

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**September 20, 2011**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, September 20, 2011 at 4:10 p.m.  
in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak  
(In the Chair)  
Professor Douglas McDougall  
(Vice-Chair)  
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost,  
Academic Programs  
Professor Robert L. Baker  
Professor Katherine Berg  
Professor Karen D. Davis  
Professor Joseph Desloges  
Mr. Cary Ferguson  
Professor Robert Gibbs  
Professor Rick Halpern  
Mr. Adnan Hussain  
Professor Paul Kingston  
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk  
Ms Cecilia Alexandra Livingston  
Professor Heather MacNeil  
Professor Michael R. Marrus

Dr. Graeme Norval  
Professor Elizabeth Peter  
Ms Judith C. Poë  
Mr. Kevin Siu  
Ms Helen Slade  
Professor Suzanne Stevenson  
Professor Joseph Wong  
Mr. Tony Han Yin  
  
Mr. Richard Levin, Executive  
Director, Enrolment Services and  
Acting University Registrar  
Ms Karel Swift, Assistant Provost,  
Registrarial  
Mr. Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary  
of the Governing Council  
  
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Brian Corman  
Professor Michelle Murphy

Ms Yuchao Niu

In Attendance:

Ms Maria Pilar Galvez, member, the Governing Council  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, member, the Governing Council; Interim Director,  
Dalla Lana School of Public Health  
Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Mr. Malcolm Billing, Acting Director, Co-op Program in Management, University of  
Toronto Scarborough  
Dr. Jane E. Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-  
President and Provost  
Professor Charlie Keil, Director, Cinema Studies Institute  
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Assistant Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Mr. Scott Moore, Quality Assessment Officer, Office of the Vice-President  
and Provost

Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal, Academic, and Dean, University of Toronto  
Mississauga

Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate, University of Toronto Scarborough

Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine

Professor David Zweig, Chair, Department of Management, University of Toronto  
Scarborough

Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council

ITEM 7 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD.  
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Welcome and Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the academic year and commented on the Committee's responsibilities and some of its key procedures.

**2. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report 151 (May 16, 2011) was approved.

**3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

In response to a member's question, Professor Regehr advised that the proposed U.T.M. Master of Science Program in Sustainability Management Program and the proposed Faculty of Arts and Science Ph.D. Program in Women and Gender Studies would be the first to come before the Quality Council. A decision was expected in about two weeks' time, and Professor Regehr would report the outcome to the Committee.

**4. Calendar of Business, 2011-12**

The Committee received for information its Calendar of Business for 2011-12.

**5. Report on Approvals Under Summer Executive Authority, 2011**

The Committee was advised that no matters within the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had been approved under summer executive authority.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011****6. University of Toronto Scarborough: Bachelor of Business Administration – Specialist Program in Management and International Business**

Professor Regehr said that the proposed new Specialist (Co-operative) Program in Management and International Business would be offered in the existing Bachelor of Business Administration degree program at the University of Toronto Scarborough (U.T.S.C.) It was based on the existing Specialist Program in Management, maintaining the same knowledge base but focusing specifically on the international context. The Program would include courses in leadership and interpersonal skills in cross-cultural contexts and a strong experiential component, requiring three work terms, including one or two abroad. To prepare for the work terms abroad, students would be required to complete two years of study in a relevant language. Pursuant to the new quality-assurance process, the proposal had been subject to an external appraisal which had been positive and enthusiastic. Arising from suggestions by the reviewer, the language requirement had been extended from one to two years of study, and the requirement with respect to student internships had been clarified. Professor Regehr reported that she had been advised by the University's Director of Student International Opportunities that there would be many exciting placements available for the students in the proposed program.

Professor Halpern and Professor Scherk responded to questions. The Department of Management had no plan to offer a graduate program in management and international business in the near-term future. U.T.S.C. planned initially to register 25 students per year in the program, with that number growing eventually to 40 students per year. While U.T.S.C. anticipated much greater student demand for places, the limited enrolment was predicated on the logistics of managing the placements and study-abroad terms.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The Specialist (Co-op) Program in Management and International Business, within the existing Bachelor of Business Administration degree at the University of Toronto Scarborough, as described in the proposal dated August 31, 2011, effective September 2012.

**7. Faculty of Arts and Science and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy Program in Cinema Studies**

Professor Regehr presented the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Science for a four-year, full-time doctoral degree program in Cinema Studies. Pursuant to the new quality-assurance process, the program proposal had been the subject of an external review, in this case by scholars from New York University and the University of Michigan. The reviewers had described the program as rigorous, serious and solid,

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011****7. Faculty of Arts and Science and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy Program in Cinema Studies (Cont'd)**

building on the strength of the undergraduate and Master's degree programs currently offered. They had observed that the University of Toronto enjoyed a comparative advantage in offering the program, arising from the international reputation of its faculty in Cinema Studies and their highly regarded contributions to the discipline.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

**(a) Funding for students.** A member observed that because the program was described as a four-year one, the Faculty of Arts and Science would be required to ensure funding packages at the doctoral level for only four years rather than five. He asked whether the faculty in Cinema Studies would be able to generate sufficient funding from research grants to provide the research assistantships needed to support students in the proposed program. Professor Baker replied that the faculty in the discipline were very strong and generated significant funding for research. Moreover, the Faculty of Arts and Science tailored its requirements for student-support funding from research assistantships to particular units, and it supplied other student-support funding in disciplines where sufficient funding was not available from research grants. The Faculty of Arts and Science was fully prepared to deal with the cost of the proposed program, including the cost of student financial support.

**(b) Connection with the film industry in Toronto.** A member observed that Toronto had become a very important centre in the field of cinema, as evidenced by the international reputation of the Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF). He asked whether the Cinema Studies program had any links with the industry. Invited to respond, Professor Keil said that the program's orientation was primarily academic. It had been the case, however, that many graduates from the Master's degree program had gone on to employment in the industry. It was fortuitous that TIFF had been expanding in recent years, and a number of graduates of the program had found employment there. TIFF was an important resource for the program. It had significant archival holdings, and TIFF, along with the program, had established a seminar series which dealt with conceptual as well as industrial aspects of film.

A member spoke in strong support of the proposal. He had some years ago served on a number of occasions as decanal representative on searches for faculty in Cinema Studies. It had been very satisfying to see the maturation and growth of the discipline at the University, and the proposal to establish a doctoral program – an aspiration from early in the history of the discipline – represented a great moment for the University and for Cinema Studies.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

**7. Faculty of Arts and Science and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy Program in Cinema Studies (Cont'd)**

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the Ph.D. Program in Cinema Studies, as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Science dated September 8, 2011, be approved, effective for the academic year 2012-13.

**8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011**

The Chair recalled that members had been assigned to reading teams. Each reading team had been asked to deal with three questions. First, did the summary provided in the compendium of reviews accurately reflect the full review? Second, did the administrative response address all of the issues identified? Or, for very recently completed reviews, did the response present a plan for moving forward to address those issues? If not, should the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs be asked to bring forward any missing information in a follow-up report? Finally, was there need to consider some action? Again, was there need to ask that the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, to bring forward a follow-up report, possibly in a year's time? If the reading team was satisfied that the summary was complete and that all issues had been dealt with, there would be no need to comment further. The compendium of reviews, and a record of the Committee's discussion of them, would be forwarded to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board. If the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs adopted the view that there were unresolved issues that should be considered by the Agenda Committee, the Chair would draw the matters to the attention of the Agenda Committee. That Committee would in turn determine whether there were issues of academic importance that should be drawn to the attention of the full Academic Board.

The Chair stressed that the Committee's responsibility was not to manage the review process, but rather to ensure that the Provost's Office was managing it well. The expected standards were very high. The policy required that the standards of University of Toronto programs be compared to "the best in their field among international peer institutions." The reviews themselves were far-reaching, dealing with many factors. However, the Committee was asked to focus attention predominantly on the discussion of the quality of academic programs rather than on any administrative issues.

A number of general points arose, including the following.

- In the previous year, the summaries were in prose format; in the current year, the summaries were presented using point form. Professor Regehr invited comment from members on the revised format. One member, citing a particular instance, was

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

**8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011 (Cont'd)**

concerned that the bullet-point format might impede the communication of the urgency of particular points in a review. Professor Regehr assured that member that she would take that concern into account.

- Professor Regehr reported that the University would, going forward, provide data-packs for all reviews to assist both the Departments and the reviewers. They would include data on: research publications and citations compared to international benchmarks; rate of offers of admissions relative to applications; time to completion of Ph.D. theses; and data from national and international studies including the National Survey of Student Engagement and the Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey.
- The reviews had been carried out just prior to the appointment of a new leader in a department or division. A member observed that the administrative response could therefore be that the new leader was in place and was dealing with the matters raised in the review. Professor Regehr replied that under the new model, reviews were undertaken prior to a leadership change. That enabled a combination of program reviews and unit reviews, and therefore avoided the need for too-frequent reviews and self-studies. In the past, the administration had waited for a year or a year and a half to bring forward reviews of Departments and divisions that were under new leadership. Doing so had enabled the Committee to see the outcome of the review in terms of changes that had been made. More recently, however, it had been concluded that it would be more appropriate to bring review reports to the Committee while they were still current, enabling the Committee to have input into responses. Where appropriate, the Committee could request a follow-up report on actions taken.
- A member observed that in some cases it had proven difficult to match the reviewers' recommendations with the administrative response and to distinguish issues' relative priority. The member suggested that it would assist the Committee to have more contextual information to assist it in its understanding.
- In response to members' questions, the Chair agreed that it would appropriate for members to raise important issues that the Committee should be aware of, even though they were not issues concerning the quality of academic programs. Nonetheless, the focus of the Committee's discussion should be on the quality of programs.

**(a) Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Institute for Aerospace Studies**

The spokesperson for the reading team observed that the review was a highly positive one. The Institute, located on its own campus in Downsview, had strong programs, strong students, and excellent faculty who were clearly devoted to their teaching. The summary

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011****8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011 (Cont'd)**

fairly reflected the review report, and, in the team's view, the administrative response was a model of clarity and completeness. The team, however, had three questions.

- The first concerned a potential move of the Institute to a new location. The review had not commented on the possibility of a move to the St. George Campus or recommended any other location. Dean Amon said that although options were under consideration, no move was planned for the immediate future. Moreover, the Institute had won a \$9-million grant from the Canada Foundation for Innovation to build an experimental facility for micro-satellites, and that facility was being constructed at the current Downsview campus, which would remain the Institute's location at least for the time being.
- The reviewers characterized the Institute as "world-class in its students, professors, and facilities," but observed that it was not well known outside of Canada. The reviewers urged that faculty members attend and present papers at conferences outside of Canada and that the Institute establish a seminar series and invite world leaders in aerospace studies to visit. The members of the reading team were puzzled that those things were not already taking place in so excellent an academic unit. Dean Amon thought that the reviewers' recommendations were positive in their tone. Faculty at the Institute were, not surprisingly, under considerable time pressure and had to make decisions on the priority for the use of their time. The reviewers' advice was useful to the Institute, as it would be to other academic units. Professor Regehr commented that the excellent reputation of the Institute was known. When the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Agency had faced a severe emergency with one of its manned space missions, it had turned to the Institute for advice. Professor Amon noted that such outstanding universities as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Carnegie Mellon University visited the Institute each year in an effort to recruit students for their graduate programs.
- The reviewers recommended that the Institute develop stronger ties to the aerospace industry. Again, the members of the reading team were puzzled that such ties had not already been established. A member commented that improved connections with industry would contribute a great deal to enhancing the visibility of the unit. Dean Amon replied that members of the Institute did currently have some projects with industry partners, but it would be valuable to do more in this area.

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, concluded that notwithstanding the questions cited by the reading team, it was clear that the Institute's academic programs were very strong ones and that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

**8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011 (Cont'd)**

**(b) Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry**

On the recommendation of its reading team, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(c) Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Division of Engineering Science**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that it was clear from the review that the program in Engineering Science was an extraordinarily good one – one of the elite programs of the University. The summary of the review was entirely fair, and the administrative response had addressed all of the issues raised. There were, however, two matters that the reading team wished to bring to the attention of the Committee.

- The reviewers had recommended toning down references to the program's elite status and stressing instead the program's unique features. Given that it was clearly an elite program, the suggestion seemed odd. Professor Amon replied that, going forward, the Faculty would stress the characteristics of the Engineering Science program that made it unique. Simply describing the program as an elite one did not provide a good understanding of its nature.
- The reviewers had observed that because the program was a highly demanding one, some students encountered burn-out. They had suggested improvement of services to assist those students. A particular concern was the difficulty faced by some students in communication, presumably in the English language. Professor Amon replied that the Faculty was seeking to bring components into all programs that would assist in the development of communication skills. The program in Engineering Science was intense, and many students chose to enroll in the program because of its intensity. However, within the framework of the new accreditation system for Engineering, the Faculty was looking into the curriculum and its intensity.

The Committee concluded that the program was a very strong one and that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(d) Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of French**

On the recommendation of its reading team, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee.



**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011****8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011 (Cont'd)****(e) Faculty of Medicine: Institute of Medical Science**

The spokesperson for the reading team commented on a number of issues arising from the review.

- The reviewers had observed that the Master of Science programs offered by the Institute might not be serving the needs of about half of their students: those who were seeking admission to the Doctor of Medicine Program or to a Ph.D. program but who did not gain admission to them.\* The reviewers had recommended that those students receive career counselling on alternative career trajectories. Professor Whiteside replied that it had been the case for many years that a significant proportion of graduates did not proceed to the M.D. or Ph.D. programs. Under the leadership of its new Director, the Institute's strategic plan included a new Master's Degree program in translational research. That program would require a research project but not a thesis. It was expected that there would be a great deal of interest in the new program, which would fill a market niche in such areas as biotechnology and pharmaceutical research and would provide an alternative to students who did not proceed to the M.D. or Ph.D. programs.
- The review had observed that "the quality of the Masters' programs seems to be more variable," and that "many students may not be as well served by the M.Sc. program as might be expected." The administrative response did not deal with the issue. Professor Whiteside said that she had no concern about the quality of the curriculum and the research being completed by students in the current programs. A large majority of students in the programs - 63% at the Master's level and 92% at the Doctoral level - had achieved publication in peer-reviewed journals.
- The reviewers had recommended that new faculty be encouraged to participate in graduate-student supervision at an earlier stage in their careers. That could, among other things, lead to the introduction of more new ideas into the work of graduate students. Dean Whiteside explained that the Institute encompassed all of the Faculty of Medicine's clinical Departments such as Medicine, Surgery, and Psychiatry and included 500 to 600 faculty. The Faculty did not accept the recommendation for graduate supervision by faculty members earlier in their careers. It was of critical importance that clinicians who were also engaged in research, especially those who did not hold Ph. D. degrees, have substantial experience at the Associate Professor level before they undertake the supervision of graduate students.

---

\* The spokesperson observed that the summary might have given greater emphasis to this important issue raised in the review. Professor Regehr undertook to amend the summary to reflect the issue.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

**8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011 (Cont'd)**

- The reviewers had noted that the time required to arrange for a thesis defence – six weeks for a Master's-degree thesis and nine weeks for a doctoral thesis – was too long. On the other hand, the time available for student decisions to transfer from the M.Sc. to the Ph.D. program was somewhat too short. A member of the Committee, who was an officer of the Institute, noted that both matters were within the responsibility of the School of Graduate Studies and beyond the control of the Institute of Medical Science.
- The average time for students to complete their M.Sc. degrees was 2.46 years, and the Institute's goal was 2.5 years. That appeared to be too long a time. Professor Whiteside agreed, and the matter was being addressed by the Institute.

Professor Whiteside concluded that the review had in many cases touched on important issues, which were being addressed. The Committee agreed that there were no matters to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(f) Faculty of Medicine: Dalla Lana School of Public Health**

Professor McDougall assumed the Chair for this item. The spokesperson for the reading team noted that the review was very complex, containing 34 recommendations as well as the suggestion of eight additional "opportunities." The administrative response was more general in its nature, and it did not specifically address all of the reviewers' recommendations. A major issue that pervaded the review was that of accreditation of the programs by the U.S. Council on Education in Public Health (C.E.P.H.) It appeared that the reviewers had been asked to deal specifically with the question of the readiness of the programs for accreditation. It was, however, unclear whether achieving accreditation was a high priority for the School and, if so, what plan was in place to do so.

Professor Whiteside reported that she had recently seconded Professor Sass-Kortsak - the Faculty of Medicine's Vice-Dean, Graduate Affairs - to become Associate Director and Graduate Coordinator of the Dalla Lana School of Public Health for one year to lead a detailed process of curricular assessment and planning. That work would initiate a two- to three-year strategic planning process that would be carried out at the same time as the recruitment of a new Director for the School. That process would, among other things, examine the possibility of implementing the various recommendations contained in the review. Because that process was only now beginning, the administrative response was necessarily a general one. Professor Whiteside did, however, assure the Committee that the Faculty was giving very serious consideration to the reviewers' recommendations. She did not anticipate that the School would implement all of them because all would likely not fit the direction the School would take. Professor Sass-Kortsak added that some of the recommendations were made from the U.S. context. It was, therefore, uncertain whether some of them would be adopted.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011****8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011 (Cont'd)**

Professor Whiteside stressed that the primary goal of the examination of the School's curricula and standards was to ensure that it maintained and improved its position as the leading school of Public Health in Canada. The other important challenge was to manage the curriculum renewal in such a way as to make a significant contribution to the workforce in the area of Public Health in Ontario and in Canada. With health-care reform, the scope of professional practice had increased greatly, and there was a real need for trained health professionals at various levels to work as members of teams to meet public-health needs. To obtain advice on curriculum renewal, Professor Whiteside and Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles, the Interim Director of the School, had struck an external advisory committee consisting of senior leaders in the field of Public Health.

Professor Whiteside addressed the matter of accreditation. At this time no Canadian school was accredited by the C.E.P.H. The current curriculum of this University's degree programs did not fit exactly with the U.S. criteria. Its Master of Public Health programs were very good and growing, but (in terms of achieving accreditation) they were very diverse and they were much more specialized than most M.P.H. programs in the United States. For that reason, the Faculty had invited two leaders from U.S. universities to conduct the review of the Dalla Lana School and to make an assessment of its readiness for the possibility of seeking U.S. accreditation. Professor Whiteside was unsure whether the process of curriculum renewal would lead to the U.S. accreditation and noted that there was some movement towards establishing a Canadian accreditation system as well as consideration of using a European accreditation process. Professor Sass-Kortsak added that the U.S. accreditation, while very strong, would also limit the ability of the University of Toronto to serve the Canadian system in some important respects. All Canadian schools of Public Health were struggling with the question of the advisability of seeking U.S. accreditation. U.S. accreditation was not mandatory for admission to the professional practice in the field of Public Health, and not only Canadian schools but many in the U.S. did not seek it.

A member asked about how a decision would be made with respect to seeking accreditation and what University approval would be required. Professor Regehr replied that decisions concerning professional accreditation were very specific to the relevant discipline and were made by the discipline-group concerned. The outcomes of the accreditation reviews were reported to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

The Chair noted that the Committee's Report would contain notes about the issues that had emerged. However, the consensus view was that there was no need for a follow-up report and no need to draw any issues to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

**8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011 (Cont'd)**

**(g) Faculty of Medicine: Department of Speech-Language Pathology**

On the recommendation of its reading team, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

Professor Whiteside noted that the Faculty of Medicine was considering whether the Ph.D. program in Speech-Language Pathology should be merged with the other doctoral programs in the Rehabilitation Sciences Sector: Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Science. Professor Whiteside would consult with Professor Regehr in arriving at that decision.

**(h) University of Toronto Mississauga: Department of Biology**

The spokesperson for the reading team reported four concerns.

- The Department had not yet developed a strategic academic plan. Professor Mullin reported that a plan had been in place for the period 2004-09. While an interim plan should have been put into place to follow the previous one, a major planning exercise under the Department's new leadership would begin shortly as part of the broader University of Toronto Mississauga (U.T.M.) planning exercise.
- The reading team reported that it had observed some confusion on the part of the reviewers about how to evaluate the graduate program in Biology at U.T.M. in light of the fact that it was only one part of a tri-campus graduate program. It would be very useful for the University to give some consideration to an appropriate general means for dealing with the matter. Professor Mullin stated her understanding that graduate programs would be reviewed separately on a tri-campus basis and that reviewers of undergraduate departments at U.T.M. would concentrate on undergraduate programs. They would, however, consider the contribution of graduate students to teaching and research in the U.T.M. Department. Professor Regehr said that the University did not wish to create a situation where graduate programs were reviewed three times more frequently than undergraduate programs.
- The external reviewers had abstained from dealing fully with certain matters owing to a lack of information. Those matters were important ones including the impact of the Department's outreach activities and indicators of the quality of student achievement. There appeared to be a mismatch between the terms of reference of the review and the information provided to the reviewers. Professor Regehr said that for all future reviews, the Provost's Office would be providing detailed data-packs which would provide much of the needed information. Professor Mullin observed that the data-packs would, however, still lack the basis for comment on certain matters such as the impact of outreach activities.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

**8. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – November 2010 – May 2011 (Cont'd)**

While a Department would be able to describe its efforts and its impression of their outcome, there would be no data to support the Department's conclusions.

- The review stressed that the availability of teaching laboratories was inadequate. Professor Mullin was pleased to advise that, since the preparation of her administrative response, the Province of Ontario had announced capital funding for U.T.M. renovations, including the provision of new teaching laboratories for Biology. The renovations would begin in April, 2012. In addition, a substantial amount of new equipment had been purchased and new laboratory courses established.

Another member of the reading team said that the summary had not always reflected the strength of the review's language. The executive summary had said that "... the stated learning objectives of the Department's undergraduate programs and degree-level expectations are not being fully met for most students. The Department can do better, but, to do so, a number of major issues need to be addressed urgently." Another member noted that the Biology students were, according to comments made by at least some of the faculty, not always strong ones. With respect to learning objectives, Professor Mullin said that the Biology curriculum was being reviewed as part of the academic planning exercise, and appropriate changes had been identified. Students admitted to the Biology Program in recent years had been strong ones, with an average mark of at least 84% in their top six Grade 12 courses. The faculty members had been concerned about writing skills, and U.T.M. had in 2010-11 funded a scientific literacy project in connection with the large first-year course in Biology. That course had been very successful and would be continued in the current year.

Professor Mullin stressed that U.T.M. had taken the recommendations of the review very seriously. Governance within the Department had been improved substantially with greater transparency and improved communication. There were clear terms of reference for the Departmental governance bodies and a number of new committees, with the expectation that minutes would be produced and shared with members of the Department. A Departmental newsletter had been established.

It was agreed that it would be appropriate to ask Professor Regehr to arrange with Professor Mullin for a follow-up report to be provided to the Committee in September 2012, after the completion of the planning and curriculum review processes in Biology.

**(i) Externally Commissioned Reviews**

The Committee received the list of reviews leading to the renewed accreditation of three professional programs and of the final reviews carried out by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011****9. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – Follow-Up Reports**

The Chair recalled that at its meeting one year ago, the Committee had requested follow-up reports on three reviews.

**(a) Faculty of Arts and Science: Centre for Environment**

Professor Regehr said that the Faculty of Arts and Science had established a broadly based working group to review activities and structures in the area of Environment. She anticipated that a part of the outcome would include proposals for three new programs, which proposals would come before the Committee in due course.

Because of the complexities involved, the matters raised by the reviewers had not yet been resolved, and a member asked whether it would be appropriate for the Committee to request a second follow-up report after the issues had been resolved. Professor Regehr said that a second follow-up report was possible, but she assured the Committee that the outcome of the working group would be brought forward to the Committees of the Academic Board: proposals for new programs to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and proposals for any structural changes to the Planning and Budget Committee. Professor Baker assured members that the Faculty was working very hard to resolve the issues that had been raised, and it was making good progress. Because of the size and complexity of the University's activities in the area of Environment, somewhat more than a year would be required to work out the proposals for program and structural change. It was agreed that, in the light of the assurances that proposals that would be brought forward, there was no need for a further follow-up report.

**(b) University of Toronto Mississauga: Forensic Science Undergraduate Program**

Professor Mullin reported that a new Director had been appointed for the program in Forensic Science. That new Director enjoyed good collegial relations with the faculty members in the various Departments that contributed to the Forensic Science Program. Several faculty members, including excellent, award-winning faculty, had made long-term commitments to teaching in the Program. The new Director was a member of the Department of Anthropology, and the administration of the Program would therefore remain in that Department. There had been substantial changes to the program requirements, which had been brought into line with accreditation requirements. A required course in Forensic Toxicology had been deemed too specialized by the accrediting body, and the requirement had been amended to a more general course in Forensic Biochemistry. Professor Mullin commented that she had temporarily halted admission to the program in Forensic Science. However, with the changes she had described, and especially with the increased commitment of faculty members to the program and the increased quality of instruction that would be provided, she had early in 2011 re-opened admission. U.T.M. was very pleased with the improvements that had been made.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

**9. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units – Follow-Up Reports (Cont'd)**

On behalf of the Committee, the Chair thanked Professor Mullin for her report on the excellent work completed to improve the Program.

**(c) University of Toronto Scarborough: Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences**

Professor Halpern said that, under the Department's new Chair, there had been substantial improvements to its curriculum, its physical infrastructure and its governance. The faculty in Physics had been granted a degree of autonomy within the Department, and the group was now assuming considerable responsibility for its own complement planning and faculty searches. The faculty in Chemistry was also carrying out a number of searches. One of them had led to the appointment of a high-profile senior chemist who brought not only scientific achievement but also leadership capability to the Department. The Department had been very fortunate with respect to infrastructure. The recent opening of the new Instructional Centre had freed space in the original Science Wing. Among other improvements, the Chemistry group would see the construction of a new TRACES laboratory with state-of-the art chemical analysis equipment for both teaching and research, and three of its teaching laboratories would receive major renovations to bring them up to date. The Department would seek accreditation of its specialist programs from the Canadian Society of Chemistry. It was making substantial progress, and Professor Halpern anticipated success in the effort in about six months' time.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chair thanked Professor Halpern for his report on the excellent work undertaken to deal with the concerns raised in the review report.

\* \* \*

The Chair thanked all members for their hard work and excellent discussion in the Committee's discharge of its very important function of monitoring reviews.

Professor Regehr also thanked members for their participation in the review process, which had enabled the Committee to carry out its responsibility for a careful consideration of the quality of the University's programs. The report-back process had given the Committee a very good opportunity to see what steps had been and were being taken when concerns had been expressed in reviews. The nature of the University's process encouraged reviewers to be candid in their findings, which then provided very important information on areas requiring improvement. That in turn helped to ensure the success of the quality-assurance process.

**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011****10. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference**

The Chair recalled that one year ago changes had been made to the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs in order to improve the Committee's functioning under the new Quality Assurance Process. At the same time, an Implementation Committee for the Report of the Task Force on Governance had been working on revisions to the terms of reference of all Governing Council Boards and Committees in order to implement the principles recommended by the Task Force and adopted by the Governing Council.

Mr. Charpentier said that the changes proposed to the Committee's terms of reference were intended to further two important principles set out by the Task Force on Governance: to delegate as much authority as possible to the lowest level of the governance hierarchy, and to reduce duplication in consideration of particular items by different committees or at different levels. Therefore, the Committee would more often be the final level of governance approval for more academic matters, with appropriate further delegation to the Councils of the academic divisions. In addition, procedural changes were also being proposed for all Governing Council Boards and Committees. For example, a consent process would be used for certain, more routine agenda items. They would be dealt with by the Committee without presentation or discussion, unless a member requested a presentation and discussion in advance of the meeting. In addition, some "for information" items would simply be posted electronically between meetings with a notice to members of the posting. Again, any member could, in advance, request consideration of the item in the usual way. The objective of the procedures was to ensure that the Boards and Committees would be able to focus on in-depth discussions such as this Committee's discussion today of the reviews of academic programs and units. A final type of change was simply a cleaning up of the language of the terms of reference.

**11. Reports of the Administrative Assessors****Grading Practices and Related Policies**

Professor Regehr advised members that policy amendments concerning grading practices would be brought forward to the Committee for its consideration later in the current academic year. The Ombudsperson had noted inconsistencies between the two current policies: the overall policy and one specifically applicable to graduate students. The Provost's Office had drafted three policies on: (i) Assessment and Grading Practices, (ii) Academic Transcripts; and (iii) Academic Continuity in event of disruptions (such as epidemics). As part of the effort to seek broad input on the policies, drafts had been published on the web. Members' comments were invited.



**REPORT NUMBER 152 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 20, 2011**

**12. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Committee of was scheduled for Thursday, November 3, 2011 at 4:10 p.m.\*

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

November 4, 2011

\_\_\_\_\_  
\* The meeting was subsequently cancelled for reason of insufficient business.