

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**October 29, 2012**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Monday, October 29, 2012 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Douglas McDougall (Chair)	Ms Michelle Mitrovich
Professor Elizabeth Peter (Vice-Chair)	Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean, School of Graduate Studies	Professor Russell Pysklywec
Professor Karen D. Davis	Ms Judith C. Poë
Professor Joseph Desloges	Ms Ioana Sendroiu
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng	Ms Maureen Somerville
Mr. Aidan Fishman	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Mr. Omar Gamel	Ms Tisha Tan
Professor Rick Halpern	Professor Steven Thorpe
Professor Paul Kingston	Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. David Kleinman	Professor Sandy Welsh
	Secretariat:
	Ms Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Mr. Michael Dick  
Professor Emmanuel Nikiema

In Attendance:

Mr. Andrew Girgis, Member of the Governing Council  
Professor Ted Banning, Chair, Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Ms Biljana Culkovic, Assistant to the Dean, Policy and Programs, Ontario Institute for  
Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)  
Mr. Jason Dumelie, Commissioner, Graduate Students' Union  
Mr. Sebastian Greenholtz, *the newspaper*  
Dr. Jane E. Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the  
Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Timothy Harrison, Chair, Department of Near and Middle Eastern  
Civilizations, Faculty of Arts and Science

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012**

In Attendance (cont'd):

Dr. Alan Hayes, Director, Toronto School of Theology  
Professor Bernard Katz, Acting Vice-Dean, Graduate, University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM)  
Dr. Daniella Mallinick, Coordinator, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Brenda McCabe, Chair, Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Professor Susan McCahan, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Professor Julia O'Sullivan, Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)  
Professor Scott Prosser, Director, M Biotech Program, UTM

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and the items approved.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting: Report Number 157 – September 19, 2012**

Report Number 157 of the meeting held on September 19, 2012 was approved.

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

There was no business arising from Report Number 157.

**3. Date of Next Meeting – Tuesday, January 15, 2013 at 4:10 p.m.**

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, April 2012 – October 2012**

The Chair reminded members that consideration of the reviews was one of the most important roles of the Committee. He explained that the Committee would first consider the follow-up report that had been requested at the September 20, 2011 meeting of the Committee on the Department of Biology of University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) and its programs. The reviews would then be considered in the order in which they appeared in the Review Compendium, with the exception of the review of the programs of the Toronto School of Theology (TST) which would be the final one considered in order to accommodate the schedule of the Director of TST.

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, April 2012 – October 2012(cont'd)****i) Follow-up Report from Previous Review**

Professor Regehr explained that the review of the UTM Department of Biology in the Fall of 2010 had suggested a number of areas for immediate attention. A one-year follow-up report to provide information on curriculum and teaching laboratories had been requested by the Committee. Professor Mullin, Vice-Principal Academic and Dean had provided the following update:

**Curriculum**

- The Department had developed a strategic academic plan and had undertaken an extensive curricular review.
- The Department now had a database of all curriculum content and teaching methods, including data on course learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, assessment methods, transferable skill development, biology skill development, biology content knowledge, and assessment of student learning gains.
  - The database was updated annually.

**Teaching Laboratories**

- The biology laboratories on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Davis Building had been renovated in the summer of 2012 and were now being used.
- New lab equipment had been purchased and was being used.
- The biology laboratories on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor would be renovated in 2014 and 2015.

There were no questions from members of the Committee. The Chair thanked Professor Regehr and Professor Mullin for the follow-up report.

**ii) Reviews April – October 2012**

The Chair reminded members that the Reading Groups had been asked to address three questions:

- 1) Did the summary accurately tell the story of the full review?
- 2) Had the administrative response addressed all issues identified?
- 3) Were there any questions, comments or substantive issues that the Committee should consider? Was there a need to ask that the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs to bring forward a follow-up report?

For each review, the spokesperson of the assigned Reading Group would be invited to comment, then other members would have an opportunity to speak. Professor Regehr would be invited to comment, and committee members would have an opportunity to ask questions.

At the end of the discussion, the Chair would confirm whether the Committee had identified any matters that should be brought to the attention of the Agenda Committee or whether a follow-up report to the Committee was necessary.

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, April 2012 – October 2012 (cont'd)**

The Chair noted that two speaking requests had been received for the agenda item and had been granted:

- Mr. Jason Dumelie, Academics and Funding Division 3&4 Commissioner of the Graduate Students' Union, would be invited to speak after all the reviews had been discussed.
- Dr. Wiebe of the Toronto School of Theology (TST) had been unable to attend the meeting but his written submission on the TST review had been distributed to members with the meeting documentation.

The Chair advised members that he would vacate the chair for the discussion of the reviews of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) reviews, as he was Chair of one of the Departments that had been reviewed.

**a) Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Civil Engineering**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary accurately reflected the full review and that the administrative response had addressed all the issues that had been identified. The Reading Group noted areas in which they would appreciate more information. The areas and the responses of Professor McCabe, Chair of Civil Engineering, are provided below.

The place of Mineral Engineering within the Department

- The Department included two undergraduate programs: Civil Engineering and Lassonde Mineral Engineering. The Lassonde Mineral Engineering program had been brought under the administrative umbrella of the Department in 2005. In 2011, there were 476 students in Years 1 through 4 of the Civil Engineering program and 99 students in the Lassonde Mineral Engineering program. A Town Hall meeting with students in the mineral engineering program had been held recently, and a Task Force had been formed to consider further harmonization of the programs.

Balancing undergraduate enrolment between Civil Engineering and Lassonde Mineral Engineering:

- One of the goals of the Faculty's academic plan was to reduce the undergraduate-to-faculty ratio. To achieve this goal, the number of students in the Civil Engineering program was being reduced slightly, while the number of students in the Lassonde Mineral Engineering program was being increased.

Improving graduate student learning

- Improvements in graduate student learning were being made by introducing new programs and streams, such as the proposed Master of Engineering in Cities Engineering and Management program, which would provide 6 new courses, and the specialized graduate stream in advanced water technologies and process design, which would result in 4 new courses.

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, April 2012 – October 2012 (cont'd)**

**a) Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Civil Engineering (cont'd)**

Time to completion for graduate students

- Graduate students were being asked to report at the beginning of each term on what they hoped to achieve in the term, and whether they had met their goal of achievement in the previous term.

The lack of seminars in the Department

- There was an active seminar series on mining in the Department during the summer, fall and winter terms.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**b) Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Anthropology**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary reflected the full review except for the area of graduate student funding. The administrative response had not mentioned the proportion of courses taught by sessional instructors and had not addressed the 'notable lacuna' in Aboriginal/First Nations' issues. The funding of graduate students, particularly international graduate students, had also been mentioned as a concern in the two other reviews of Arts and Science Departments and was a university-wide problem.

The Reading Group noted that a number of tri-campus issues had been raised, including the need for enhanced communication and collaboration.

Professor Welsh and Professor Banning responded to the points raised by the Reading Group.

Graduate Student Funding

- The senior administration of the Faculty was working with Chairs to package funding opportunities for international graduate students.

Master's Research Paper

- The Department had not considered the possibility of changing the requirements for a Master's Research Paper (MRP). This might not be an appropriate action as the M.Sc. program was a terminal degree for most students.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee. However, the Reading Group requested an informal oral follow-up report in a year on tri-campus issues.

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)****c) Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary reflected the full review, although it had omitted the reference to the 'noteworthy' ties of the Department with other Departments and programs in, and beyond, the University of Toronto. Professor Regehr agreed to add the reference to the summary.

The administrative response had not addressed all the issues of curriculum and program delivery that had been raised by the reviewers. The Reading Group noted the concerns about the physical space occupied by the Department, and pointed out that the previous review of the Department conducted in 2004-05 had raised the same concerns.

Professor Welsh replied that the Faculty of Arts and Science had hired a Chief Administrative Officer and had reorganized the infrastructure unit within the Faculty. Professor Harrison added that planning for renovations of the Bancroft building had begun.

A member commented that the reviewers had expressed concerns about the lack of clarity and consistency around Comprehensive Examinations for graduate students, and issues concerning the combined undergraduate/graduate content courses. Professor Harrison indicated that the administrative response had included an explanation of the requirement of slightly different Comprehensive Examinations for the two accredited fields of study. The Department was addressing the undergraduate/graduate content courses.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee. However, the Reading Group requested a written follow-up report in a year on the renovations to the Bancroft Building.

**d) Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Sociology**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group made suggestions for changes to the summary. The summary will be revised accordingly.

The administrative response had not addressed the funding of international students, nor the role of teaching stream faculty.

Professor Welsh replied that the faculty of the Department held strong and divided opinions on the use of teaching stream faculty. However, a teaching stream position was currently being advertised. It was expected that Departments would consider the norms within their academic disciplines when making hiring decisions.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee. The Reading Group requested an oral report in a year on class size, pedagogical innovation and the use of TA's, and fundraising.

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012**

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)**

**e) Faculty of Medicine**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary had accurately reflected the full review and that the administrative response had addressed all the issues that had been identified. No follow-up was required.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

Professor Peter assumed the Chair.

**f) Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT):  
Department of Applied Psychology and Human Development**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary had accurately reflected the full review. The administrative response had noted that the review had taken place during a time of departmental restructuring within OISE/UT. Many of the issues that had been identified by the review were being addressed by new guidelines and plans that were being developed as a result of the restructuring. The Reading Group requested follow-up in the areas of student recruitment for increased national diversity and the balancing of class size and course offerings.

Professor O'Sullivan explained that all OISE/UT Departments had held Open Houses in an effort to increase the diversity of faculty, staff and students. However, focused efforts to increase diversity beyond Toronto were needed. A member commented that Open Houses were not the most effective way of increasing national diversity. Professor Corman stated that the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) participated in national student recruitment fairs, but take-up from those fairs had been decreasing. Most students found out about graduate programs via computer.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee. A verbal follow-up report in one year on OISE/UT restructuring and the resulting guidelines and plans was requested.

**g) Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT):  
Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary had accurately reflected the full review. One issue had arisen from the administrative response: the relationship among the seven degree programs offered by the Department. It was not clear whether the current curriculum review would include an examination of the number of degrees being offered. Professor O'Sullivan responded that the curriculum review would indeed consider this issue.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee. A formal report in two years was requested to provide an update on proposed MT, MEd and Flex PhD expansion and other program enrolment, quality issues, curriculum review, and faculty renewal plans.

**REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)****h) Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT):  
Department of Humanities, Social Sciences and Social Justice Education**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary had accurately reflected the full review. Again, the administrative response had noted that the review had taken place during a time of departmental restructuring within OISE/UT in which two units had combined to form this new Department. Many of the issues that had been identified by the review were being addressed by the development of a new curriculum model, a comprehensive research plan, and a faculty renewal plan for the Department.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee. A formal report in two years was requested to provide an update on the new curriculum model, thesis stream student:faculty ratio, faculty research and the faculty renewal plan.

**i) Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT):  
Department of Leadership, Higher and Adult Education**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary had accurately reflected the full review. The summary noted that the programs had been reviewed in bundles that reflected the departmental structure that had come into effect on July 1, 2012. The administrative response had been very detailed, but the response to the concerns about the number of degrees offered did not address the viability of the MA programs. Professor O'Sullivan responded that the curriculum review would consider these issues.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee. In light of the departmental restructuring, a formal report in two years was requested to address MA program viability, curricular coordination across nine degrees and different areas, and to follow up regarding the major shifts and changes the programs and department were undergoing.

Professor McDougall assumed the Chair.

**j) University of Toronto Mississauga: M. Biotech**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the summary had accurately reflected the full review and that the administrative response had addressed all the issues that had been identified. No follow-up was required.

On the recommendation of the Reading Group, the Committee concluded that there were no issues to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee



## REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012

## 4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)

## k) Toronto School of Theology (TST)

**Background of Review**

Professor Regehr explained that the terms of reference for the review of the Toronto School of Theology (TST) had focused on the programs of TST and not on administrative issues.

- The Toronto School of Theology was an independent organization consisting of seven member colleges (Trinity College at Trinity University, Emmanuel at Victoria University, St. Michael's at University of St. Michael's, Regis, Wycliffe, Knox, St. Augustine's)
  - Since 1979, TST and its member colleges had been connected to the University of Toronto through a memorandum of agreement.
  - The University conferred degrees conjointly with the TST member colleges.
  - This model of granting theological degrees was not unique to University of Toronto and was found in other universities in Ontario and beyond.
- TST had agreed to conform to certain policies of the University, however, faculty members were hired, students were admitted, and curriculum was revised and delivered by the member theological colleges – not by the University.
  - The professional programs at TST were accredited in the same manner as were other professional programs.
- Under the previous provincial quality assurance framework, conjoint programs were not included in the cyclical review process. Only two of the programs, the ThM and the ThD had been approved by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS), and had therefore undergone quality review.
  - The new Provincial Quality Assurance Framework now included conjoint programs and this review represented the first time the University had formally reviewed the programs it offered conjointly with TST.
  - The review process for TST was the same as that for other program reviews, including the self-study, terms of reference, site visit and administrative report.
- Under the terms of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP), if a program did not meet quality standards in the review process, admissions to the program were suspended until such time as quality improvements were made.
  - Given the unique circumstances of the conjoint degree, the Provost's Office had suspended admissions to the ThD and DMin (both of which were deemed to be below standard by the external reviewers) in consultation with the Director of TST.
  - TST had developed a system by which quality concerns would be addressed, and the suspension of admissions had subsequently been lifted by the Provost's Office.

## REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)****k) Toronto School of Theology (TST) (cont'd)**

Professor Regehr noted that the reviewers had been asked only to address the TST programs that were conjoint with the University.

**Reading Group Report**

The spokesperson for the Reading Group stated that the review had not included:

- a discussion of reasons for the assessment;
  - faculty scholarship; or
  - clarity about the affiliations of the reviewers.
- Professor Regehr noted that the reviewers' report had mentioned scholarship and that the self-study provided to the reviewers had discussed faculty scholarship, drawing on a standardized data set generated for all UTQAP reviews. Professor Regehr clarified that Professor Ellen Aitken was Dean of the Faculty of Religious Studies at McGill University; Professor David Ford was Regius Professor of Divinity in the Faculty of Divinity at Cambridge University; and Professor Richard Rosengarten was Associate Professor of Religion and Literature at the University of Chicago Divinity School.

The Reading Group had been concerned with the reference to the 'broader scope of authority of U of T'.

- Professor Regehr explained that the Memorandum of Agreement with TST was scheduled for renewal in 2014. She reminded members that TST programs were considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Academic Board for approval.

The reviewers had noted that the PhD program was under standard.

- Professor Regehr pointed out that the PhD was not a conjoint program, but was offered by the Faculty of Theology of the University of St. Michael's College. The review of the PhD program was not part of the mandate of the reviewers.

**Discussion**

The following points were raised in discussion.

- The development of chaplaincies had been mentioned in the administrative response.
  - The creation of a rabbinical school was currently under discussion.
  - The Canadian Council of Imams was interested in a chaplaincy program.

REPORT NUMBER 158 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – October 29, 2012

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)**

**k) Toronto School of Theology (TST) (cont'd)**

**Discussion (cont'd)**

- A proposal for a conjoint PhD program was currently in development and would come forward to AP&P as part of the standard new program proposal process.
- What was the balance between theological studies and religious studies.
  - The University of Toronto Department of Religion had developed a paper that clearly differentiated between a PhD in Religious Studies and a PhD in Theological Studies.
- The course duplication description on page 4 of the administrative response was a concern.
  - Course codes could be used for courses, research projects, off-site field placements and internships, supervisions, and placeholders.
  - Courses could have similar titles but different interests.
  - Different courses could function as different sections of the same course.
  - Each college wanted to have its own introductory courses based on its theological history;
    - The problem was combining different approaches into a single course.

**Follow Up**

The Reading Group requested that a follow-up report, including the content of a conjoint PhD degree, be given in one year. Professor Regehr agreed that a follow-up report would be appropriate prior to the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding.

**l) External Speaker**

The Chair invited Mr. Dumelie to address the Committee. Mr. Dumelie commented that, in his view, there was not enough connection between concerns expressed by faculty and students and the purpose of a review. He also noted that graduate student funding was only mentioned in half of the reviews.

The Chair thanked Mr. Dumelie for his comments.

The Chair thanked Dr. Harrison and Dr. Mallinck for their work in organizing the review material for the Committee.

**5. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

There were no reports from the administrative assessors.

**6. Other Business**

No items of other business were raised.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

November 12, 2012