustained self-assessment primarily with consideration of the development of a research trajectory going forward.

With Brian Cantwell Smith’s “Skunkworks” document as a basis, the CHI has mapped a vision oriented toward situating itself in an autonomous position vis-à-vis the University (‘in but not of’), as well as concerned with providing excellence in terms of the quality of research, aspiring to the level of influence McLuhan’s work achieved in his time.

Both the brilliance and controversial character of McLuhan’s research derived from its cross-disciplinary dimensions as well as studied indifference to entrenched methodologies where they stood in the way of insights. To a large degree, the documents as well as discussions with reviewers reiterated the need to provide a structure that enabled unfettered inquiry, encapsulated in the slogan “safe house for (unsafe) ideas,” that would ensure a future program patterned on the legacy, but reconsidered in light of the structural and technological changes that have occurred in McLuhan’s wake.
There was certainly support in discussions for an arrangement that ensured a degree of autonomy for the CHI, and there was emphasis on the manner in which engagements with other communities, particularly artists, had proven fruitful, and served as models for the kinds of interactions and dialogue that can emerge in a more experimental environment. Graduate students likewise envisioned the CHI as a place for experimentation and opportunities to develop alternate pedagogies and approaches to knowledge production, as well as a meeting ground for collaboration with non-academic publics and, importantly, a place for “safe failure,” where processes could be explored without immediate definitive outcomes.

Challenging in this context is the development of specific research lines with some eventual publication output. The documents and discussions pointed to “broad strokes” in terms of vectors for inquiry, but at this juncture these have not been formulated as concrete plans. Moreover, no structure has been outlined for moving whatever “idea work” is accomplished into distributable form (articles, books, videos, exhibits, interactive web sites, etc.). Indeed, the expressions of a need for open-ended primary research without necessarily indicating determinate outcomes or deliverables pose challenges with defining a program. Yet, these are challenges that the Review Team feels need to be embraced and addressed to secure the long-term reputation and influence of the CHI and MPCT.

It is evident, nevertheless, that considerable effort has been undertaken to frame the basis upon which a substantive program could be developed, and there is substantial support for what is deemed to be a unique opportunity to have an institutional setting to pursue innovative and original research in a relatively unfettered manner.

e) EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Over the years, the CHI & MPCT have offered a number of individual courses in the FI focused on McLuhan’s writings and the philosophy of information. Initially as an EDU type D and subsequently an EDU type C, the CHI/MPCT does not have any teaching faculty per se, but such units are able to offer courses in an academic area, as has been the case in FI.

More recently, as a component of regularisation, the major pedagogical effort of the MPCT was the development of a Culture & Technology (C&T) concentration within the FI Master’s of Information (MI) degree. Founded on two new core courses, the concentration was launched in September 2012, in order to support Culture & Technology as a central subject within the FI MI curriculum. This concentration was expected to draw on the uniqueness of the concentration vis-à-vis other degree programs as well as its distinctive affiliation with the CHI & MPCT.

During the site visit there was considerable discussion regarding the role of the CHI & MPCT as a teaching program. With respect to the concentration in the MI degree program specifically, concerns were expressed regarding students’ expectations for a professional degree, and the extent to which a more research-based, theoretical option (which would be
more in line with the CHI & MPCT initiatives) was a good fit with the existing and potential students for the program, and presented challenges for maintaining enrolments. Some concern was also raised about the use of part-time course directors for the core courses, and the possibly negative signal this sent regarding the status of the concentration.

There was also much discussion about alternatives to the existing concentration. This discussion included whether a communication- or media-focussed MA degree was appropriate, or in fact feasible given the proliferation of such graduate programs in Ontario and nationally. Consideration was also given to the possibility of a program that had an orientation to media and information policy, which may provide a better fit with existing and future students. Moreover, since successful policy initiatives typically grow out of historical and theoretical analyses, a policy focus would therefore offer a tie to media-theory perspectives that the McLuhan program explores.

In addition to the consideration of existing and potential FI offerings, there were also discussions regarding the relation between the CHI and the undergraduate Book and Media Program at St. Michael’s College. Some discussion was devoted to whether the CHI might, via the directed research courses offered at St. Michael’s, provide faculty supervision to students, who in turn could assist CHI-affiliated faculty or McLuhan Fellows with their research.

With regard to the broader role of the CHI & MPCT, the issue of teaching prompted a number of different positions. There were questions raised as to whether the development of a teaching or degree program could hamper the explorations of the Institute by placing undue burdens on it in terms of University expectations and curricular standards that could restrict the latitude of seminars. Referencing the aims to foster excellence in terms of the level of scholarly discourse, others suggested that student involvement be limited to doctoral candidates and post-doctoral fellows. Ultimately, experimentation may be the only means of answering this question.

It should be noted that the Self-Study documents provide no specific guidance here in terms of a future orientation for teaching; the implementation of the concentration in the MI program nevertheless indicates a commitment at the faculty level to provide the resources to develop a pedagogical presence in the University.

f) INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES

The Coach House:
In the context section above, issues were alluded to regarding the physical resources of the CHI. In some ways, the clear state of things is registered in the condition of the Coach House itself. Despite minor renovations, the facility is in poor shape and lacks appropriate infrastructural amenities. As the Self-Study report notes, “it remains a significant distance away from being renewed to the point where U. of T. could be proud of it, as a space of significant historical, cultural, and architectural value.”
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It was clear in the case of those familiar with the site and legacy that the building has iconic status, and in discussion with reviewers, where it was touched upon, there was also clear consensus that the building needs to be preserved and that it requires further maintenance and renovation to function properly. It was also noted that there was an additional adjacent unused building (‘Coach House II”) that could provide much-needed additional space.

Although it did not arise in discussion, the reviewers also note that the Self-Study indicates substantial remaining renovation funds awaiting matching funds from external donors. This indicates, in principle at least, a commitment by the University to upgrade the existing facilities. The reviewers also took note of the renovation plans included in the unsuccessful CFI application, “Lab for Foundational Research.”

Unfortunately, although referred to in the Self-Study, the reviewers were not able to view the project documents arising from the Design Charrette, and therefore unable to comment on their potentials vis-à-vis existing physical resources. Nevertheless, in discussions, these suggested the scope of thinking about the manner in which the CHI could develop a significant institutional footprint and profile beyond the existing facilities.

What became clear through the consultation process is that if the CHI & MPCT are to be situated in the Coach House itself, the building is inadequate in its present state to provide a proper space for faculty, fellows, administration, and on-going activities. Moreover, potential donors seeing the Coach House as it is will likely be turned off by the obvious lack of internal institutional support that its condition signals.

**Computing Resources:**
According to the Self-Study document, the Coach House is currently equipped with a number of computers and peripherals that were acquired through Professor Cantwell Smith’s Canada Research Chair in 2003. This equipment is still functional, but is now more than 12 years old, and in need of renewal. There is WiFi and Ethernet, but little else by way of technology available.

For many of the discussants, the absence of any sort of digital footprint for an organisation putatively concerned with media and technological transformation is highly problematic. Being “on the border” does not mean being offline. It was considered by many to be of crucial importance that the CHI develop a comprehensive digital platform as a vital component of its contemporary profile. In addition to the analysis of new media, constituents advocated for innovative usage as well.

A number of different ideas emerged in this context, from digitising McLuhan’s works and library, to revivifying the *Explorations* journal, or developing a broader site devoted to the nexus of media research that produced the “Toronto School” and its legacies. In short, there were a wide range of potential ideas and projects that could be promulgated though an online portal with the appropriate infrastructure and support in place.
**Funding and Support:**
The reviewers noted the broad symbolic support for the CHI & MPCT, while at the same time recognising the challenges faced with regard to on-going financial support and security. One of the biggest challenges concerns the shared desire to see the CHI remain “at the margins” of the University, which seems, at the moment, to entail its continued marginal status financially as well. Clearly the central concern is the manner in which an operation or unit “in but not of” the University can be sustained, or even self-sustaining. The current situation, with almost no institutional support, is incompatible with the goals laid out in the Self-Study documents.

The CHI/MPCT does not have an official line-item budget, although the then-Provost Vivek Goel agreed that the $200,000 obtained from the Academic Initiative Fund (AIF) in 2005 should be rolled into the FI base operating funds, in order that CHI support would continue on a permanent basis (although no legal document apparently exists that officially “targets” those funds towards the CHI & MPCT).

Nevertheless, the current Dean has been generous in supporting the CHI & MPCT. Among other things, he has provided a modest stipend for MPCT Director Dominique Scheffel-Dunand; supported the McLuhan Centennial Fellows; and provided support for significant events. In addition, the CHI has been successful in raising external funding from SSHRC and other agencies for a range of activities under it aegis.

The main costs attributed to the “base” funding consist of a portion of the CHI Director’s salary, the small stipend for the MPCT Director, the stipends for current Fellows, and rent on the Coach House building. Surprisingly, a substantial portion of the funding remains unspent: this is in part attributable to the current suspension of significant activity in order to undertake the review exercise, but it also points to the challenges in mounting a more extensive program in the absence of adequate resources for a full-time Director. Some discussion was also devoted to whether this fund could be put toward administrative support if a faculty position could be secured for a Director.

If this fund appears to be underutilised at this juncture, there was nevertheless concern expressed that this fund alone was insufficient to develop the CHI along the lines envisioned in the Self-Study and in the minds of many. In response to this, there were a number of ideas bruited during discussions.

With respect to the need for funding full-time committed leadership, a few options were put forward. One concerned the development of another MA stream within the FI with sufficient enrolment to create a full-time faculty position. For their part, representatives of St. Michael’s expressed interest in assisting with a position if a relation could be established with the Book and Media program, and with an appointment in FI. It was also the case that concern for an unencumbered Director was directly related to the capacity to devote time and effort to fundraising and forging partnerships within and outside of the University.
In addition, St. Michael’s representatives indicated they would consider providing relief from the costs of renting the Coach House if the facilities could be made available for a broader range of activities. Likewise, others indicated a range of potential partnerships that could assist with in-kind or financial support.

It was certainly the case that endowment was seen as the best way to protect the CHI from any vulnerability. The Jackman Humanities Institute provided an important example here. However, it was not entirely clear whether the CHI is in a position to pursue such a thing. Our discussions with current Fellow David Nostbakken and FI Senior Development Officer Audrey Johnson on this subject suggested that any discussion of endowment may be premature at this time. Nevertheless, there was a potential, beyond the scope of the current discussions Dr. Nostbakken was holding within the parameters of his fellowship project, that his interlocutors might be viewed as possible donors.

g) ENGAGEMENT

As the documents provided to the reviewers make evident, the CHI & MPCT has gone to extraordinary lengths in the past decade to foster engagement with the Institute and Program, and to build links, forge partnerships and connections with communities within and beyond the University, in a variety of different fields and venues and at a national and international scale.

Notable in this context was the utilisation of the various centenaries as a means to mount a wide variety of events and activities that worked to revivify the profile of McLuhan and the CHI. This effort involved not only repairing and strengthening existing relationships, but also developing new and remarkably numerous connections across the globe. As detailed in the Self-Study documents, the CHI & MPCT invested an enormous amount of labour in producing and coordinating an impressive array of activities in this period.

Also noted by the reviewers was the range of constituents and stakeholders willing to participate in the Self-Study and to meet and discuss issues as part of this review. This also speaks to the degree and diversity of engagement and concern for the wellbeing of the CHI & MPCT.

The CHI, through its Self-Study, has raised a set of crucial concerns that point to a variety of foci through which it can seek to further engage with a range of publics in a number of different ways. However, there were some concerns raised regarding the visibility of the CHI in particular, because while the “Marshall McLuhan” name is almost universally familiar, the “Coach House” is not. There is thus a potential challenge in raising the profile of the CHI itself.

Additionally, despite the wide range of stakeholders consulted and engaged in the past and through the review process, there was a sense in which the community was nevertheless narrowly construed. The formulation of a set of concerns regarding media transformation...
in the present and future is absolutely central, but the concern for its effects at times seemed limited to a set of academic issues. Some discussion was therefore devoted to identifying a broader range of publics and communities affected by these processes. One suggestion, for instance, was that the CHI be occupied, at times, by non-academic actors or provide a residency; another suggested that a portable or mobile CHI could be devised which, rather than reaching out to communities, could situate itself within various sites to develop probes or provocations.

In addition, at this juncture some concerns (as noted above) were raised regarding the perceived absence of concrete research and publication plans in the documents. If these were not necessarily the goals of the period of self-study, these concerns point to the manner in which a clearer set of specific research lines might represent an avenue for fostering further engagement.

Despite some possible shortcomings, the CHI & MPCT has accrued considerable assets in terms of the liaisons created through its activities, which in turn have fostered considerable engagement with the unit in recent times. The capacity to attract high-profile Fellows is another indicator of degree to which the reputation of the CHI & MPCT has maintained. These assets undoubtedly form the basis for further enhancement of the CHI & MPCT with a broad number of existing and potential stakeholders.

h) FUTURE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The CHI/MPCT has invested an enormous amount of labour in developing a sense of where it has come from and what it has accomplished, and utilised that as a basis to develop a vision of its future arising from a comprehensive engagement with current stakeholders and constituents.

What this vision articulates as an outcome of consultations is a concern for capitalising on the opportunity to strengthen the McLuhan “brand;” to address the key social and cultural consequences arising from media shifts; ensuring the autonomy of the CHI; enabling a space for innovative thought under the slogan “safe house for unsafe ideas;” and demanding excellence in the work of the CHI.

Each of these individually constitute significant challenges, and collectively represent a major challenge to implement. However, as the Self-Study document notes, one of the consistent themes was urging the CHI to “aim high,” which the vision certainly does.

In the first instance, the challenge is operational, that is, to secure the basis for the CHI through adequate resources, beginning with a supported Director position, and then to acquire the requisite resources to sustain the Institute in a way that will enable it to operate in a stable manner as the basis upon which to implement aspects of the vision. The specific challenges here relate to the degree of autonomy required, and how that might be negotiated within the confines of the University structure.
As noted at the beginning, there are still entrenched elements within and beyond the University that are not well-disposed toward the Institute and Program, and these will have to be addressed as well. To some extent, this might be mitigated with further engagement and with specific, clear research objectives and output. Additionally, the now-substantial literature documenting the significance of McLuhan’s work could be highlighted and publicized (beginning with collection and display of such work). Moreover, there remain tensions between those concerned with preserving the McLuhan legacy, and those advocating for adaptation and renovation in the context of the present and future conditions of inquiry; these may need to be resolved as well. Ultimately, however, these strains ought to be seen as complementary. Those wishing to follow in McLuhan’s general footsteps into a future he did not live to see and study obviously value much of what McLuhan did accomplish.

As much of the documentation points to, and which arose frequently in discussion, the McLuhan name and “brand” still has significant cultural and social (and academic) profile, and there still remains an important opportunity for the University to “capitalise” on the potential it augurs. The more recent resurgence in interest in McLuhan prompted by a reassessment of his insights in the current context only provides further impetus to give serious consideration to the value it holds as an opportunity to develop a high-profile research facility in McLuhan's name.

Beyond the Self-Study, there were numerous comments and suggestions arising from the consultation process suggesting that there is substantial energy, creativity and commitment that can be brought to bear on the development of the CHI into the future. If these at times differed in the details, there was no questioning of the importance of seeing that the CHI & MPCT continue to exist and thrive; that was taken for granted. With this consensus, it appeared then that the central focus should be on formulating the means through which the CHI could effectively move forward and make a substantial contribution.

Since McLuhan's reputation has relatively recently received major boosting as a result of the rise of the World Wide Web and the evidence of many trends that he predicted decades ago, along with a sequence of globally celebrated anniversaries over five years (which the University of Toronto did step up to celebrate locally), it is not too late for the University to rescue the McLuhan legacy and the University’s role in it. Next, we offer a list of specific recommendations based on our review.
RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, the reviewers have sought to make recommendations below that offer some potential ways by which the vision might be implemented:

♦ Maintain and dramatically enhance the McLuhan Program in Culture and Technology and the Coach House Institute, keeping the “at the margins” status described as the preference in the Self-Study document;

♦ Create and support a position of full-time Director of the CHI & MPCT. We believe that this should be for someone with relevant academic training (not merely administrative experience), perhaps with faculty rank in the FI or another college, and with significant release from teaching to run the activities of the Coach House Institute and the McLuhan Program in Culture and Technology;

♦ Given the extensive role that Dominique Scheffel-Dunand has played in organizing major MPCT events in recent years and in keeping disparate “constituencies” in contact and active collaboration with each other (even though she has been receiving only a very small stipend), we recommend that the University of Toronto find a way of maintaining her valuable involvement with the CHI & MPCT (perhaps as Assistant Director, Special Assistant to the Director, or Special Projects Coordinator), if she so desires, but at a more reasonable rate of compensation;

♦ Consider creation of a new master’s level program in Communication Theory and Policy. The full-time Director of the CHI & MPCT could hold a rank in this program, students in the program would engage with the Centre, its Fellows, and other activities. Graduate students in the program might also work on special-topics courses with advanced St. Michael’s undergraduates;

♦ To better build on the McLuhan “brand” for fund-raising and for the draw to events that the McLuhan name engenders, consider seeking the McLuhan family’s permission for renaming the Coach House Institute as the Marshall McLuhan Coach House Institute. (The Review Team noted that one “external” whom we interviewed reported that he had almost ignored the invitation to meet with the Review Team, because he did not initially recognize what the “Coach House Institute” was, even though he had played a major role in some CHI events);

♦ Preserve the Coach House building itself as a historic treasure, while also working to renovate it into a more impressive facility, perhaps connecting it with a first and/or second floor connector to the adjacent “Coach House Two” and perhaps adding an additional attached structure with more offices, meeting/class rooms, etc. (The second floor of the current Coach House has three offices and a bathroom, but the ceilings are low, and the staircase is somewhat treacherous. Big ideas sometimes
need adequate spaces in which to flourish. Potential large donors will likely want to see that there is a physical space meriting their support.) Ideally, the forlorn and treeless parking lot in which the Coach House currently sits could be “buried” underground to allow for the surface around the Coach House to be greener and more engaging. With a more park-like setting, the Coach House (or both Coach Houses) could be moved away from the edges near adjacent buildings and situated more centrally and prominently. (Since these building have no basements, such a move would be feasible.) Alternatively, find another appropriate, more park-like setting to which the Coach Houses could be re-situated. Moreover, designated (free) parking spaces for the Director(s) should be available and arrangements should be in place for reasonable parking for attendees of Coach House events to foster greater participation and engagement;

♦ Upgrade/update the computer equipment for the Coach House (or expanded building);

♦ Re-establish the regular meetings of the famous and free-flowing Monday Night Seminars, open to students and faculty in different fields, and to members of the public. The seminars should be run or coordinated by the full-time faculty member heading the CHI & MPCT with the participation of the Fellows present at any given time;

♦ Institute a Wednesday Night Idea “Playroom” (as suggested by the graduate students we met with). This would be “hosted” by the Director and the current fellows but feature graduate students testing out new ideas in an open, non-judgemental atmosphere, apart from immediate “deliverables” such as formal papers and formal presentations. Some of the ideas developed could eventually be revised into “probes” for publication (at least online) in the reincarnation of Explorations or in a new Probes experimental journal;

♦ Continue to develop and build a strong program of Centenary Fellows, adding more structure and visibility to their activities, including an opening reception each year or semester for the new fellows, with invitations to a wide spectrum of interested parties on and off campus;

♦ Offer a series of publicized workshops linked to the research interests of the Fellows and graduate students (and perhaps even advanced undergraduates);

♦ Strengthen the relationship with St. Michael’s College, whose staff have voiced enthusiasm for working with CHI and might, with enhanced cooperation, consider waiving the rent on the Coach House and joining it in some way with “Coach House Two;”
Engage St. Michael's undergraduate students in CHI events and facilitate their for-credit independent studies with the Fellows and with graduate students;

See that somewhere in the Coach House(s) or adjacent facility that a full set of Marshall McLuhan's writing are available (perhaps in a glass-door bookcase to allow for locking it for security without obscuring the titles while also permitting perusal of its contents by Fellows and graduate students with sign-out privileges). We recommend a similar library of books written about McLuhan and a selected library of books in the related areas of "medium theory" and "media ecology;"

Hire (or borrow from within the institution) a web-master to manage a much-enhanced web site for the CHI & MPCT. The web site could feature announcements of and reports on on-going activities; links to available McLuhan videos and audio and interactive sites; links to related work in "medium theory" and "media ecology," including the work of Harold Adams Innis, Walter Ong, Edmund Carpenter, J.C. Carothers, Jack Goody and Ian Watt, Eric Havelock, Elizabeth Eisenstein, and so on. Alternatively, the web maintenance could be handled by an assistant director who also helps with coordinating other activities within the centre and in its connections to outside publics;

Develop, maintain, and update an email list to keep various on- and off-campus constituencies informed of CHI & MPCT activities and events. (A link on the web site should be established for those wishing to be added to the email list);

Re-establish some form of the Carpenter-McLuhan idea journal, Explorations or perhaps Probes (at least online, perhaps in both limited print run and online), presenting original and provocative ideas about technology and culture (some derived from the Monday Night Seminars and Wednesday Night "Idea-Playroom" Workshops, as noted above);

Establish a plan for more refined, "completed" publications (articles, pamphlets, books, online publishing, etc.) and other output (videos, exhibits, interactive online sites, etc.). Some form of regular and consistent output (even if it follows a long fermentation period for each project) will help to build reputation and visibility;

Take full advantage of available internal funds (such as the $200,000 budgeted annually for the CHI & MPCT) and consider collaborations with other University entities, such as the Jackman Humanities Institute, which might facilitate co-planned and co-funded activities;

The full-time Director should work with others to access research funding similar to those grants secured by other FI Institutes such as the Knowledge Design Institute and the Semaphore Lab;
The Director should coordinate with the University’s development director and interested “friends of the CHI & MPCT” (such as David Nostbakken) to try to find major donors interested in funding the cutting-edge work that the CHI & MPCT hope to be hosting via Fellows and graduate students;

Create a “line item” for an annual contemporary art component for the CHI & MPCT in the form of a curated exhibition, a commission, or an artist-in-residence (which could be one of the Centenary Fellows but with some funds earmarked for production);

Given the multidisciplinary and multifaceted activities and outputs that the CHI & MPCT could engage in, the Dean and Director might want to explore the feasibility of establishing an Advisory Board representing various constituencies. The Jackman Humanities Institute Advisory Board could serve as a potential model. The existence of such a board might also encourage more outside donations, as donors realize that the continuity of CHI & MPCT activities is not dependent on the specific holder or holders of the directorship position(s).

We believe that the MPCT and the CHI should also draw on scholars and graduate students from related fields (as was true of McLuhan’s interdisciplinary seminars starting in the 1950s), both at the University of Toronto and other area schools: anthropology, art, economics, history, information technology, linguistics, neuroscience, psychology, urban studies, and so forth.

***

Marshall McLuhan argued that: “We look at the present through a rear view mirror. We march backwards into the future.” McLuhan saw better than most what was in front of him and us. The CHI & MPCT goal of organizing McLuhanesque “advance parties” to scout the future may help us to look through our windshields at the road ahead and the cultural horizon in the distance.
APPENDIX

a) Potential topics for the “Irreverent Excellence” as described in the Self-Study document

Although many of Marshall McLuhan’s claims are now seen as spot-on (decline of literate modes of thought and social organization, the importance of transdisciplinary “problem” solving over disciplinary “expertise,” globalization, hunger for meaningful “roles” over narrow “jobs”, etc.), some of his other “probes” seem to have been off-target (e.g., the end of baseball in the TV era). Thus, in order to embrace his legacy and move forward in his footsteps, we recommend that the CHI and MPCT recruit guest speakers, fellows, and graduate students (and even independent study undergraduates in St. Michaels College) who are working on “the dangerous edge” of current issues, with approaches that stimulate new thinking but may also irritate and disrupt by challenging the accepted definitions of terms (e.g., what violence is or is not “terrorism”) and even risking being seriously wrong on some dimensions of exploratory probes. This suggestion is in the spirit of Brian Cantwell Smith’s idea for an institute that would organize “advance parties” to be sent 10 to 20 years into the future “to scout out the territory, bring back news, routes, maps, insight, local knowledge, or perhaps to set up camp and “domesticate” the new territory, which will be occupied by the university as a whole, when it arrives, complete with all its supplies, personnel, and paraphernalia, years down the road” (Self Study, p. 7).

Potential topics that could be approached in this way through guest speakers, Coach House Fellows, graduate students, and advanced undergraduates include:

- Celebritification of Culture;
- Corporatization;
- Cyborgian extensions of the human;
- Digital Divides and Bridges (including spreading mobile phone tech in Africa, Asia, & Latin America);
- E-waste and digital environmentalism;
- Free Expression as it interacts with concerns over “civility,” racism, homophobia, etc.;
- Fundamentalism/Tribalism as they interact with social media and technology;
- Gamification trends;
- Glocalization (mix of global and local trends);
- Infotainment;
- Intellectual property rights (copyright, copyleft, creative commons, open access);
- Mediatization;
- Militainment;
- Online Education/Distance Learning;
- Pornification of Culture;
- Public Relations’ role in the shaping (and distortion) of public debates;
- Propaganda;
• Surveillance as it interacts with corporatism, national security, even playful exhibitionism; and
• Terrorism (including cyber-terrorism).

b) The type of guest speakers or McLuhan Fellows who could fulfil the mission outlined above would include (as a small initial sample) scholars such as the following:

• Nicholas Carr, author of *The Shallows: What the Internet is Doing to Our Brains*;

• Manuel Castells, author of *The Rise of the Network Society*;

• Ron Deibert, author of *Black Code: Surveillance, Privacy, & the Dark Side of the Internet*;

• Brian Eno (“Brian Peter George St. John le Baptiste de la Salle Eno, RDI, professionally known as Brian Eno or simply Eno, is an English musician, composer, record producer, singer, and visual artist, known as one of the principal innovators of ambient music.” —Wikipedia);

• Henry A. Giroux, author of *Neoliberalism’s War on Higher Education*;

• Paul Grosswiler, author of *Old New Media: From Oral to Virtual Environments*;

• Donna Haraway, author of *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*;

• Philip N. Howard, author of *Pax Technica: How the Internet of Things May Set Us Free or Lock Us Up*;

• Jane McGonigal, author of *Reality is Broken: Why Games Make Us Better and How They Can Change the World*;

• Taylor Owen, author of *Disruptive Power: The Crisis of the State in the Digital Age*;

• T.V. Reed, author of *Digitized Lives: Culture, Power, and Social Change in the Internet Era*;

• Charles Stankievech, artist and curator and U. of T. professor in the Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, and about to become the Program Director of Visual Studies. His exhibition *Counterintelligence* was at the JMBarnicke Gallery, Hart House, January 2014, and was named exhibition of the year in a number of publications and columns;
• Sherry Turkel, author of *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*;

• Eyal Weisel, architecture and Director of the Centre for Research Architecture at Goldsmith’s, University of London, author of *Mengele’s Skull* (2012) and *Forensic Architecture* (2012).
Careers Report to Faculty Council

Function: Career Services
Report Date: November 19, 2015
FC Meeting Date: November 26, 2015
Report By: Isidora Petrovic, Careers Officer

Practicum (INF2173H) and Internship (MSL3000Y) courses

✓ Assisted with the practicum course (INF2173H – Winter 2016) by promoting it to 300+ previous and potential new practicum hosts; answered specific questions and requests from hosts and/or students; due date to submit projects is Dec. 18

✓ Assisted with MMSt Internship course (MSL3000Y) by updating the MMSt Internship portal for future/new internship descriptions which employers have started submitting; updated the employer flyer

Career Services

✓ Organized 5th annual Associations Networking event held on Wednesday, October 21 and attended by over 100 students and 29 professionals from 18 associations:
  o ACMLA, APRA Canada, ARLIS, ARMA, CALL, CAML, CAPAL, IASSIST, ICOMOS Canada, IRMAC, ISACA, IxDA, OLA, OMA, SLA, TAAG, TALL, THLA

✓ Assisted with student recruitment by presenting at the recruitment information sessions for both MI and MMSt programs held at the iSchool on Saturday, Oct. 24

✓ Met with student association (MISC) PD team to discuss future career events and upcoming Employer Showcase; arranged with 3 organizations (PwC, Oxford Properties, Treasury Board Secretariat) to attend the event

✓ Organized a visit by two NSCU Fellows, who will do a presentation and interview students interested in academic librarianship through NSCU Fellows program; event will be held on Wed. Dec. 2

MI Co-op

✓ Promoted the co-op to potential employers from financial, government, health, education, and other sectors; currently in conversations with Air Canada, Manulife, RBC, Treasury Board Secretariat, Ontario Heritage Trust, Goodmans LLP, Southern Ontario Library Service, Ontario Ministry of Finance, and IBM

✓ Reached out to 300+ contacts who participated either in practicum or career events at the iSchool to promote the MI Co-op and hire co-op students

✓ Connected with alumni individually and through social media (LinkedIn) to ask for help with promoting co-op and recruiting co-op students

✓ Interviewed, together with Prof. Stevenson, 46 first year full-time MI students who submitted applications for the co-op option
✓ Wrote 3 sample co-op projects/job descriptions with required qualifications focusing on user experience design, data analytics and information policy roles, as per public library employer’s request; utilized descriptions for other promotional material
✓ Created 2-page flyer for potential co-op employers as promotional material

Ongoing Activities
✓ Provide career advice to students, alumni, and prospective students individually in one-hour meetings on career topics such as career options, resume, cover letter, CV, interviewing techniques, professional networking, job search, and similar
✓ Receive, verify, and post new work opportunities on the iSchool’s job site
✓ Administer and collect signed WSIB insurance forms for practicum hosts and students
COMMUNICATIONS
Publicity/Media/Event Management

- Set up doctoral student Jenna Jacobson to be interviewed for article in *FASHION* magazine
- Published, distributed, and publicized annual alumni magazine, *Informed*, to alumni, donors and friends
- Shared requests with faculty to appear in Toronto Star, CityNews, and Deseret News. Helped coordinate requests between journalists and faculty members.
- Wrote content and had designed an Alise ad to be placed in 2016 conference brochure
- Edited and posted at least seven news stories to website promoting faculty research, promotions, awards, and alumni & students news
- In last stages of working on publicizing a professor’s research for pitch to UofT News
- Publicized McLuhan’s City as Classroom series with media, online, stakeholders, address feedback from international queries
- In process of executing plan to merge websites’ faculty and doctoral students directories
- Conducted research, interview, and gave report to Dean’s Office assessing viability of SitelImprove website service
- Designed posters and plasmas for various events (IP Sharp) and iteas
- Helping with ideas and plans for future iTees
- Liaising with students re communications for iJournal
- Liaising with student re merchandizing
- Pitched *Bulletin* several stories and events (IP Sharp event, ran as did McLuhan Launch)
- Met with and worked with Paola Granata to publicize Fall Event series for McLuhan Centre

DEVELOPMENT
Stewardship/Alumni Relations/Event Management

- Sent DARE Reception photos to donors
- Updated design and getting made 1,000 holiday cards for donors
- Compiled and sent in Ask an Alum list for next year’s Mentor Recognition Event
- Publicized conference and research grants (designed poster/plasma)
- Attended monthly executive meetings and gave report
- Preparing about 150 thank you cards for donors
- Helped publicize alumni book on social media
- Arranged deal to list OLA Super Conference Alumni Reception on the conference site to capture attendance registrations
Continuing Key Priorities

Supporting the iSchool Strategic Plan 2012-2017
- Develop specific fundraising strategies to address the need for increased student financial support and co-op program support. These funding priorities have been identified as key to achieving Student Recruitment goals.

The following are highlights of advancement activities since the last Faculty Council meeting toward the achievement of this goal

Upcoming Event: I. P. Sharp Lecture & Reception – December date Dec 2, 2015
- D. Haim Gertner, Director of Archives at the Yad Vashem in Jerusalem will be the guest lecturer
- 150 registered to attend as of Nov 26. If you haven’t registered, please do so ASAP
- Confirmed sponsorship from the UJA & U of T Centre for Jewish Studies
- Event marketed to Alumni/donors and the internal iSchool community and broader Jewish community

Panel Discussion: Archives Post Space in the Curation of Collective Memory
- Dec 2\textsuperscript{nd}; 12:00 – 1:30 at the Coach House Institute (39A Queens park Cres. East)
- Students and iSchool community encourage to attend
- Light lunch will be provided

Providing support to:
- Museums Studies Alumni Mixer Event on Dec 3\textsuperscript{rd}; 6:00 – 8:00 pm
  - Tour of Museum of Inuit Art followed by social at Shoeless Joe’s pub

- Museum Studies Class Trip Alumni Social – January 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 2015
  - Opportunity to engage with alumni in the Niagara Region

Fundraised Revenue since May 1\textsuperscript{st}. (See table below)
- Year-to-date numbers show an almost 50% increase in revenue across all categories compared to same time last year
Initiating innovative approaches to mailings using more personal stories from alumni and students. This strategy is yielding positive results.

A few major gift prospects looking promising - should drive up overall numbers by end of fiscal year.

### Planned Giving
- One gift intention signed since May. Two additional prospects are expected to sign by year’s end.
- Placing more emphasis on securing bequests and deferred gifts given the demographics of our donor base.
- Goal is to secure 3 – 4 gift intentions annually.

### UNESCO Internships
- Very close to securing funding for the first year
- Framework for the program and selection process being developed
- Hope to send two students starting in May 2016
- Stay tuned for details

For more information about any of the above, please contact:

Audrey M. Johnson MBA, LL.M  
Senior Development Officer | Faculty of Information  
Phone: 416-978-3934 | Email: am.johnson@utoronto.ca

---

**Furndraised Revenue Since May 1, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>YTD 2014/15</th>
<th>YTD 2015/16</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Gifts</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>53,501</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fund &amp; LAG</td>
<td>21,666</td>
<td>45,797</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,298</strong></td>
<td><strong>49%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major gifts = $25K+;
LAG = Leadership Annual Giving (gifts between $500 – $24,999);
Other includes Gifts-in-Kind and miscellaneous revenue
The Innovations & Partnerships Office (IPO) information session is on Thursday, December 3rd from 2:00-3:30 in Room 225. Presenter is Colin Swift, Business Development Officer. There is still room for extra people.

One-on-one research meetings with faculty members are underway.

Currently updating the Funding Opportunities section of the iSchool’s web page (current.ischool). Links provided in my weekly research emails will be posted here.

- Funding opportunities that have ongoing/open deadlines will also be posted here: e.g. Mellon Foundation, Ford Foundation, NSERC Collaborative Research and Development grant.

Please remember that for the SSHRC Insight Development grant applications, Associate Dean of Research Leslie Shade has established a peer review process. The deadline is January 5, 2016 to hand in your draft applications and she’d like to meet with you sometime during that week.

There are more upcoming SSHRC opportunities in early 2016 –

- Connection grants – end of January (iSchool deadline)
- Partnership grant, Letter of Intent stage – mid-January (iSchool deadline)
- Knowledge Synthesis grants – iSchool tentative deadline is January 5, 2016, and U of T’s tentative deadline is January 8, 2016.

In the works –

- Future discussion(s) regarding potential faculty award nominations.
- Mitacs information session in January 2016.

Thank you.
Report to Faculty Council

26 November, 2015

On behalf of MISC, I would like to extend my best wishes and gratitude to Dean Ross upon the conclusion of his term at the end of next month. I have been fortunate to work with him more closely than many students at the faculty, and I have seen how dedicated he has been to improving student life and championing student concerns. At the same time, MISC would like to congratulate Prof. Duff upon her appointment as Interim Dean, and wishes her well in her brief and no-doubt memorable tenure.

Since the last Faculty Council meeting, MISC has held two Governing Council meetings. There is nothing significant to report from either, but we have a number of initiatives in progress, and I look forward to reporting on them in the near future.

I have had meetings with members of the administration, including with Dean Ross regarding general student affairs as well as jump-starting next year's student conference. Also, I have met with Assistant Dean Brown and provided her with a very broad introduction and overview of the student experience at the faculty.

Due to a number of recent security concerns pertaining to the student lounge (Room 705A), MISC has asked all students to ensure that the door to the lounge remains closed at all times. If anyone sees the door being held ajar by a recycling bin or a bocce ball set, please remove it.

A few minor things that have occurred are that: our Vice President has initiated office hours to better facilitate communications with students; our Merchandise Committee Chair is soliciting feedback via a survey to determine what merchandise students wish to see; and we've changed our weekly newsletter from the MISC Weekly Digest to MISCellaneous.

Submitted by Christopher Hogendoorn, President
1. **Kate MacDonald** – Past President of FIAA (and current acting president), won an Arbor Award in September 2015

2. **Grants and Awards Committee**
   - Currently accepting applications for the Student Conference/Research Grants – deadline is November 30
   - Creating a new grant: FIAA Alumni Professional Development Grant – details to follow
   - Finalizing plans to administer the Wendy Newman Library Leadership Award

3. **Ask an Alum – mentoring program**
   - Our Ask an Alum (AaA) program helps iSchool students and recent grads make contacts with professionals in their field of interest
   - Currently need more mentors in the “Critical Information Studies” area
   - Please go to the AaA page for more information and to sign up: [http://www.ischool.utoronto.ca/ask-alum](http://www.ischool.utoronto.ca/ask-alum)

4. **SLA / OLA-SLC / THLA / FIAA Joint Holiday Social**
   - This very fun event is coming up on December 10
   - All welcome!
   - Remember if you graduate from the iSchool you are a FIAA “member”

5. **Master of Museum Studies Mixer**
   - Upcoming event: "Abraham Anghik Ruben: Beyond Aurora Borealis" at the Museum of Inuit Art
   - Thursday, December 3, 2015, 6:00pm – 7:30pm tour of the exhibit and museum; 7:30 – 9:00pm reception at Shoeless Joe’s (249 Queens Quay W)
   - Tickets $11.20 - $16.51
   - To get tickets go to [https://www.eventbrite.ca/e/master-of-museum-studies-mix-with-museum-masters-tickets-19576744570](https://www.eventbrite.ca/e/master-of-museum-studies-mix-with-museum-masters-tickets-19576744570)