

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

Tuesday, March 31, 2009 at 4:10 p.m.

Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall

AGENDA

- 1. Report of the Previous Meeting – Report 139, March 3, 2009***
- 2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**
- 3. Faculty of Medicine, Undergraduate Program in Medicine: Grading Practices***

Be it Resolved

THAT the proposed change in grading for all courses in the undergraduate program in Medicine (MD) to Credit/No Credit be approved, effective September 2009.

- 4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 2007-08: Annual Report, Part II***
- 5. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2007-08****
- 6. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**
- 7. Date of Next Meeting – Tuesday, May 12, 2009 at 4:10 p.m.**
- 8. Other Business**

* Documentation attached.

** Documentation to follow.



TO: Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

SPONSOR: Edith Hillan
CONTACT INFO: edith.hillan@utoronto.ca

DATE: March 18, 2009

AGENDA ITEM: 4

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Reviews of Academic Units and Programs 2007-08 – Annual Report Part II: Divisional Reviews

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

The Committee is the point of entry into governance for reports on the results of academic reviews of programs and units commissioned by academic administrators. The role of the Committee is to ensure that the reviews are done, that an appropriate process is being used, that adequate documentation is provided and consultations are undertaken, and that issues identified in the review are addressed by the administration.

The compendium of review summaries is forwarded, together with the record of the Committee's discussion, to the Agenda Planning committee of the Academic Board, which determines whether there are any issues of general academic import warranting discussion at the Board level. The same documentation is sent to the Executive Committee of the Governing Council for information.

PREVIOUS ACTION

Governing Council approved the *Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs* in 2005¹. The *Policy* governs the overall framework for the internal assessment of proposed new programs and units and the review of existing programs and units at the University of Toronto and defines the overarching principles, scope, procedures and accountability within this framework. The *Policy* specifies two administrative guidelines that outline the procedures for the actual assessment and review of programs and units.

HIGHLIGHTS:

External reviews of academic programs and units are important mechanisms of accountability for the University and an integral part of the academic planning process. The academic reviews are critical to ensuring the quality of our programs through vigorous and consistent processes. External review reports may also inform the search for a new academic administrator.

Twenty-five reviews of units and/or programs were commissioned by University divisions in the 2007-08 academic year. The overall assessments of these units and their academic programs were positive. Common themes continue to be the strength of our faculty

¹ <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/policy/review.htm>

excellence and the emphasis on enhancement of the student experience. Degree level expectations were approved by academic divisions in the spring of 2008. The 2007-08 reviews are the last reviews commissioned under review guidelines that did not incorporate of degree level expectations in the terms of reference.

The Faculty of Arts and Science commissioned two reviews of interdivisional programs, the Forestry Conservation program (with the Faculty of Forestry) and the Music program (with the Faculty of Music). Although both the Faculty of Forestry and the Faculty of Music were reviewed externally in 2004, the undergraduates programs were reviewed separately in 2007-08 because they had not been fully considered in the provostial reviews.

The Faculty of Medicine reviews highlight that the Faculty's undergraduate medical curriculum has undergone many innovative developments and provides a standard of excellence in medical education. Several reviews highlight the need for academic planning within a unit. Several reviews noted the changing health funding within the Province of Ontario, referring to the Phase 3 of Alternate Funding Plan (AFP) funds in support of education and research as well as relationships with health care providers within the newly established Local Health Integrated Networks.

The reviews conducted by the University of Toronto Mississauga are the first external reviews of the departments since their establishment in 2003. The review reports reflect the rapid undergraduate expansion that the campus has seen since the establishment of the departments.

University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) separately reviewed the five interdisciplinary programs it offers jointly with Centennial College, established in 2003-04. Students receive a BA/BSc from UofT and a diploma or certificate from Centennial. As part of the process to establish the programs, a *Memorandum of Understanding between Centennial and the University of Toronto* was signed by both institutions. In accordance with the MOU, UTSC and Centennial commissioned a review of the MOU during 2007-2008, concurrent with the external reviews of the programs. During the deliberations of the Review Committee, as well as in the self-studies prepared for the review and the external review reports themselves, it became clear that certain common administrative issues needed to be addressed for the joint programs. As outlined in detail in the administrative responses, UTSC and Centennial have worked to revise the MOU, clarifying the program's senior academic administrative leadership, setting up a Joint Programs Steering Committee and a Joint Programs Coordinator, and coordinating a new marketing and recruitment campaign to raise program awareness.

Several of the departmental review reports of the Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto Mississauga and University of Toronto Scarborough comment upon the complex nature of the tri-campus relationships. The University has engaged in the *Towards 2030* comprehensive planning strategy which is, amongst many other things, the next step in the evolution of the tri-campus structure. The *Towards 2030 Framework*², approved by Governing Council in 2008, highlights the University's de-facto tri-campus system. The document affirms the University's commitment to "sustain inter-campus collaboration while enabling strategic tri-campus differentiation of academic programs. Campus-specific

² <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=5517>

autonomy will be supported insofar as it does not compromise efficiency or academic quality.” For this complex endeavor to be successful, the continued goodwill, collaboration, and cooperation between the arts and science divisions on all three campuses is essential. The issues raised in the review reports have been discussed within the Tri-campus Deans Committee, whose biweekly meetings serve as an important forum for communication, consultation, and coordination across the three arts and science divisions.

Additional reviews of programs are conducted by organizations external to the University. Reviews of academic programs by external bodies form part of collegial self-regulatory systems to ensure that mutually agreed-upon threshold standards of quality are maintained in new and existing programs. A summary listing of these reviews is presented in the Appendix.

These reports compliment the University’s Performance Indicators and other institution-wide quantitative measures of our performance towards key goals and compares that performance to its peers. The full review reports are available in the Office of the Governing Council should members wish to consult them.

FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS: n/a

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information.

**REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS
2007-2008**

**Annual Summary to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs
Part II: Divisional reviews**

March 2009

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS
2007-2008
Part II: Divisional reviews

Index

| | |
|---|-----|
| Faculty of Arts and Science | |
| Chemistry, Dept of | 2 |
| English, Dept of | 8 |
| Equity Studies Program, New College | 13 |
| Forestry Conservation Program | 17 |
| Music Program | 21 |
| Philosophy, Dept of | 26 |
| Sexual Diversity Studies Program | 30 |
| Women and Gender Studies Institute | 33 |
| | |
| Faculty of Medicine | |
| Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, Dept of | 38 |
| Nutritional Sciences, Dept of | 44 |
| Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Dept of | 51 |
| Occupational Sciences and Occupational Therapy, Dept of | 57 |
| Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Dept of | 63 |
| Surgery, Dept of | 69 |
| | |
| Ontario Institute for Studies in Education | |
| Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, Dept of | 77 |
| | |
| University of Toronto Mississauga | |
| Economics, Dept of | 85 |
| English and Drama, Dept of | 88 |
| Management, Dept of | 92 |
| Mathematics and Computational Sciences, Dept of | 98 |
| Sociology, Dept of | 102 |
| | |
| University of Toronto at Scarborough | |
| Social Sciences, Dept of | 107 |
| Joint programs with Centennial College: | |
| Environmental Science and Technology | 116 |
| Industrial Microbiology | 121 |
| Journalism and New Media Studies | 126 |
| Paramedicine | 132 |
| | |
| Appendix: Externally-commissioned reviews of academic programs | 138 |

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

REVIEW SUMMARY

| | |
|---|--|
| PROGRAM/UNIT DIVISION | Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL) Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) |
| DATE: | November 1-2, 2007 |
| COMMISSIONING OFFICER: | Dean |
| PROGRAMS OFFERED: | |
| Undergraduate | Bachelor of Education, BEd: Participation in the initial teacher education program |
| Graduate: | Master of Teaching, MT Master of Education, MEd Master of Arts, MA Doctor of Philosophy, PhD |
| EXTERNAL REVIEWERS | |
| International | Prof. Victoria Chou, Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago |
| Canadian | Prof. Dennis Sumara, Head, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy, University of British Columbia |
| PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE: | 2003 |
| SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: | <p>Departmental strengths include the high quality of teaching, commitment to preservice teacher education and of faculty, staff and students to solving problems, a strong research funding record, high quality and reputation of graduate programs in Second Language, Measurement and Evaluation, and Comparative, International and Development graduate programs.</p> <p>There is a tension between the preservice and graduate programs. This is common in major research universities. Universities that have high-enrolment teacher education programs have a very high percentage of teacher education classes taught by seconded and contract teachers.</p> <p>OISE has made a commendable commitment to the preparation of teachers, and to involve tenure-stream faculty in the program. Following organizational tensions and concerns were noted: (1) the perception that CTL has little control over the preservice programs, even though it has major responsibility (in terms of numbers of faculty participating) for preservice education; (2) decision-making is currently divided between CTL and the Associate Dean's Office, and there is consequent confusion about locating and allocating resources; (3) the model for making teaching assignments for tenured and tenure-stream faculty, with an attempt to assign .75 of the workload to preservice teaching; and (4) the danger of CTL losing some of its most prestigious graduate programs if the department is required, in a context of declining resources, to devote substantial resources to preservice programs.</p> |
| RECENT OCGS REVIEW DATE: | 2003/04 |
| DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS: | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Self-Study• Terms of Reference• Department's Academic Plan, 2004-2009 (2004)• Ontario Council of Graduate Studies reports for two graduate programs (Curriculum and Teacher Development, Second Language Education)• Previous external review report (2003)• Faculty member CVs• OISE 2007/2008 Graduate Studies in Education Bulletin, 2007/2008 Initial Teacher Education Calendar |

CONSULTATION PROCESS: Reviewers met with the Dean and Associate Deans; the Department Chair and Associate Chair; members of the OISE Research Advisory Committee and Manager's Administrative Team; CTL Council Chair and Vice-Chair; faculty, teaching and administrative staff; graduate and undergraduate students, CTL's external community. The reviewers also met with CTL external community members, and chairs of cognate OISE departments.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The reviewers commended the Department Chair's leadership, accomplishments and enormous positive impact on the department. His accomplishments were described as "significant and many" including the introduction of the establishment of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL) Council as a substantive governance structure; promotion, retention and hiring of valued faculty; creation of a programmatic home; attention to quality of the student experience; increased transparency and fairness in administrative matters; a more coherent curriculum, and professional development for staff.

The departmental culture was characterized as welcoming, supportive and focused on mentoring. Future challenges and opportunities are related to resolving ongoing tensions between the initial teacher education and graduate programs, and negotiating ownership, and decision-making and budgetary authority for these programs.

Research

The Department has an excellent research record with many areas of strength and depth. Its senior scholars are distinguished and internationally recognized and there are also many talented new professors. The depth and concentration of CTL faculty knowledge and expertise about social justice, equity, and diversity; anti-oppressive approaches to education; indigenous knowledge and second-language learning; and critical perspectives is at its strongest level to date. It has much to contribute to both "teacher education and educational praxis in a globalizing educational context."

The sponsored conferences arranged by the Department for teachers and teacher educators were innovative and well-received by community constituencies (schools, media, professional educator groups). Community members recommended more formal structures for the sharing of research with themselves and schools.

Some faculty indicated that those who are not garnering large grant awards have disproportionate responsibilities for running the teacher education program. This may make them more vulnerable at promotion and tenure time if they do not have the time to devote to securing large research grants. Conversely, senior faculty recipients of large grants feel overextended with research and supervisory responsibilities. The reviewers strongly endorsed the Research Advisory Committee's five year plan and especially the proposed mentoring program. The proposed mentoring program provides support for collective mentoring of tenure-line faculty in preparation of grant proposals and promotion/tenure files, data analysis, manuscript review for publication in high quality journals.

The reviewers noted a strong interest of faculty for interdisciplinary and collaborative research. Lack of administrative support and the fact that the Department is very large contribute to the difficulty of achieving such research. The Research Advisory Committee proposal for centres to assist in creating academic homes was noted by the reviewers.

Faculty reported progress in developing departmental criteria to define "valued scholarly work," though the nature and value of creative and professional activity is an ongoing conversation between the University's professional faculties and the Provost's office.

Graduate Studies

Distinctions between the MT, MEd and MA need to be more explicitly stated in informational materials as the distinctions are not perceived very clearly by students. Programmatic improvements are ongoing with

greater contributions from the faculty. The Department has merged two graduate programs into one (Curriculum Studies and Teacher Education) and has deleted one program (Measurement and Evaluation). Recently appointed faculty members are academically strong and making contributions to the Programs. Communication and decision making are improved and organizing faculty into area groups is positive. Full time students were pleased with the program and University financial support; there is a good sense of community. The reviewers suggested that more attention should be given to part-time students' needs.

The reviewers reported that graduate students are interested in assisting with or teaching courses. The reviewers recommended that the Department identify opportunities for students to teach in order to gain experience in teaching.

The Master of Teaching is a new initiative for the Department that appears to be satisfying both students and faculty. The reviewers characterized it as important for the Department and OISE as it provides students with a "more robust academic and research experience." They suggested extending the MT program to secondary education "but only if CTL faculty are formally brought into the decision-making process and sufficient resources are allocated." Research might be conducted to determine accomplishments of graduates of this program as compared to BEd graduates as the Program's viability and growth seem to depend on such evidence.

The MEd/PhD programs, though more cohesive than in the past, need continued evaluation and a clearer identity. The MEd Program has "great promise for showcasing the considerable professional development expertise of the OISE faculty and staff" but some part-time students feel they are given less status and resources. This group merits attention from program faculty and administrators. The team recommended consideration of more courses, particularly in theory and research methodologies. The Studies in Second Language Education (SLE) graduate programs are high quality, internationally recognized research training programs. New hiring is necessary to maintain quality and reputation and take on new program responsibilities.

Initial Teacher Education (ITE)

The ITE programs are administered centrally at OISE, however, "CTL faculty and staff are more involved with the BEd than faculty and staff from any of the other departments." CTL provides significant leadership in ITE. Its faculty teach in all program components, including 75 percent of the required BEd courses and two thirds of the MT courses. Department faculty are "responsible for the majority of the BEd curriculum and the housing of the seconded and contract faculty, but are unfamiliar with the day-to-day management of the program and unaware of the revenues associated with the program."

Students had positive field placement experiences. Students noted that there is a great theory component that is not attached to "real world applications" or to educational practice. The reviewers commented: "Faculty discussed the difficulty in sustaining a programmatic focus on equity, diversity, and social justice, when extreme inconsistency in what that focus looks like exists from cohort to cohort, and program option to program option, given the different individuals in charge."

The reviewers suggested the Department consider a mix of more tenure/tenure-track faculty and fewer seconded/contract instructors in the BEd and MT programs. This would ensure appropriate leadership for the proposed programming mix as "these roles are best served by faculty who are most familiar both with the scholarly fields of knowledge associated with teacher education and with teacher practice in schools and communities, if research-based programming is a value."

With regards to the recently initiated Concurrent Teacher Education Program (CTEP), faculty members did not object to the main concept of the program but were concerned about workload. "It is important to note that teacher education programs require leadership from the same CTL faculty at the expense of their research and scholarship, and opportunities to teach in non-teacher education courses. The reviewers reported that faculty members "would like to see a greater proportion of the revenues generated by the initial teacher education programs be dedicated to CTL support for these programs, and they would like to see these issues addressed before further expansion takes place."

The reviewers recommended "that CTL study how its teacher candidates are supervised and supported. Tenure-stream faculty members in CTL who are teaching curriculum courses either need to receive teaching credits for

providing practicum supervision or, if this is not possible, they should not be assigned these duties." They raised the question of whether Associate Teachers qualifications to supervise teacher candidates are being evaluated.

The reviewers recommended that the existing "cohort" model for teacher education might benefit from some revision given the significant human and fiscal resources it requires, although they acknowledged that "there are many positive features of this program (such as experiences of coherence and community for students and faculty members)." Though staff are generally extremely happy, there is evidence of some redundancy and inefficiency and some confusion around roles and expectations. The latter can make it confusing for students.

Demands of the graduate research-focused programs and ITE often compete. As CTL faculty are "the most involved with the teacher preparation programs, they are most affected by these competing demands." The reviewers recommended that in light of possible plans to expand CTEP and add a secondary MT cohort, there is a need to directly, transparently and collaboratively address the "widespread perception that CTL is responsible for much of the labor of initial teacher education," while OISE centrally controls the ITE decision-making and finances.

The reviewers recommended OISE "consider consolidating infrastructure and staff support for certain functions centrally." Despite its "extraordinarily talented and dedicated group of support staff" perhaps their duties are not as well coordinated or articulated with one another as they could be. The reviewers nevertheless emphasized that "[t]he oversight and leadership provided by the Administrative Managers of the Department is extraordinary." The reviewers felt "the fragmentation [they] noticed emerges from the way in which the teacher education and graduate program duties are shared with the Dean's office. To the extent that CTL or the entire OISE faculty can be brought into a common understanding of the opportunities and constraints imposed by the province and other entities with authority over OISE, a collective solution to resolving existing tensions might be found."

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE (Commissioning Officer)

Since the review, Professor Tara Goldstein has become the Chair of the department, and she is enthusiastically committed to building upon the work that Dennis Thiessen and his administrative team, especially the two Associate Chairs and Manager of the Department, have accomplished.

1. Research

The department continues to support knowledge generation, knowledge application and knowledge integration at a high level of sophistication, in a global context. Research funding has increased and the new Chair meets with junior faculty on a regular basis to counsel and support them. CTL's Research Advisory Committee (RAC) has made recommendations to strengthen the research culture in the Department and collectively mentor early and mid-career faculty. Last year, such mentoring began under the direction of the Department's Associate Chair of Research and Development and the RAC. The Department's recently appointed Associate Chair, Academic, is working on research and faculty development across all CTL programs and with the Chair on processes related to promotion, tenure and review.

It is an expectation that all faculty will involve themselves in research, as well as teaching at the graduate and teacher education levels. This workload reflects OISE's and the University's commitment to integrating undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching and research activity. The average course load in CTL in 2007/08 was within both departmental and divisional norms. The department and the Dean's Office are working on an equitable and transparent work assignment guideline that is balanced over a three year time period and available to scrutiny.

The tension between undertaking individual and collaborative research in order to create vibrant long-term research careers characterizes the research lives of many academics, not only those in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning (CTL). While such a tension cannot be completely resolved, it can be negotiated throughout a research career. The Research Advisory Committee is holding discussions in order to ensure expectations in the department are shared.

CTL includes five research centres, which provide opportunities for interdisciplinary and collaborative work that draws on the broad array of research expertise found in this large department. The centres

have a mandate to diversify research funding and engage in outreach with schools and communities. For example, the Centre for Urban Schooling (CUS) engages in a number of knowledge application and knowledge integration projects through its Building Capacity for Urban School Success (BCUSS) program. Researchers associated with CUS and the Modern Language Centre have obtained funding from a wide range of sources, including SSHRCC, the Ontario Ministry of Education and the Toronto Board of Education. CUS has secured funding from private donations. All CTL research centres work with the Associate Dean of Research's office at OISE to learn about new funding opportunities.

CTL is committed to scholarship that includes knowledge application and integration, as well as knowledge generation. It is engaging in discussions about the nature and value of "creative professional activity", and documenting evidence of creative professional achievement more consistently, as many CTL tenure and promotion cases are characterized by all three kinds of activity.

2. Graduate Studies

The MEd/MA/PhD Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development (CSTD) degree program is the result of a merger of two previous programs, and the reviewers state it is "still in search of a clearer identity", would benefit from even greater coherence and from more courses in theory and research methodologies. Two strategies have been adopted to address this. First, the number of coordinators of the CSTD program has been increased from one to two. One coordinator is responsible for program design and timetabling while the other is responsible for program admissions and program requirements. The first coordinator is analysing the needs and interests of CSTD students and working with CSTD faculty towards greater coherence and relevance in the program. Second, a new foundations course, Foundations of Curriculum Studies and Teacher Development and a new Doctoral Colloquium for CSTD PhD students have been developed. The new foundations course will be piloted for 60 students in January (2009) and the Doctoral Colloquium will be piloted in 2009-2010.

The new foundations course, which addresses basic concepts in, frameworks for, and approaches to the study of curriculum and teacher development, interweaves three major themes:

1. Historical foundations of curriculum theory and philosophy;
2. Diverse approaches and conceptualizations of curriculum theory and teacher development and
3. Contemporary debates in the fields of curriculum studies and teacher development.

Within the next two years, all courses in the CSTD program will be linked to the ideas and conversations begun in the foundations course.

The department's PhD Task Force has agreed with the reviewers that more attention needs to be given to the needs of part-time students. A Flex-Time PhD Program Planning group has a mandate to recommend new programming initiatives for CTL's part time PhD students. The group will also look at the access part-time students have to orientation and other student activities. Early suggestions to improve access include virtual strategies for sharing information and scheduling events on weekends.

The reviewers recommended that CTL find more opportunities for graduate students to assist with or teach courses. OISE's Teaching Task Force has made the same recommendation, our data from graduate students show that they want more teaching experiences, and the Dean has established a Task Force on Student Funding to explore ways to increase teaching opportunities for students. Several substantial challenges limit the number of TA positions that can be created. 1) The BEd Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programs have been developed on a cohort model, which has teacher candidates working together in small learning communities of 30, 60 and 90 students rather than in large-lecture style courses, which would more easily support large numbers of TAs. This cohort model has been cited in the teacher education literature as a powerful model for educating new teachers and there are no plans for adopting a different model within the ITE program at OISE. Therefore, TA positions must work within cohorts. 2) Our collective agreements make the graduate assistantship (GA) rather than the TA a default option for graduate students. 3) Our graduate programs do not line up easily with our teacher education program in terms of expertise. Despite these challenges the Task Force is finding some ways to move forward.

The new secondary focus of the MT degree has been approved by the governance structures at both the Department and University level and the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies (OCGS). The accreditation visit from the Ontario College of Teachers took place in December 2008. Following up with OISE graduates is difficult, but a survey is underway to assess the preparedness and outcomes of BEd and MT graduates.

The primary difference between the MT and the other master's degree types offered by CTL (MA/MEd) is that the MT program qualifies students to teach at the elementary or secondary levels in addition to providing them with advanced theoretical knowledge and research skills, whereas the MA and MEd degree programs do not provide teacher certification. This distinction is made clear on the OISE and CTL websites and in the OISE Graduate Studies Bulletin. The MA and MEd programs are differentiated as follows: 1) Prospective students are advised on the CTL website and in the Bulletin that "Students who anticipate going on to further study at the PhD level are advised to apply for enrolment in an MA rather than an MEd degree program." 2) Prospective and newly admitted students are advised at open houses, orientations and through the department website that the MA degree program involves coursework and a thesis, whereas the MEd is a coursework only program. At this time master's level courses are not divided into MA and MEd offerings. The distinction between the MA and the MEd degree is not consistent across research universities; other faculties of education in Ontario offer only an MEd, and use it for admission to the PhD. The distinctions are a matter of ongoing conversation, both at OISE and within the education community, as is the appropriateness of the MEd degree as preparation for doctoral programs.

The reviewers noted that while the SLE program continues to be internationally recognized as a high-quality research-training program, SLE faculty are worried about maintaining their program without new hires. Of the three faculty searches CTL is holding this year, one is looking for a new faculty member for the SLE program (the French Language Pedagogy search), a second is looking for a new faculty member for the CSTD program (the Curriculum Studies search) and the third is looking for a new faculty member who could work with students from both the SLE and CSTD programs (the Multiliteracies search). We feel this will maintain the program in a strong position.

3. CTL'S Contribution to the BEd Initial Teacher Education Programs

The Reviewers' mandate did not extend to a review of OISE's Initial Teacher Education programs (ITE), and they were not provided with general information about that program. The report contains some fundamental misconceptions about the relationship between the department and the program. For example, the notion that CTL "study how teacher candidates are supported" indicates no awareness of the research the ITE program already carries out and shares with instructors. The suggestions about redistributing revenues indicate no awareness of the budget models that provide CTL with revenue from ITE. The suggestions about associate teachers indicate no awareness of the work of our School-University Partnership Office (SUPO). The suggestions about hiring sessional instructors ignore the very consultative processes that are in place for ITE, and the suggestion that there is redundancy in staffing suggests a lack of understanding of cohorts and component coordinators, though this is something that ITE might fruitfully pursue in its upcoming review.

There are now three pathways to initial teacher education programming at the University of Toronto in which CTL participates: the consecutive BEd program; the concurrent BEd program (CTEP), and CTL's Master of Teaching (MT) program. The governance of the consecutive BEd and CTEP programs crosses departments, using what is known as a "matrix" model, led by the Associate Dean-Teacher Education. The MT program is entirely run out of the department and was discussed under graduate programs above.

CTL tenure stream and teaching stream faculty participate in and provide leadership for both of the ITE programs that are run on a matrix model. The Associate Dean-Teacher Education, the Director of CTEP, the Director of the secondary program, the Director of the elementary program and the Executive Director of ITE are all CTL faculty. They are responsible for and very familiar with the management of the program; the new budget model at U of T has made all administrators much more aware of the revenues and costs of the program. Moving forward, the Dean's Office and the Chair of CTL will work to ensure that CTL faculty gain a greater understanding of the academic and financial implications of the matrix model programs.

As noted above, while our ITE program has a common set of courses, values and objectives, the cohort model encourages differentiation of focus from cohort to cohort. This could look like “inconsistency” but there is a good deal of literature that supports cohorts as most effective at creating student engagement and integrating theory and practice with teacher candidates.

At the moment, about one third of the teaching in ITE is carried out by teaching or tenure stream faculty. As 200 places of the 1200 in the program are funded in a contingent way with the Ministry of Education in Ontario, and recent teaching experience is of great value for faculty in the program, we value the contributions of sessional and contract instructors. Permanent faculty provide coordination, leadership and substantial teaching, but it is not financially feasible to increase the level of full time faculty involvement at the moment. Because of its contributions to ITE, CTL is the largest department at OISE; its workload is similar to that of the other departments.

Teaching assignments are established annually through discussions among the CTL graduate program coordinators, the Chair of CTL, the Associate Dean–Teacher Education and the Associate Chair–Teacher Education. They must take into account both undergraduate and graduate programming needs. Currently faculty supervision of the practicum carries no workload credit. Practicum supervision is specified in contracts with non-permanent faculty. Permanent CTL faculty work out their responsibilities with the Chair and the Associate Dean–Teacher Education, trying to ensure that there is a connection between the practicum and the coursework in the program, while not overburdening faculty. Agreements have been reached, but the status of the practicum is under review.

Finally, we do not feel that teaching detracts from scholarship; as discussed in the section on Research, OISE is committed to a synergy between teaching and research, and we value both teaching and research.

4. In Summary

The tensions between serving the pre-service teacher education and graduate program commitments will persist in CTL as they do in all research intensive faculties of education. Managing them productively involves annual and multi-year program and staffing planning conversations between the Chair of CTL and the Associate Dean–Teacher Education.

As the reviewers point out, CTL has made “tremendous progress” in establishing a strong identity in the past five years and continues to make progress in establishing robust and stimulating graduate programming. It provides first-rate, cutting-edge leadership in OISE’s teacher education programs and supports knowledge generation, knowledge application and knowledge integration in the area of curriculum, teaching and learning.

The Department has adopted the recommendation of the reviewers to treat International Development Studies as a discipline and will incorporate this into its administrative and governance structures. The IDS program is in high demand, attracts high caliber students and faculty are committed to seeing it continue to succeed but it has been based on an unsustainable model. During the 2007-08 academic year, a task force was established to review the program, in particular the protocols for the safety of students on placement abroad and for admission to the program. The Task Force submitted its report in May 2008. Many areas of concern, including safety abroad and admission to the program, have been successfully resolved. Other issues, such as the curriculum, will be addressed as part of the ongoing resolution of departmental concerns.

With regard to the reviewers' comments on the student experience, we recognize that the reviewers had very limited opportunities to meet with students and based their comments about the student experience largely on a discussion with a small group. We regret that we were not able to bring together more students to meet with them. Unfortunately, such a small group of students cannot be considered a representative sample of the approximately 3,500 students enrolled in Social Sciences programs. There is a general sense among faculty that the students' comments do not reflect the general view of students in Social Science programs. On the basis of course evaluations, the standards of teaching in the Department are high, and many of the senior undergraduate students interact closely with faculty by serving as RAs, working as assistants on field projects, or taking supervised research and reading course. Nevertheless, we take their comments about the student experience very seriously and will continue to seek ways to improve it.

Following the development and adoption of UTSC Degree Level Expectations in 2008/09, this academic year UTSC is revising its degree and program requirements as well as developing guidelines for the review of academic programs. The Department of Social Sciences will be one of three Departments whose academic programs will be thoroughly reviewed and revised during the 2009/10 academic year. At that time, careful consideration will be given to the external reviewers comments regarding the Department's programs as well as to ensuring that course offerings are commensurate with resources available. The Department plans to introduce social science foundations courses and capstone courses that will significantly improve the student experience, as well as making all the programs more solid.

The reviewers noted that the Department has insufficient faculty to sustain current and planned needs. We concur. The campus as a whole has been operating under very constrained circumstances following a doubling of student enrolment over a time when resources increased at a substantially lower rate. Now, during this time of general constraint, UTSC is in the fortunate position of being able to hire additional faculty. Four additional faculty positions were added to the Department complement during the current year and we anticipate adding more faculty in the coming years. The Department is requesting an increase over the planning period of seventeen faculty, with twelve in the tenure-stream and five in the teaching-stream. Department plans are still under review and any increases in complement will be commensurate with available resources. We are committed to ensuring that no further growth in student enrollment occurs until the campus in general, and this Department in particular, has reached a sustainable platform.

REVIEW SUMMARY

| | |
|--|---|
| PROGRAM/UNIT DIVISION | Environmental Science and Technology Program Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough |
| DATE: | June 5-6, 2008 |
| COMMISSIONING OFFICER: | Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean |
| PROGRAMS OFFERED: Undergraduate | Offered jointly with Centennial College: Environmental Science and Technology, BSc |
| EXTERNAL REVIEWERS International Canadian | Dr. J. Buttle, Department of Geography, Trent University, Peterborough Dr. S. Liss, Department of Environmental Biology and Associate Vice-President for Research, University of Guelph, Guelph |
| PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE: | This is the first review of the program which was first offered in 2003-04. |
| DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS: | Terms of Reference Program Self Study Course materials and textbooks; Agreement on Academic Aspects of the Implementation of the Joint Program in Environmental Science and Technology (June 16, 2003) Program descriptions from UTSC Calendar and Centennial Calendar CVs of all faculty associated with the Program <i>Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units</i> |
| CONSULTATION PROCESS: | The review team met with students, faculty members and administration of the University of Toronto at Scarborough and Centennial College. At UTSC, the reviewers met with the Vice-Dean, the Chair of the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, the current UTSC Program Supervisor, and students of the Joint program. The reviewers toured the teaching and research facilities in the Physical and Environmental Sciences. At Centennial the reviewers met with faculty members, the Manager of the Centre for Innovation and the Chair, Applied Biological and Environmental Sciences. |

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The reviewers consider that the Joint Environmental Science and Technology Program offered by UTSC and Centennial College is a "valuable option for preparing graduates with a combination of key theoretical and practical skills to work in the environmental field. UTSC and Centennial College bring considerable strengths, expertise, and excellent facilities in support of environmental science education and training. The program operates well below its potential despite being generally embraced by both partners. UTSC and Centennial College are well positioned to brand the Scarborough campus they share as a leading centre for environmental science."

The reviewers noted the lack of coordination of the program on an academic and administrative level by both institutions and its faculty members, and make a number of recommendations to address these issues.

Quality of joint program

Demand for the program: The program does not seem to be in demand at either institution. It is undersubscribed and this is a great concern to faculty at UTSC and Centennial College who see it as a

unique and valuable program. Centennial College students who go on to obtain a university degree after receiving the college diploma and UTSC students who obtain a college diploma after their university degree appear to be obtaining professionally relevant work. The joint program appears to suit the needs of such students.

Quality of the students: Student quality is mixed. Some UTSC faculty expressed concern that Centennial College students who enter the program struggle with UTSC courses. It's unclear whether such students are a result of an articulation agreement rather than relating to students in the joint program. There are biases from faculty at both institutions regarding student performance but no real evidence of a problem

Appropriateness of the program's structure: The structure is sound on paper but the reviewers consider the program to be "bipartite" as opposed to joint in nature. The reviewers strongly support the program's emphasis on a strong background in chemistry. Course information provided to students is inconsistent at UTSC and more uniform at Centennial College. The reviewers recommend that attention be given to the expectations for undergraduate academic performance. Evaluation of the degree to which these courses are meeting students' academic needs is needed. Such evaluation needs interaction between UTSC and Centennial College faculty and a common curriculum committee for the joint program is recommended.

There should be focus on the use of modeling in the environmental sciences in upper year classes. This will address environmental issues and demonstrate the need for introductory calculus and physics. A capstone course that integrates student experience into the joint program should be advocated.

The reviewers recommend joint discussions between UTSC and Centennial College regarding the program's structure and ways to set it apart from the competition. UTSC's successful Masters of Environmental Science program could be used as a model to help promote "the joint program and cultivate interest amongst incoming undergraduates in it".

Level of achievement of students: Although evidence suggests that students who complete the joint program go on to graduate work, employment or further educational training in professional programs, there haven't been enough graduates to adequately assess this.

Quality of teaching: Centennial's emphasis on supporting students through the joint program is impressive as is UTSC's high level of teaching commitment in introductory sciences.

Scope of faculty members' involvement

Participation in teaching and delivery of the program: The reviewers observed that this is difficult to gauge at both institutions, as joint program courses are regularly taught by faculty at these institutions for non-joint programs as well. They recommended that greater "faculty engagement in the joint program (initially through internal promotion of the joint program and through a joint curriculum committee) might encourage discussions about revising the joint program structure.... It might identify material covered in one or more courses at one institution that could be addressed to a greater or lesser degree or from a different and complementary perspective in course material at the other institution."

The reviewers considered that course delivery is at an appropriate level; however, faculty at both UTSC and Centennial College indicated that they were not aware of which students in their courses were enrolled in the joint program. Bringing this to their attention might result in the inclusion of course material that was particularly relevant to the joint program students.

The extent to which research activities benefit students in the program: The reviewers saw no clear evidence of this and suggested that "setting aside summer research assistantships to support joint program students to work on joint research projects with UTSC and Centennial College faculty would be one way of establishing a link between teaching and research in the joint program." They recommended that the two institutions "explore the possibility of establishing a matching program (with monies from faculty research program and from each institution) to support student research projects, some of which might be done as part of a co-op or internship placement".

Scope and nature of the relationship between UTSC and Centennial College

UTSC's Program Supervisor and Centennial College's Program Coordinator are responsible for the operation of the joint program at each of the respective institutions. They have tried to sort out students' issues but there has been no attempt to have a meeting of UTSC and Centennial College faculty involved in program delivery since the programs inception. Faculty members from both institutions consider that a meeting is a good idea. Both "have expressed a commitment to the joint program, and UTSC has indicated they would support up to a 0.5 position to deal with administration of joint UTSC-Centennial College programs." The review team recommended that Centennial College contribute to this support in order to create a single full time equivalent position to administer all the joint programs.

Scope and nature of the program's connection to external government, academic and professional organizations.

Connection to external government, academic and professional organizations was deemed difficult to judge by the reviewer but could be enhanced by an internship or co-op program. How external interactions with the joint program take place is unclear. Existing contacts should be taken advantage of "as a means of marketing the joint program. Strategies for developing these linkages should be developed jointly by UTSC and Centennial College faculty, based on an effective faculty team that has developed around the joint program. Part of this issue relates to growing out the applied research work at Centennial College and taking advantage of expertise and capacity at both institutions."

The review team didn't feel they were in a position to judge the Program's social impact. More emphasis on promoting the joint program should be put in place. The Environmental Students Society at Centennial College could be a vehicle for such promotion.

Appropriateness and effectiveness of organizational, administrative, financial structures

Organizational structures: The reviewers considered that organizational structure was non-existent. The Environmental Students Society at Centennial College could be used to encourage cohesion. Library facilities at both schools are excellent and UTSC's undergraduate teaching labs are impressive.

Administrative structures: UTSC's Program Supervisor administers its joint program but receives no real compensation. A Program Coordinator administers the joint program at Centennial College and is allocated 4 hours per week for the program. They jointly review applications and agree on offers of admission to the joint program. Continuity on the part of the administration of both Centennial College and UTSC is needed to ensure "that articulation agreements related to this and other joint programs continue to function. An example of this commitment might be to encourage cross-teaching ... as part of course delivery in the joint program."

Financial structures: The lack of additional financial structures supporting the joint program could be improved by "greater promotion of the joint program, by commitment to student support for research, the development of program internships, etc."

Management and leadership: Leadership is lacking. A faculty "champion" is needed to focus on issues of academic leadership while joint administration of the program is needed. An online newsletter could assist communication between UTSC and Centennial College faculty and students regarding the joint program and its activities.

Morale of faculty, students and staff

Faculty at both institutions "generally support the joint program and feel that it provides a high-quality education in the environmental sciences; however, they are unclear as to why it is undersubscribed by students. Student morale seems very good."

Special challenges facing the joint program in relation to: complement planning; enrolment planning; development/fundraising initiatives; and management and leadership.

The challenges require attention from both institutions. The reviewers considered the key issues are administrative support for and academic leadership of the joint program; greater program promotion; possible accreditation and professionalization to increase the program profile. A curriculum review by

both institutions and its faculty members, may address some of the issues regarding ability to transfer some Centennial College course credits to UTSC.

Recommendations:

1. Establish enrolment targets with the goal to achieve this within a three year window. It is recommended that the steady-state intake be 24 students.
2. Establish a full time administrative coordinator to be jointly funded by UTSC and Centennial College to provide the necessary support for students in the program and to assist with promotion, clerical responsibilities and communication.
3. Provide adequate release for academic coordinators to be able to supply the required effort for curriculum review, student mentoring and recruitment, and encouraging faculty involvement in all aspects of the joint program (course delivery as well as participation in the activities noted in the subsequent recommendations).
4. Establish a joint curriculum committee comprising faculty members from both institutions and conduct a complete review of the curriculum structure, course content, and assessments for evaluating academic performance. Development of a capstone course is highly recommended.
5. Explore opportunities to participate in joint research and collaborative partnerships with industry.
6. Commit to incorporating co-op, internship and research opportunities in the program.
7. Incorporate opportunities for students to acquire professional designation(s) as environmental professionals.
8. Cultivate and expand student leadership opportunities for students in the joint program and integrate their involvement with other initiatives involving UTSC or Centennial College students in environmental science and technology programs.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE (Commissioning Officer)

The Dean is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions, which have helped to provide a clearer focus on the issues facing the program. Our partnership with Centennial College over the past five years has been a positive one. We remain mutually committed to advancing the excellence of our Joint Programs and to providing the very best learning experience for our students.

External reviews of all five of the UTSC-Centennial joint programs were conducted in tandem with a review of the Memorandum of Understanding between the two institutions, an agreement that was developed at the time that the joint programs were established. During the deliberations of the committee established to review the Memorandum, it became clear that certain common administrative issues needed addressing, in particular poor communication, registrarial difficulties, and insufficient contact between the two institutions. These issues were also raised in the program self studies and the reports of the external reviewers. We have developed a protocol for the academic administration of the programs, which we believe will enable us to administer and coordinate these programs better.

The protocol identifies three levels of oversight of the programs: 1) senior executive leadership will be provided by the Vice-President Academic at Centennial College and the Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean at UTSC; 2) operational leadership will be provided by a Steering Committee co-chaired by the Centennial College Dean of the School of Communications, Media and Design and the UT Scarborough Vice-Dean and with a membership that includes the Centennial Deans and UTSC Chairs (or designate) for each program, the Registrars and Directors of Marketing from both institutions and two students enrolled in a joint program, the Assistant Dean and the Joint Programs Administrative Coordinators; 3) leadership on the academic aspects of each Joint Program will be provided by the Dean of the Faculty (CC) and Chair of the Department (UTSC) where the programs reside and a joint program curriculum committee will be established for each program. In addition, there will be at least 0.5 FTE staff support (Joint Programs Administrative Coordinator) at each institution for general administrative support for the Joint Programs. Among other duties, the Coordinators will be responsible for communications with students, the creation and maintenance of a Joint Programs web site and a student Handbook.

The Steering Committee met for the first time in February. It arranged for groups of faculty from the two institutions to revise the curriculum of each program following the recommendations of the external reviewers and the findings of the self-studies. The groups will report to the Steering Committee at the end

of May 2009. As well, the Directors of Marketing will prepare a marketing plan by the end of May. This will include the preparation of brochures and other promotional materials for the fall recruitment events: the University and College Fairs. We expect that representatives from both our institutions will jointly attend the Fairs. The Joint Programs website at UTSC is currently being updated. Redesign of the websites at both UTSC and Centennial College will be part of the marketing plan.

Some external reviewers suggested that more effort be put toward collecting data and opinions from students (incoming and outgoing) regarding expectations, satisfaction, employment outcomes etc. We agree and see such feedback as a key means by which the programs can be progressively improved. Coordination of these activities will be added to the duties of the Joint Programs Administrative Coordinators. In consultation with Program Supervisors, the Coordinators will develop a formal and standardized questionnaire that can be used for each of the joint programs. Such data will be centrally collected and distributed on an annual basis to all units involved with the joint programs.

Response to Specific Recommendations

1. An intake target of at least 24 students has been set. To achieve this target will require more effort in recruiting. The University and Centennial College are undertaking active promotion of all the joint programs. The Department of Physical & Environmental Sciences and Centennial College are participating in a pilot project with ECO Canada (the Environmental Careers Organization of Canada) and two Toronto high schools to promote environmental science elements in the high school curriculum, leading ultimately to a "major stream" in the curriculum. If successful, this should expand to include all high schools and will form an excellent basis for program promotion.
2. See response above.
3. The Department of Physical & Environmental Sciences is seeking authorization to search for a late career environmental practitioner to join the department as lecturer. One of the responsibilities of this person would be to oversee the Joint Program and to provide the professional perspective on program content. Such a person would also provide a stronger connection to industry.
4. See response above. The curriculum revision group will explicitly consider the recommendation of a capstone core course for the program.
- 5&6. The Joint Program is now "co-op-able". Summer research opportunities will continue to be promoted among the students and faculty. Students in the Joint Program have the opportunity to compete for NSERC Summer Research Fellowships as do all students in the department.
7. The Department is working with ECO Canada on a Canada-wide accreditation process for environmental programs at Canadian colleges and universities. The Department Chair serves on the advisory board for this initiative. It is expected that the Joint Program will be amongst the first programs accredited through this process.
8. The Departmental Student Association is an organization that has been proactively involved in department activities. Its current president is a Joint Program student. Such involvement will continue to be encouraged in the future.

REVIEW SUMMARY

| | |
|---|--|
| PROGRAM/UNIT DIVISION | Industrial Microbiology Department of Biological Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough |
| DATE: | April 28-29, 2008 |
| COMMISSIONING OFFICER: | Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean |
| PROGRAMS OFFERED: Undergraduate | Offered jointly with Centennial College: Industrial Microbiology, BSc |
| EXTERNAL REVIEWERS | |
| International | Prof. Owen Ward, B.Sc. (Biochemistry) 1970, Ph.D. (Industrial Microbiology) 1973, National University of Ireland. |
| Canadian | Robert G. White P. Eng., CMC, B.A.Sc., (Civil Engineering) University of Toronto 1969, MBA University of Toronto 1985 |
| PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE: | This is the first review of the program which was first offered in 2003-04. |
| DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS: | Terms of reference Program Self Study Program descriptions from UTSC Calendar and Centennial Calendar CVs of all faculty associated with Program Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units |
| CONSULTATION PROCESS: | The review team met with students, faculty members and administration of the University of Toronto at Scarborough and Centennial College. At UTSC, the reviewers met with the Vice-Dean, the Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences, the current UTSC Program Supervisor, and students of the joint program. The reviewers toured the teaching and research facilities in the Biological Sciences. At Centennial, the reviewers met with the Chair, Applied Biological and Environmental Sciences, the current Centennial Program Supervisor, and faculty members. |

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The Joint Specialist Program in Industrial Microbiology allows students to earn a four year Honours B.Sc. by taking courses as University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) and Centennial College. Students qualify for the Ontario Advanced Diploma in Biotechnology Technologist-Industrial Microbiology from Centennial College. The program meets the requirements of the Canadian Council of Technicians and Technologists (CCTT) and receives national accreditation status by the Canadian Technology Accreditation Board (CTAB).

The reviewers reported that the program "combines theory with technical practice, providing many opportunities for students to enhance their hands-on experience. The UTSC courses provide theoretical and academic depth in biology (ecology, physiology, cell and molecular biology) while also giving opportunity for a broad educational experience by the taking of elective courses. The Centennial College courses provide invaluable applied and practical experience in various aspects of microbiology, with an emphasis on project work that develops skills in research, laboratory techniques, report writing and presentation."

The reviewers concluded that the "program is conceptually sound with the potential to provide students with an outstanding academic, experiential learning and personal development experience and to deliver graduates who are highly competitive for careers in the private and public sector and as postgraduate research students." They strongly encouraged both institutions to consider their recommendations in order to address the program's challenges and improve its delivery. The review team recommended the

creation of the Oversight Inter-institutional Board (OIB) to oversee all the joint programs including common issues, administration and academic matters. Separate boards could support the OIB for each program.

The reviewers addressed the terms of reference with respect to the quality of the program, scope of faculty member involvement, institutional relationships and other matters.

Quality of the program

There is a low demand for the program due to lack of promotion and communication with potential students and employers. The program has lower admission criteria than UTSC programs. The reviewers identified several specific issues related to pre-requisites, grading, laboratory courses. The reviewers recommended engaging faculty to define learning objectives and create a development path matched by courses. The reviewers also identified specific matters related to the program's structure and curriculum.

The reviewers suggested the development of bridging programs to help students enter and progress through the program; organize sessions for UTSC and Centennial faculty and students to better understand and recognize the value of the college process of education, and have faculty develop a grade comparing mechanism. Cross-teaching opportunities should be identified by the two institutions, as well as a program champion at each institution. UTSC faculty should get involved in evaluating the college learning process and UTSC and Centennial faculty should work together to review and improve the evaluation and examination process as well as a "universal mechanism to evaluate quality of teaching" in the program.

Scope of faculty members' involvement in the program

The reviewers reported a lack of cross-training of faculty between the two institutions. Again, involving the faculty from both institutions in the development of the program's learning objectives and a developmental path for students was recommended by the reviewers to increase faculty awareness and involvement in the program. The reviewers did not comment on how the faculty members' research activities benefit the students in the program.

The nature of the relationship between the two institutions

The reviewers noted several institutional administrative matters that were identified as issues such as exam scheduling and lack of awareness of each other's courses and objectives. The development of a joint oversight board for all the joint programs was recommended by the reviewers. They recommended the development and implementation of policies and procedures to manage the program process and a process to measure the performance of administration and report back to the institutions.

Scope and nature of the program's connection to external government, academic and professional organizations.

The reviewers considered that the scope and nature of the program were not clearly defined. Again, engagement of students, faculty and employers should result in the development of clear expectations as well as performance measures.

Appropriateness and effectiveness of the organizational, administrative and financial structures

The reviewers reported many difficulties for the joint programs as related to registration, course setting, communication, lack of clear program manager/champion (rather than program coordinator), calendaring, pre-requisites, lack of community for students and faculty, assignment of credits, course lists, and grading confusion. The program is not managed well.

Morale of faculty, staff and students.

There is no sense of ownership and UTSC faculty members do not appear to see the benefits or be committed to the program. There are mixed and at times, negative, feeling for the program both in terms of its objectives, administration and perceived benefits. There is a lack of appreciation for the objectives of the educational experience at each other's institution. The reviewers reiterated the need faculty to be engaged to articulate a shared vision and agree on objectives and performance indicators. Morale could be improved through articulated demonstration of student and graduate success.

Reviewers reported a lack of vision and strategy for the program, lack of enrolment and program planning, lack of awareness of the program and buy-in from faculty and staff.

The reviewers summarized the overall issues for the joint program and presented recommendations:

Lack of a shared vision and commitment of faculty and staff

The reviewers found a lack of shared vision on the parts of the program faculty members. They found the faculty members were not engaged in defining and planning the program's impact on students, faculty, administrative staff, employers, the community, and the two institutions. There was a lack of process on several levels: to achieve a collaborative relationship; to engage stakeholders to understand expectations; to measure the program's performance and report it to stakeholders; to improve process and the program against stakeholders' expectations, and to engage administrative staff in order to understand their expectations. There is a lack of awareness of the need for an effective "win-win relationship" between Centennial College and UTSC. A mechanism to engage faculty in program evaluation and improvement against stakeholders' expectations is wanting. Incentives are lacking for faculty from one school to teach at another.

The development of a "mission that recognizes that inter-institutional and interdisciplinary programs in general have the potential to be highly competitive in attracting the best students and delivering graduates who can be highly competitive in the new technology/global economy" should be developed by the two institutions. Faculty and staff should be engaged to articulate this shared vision and program objectives.

Lack of faculty and staff involvement in Program and Program Design

The reviewers found that UTSC faculty lack understanding and recognition of the value of the college process in education. They lack engagement to ensure "buy-in" for the program and make contributions to course content based on needs and the learning process. Broad faculty involvement was required in order to identify graduates' and employers' needs, in defining learning objectives, development path and identification of courses or bridging courses to meet objectives, and in the program's design and delivery. There was lack of participation on the part of the administration in program design and the identification of roles and responsibilities to ensure success.

Students' needs not identified and addressed

Reviewers noted the lack of clearly identified needs of graduates and employers of graduates; of defined learning objectives and development path matched by courses; of bridging programs for students and potential students to enter and progress through the program. Students lack understanding of the differences and value the process of university and college educational paths.

Lack of promotion/marketing of the joint program

The reviewers reported a lack of marketing strategy to promote the program to students and employers, and lack of communication with students, faculty and employers on the program's value. The program is considered a "well kept secret" and a greater number of students are required to ensure the viability of the program. The reviewers concluded that employers do not understand the programs credentials. The reviewers recommended that a program marketing strategy be developed and implemented in order to ensure students and potential students and employers are aware of the program.

Inadequate Program administration

The reviewers noted a lack of an effective method to evaluate the program's teaching quality. A lack of clearly defined relationships between the two institutions was identified as was the lack of policies and procedures to manage the program process between UTSC and Centennial College to avoid negative impacts on students and faculty. The program evaluation does not include a mechanism to compare grades in UTSC with those at Centennial. A process to continually improve the administrative process and program is lacking.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE (Commissioning Officer)

The Dean is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions, which have helped to provide a clearer focus on the issues facing the program. Our partnership with Centennial College over the past five years has been a positive one. We remain mutually committed to advancing the excellence of our Joint Programs and to providing the very best learning experience for our students.

External reviews of all five of the UTSC-Centennial joint programs were conducted in tandem with a review of the Memorandum of Understanding between the two institutions, an agreement that was developed at the time that the joint programs were established. During the deliberations of the committee established to review the Memorandum, it became clear that certain common administrative issues needed addressing, in particular poor communication, registrarial difficulties, and insufficient contact between the two institutions. These issues were also raised in the program self studies and the reports of the external reviewers. We have developed a protocol for the academic administration of the programs, which we believe will enable us to administer and coordinate these programs better.

The protocol identifies three levels of oversight of the programs: 1) senior executive leadership will be provided by the Vice-President Academic at Centennial College and the Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean at UTSC; 2) operational leadership will be provided by a Steering Committee co-chaired by the Centennial College Dean of the School of Communications, Media and Design and the UT Scarborough Vice-Dean and with a membership that includes the Centennial Deans and UTSC Chairs (or designate) for each program, the Registrars and Directors of Marketing from both institutions and two students enrolled in a joint program, the Assistant Dean and the Joint Programs Administrative Coordinators; 3) leadership on the academic aspects of each Joint Program will be provided by the Dean of the Faculty (CC) and Chair of the Department (UTSC) where the programs reside and a joint program curriculum committee will be established for each program. In addition, there will be at least 0.5 FTE staff support (Joint Programs Administrative Coordinator) at each institution for general administrative support for the Joint Programs. Among other duties, the Coordinators will be responsible for communications with students, the creation and maintenance of a Joint Programs web site and a student Handbook.

The Steering Committee met for the first time in February. It arranged for groups of faculty from the two institutions to revise the curriculum of each program following the recommendations of the external reviewers and the findings of the self-studies. The groups will report to the Steering Committee at the end of May. As well, the Directors of Marketing will prepare a marketing plan by the end of May. This will include the preparation of brochures and other promotional materials for the fall recruitment events: the University and College Fairs. We expect that representatives from both our institutions will jointly attend the Fairs. The Joint Programs website at UTSC is currently being updated. Redesign of the websites at both UTSC and Centennial College will be part of the marketing plan.

Some external reviewers suggested that more effort be put toward collecting data and opinions from students (incoming and outgoing) regarding expectations, satisfaction, employment outcomes etc. We agree and see such feedback as a key means by which the programs can be progressively improved. Coordination of these activities will be added to the duties of the Joint Programs Administrative Coordinators. In consultation with Program Supervisors, the Coordinators will develop a formal and standardized questionnaire that can be used for each of the joint programs. Such data will be centrally collected and distributed on an annual basis to all units involved with the joint programs.

With regard to the Industrial Microbiology program, the reviewers noted the lack of a shared vision and a lack of commitment to the program among UTSC faculty. These are valid observations that reflect the sentiments expressed in the self-study document:

"The joint program was not initiated at the grass-roots level of any UTSC department. Further, it involves two institutions, is administered at UTSC by the Department of Biological Sciences and has a UTSC program supervisor who is a faculty member within the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences. Further, the number of students within the program is very small. All of these factors contribute to a sense that the program lacks ownership, leadership and worth. ... Presumably, the lack of ownership / leadership has also allowed problems associated with course offerings and program structure (see above) to persist."

In view of the sense that the program lacks ownership as well as the low enrolment in the program, it is clear that careful consideration must be given to reshaping the program, refocusing the curriculum and finding the appropriate departmental fit for the program. To this end, conversations have begun with the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, where there are faculty members who would be interested in the program with an emphasis on Environmental Microbiology. Centennial College is open to such a repositioning. In the coming months the curriculum revision group will consider whether changes to the curriculum are feasible, keeping in mind the points raised by the reviewers and the self-study of the program. If there is general agreement to move ahead in this direction, the Steering Committee will oversee the redesign of the program with full participation and support of faculty at both UTSC and Centennial College. If no solution can be found, UTSC and Centennial College will consider the possibility of closing the program.

REVIEW SUMMARY

| | |
|--|---|
| PROGRAM/UNIT DIVISION | Journalism and New Media Studies Programs Department of Humanities and Department of Social Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough |
| DATE: | May 15-16, 2008 |
| COMMISSIONING OFFICER: | Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean |
| PROGRAMS OFFERED: Undergraduate | Offered jointly with Centennial College: Journalism, BA: Spec New Media Studies, BA: Maj |
| EXTERNAL REVIEWERS International Canadian | Jim Cunningham, Instructor, School of Journalism at SAIT Polytechnic, Calgary, Alberta Dr. Mary Lynn Young, Director, Graduate School of Journalism, University of British Columbia |
| PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE: | This is the first review of the program which was first offered in 2003-04. |
| DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS: | Terms of Reference Sample course materials/course outlines for Journalism and New Media Studies and for Journalism and Interactive Digital Media Program Self Study Program descriptions from UTSC Calendar and Centennial Calendar CVs of UTSC and Centennial faculty associated with the Joint Programs <i>Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units</i> |
| CONSULTATION PROCESS: | The reviewers met with students, faculty members and administration of the University of Toronto Scarborough and Centennial College. At UTSC the reviewers met with the Vice-Dean, Chairs of the Department of Humanities and the Department of Social Sciences, the current Joint Program Supervisors, and students of the Joint programs. At Centennial they met with the Dean, School of Communications, Media and Design, the Program Supervisors, and faculty members. |

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The reviewers provided a brief overview of journalism and new media studies in Canada and North America, noting that these areas of scholarship present "significant challenges for educators" in that the "combination of an evolving media landscape driven by the rise of digital media and the increase in the number of college and university programs as well as degrees in journalism and new media have made it important for people in individual programs to remain both current and competitive".

The reviewers had greater input for the Journalism program and were told less of the potential of the New Media program. They observed that both joint programs lack "clearly articulated learning outcomes", a functioning governance structure, and resources. They recommended that in order to achieve their potential, both programs "must be reorganized around a strategic vision that builds on the strengths of its faculty and institutions. This vision must also address significant leadership, communication and resource challenges at the program level."

In the reviewers opinion, there is a "genuine opportunity" for UTSC in the area of diversity and global media, and critical journalism studies as these areas have been underdeveloped in Canada, noting that: "It is our considered judgment that no other post-secondary program in the country has the combined academic and applied expertise to execute such a sustained contribution to global media studies. Some competitive institutions offer courses in diversity or international journalism. However, they do not have

the resources to do it on the same scale as would a combined University of Toronto-Centennial partnership.”

However, the reviewers did not have the same view for the New Media program as it lacks a specific focus with no learning outcomes. Although the two faculty members who teach and manage the program, one at each institution, are enthusiastic, the reviewers concluded that they “did not clearly identify an area in which they could make a significant contribution to education in this area that would create a distinct presence in an already over-crowded area. They also do not have the resources nor do they have the number of students to sustain a robust program in this area”. They recommended that a working group be established to move the program forward, subject to a curriculum review.

Both institutions have dedicated facilities and/or faculty members to the program for the Journalism program. The same is not the case for the New Media Studies program. For both programs, however, the reviewers concluded that: “Leadership is one of the key voids in both programs and needs to be addressed, through structural change at the program level and explicit commitment and support from senior administrators.”

The reviewers recommended that the student experience must be a priority and a key focus. Prospective students should be better informed about the nature of the program, as well as the “competing bureaucratic structures that need to be satisfied” in order for students to find their way through the joint programs. The reviewers noted that the expectations of the students in the programs are evolving with a growing demand for “experiential” learning. They commended the co-op component of the programs, although they considered that both programs are “too industry and institutionally focused limiting their ability to see student needs as integral to their mission”.

Journalism program

The reviewers provide an overview of the history for the program's establishment. Enrolment in the program is “healthy”, with annual intakes of 25-30 students per year. They report that student retention is good.

The reviewers highlighted issues relating to program structure and design, administration, communication and student issues. “Extremely limited contact” between UTSC and Centennial has resulted in problems for faculty, staff and students. For example, Centennial faculty members with whom the reviewers met were unaware that UTSC had developed and implemented two new first-year journalism courses. Most of the faculty members had not met faculty from the other institution, “despite teaching in the program for five years”. Faculty members had not visited each others’ institutions. Program co-ordinators at each institution dealt “almost exclusively with their counterparts and had little or no experience with the senior administrators at the other institution”. In terms of the curriculum, the reviewers recommended that course material taught at the institutions in all four years of the degree program should be integrated. The reviewers reported several issues with facilities, recommending that consideration should be given to moving courses currently offered at Centennial HP Centre to the Centennial Communications Centre campus in order to have the appropriate level of space for students.

Some issues are related to “cultural differences” between the institutions: “At a deeper level, faculty at the respective schools have had and continue to have significant questions and concerns, even resentments, with the learning approach taken by the other group. On evaluation of student performance, for example, faculty at UTSC indicated a concern with “quality control” and the rigor of the program at Centennial. Centennial faculty appeared to be aware of this criticism but defended it on the grounds that, in their view, the main learning outcome of the program should be that graduates were able to “get a job” upon completing their studies. A number of Centennial faculty members also suggested that their approach to Journalism education, which involves an applied or apprenticeship model of learning, was marginalized by counterparts at UTSC.”

The reviewers concluded that the lack of engagement by faculty and administrators is “reflected in a bifurcated and disconnected approach to teaching Journalism that separates the conceptual and theoretical frameworks from skill development”. Although there is some appreciation for the goals of the other institution, the reviewers noted that there are significant differences in the approach to instructional methods and goals: “little has been done to breach the walls which separate them to allow joint problem solving and a sharing of perspectives and objectives to occur”. This distance impacts results in students seeing these differences as a “significant problem

that they must overcome if they are to be successful". The reviewers recommended that "formal mechanisms be introduced to create clear lines of communication between both institutions moving forward".

Aware of the challenges in teaching Journalism at a research institution and that teacher training at applied institutions is often an issue because Schools of Journalism tend to rely on practitioners who are balancing career demands and part-time teaching loads, the reviewers recommended that "the training and expectations for teaching professionalism of instructors at Centennial College be examined and improved moving forward".

There is no dedicated program co-ordinator. Faculty members have had to become ad hoc co-ordinators and manage students' issues such as overcrowding, evaluation and availability of instructors. The reviewers recommended that a co-ordinator for the program be designated. The co-ordinator should report to the administrations of UTSC and Centennial for the performance of the program relative to its goals and objectives, and for the operation of the program. The selection process should be conducted jointly by both institutions.

There is no clear, overarching vision for the joint program: "The lack of such a vision for the Centennial-UTSC joint program has not prevented the program from functioning to date but it may be the root of the program's problems. And the lack of such a vision may well hamper future growth of the program and prevent it from capitalizing on the evident strengths of its institutional partners and environment." The reviewers recommended that the institutions develop clear learning objectives and a strategic vision for the program. This should be undertaken with the "full involvement of all program faculty from both institutions, current students and alumni, administration from both institutions and the program co-ordinator. ...[E]mphasis should be given to defining a vision that can capitalize on the strengths of the two institutions, such as the cultural diversity of the communities they serve, and that takes account of other Journalism programs in Ontario and throughout Canada."

New Media Studies program

Aside from its success as an incubator for new media talent and a good placement track record for graduates, the reviewers heard little about the potential of the New Media Studies program. They reported that students "do not understand what the program or its portfolio requirements entails". There are only two faculty members, one at each institution, attached to the program. Enrolment in the program is not robust. The reviewers considered that the "program lacks intellectual rigor and rationale, as well as dedicated personnel". They recommended that a joint task force or working group should be appointed "to determine the most appropriate way forward in terms of focus if a commitment to continue this program is made on the part of senior administration" adding that a "significant commitment and exploration of appropriate focus be initiated before making any structural changes" within the program. The group should consider that programs of this nature require significant equipment costs and resource allocation. The program could benefit from links to the Knowledge Media Design Institute, at the UofT's St. George campus.

The reviewers observed that "less cultural tension exists between applied practitioners and research faculty identified in this program, which suggests an easier way forward on the institutional level, if a marriage between the two institutions on this substantive area is going to prove productive."

The reviewers reported that UTSC "appears to have a vision for a revitalized New Media Studies program that involves moving the program to Humanities from its current home in the Social Sciences". The reviewers considered it "intriguing to consider combining a focus on culture/arts with New Media Studies, effectively situating it outside of its traditional science and technology studies or applied training approach." The reviewers recommended UTSC consider transferring the New Media Studies joint program from its current home in the Department of Social Sciences to the Department of Humanities.

The reviewers observed that some staff "appear low on morale citing years of limited support and lack of resources that has resulted in a stagnant curriculum, which is problematic in such a dynamic field as New Media Studies."

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE (Commissioning Officer)

The Dean is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions, which have helped to provide a clearer focus on the issues facing these programs. Our partnership with Centennial College over the past five years has been a positive one. We remain mutually committed to advancing the excellence of our Joint Programs and to providing the very best learning experience for our students.

External reviews of all five of the UTSC-Centennial joint programs were conducted in tandem with a review of the Memorandum of Understanding between the two institutions, an agreement that was developed at the time that the joint programs were established. During the deliberations of the committee established to review the Memorandum, it became clear that certain common administrative issues needed addressing, in particular poor communication, registrarial difficulties, and insufficient contact between the two institutions. These issues were also raised in the program self studies and the reports of the external reviewers. We have developed a protocol for the academic administration of the programs, which we believe will enable us to administer and coordinate these programs better.

The protocol identifies three levels of oversight of the programs: 1) senior executive leadership will be provided by the Vice-President Academic at Centennial College and the Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean at UTSC; 2) operational leadership will be provided by a Steering Committee co-chaired by the Centennial College Dean of the School of Communications, Media and Design and the UT Scarborough Vice-Dean and with a membership that includes the Centennial Deans and UTSC Chairs (or designate) for each program, the Registrars and Directors of Marketing from both institutions and two students enrolled in a joint program, the Assistant Dean and the Joint Programs Administrative Coordinators; 3) leadership on the academic aspects of each Joint Program will be provided by the Dean of the Faculty (CC) and Chair of the Department (UTSC) where the programs reside and a joint program curriculum committee will be established for each program. In addition, there will be at least 0.5 FTE staff support (Joint Programs Administrative Coordinator) at each institution for general administrative support for the Joint Programs. Among other duties, the Coordinators will be responsible for communications with students, the creation and maintenance of a Joint Programs web site and a student Handbook.

The Steering Committee met for the first time in February. It arranged for groups of faculty from the two institutions to revise the curriculum of each program following the recommendations of the external reviewers and the findings of the self-studies. The groups will report to the Steering Committee at the end of May. As well, the Directors of Marketing will prepare a marketing plan by the end of May. This will include the preparation of brochures and other promotional materials for the fall recruitment events: the University and College Fairs. We expect that representatives from both our institutions will jointly attend the Fairs. The Joint Programs website at UTSC is currently being updated. Redesign of the websites at both UTSC and Centennial College will be part of the marketing plan.

Some external reviewers suggested that more effort be put toward collecting data and opinions from students (incoming and outgoing) regarding expectations, satisfaction, employment outcomes etc. We agree and see such feedback as a key means by which the programs can be progressively improved. Coordination of these activities will be added to the duties of the Joint Programs Administrative Coordinators. In consultation with Program Supervisors, the Coordinators will develop a formal and standardized questionnaire that can be used for each of the joint programs. Such data will be centrally collected and distributed on an annual basis to all units involved with the joint programs.

Journalism

Contact between the Coordinator at Centennial and the Program Supervisor at UTSC is now regular and positive and includes frequent informational updates, invitations for students and faculty to participate in events at both campuses, and "joint program solving" – concerns are now addressed and resolved quickly. Two joint meetings per academic year have been scheduled for faculty at both institutions, and the first meeting (held at the downtown Centennial campus in the fall) was immediately beneficial and marked an encouraging beginning to the regular "sharing of perspectives and objectives".

The joint program in Journalism continues to hold "tremendous potential". The program has been strengthened through significant curricular changes over the past year. The Department of Humanities

has introduced a Media Studies program which will be offered for the first time in 2009-10. The Media Studies program is an innovative, interdisciplinary program that combines media theories with critical practices in culture and journalism. It is engaged with the creative analysis, production, and research into traditional and emerging forms of media. Students in the media studies program explore the origins, structures and implications of contemporary media in light of general concerns about technology, culture, society and politics. In addition, the Department of Humanities is committed to stimulating fruitful conversations with other disciplines and considering how media shapes knowledge from philosophical, historical, literary, and artistic perspectives.

With the explicit support of the Dean and faculty at Centennial College, the joint programs in Journalism and New Media will benefit from the resources allocated to this new program as well as the strengths of the faculty at the University of Toronto Scarborough. There will be more cross-listing of courses between Journalism and New Media within the Media Studies program and many of the new courses offered in the Media Studies program will become required or elective courses for students in the joint programs. In order to accommodate new program requirements into the Journalism program, some previous breadth requirements have been eliminated, thereby creating a more "strategic vision" of the program that addresses diversity, global media and critical journalism.

Steps have also been taken to "integrate course material taught at the two institutions". For example, to better prepare the students for the professional courses at Centennial College taken in third year, the CP Style Book will be introduced in the UTSC second-year course Fundamentals of Journalistic Writing. In addition, first-year textbooks will be changed to be more in line with those used at Centennial and consideration is being given to moving Law and Ethics from Centennial College to UTSC. Doing so will make room for a new course at Centennial College (for example, Online Journalism). Consideration is also being given to offering senior seminar courses in fourth year at UTSC that would build on the knowledge and experience students will have gained during their studies at Centennial College, as well as offering a second radio broadcasting course at Centennial College. In this course, students would produce and host a radio show at the University of Toronto's campus community radio station (CIUT), thereby utilizing the existing facilities at one institution for a course taught at the other.

In response to the external reviewers comments about "training and expectations for teaching professionalism of instructors at Centennial College" we intend to work with the UTSC Centre for Teaching and Learning to share syllabi (and learning outcomes, rubrics, assignments, etc.) in a closed system for teaching development, and jointly develop a set of standards and instructor training for all sessional faculty members involved with the program. The anticipated outcomes would include: greater understanding between and among those teaching at the two institutions, transparency and consistency of methods and approaches, the development of shared expectations, more consistently rigorous assessment of student performance appropriate to a limited-enrolment professional program at the University of Toronto Scarborough and a simplified and supported transition for students from one institutional culture to another

There have also been other efforts to ensure that students are "better informed about the nature of the program they are entering as well as the competing bureaucratic structures that need to be satisfied". Beyond continuing what has always been done – joint presentations at recruitment events and in the first-year class, for example – we are also working with the Centennial Coordinator to develop a "welcome package" for students entering their third year (and thus beginning their time at the college), and have invited the Coordinator and other Centennial faculty to address and answer questions posed by the students in the JOUB02 course at the end of this semester (as almost all of them will be heading to Centennial in the fall). We are also in the process of rewriting the content for the Journalism website and will both strengthen the Frequently Asked Questions area and include additional information related specifically to the unique nature of the program.

Recognizing that the facilities at the HP Centre are inadequate, we are planning to move courses currently offered at the HP Centre to the Centre for Creative Communications (CCC). Because Centennial College will need to expand their facilities at the CCC to accommodate all of the programs taught there, our target date is set for the 2011-12 academic year.

New Media Studies

The New Media Studies program has been moved from the Department of Social Sciences to the Department of Humanities, where it has already benefited from a close alliance with the newly created

Media Studies program and the Journalism program. This move was recommended by the reviewers. However, instead of combining the Journalism and New Media Studies program as suggested, both programs are now structured as major streams in a newly created Media Studies program, an umbrella program that also includes Cinema and Visual Studies. The Media Studies program was approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs in January 2009. This organization is intended to address a main concern expressed by the reviewers, who found that students are "increasingly asking institutions to examine media in more complex and critical ways. At the same time, both programs are too industry and institutionally focused limiting their ability to see student needs as integral to their mission." Within the Media Studies program, the theoretical elements will be strengthened and the professional components of both reinforced. Students will also have a greater choice of media courses that will enable them to create their own paths towards careers in media related fields.

In the coming year, the New Media Studies curriculum will be reviewed at the same time as all other joint programs are reviewed. Close attention will be given to strengthening the academic rigour and focus of the program. This process will be guided by the Joint Programs Steering Committee, the Dean of the School of Communications, Media and Design and the Chair of the Department of Humanities. Work has begun on the development of the overall learning objectives and strategic vision for the program. A strategic vision for the program is indeed critical, since the program has the potential to fill a major void in the Eastern end of Toronto, providing a hub for new media learning and production as well as community and industry connections. But much community building and resource development remains to be done.

Consideration is being given to the external reviewers' recommendation that students at both institutions should be interviewed and followed for outcome measures at least over the next 3 years in order to provide systematic research on the efficacy of each program. At this stage, it is not entirely clear how such a recommendation can be implemented, but it will be fully explored by the New Media Studies Program and Curriculum Committee in the coming year.

REVIEW SUMMARY

| | |
|--|--|
| PROGRAM/UNITY DIVISION | Paramedicine Program Department of Biological Science, University of Toronto Scarborough |
| DATE: | June 2-3, 2008 |
| COMMISSIONING OFFICER: | Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean |
| PROGRAMS OFFERED: Undergraduate | Offered jointly with Centennial College: Paramedicine, BSc |
| EXTERNAL REVIEWERS International Canadian | Mr. Richard Poon, EMT-P, Med., Paramedic Program, School of Health Sciences, Northern Alberta Institute of Alberta Prof. Thomas W. Moon, Department of Biology, University of Ottawa |
| PREVIOUS REVIEW DATE: | This is the first review of the program which was first offered in 2003-04. |
| DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS: | Terms of Reference Joint Paramedicine Program Self-Study, March 2008 Program descriptions from UTSC Calendar and Centennial Calendar CVs of all faculty associated with the Joint Program <i>Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units</i> |
| CONSULTATION PROCESS: | The reviewers met with students, faculty members and administration of the University of Toronto at Scarborough and Centennial College. At UTSC, the reviewers met with the Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean, the Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences, the current UTSC Program Supervisor, and students of the Joint Program. The reviewers toured the teaching and research facilities in Biological Sciences and at the Centennial HP Centre. At Centennial the reviewers met with the Dean, School of Community and Health Sciences, the Chair, Health and Wellness Studies, the current Program Supervisor, and faculty members. |

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - OVERALL ASSESSMENT AND SPECIFIC ISSUES:

The reviewers consider that the joint paramedicine program has potential improvements in various areas are necessary. They reported a perception amongst current faculty members and administration that the joint paramedicine program was imposed onto the two institutions without consideration of faculty member input or consultations. The reviewers proposed several recommendations for improving the quality and delivery of the program, as well as increasing communication and collaboration between UTSC and Centennial College.

Program strengths and issues

The joint program has several strengths that should be "recognized and further strengthened".

- The program is a "proactive move" by both institutions to advance the field of Paramedicine; other health professions are moving towards a degree credential.
- Faculty members at both institutions are committed to teaching excellence.
- The majority of interviewed faculty members are supportive of the program and are open to meeting its objectives.
- The excellent educational resources and faculty members are ideal for program delivery in terms of both the curriculum and the facilities.

- Students interviewed were “very positive of the outcome of their education but their journey was at times rough”.
- The UTSC and Centennial program coordinators are active in addressing some of the student concerns and issues.
- Faculty and administration are committed to improving the program components to ensure its success

The reviewers considered that several issues will need to be addressed:

Marketing and promotion: There has been no marketing or promotion of the program, contributing to the program’s low enrolment. Reviewers expressed concern over UTSC’s lack of awareness of the Paramedicine Profession, the absence of the program’s statement of goals, and the lack of information of future advancement of the program graduates. There is an inadequate description and presence for the program both in the printed calendar and on the UTSC web site. Until recently, representatives from both institutions were not jointly attending recruitment fairs. Only one institution attended leading to situations where prospective students’ questions could not be adequately addressed.

UTSC faculty and administrators are “unaware of the levels of the Paramedicine Profession in Ontario, e.g. Primary Care Paramedic (PCP), Advanced Care Paramedic (ACP) and Critical Care Paramedic (CCP). Each of these levels has a National and Provincial regulated scope of practice, knowledge base and set of competencies. Without this knowledge it would be difficult to communicate to potential students or to assist students already in the program. Also this knowledge would help faculty develop rationale and application linkages to the UTSC curricula. Currently the UTSC BSc Paramedicine program produces a Paramedic at the PCP level... The students interviewed definitely indicated a desire to obtain ACP level training and certification sometime after graduation from the PCP program offered by the UTSC-CCC paramedicine program. The significance of this point has been missed in the marketing of this program and should be used as a key marketing tool. It was not noted in any of the promotional material of how the BSc could help prepare the graduate for ACP training.”

The reviewers concluded marketing and promotion of the program needs to be improved. They suggested three potential groups that should be targeted for student recruitment: high school students, first year UTSC science students, and non-degree Centennial PCP graduates. Each group has specific needs that should be considered when a promotional strategy is considered. Information sessions and web site information should be tailored for these groups. Overall:

- The value added aspect of the joint program must be brought to the attention of students, as well as how the program prepares students for the ACP level.
- Data need to be obtained from employers and other students as to whether there is a benefit to employment for UTSC grads.
- Students entering the program should be surveyed as to why they selected UTSC over other Ontario PCP schools.

Program ‘Major’: There is a question of whether a Biology major is most appropriate for paramedic students. This issue arises in part because of the changes to the Department of Life Sciences (now separated into two departments: Biological Science and Psychology) and whether paramedicine students can meet course requirements for a Biology major. As well, students had difficulty in enrolling into and completing some of the higher-year Biology courses because of prerequisites and sequencing of courses. The reviewers suggest that Human Biology, Psychology and Neuroscience Program majors should each be considered as alternative majors.

Program Progression: There is a concern that students are not completing the program in four years, with the fourth year being completed over several years.

Some at UTSC consider this to result from the fact that students can receive a PCP certificate and work for Emergency Medical Services (EMS) full or part time at the end of year three. If students do so, it can become difficult to focus on both school and work matters. As many as two-thirds of the UTSC students take summer courses in order to complete the degree in three years. It has been suggested that year 3 of the Program (the PCP diploma part of the Program - Centennial’s curricula) should be protracted across

years 3 and 4. The reviewers concluded that this was not a practical one given the scheduling issues that would result and would delay students' ability to write provincial certification exams and obtain work.

The reviewers explored this suggestion as well as several others put forth by faculty and students. They recommended that the most viable solution might be to use the current curricular model but have the last year available on a part time basis over two years. They acknowledge that there would need to be changes in UTSC regulations to accommodate this structure.

Program Curriculum: Several curriculum issues are highlighted by the reviewers:

- Fourth year courses are perceived as "anti-climatic and fillers" by some UTSC faculty and students while UTSC professors feel there are inadequate numbers of 'advanced' courses to provide students with a creditable university 'biology' degree".
- Curriculum development and management is generally not integrated between the institutions.
- Some curriculum modifications have occurred but some Centennial instructors feel these modifications have created content delivery problems.
- Some UTSC professors were concerned that their course was available in the joint program without their knowledge.
- Some instructors felt the students were unprepared (course prerequisites) for higher level courses such as Microbiology BGYC17 and Political Science POLC055.

Noting the entire curriculum structure of this program has not been assessed since its inception, the reviewers recommended that:

- A joint curriculum review committee is established to address course content, delivery and progression issues.
- More clinically-related courses should be developed to serve both human biology and Paramedicine students and any other life science programs.
- Some special interest courses, e.g. Health Sciences, should be developed to recruit new students and to retain existing ones.
- Consideration should be given to part time and alternative delivery of the year four courses of the program.
- Cross-teaching across the institutions by faculty members based on their expertise.
- Consideration of the curriculum in some areas such as physiology to ensure there is more human anatomy and physiology content in the program.

Additional program observations: The reviewers consider that there is a conflict between two distinct educational cultures of college and university. In addition, "there is a perception that the degree received by UTSC students in this program is not the same as those in other science programs leading to the idea of a 'cheap degree'". They recommended that the "bridging program initiated at Centennial this past year should be continued as a way to increase the number of students moving into the UTSC BSc Paramedicine program. Industry predictions of future employment opportunities all indicate this program will benefit students from the paramedic program at Centennial."

Student achievement levels and grades between the two institutions

The reviewers reported that UTSC faculty and administration feel there is a discrepancy between the pass marks at UTSC and Centennial, and that some Centennial marks are inflated.

The reviewers recommend that UTSC students be more clearly informed that the pass mark for Centennial's EMS specific courses is 60%. UTSC regulations for students in this program should be modified to reflect this. The reviewers report that this high standard is the norm for health science program in Canada; it is warranted "because Health Science graduates are involved in patient care and a higher level of proficiency is needed to reduce patient morbidity and mortality."

The reviewers noted several factors that indicate that the marks are not "inflated" but reflect several factors resulting from Centennial's PCP standards, high caliber students, and its 'master learning' philosophy that "allows students to achieve the high standards imposed by EMS".

Communication between the two institutions

The reviewers considered that communication between UTSC and Centennial is lacking in many regards including:

- UTSC faculty lack knowledge of Paramedic classification levels and scope of practice.
- The Final Draft of the program self-study document was not shared between institutions.
- Though both institutions have student course and program feedback, they did not share the results with each other.
- There was minimal interaction between the faculty members delivering the program.
- Students indicated that it was a “nightmare working within the two systems”.
- There was limited student contact with Centennial faculty in the first year of the program leading to disconnection between what the students signed up for and their experience.
- UTSC student performance records are not accessible to Centennial staff.

The reviewers recommend that:

- Faculty members from both programs should have a ‘meet and greet’ social function at least twice a year, to be held once at each institute.
- A first year orientation should be implemented at both institutions including tours of both facilities.
- Student feedback on instructors, courses and the program should be shared between the two institutions.
- The information technology departments at both institutions should plan for future realignment of the student administration portal for both schools.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE (Commissioning Officer)

The Dean is grateful to the reviewers for their many thoughtful comments and suggestions, which have helped to provide a clearer focus on the issues facing the program. Our partnership with Centennial College over the past five years has been a positive one. We remain mutually committed to advancing the excellence of our Joint Programs and to providing the very best learning experience for our students.

External reviews of all five of the UTSC-Centennial joint programs were conducted in tandem with a review of the Memorandum of Understanding between the two institutions, an agreement that was developed at the time that the joint programs were established. During the deliberations of the committee established to review the Memorandum, it became clear that certain common administrative issues needed addressing, in particular poor communication, registrarial difficulties, and insufficient contact between the two institutions. These issues were also raised in the program self studies and the reports of the external reviewers. We have developed a protocol for the academic administration of the programs, which we believe will enable us to administer and coordinate these programs better.

The protocol identifies three levels of oversight of the programs: 1) senior executive leadership will be provided by the Vice-President Academic at Centennial College and the Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean at UTSC; 2) operational leadership will be provided by a Steering Committee co-chaired by the Centennial College Dean of the School of Communications, Media and Design and the UT Scarborough Vice-Dean and with a membership that includes the Centennial Deans and UTSC Chairs (or designate) for each program, the Registrars and Directors of Marketing from both institutions and two students enrolled in a joint program, the Assistant Dean and the Joint Programs Administrative Coordinators; 3) leadership on the academic aspects of each Joint Program will be provided by the Dean of the Faculty (CC) and Chair of the Department (UTSC) where the programs reside and a joint program curriculum committee will be established for each program. In addition, there will be at least 0.5 FTE staff support (Joint Programs Administrative Coordinator) at each institution for general administrative support for the Joint Programs. Among other duties, the Coordinators will be responsible for communications with students, the creation and maintenance of a Joint Programs web site and a student Handbook.

The Steering Committee met for the first time in February. It arranged for groups of faculty from the two institutions to revise the curriculum of each program following the recommendations of the external reviewers and the findings of the self-studies. The groups will report to the Steering Committee at the end of May. As well, the Directors of Marketing will prepare a marketing plan by the end of May. This will include the preparation of brochures and other promotional materials for the fall recruitment events: the University and College Fairs. We expect that representatives from both our institutions will jointly attend the Fairs. The Joint Programs website at UTSC is currently being updated. Redesign of the websites at both UTSC and Centennial College will be part of the marketing plan.

Some external reviewers suggested that more effort be put toward collecting data and opinions from students (incoming and outgoing) regarding expectations, satisfaction, employment outcomes etc. We agree and see such feedback as a key means by which the programs can be progressively improved. Coordination of these activities will be added to the duties of the Joint Programs Administrative Coordinators. In consultation with Program Supervisors, the Coordinators will develop a formal and standardized questionnaire that can be used for each of the joint programs. Such data will be centrally collected and distributed on an annual basis to all units involved with the joint programs.

To improve marketing of the Paramedicine program specifically, the UTSC program supervisor has been delivering (with increased frequency) information sessions to UTSC first year students (who have not yet chosen their program) in order to generate interest in the program. The Paramedicine program is highlighted at our major UTSC recruitment events. As we move forward, the UTSC coordinator will ensure that UTSC recruitment events also include Centennial representatives of the Paramedicine program.

The external reviewers laud the overall excellence of the faculty at both institutions who deliver this program. However, the reviewers rightly point out a number of issues concerning the overall program structure and the course offerings available at UTSC. They suggest that a key first step in addressing this issue is to define clearly the goal of the Paramedicine program and the role of each institution in meeting this goal.

The role of Centennial is clear – to provide the specialist content in paramedicine. The role of UTSC, on the other hand, is not yet clear and there are several challenges that must be considered.

The Paramedicine program currently resides within the Department of Biological Sciences but is not identified as one of the Department's key academic priorities. Hence, while there has been and will continue to be some opportunistic capacity for Biological Sciences to improve the program (e.g. the Department hopes to deliver an Exercise Physiology course in the near future that may be appropriate for this program), Paramedicine will remain at the fringe of specific departmental teaching and research interests and expertise.

The Paramedicine program is classified as a specialist program but might perhaps be better compared to a UTSC double major in which one institution (Centennial) provides a 7 FCE major in a strongly focused area (paramedicine) and the other institution (UTSC) provides an 8.5 FCE major that needs to be better defined as it is presently a mix of biology, chemistry, psychology, anthropology and health studies. Given this, the curriculum revision committee will explore the potential for UTSC to offer different discipline streams of this program, to improve student choice and to provide sufficient breadth and depth of study.

The current structure of the program poses another challenge. The first and fourth years of the program are at UTSC while the second and third years of the program are predominantly at Centennial. This leaves little opportunity to properly stream students through the introductory to advanced UTSC offerings. It is this constraint that has likely lead to the broad range of disciplines being drawn upon and the lack of upper year UTSC courses in the program. Currently the program can be completed while taking only 1 FCE of third year and 0 FCE of fourth year courses at UTSC. Furthermore, the Centennial courses (while taken in the student's second and third years) are considered first and second year courses at Centennial. A completely new model needs to be advanced and the joint curriculum revision committee that has been struck is addressing this.

Another issue of concern is that few of the students are completing their degree within the normal 4-year timeframe, since many begin working as paramedics after third year, hence only allowing them to complete the fourth year of their program on a part-time basis. The certifying body obliges the students to

start working immediately following receipt of their certificates (which occurs at the end of the third year), in order to retain their certification. This is one issue that we hope will be resolved through the design of a completely new model for this program.

In the coming year, the Steering Committee will consider and make recommendations to the Dean on these pressing issues. UTSC will also independently be considering the curriculum of our Health Studies program and the resources currently available to this program. We anticipate that some welcome synergies between these two programs will be found.

The external reviewers suggest that communication between the two institutions is resulting in some problems. While this may have been the case in the initial years after launch of this program, we feel that it is no longer a significant issue, at least for this joint program. Students register easily for courses and integrate into both systems well. Marks could be returned faster for the fall semester but given that Centennial's exam period starts a week later than ours, this leads to fall marks not being sent to UTSC until after the holiday break. Unless the two institutions co-ordinate the timing of exam periods this cannot change.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

March 31, 2009

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, March 31, 2009 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

| | |
|---|---|
| Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair) | Professor Lesley Ann Lavack |
| Professor Douglas McDougall (Vice-Chair) | Professor Rhonda Love |
| Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic | Professor Hy Van Luong |
| Professor Jonathan Freedman, Deputy Provost | Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth |
| Professor Gage Averill | Ms Lynn Snowden |
| Professor Katherine Berg | Miss Maureen J. Somerville |
| Professor Ragnar Buchweitz | Professor Suzanne Stevenson |
| Professor Elizabeth Cowper | Mr. John David Stewart |
| Professor Robert Gibbs | |
| Professor William Gough | Non-Voting Assessor: |
| Ms Jacqueline Greenblatt | Professor R. Paul Young, Vice- President, Research |
| Ms Emily Greenleaf | Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary |

Regrets:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Professor Luc F. DeNil | Professor Ato Quayson |
| Ms Anne Guo | Professor Cheryl Regehr |
| Ms Jenna D. Hossack | Ms Charlene Saldanha |
| Mr. Joseph Koo | |

In Attendance:

Mr. Andrew Dale Brown, Senior Vice-President, Education, University of Toronto
Medical Society
Ms Melissa Berger, Planning and Program Officer, Office of the Dean, University of
Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Robin Elliott, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Music
Professor Glen Jones, Acting Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President
and Provost
Ms Daniella Mallinick, Assistant to the Dean, Policy and Planning, Ontario Institute
for Studies in Education
Professor Jay Rosenfield, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education, Faculty of Medicine
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Vic Timmer, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, Faculty of Forestry

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

2. Faculty of Medicine, Undergraduate Program in Medicine: Grading Practices (Cont'd)

(b) Distinctions with respect to student performance. A member asked how those evaluating graduates from the program for employment or further study would distinguish among applicants with only a two-interval system and presumably all applicants presenting only “credit” scores on their transcripts. Professor Rosenfield replied that while the official transcript would report only credit or no credit scores, the detailed system of grading and feedback would remain in use in the Faculty’s clinical courses. Detailed transcripts were not in fact helpful. All medical students would likely receive the highest or second highest scores; students admitted to medical programs did not perform at a lower level. With the removal of the importance of distinctions between those high levels, instructors would feel free to give more detailed feedback without concern about the major consequence of marginal differences having exaggerated consequences, leading to a pass rather than an honours grade. When students applied for specialty training, a “Dean’s Letter” was sent to the Canadian Residents’ Matching Service.” That letter could and did report detailed information about student performance.

On the recommendation of the Faculty of Medicine,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed change in grading for all courses in the undergraduate program in Medicine (MD) to Credit/No Credit, effective September 2009.

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II

The Chair reminded members that the Committee’s function was to consider whether “the University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements.” The record of the Committee’s discussion would be forwarded to the Academic Board’s Agenda Committee, which would review it and determine whether the Board should discuss issues of academic importance. Each reading team had been asked to deal with the following questions:

- (a) Did the summary before the Committee accurately reflect the review report?
- (b) Did the administrative responses address the issues identified?
- (c) Were there any questions/comments/issues for the Committee?

The Deans or other officers responsible for the various units and programs were in attendance to respond to any questions or concerns. If the Committee’s lead readers were satisfied that the summary was complete and that all issues had been dealt with, they were

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

asked simply to report those facts. There would be no need to comment further. If, on the other hand, the Committee took the view that there were unresolved issues that should be considered by the Agenda Committee, the Chair would make that consensus clear and ensure that it was reflected in the Committee's Report.

A member commented that he had observed certain issues of a general nature that had arisen from the reviews. Those matters were not discreet problems within a particular division and would not emerge from the three questions that members were being asked to consider. He asked whether there would be an opportunity for the Committee to give attention to such general issues or to refer them to the Academic Board for consideration. Professor Hillan replied that the administration had, in its own work on the reviews, recognized that certain such issues would require further thought. In addition, about two months ago, the Executive Committee of the Governing Council had approved the establishment of the new position of Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. That officer would play a central role with respect to very important matter of quality assurance. An appointment was anticipated very shortly. Professor Hillan therefore took notice of the question of the appropriate mechanisms for discussion of the broader concerns. She would raise the matter with the new Vice-Provost. If it then appeared appropriate, she could propose mechanisms for broader Committee discussions.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified, and there were no outstanding questions that would require the Committee's attention. Three matters had arisen in the review. The first was the tension between obligations to the separately administered, pre-service Initial Teacher Education Program and the Department's obligations to its own graduate programs. Among the concerns was the absence of teaching-load credit for practicum supervision in the Initial Teacher Education Program and the perception of inadequate recognition of that service in promotion and tenure decisions. The second concern had to do with need for more administrative support and the third had to do with workload. Those issues had, however, been recognized and were being addressed.

Invited to comment, Professor Jones noted that at least one element of the review had gone beyond its mandate: its comments on the Initial Teacher Education Program. Nonetheless, the review had been a very helpful one, which had reached a highly positive response from the Department. A member requested amplification of the comment that the "status of the practicum [in the Initial Teacher Education Program] is under review." Professor Jones replied that the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education itself would be

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

subject of a Provostial review in 2010-11 and the practicum would be considered in that review. The Ontario College of Teachers would also be conducting an external review in the next few years. Some changes had been made to the practicum, but more would be considered.

In the course of discussion, it was noted by two members that the review's reliance on a large number of acronyms made it very difficult to understand. They urged either that such extensive use of acronyms be avoided or that a glossary be provided.

The Chair understood the consensus of the Committee to be that there were no issues arising from the review that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Chemistry

The lead reviewer commented that it was a great pleasure to comment on this highly positive review of a "uniformly excellent" department. He noted that the Department offered two programs not noted in the summary: the Minor Programs in Chemistry and in Environmental Chemistry. The summary had accurately reflected the review report. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified (including some that were outside of the scope of the review and of the responsibilities of the Department and the Faculty). There were, therefore, no issues requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of English

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the highly positive review report and the administrative response addressed all of the issues identified. The questions arising from the review that required attention were not specific to the Department of English but were more general questions for the University's consideration. Those questions included tri-campus coordination and dealing with rapid enrolment growth, particularly in the number of undergraduate and Master's degree students.

Professor Klausner replied that the Department and the Faculty were closely monitoring the rapid growth of enrolment in the Master's degree program. There was concern that the growth might well be disturbing the balance between the M.A. and Ph.D. programs.

Professor Klausner observed that the question of tri-campus relations was one that had arisen in a number of reviews, and it should be of very high priority for the Provost's Office. He noted that in some cases, such as the Department of Chemistry, the relationships were working very well.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)****U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Environmental Science and Technology**

The lead reader commented that there were common themes that appeared in the reviews of all four of the programs offered jointly with Centennial College. The underlying cause appeared to be the lack of a real understanding of the appropriate administrative interactions by the two institutions. (Professor Hillan's covering memorandum referred to the decision by the two institutions to revise their Memorandum of Understanding with respect to the programs, clarifying their "senior academic administrative leadership, setting up a Joint Programs Steering Committee and a Joint Programs coordinator, and coordinating a new marketing and recruitment campaign to raise program awareness.")

With respect to the joint program in Environmental Science and Technology, the lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. In spite of the general issues with respect to the joint programs, this particular program had real academic value and potential as a vehicle for "preparing graduates with a combination of key theoretical and practical skills to work in the environmental field." The administrative response discussed the general concerns pertaining to all of the jointly offered programs and it also addressed the specific recommendations relating to this particular program. There were, therefore, no matters requiring the attention of the Academic Board.

Professor Buchweitz commented that U.T.S.C. had learned a great deal through the review process, and it was committed to continue and improve the joint programs with Centennial College, which had been initially offered in 2003-04. For example, it would undertake marketing and communications efforts to promote those programs that were undersubscribed with strong students. It had been remarkable that demand for some of the joint programs had been very strong in spite of the complete absence of marketing efforts previously. The two institutions were putting joint committees into place. Professor Buchweitz would within a week be commencing discussions with his counterpart at Centennial College concerning other areas for collaboration.

A member observed that in this case and perhaps others, the review process itself appeared to have played a substantial role in bringing about improvement. It was not surprising that problems would be brought to the surface in an initial review of particular programs. That decisive action was being taken to deal with those problems represented a real triumph for the process of reviews. Professor Buchweitz agreed with the observation, and he noted that the success of the process was even more remarkable in the case of the joint programs. It had been difficult to identify appropriate reviewers, who would both evaluate the programs as university-level academic programs and who would also

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

understand and evaluate the elements of the programs providing training in the applied and technological aspects. Once appropriate reviewers had been identified, they had found it difficult to appreciate and evaluate both elements.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Industrial Microbiology

The lead reader commended the summary very highly, stating that it was exemplary and was very helpful in that the review report itself was difficult to understand. The administrative response had dealt with the all of the review's recommendations. In particular, it had dealt with the pivotal issue of lack of commitment to the program on the part of U.T.S.C. faculty in biological science, who had not played a role in the genesis of the program. The U.T.S.C. administration planned decisive action and, if the program could not be appropriately redesigned with full faculty support from both institutions, it might well be closed. There were no remaining issues that would require the attention of the Academic Board. The member reinforced the importance of rigorous review of joint programs to ensure the commitment by the faculty of both institutions; in the absence of such commitment, the students in the program would not be well served.

Professor Scherk said that the review had found many aspects of the joint program to be very promising. He noted, for example, that graduates with good training in applied laboratory techniques would be better prepared for graduate study than those from typical science programs. Given that faculty members in Biological Science had not exhibited great interest in the program, it had been suggested that U.T.S.C. position the program more in the area of Environmental Microbiology, because there was a higher level of faculty interest in the Environmental Science Department. U.T.S.C. would work to reposition the program in that manner and would review the curriculum carefully. Professor Scherk anticipated that the program would be retained and would have a very worthwhile future.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Journalism and New Media Studies

The Committee's lead reader reported that the review outlined very real potential for the two recently established joint programs as well as areas of serious challenges. This was accurately reflected in the summary. The administrative response had demonstrated a substantial commitment to address the challenges, and several important improvements had already been made. The reviewers and the administrative response had dealt with a number of the general themes with respect to the joint programs with Centennial College, and the response had reiterated the steps being taken to improve the programs.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Paramedicine

The lead reader said that the summary of the review was an excellent one, which had organized the content of the review very well and had provided observations in a highly coherent

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

manner. The reading team was concerned that the administrative response did not completely address all of the issues raised in the review. First, the review stated certain concerns about the design of the curriculum for the joint program. While the administrative response indicated that the joint program curriculum committee would examine the concerns, the outcome was unclear. It was proposed that a new choice of major programs or streams might be available for the academic part of the revised curriculum to replace the current mix of courses in biology, chemistry, psychology, anthropology and health studies. It was, however, not specified in the response what the revised curriculum would be. It was also noted that students ran into problems progressing through the program because they completed their qualification for their paramedic certification following their third year of study, and they were required by the certifying body to begin work immediately following that certification. They could therefore complete their degree requirements only through part-time study, sometimes including summer study before completion of their third year. Second, the review raised questions concerning communications between faculty at the two institutions and communications with students. Improved communications would be important to break down the current barriers and to promote understanding between the faculty involved in offering the program. For example, the reviewers proposed the initiation of orientation activities for students and “meet and greet functions” involving faculty from U.T.S.C. and Centennial College. The administrative response did not deal with the specific suggestions. Third, the review spoke of a lack of understanding by the U.T.S.C. faculty of matters having to do with the levels of qualification within the profession of Paramedicine. Clearly, such understanding would be required to make the joint program work. The reading team was concerned that there be clarification of these specific matters and that there be a clarification of the overall goal of program.

Professor Scherk said that he regretted that the administrative response had not specifically addressed all of the questions raised. The U.T.S.C. administration did, however, take the matters raised in the review very seriously and was addressing them. In order to address all of the specific questions, however, it was important to deal with the major problem which was the overall goal and the appropriate structure of the program. U.T.S.C. and Centennial College had established joint curriculum committees for all of the joint programs and had asked that they report to the Steering Committee by the end of May. In this case, however, the people involved in the Paramedicine program said that it would take longer to resolve the issues. The key was to develop a structure that would deal with the current requirement of the certifying body that students must begin their work in Paramedicine immediately after qualifying for their certificate – now after their third year. They were still one year from the University degree at that stage. It was important, therefore, that the program be structured in such a way that students could both complete their professional requirements and their academic requirements in a suitable progression. While it was clear that restructuring must take place, it was not yet clear how it would be achieved. Professor Buchweitz added that, in spite of the problems in program design, Paramedicine had attracted many very good and very enthusiastic students, who had greatly enriched life at U.T.S.C. He was confident that the problems of program design would be solved.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

March 31, 2009

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, March 31, 2009 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)
Professor Douglas McDougall
(Vice-Chair)
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Deputy
Provost
Professor Gage Averill
Professor Katherine Berg
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Professor Robert Gibbs
Professor William Gough
Ms Jacqueline Greenblatt
Ms Emily Greenleaf

Professor Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Rhonda Love
Professor Hy Van Luong
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Ms Lynn Snowden
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Mr. John David Stewart

Non-Voting Assessor:

Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-
President, Research

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Luc F. DeNil
Ms Anne Guo
Ms Jenna D. Hossack
Mr. Joseph Koo

Professor Ato Quayson
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Ms Charlene Saldanha

In Attendance:

Mr. Andrew Dale Brown, Senior Vice-President, Education, University of Toronto
Medical Society
Ms Melissa Berger, Planning and Program Officer, Office of the Dean, University of
Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Robin Elliott, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Music
Professor Glen Jones, Acting Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President
and Provost
Ms Daniella Mallinick, Assistant to the Dean, Policy and Planning, Ontario Institute
for Studies in Education
Professor Jay Rosenfield, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education, Faculty of Medicine
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Vic Timmer, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, Faculty of Forestry

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions
and Dean, Faculty of Medicine

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report 139 (March 3, 2009) was approved.

2. Faculty of Medicine, Undergraduate Program in Medicine: Grading Practices

Professor Hillan reported that the Faculty of Medicine proposed a change to its grading practice with respect to transcripts for students in its Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) program. The Faculty currently recorded grades using three intervals: honours, pass or fail. It proposed to move to a two interval system: credit or no credit. The two-interval system was used in almost all other medical programs in Canada. The proposed change was consistent with the University's Grading Practices Policy. Academic awards for excellence would continue to be given. The proposal followed extensive consultation within the Faculty, involving both faculty members and students.

The Chair reported that the University Registrar, Ms Karel Swift was unable to attend the meeting, but she had confirmed that the proposal was consistent with the Grading Practices Policy. While no other division currently used CR/NCR throughout its program, the Policy made it entirely permissible for the Faculty of Medicine to do so.

The following matters arose in discussion.

(a) Student consultation and the effect of the proposed change with respect to applications for further study. A member asked whether, in the process of consulting with students, there had been any expressions of concern about any negative effect of the proposed change on student applications for placements or subsequent degree programs. Professor Rosenfield replied that the Faculty would not have moved forward with the proposal in the absence of broad support emerging from full consultation. The process of consultation had been led by Mr. Brown, culminating in a very professionally managed referendum involving students in all four years of the program. Mr. Brown reported that a remarkable 84% of all students in all years, including those in the combined M.D./Ph.D. program had participated in the referendum. Of those students, a very strong majority of 77% supported the proposal. The referendum had followed full discussion using a lunch-time information session, on-line presentation of the information, podcasts, and information in the University of Toronto Medical Journal. As part of the ballot (conducted on-line), students were asked to indicate whether or not they felt they were well informed about the implications of the proposal, and only a small minority stated that they were not well informed.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

2. Faculty of Medicine, Undergraduate Program in Medicine: Grading Practices (Cont'd)

(b) Distinctions with respect to student performance. A member asked how those evaluating graduates from the program for employment or further study would distinguish among applicants with only a two-interval system and presumably all applicants presenting only “credit” scores on their transcripts. Professor Rosenfield replied that while the official transcript would report only credit or no credit scores, the detailed system of grading and feedback would remain in use in the Faculty’s clinical courses. Detailed transcripts were not in fact helpful. All medical students would likely receive the highest or second highest scores; students admitted to medical programs did not perform at a lower level. With the removal of the importance of distinctions between those high levels, instructors would feel free to give more detailed feedback without concern about the major consequence of marginal differences having exaggerated consequences, leading to a pass rather than an honours grade. When students applied for specialty training, a “Dean’s Letter” was sent to the Canadian Residents’ Matching Service.” That letter could and did report detailed information about student performance.

On the recommendation of the Faculty of Medicine,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed change in grading for all courses in the undergraduate program in Medicine (MD) to Credit/No Credit, effective September 2009.

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II

The Chair reminded members that the Committee’s function was to consider whether “the University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements.” The record of the Committee’s discussion would be forwarded to the Academic Board’s Agenda Committee, which would review it and determine whether the Board should discuss issues of academic importance. Each reading team had been asked to deal with the following questions:

- (a) Did the summary before the Committee accurately reflect the review report?
- (b) Did the administrative responses address the issues identified?
- (c) Were there any questions/comments/issues for the Committee?

The Deans or other officers responsible for the various units and programs were in attendance to respond to any questions or concerns. If the Committee’s lead readers were satisfied that the summary was complete and that all issues had been dealt with, they were

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

asked simply to report those facts. There would be no need to comment further. If, on the other hand, the Committee took the view that there were unresolved issues that should be considered by the Agenda Committee, the Chair would make that consensus clear and ensure that it was reflected in the Committee's Report.

A member commented that he had observed certain issues of a general nature that had arisen from the reviews. Those matters were not discreet problems within a particular division and would not emerge from the three questions that members were being asked to consider. He asked whether there would be an opportunity for the Committee to give attention to such general issues or to refer them to the Academic Board for consideration. Professor Hillan replied that the administration had, in its own work on the reviews, recognized that certain such issues would require further thought. In addition, about two months ago, the Executive Committee of the Governing Council had approved the establishment of the new position of Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. That officer would play a central role with respect to very important matter of quality assurance. An appointment was anticipated very shortly. Professor Hillan therefore took notice of the question of the appropriate mechanisms for discussion of the broader concerns. She would raise the matter with the new Vice-Provost. If it then appeared appropriate, she could propose mechanisms for broader Committee discussions.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified, and there were no outstanding questions that would require the Committee's attention. Three matters had arisen in the review. The first was the tension between obligations to the separately administered, pre-service Initial Teacher Education Program and the Department's obligations to its own graduate programs. Among the concerns was the absence of teaching-load credit for practicum supervision in the Initial Teacher Education Program and the perception of inadequate recognition of that service in promotion and tenure decisions. The second concern had to do with need for more administrative support and the third had to do with workload. Those issues had, however, been recognized and were being addressed.

Invited to comment, Professor Jones noted that at least one element of the review had gone beyond its mandate: its comments on the Initial Teacher Education Program. Nonetheless, the review had been a very helpful one, which had reached a highly positive response from the Department. A member requested amplification of the comment that the "status of the practicum [in the Initial Teacher Education Program] is under review." Professor Jones replied that the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education itself would be

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

subject of a Provostial review in 2010-11 and the practicum would be considered in that review. The Ontario College of Teachers would also be conducting an external review in the next few years. Some changes had been made to the practicum, but more would be considered.

In the course of discussion, it was noted by two members that the review's reliance on a large number of acronyms made it very difficult to understand. They urged either that such extensive use of acronyms be avoided or that a glossary be provided.

The Chair understood the consensus of the Committee to be that there were no issues arising from the review that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Chemistry

The lead reviewer commented that it was a great pleasure to comment on this highly positive review of a "uniformly excellent" department. He noted that the Department offered two programs not noted in the summary: the Minor Programs in Chemistry and in Environmental Chemistry. The summary had accurately reflected the review report. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified (including some that were outside of the scope of the review and of the responsibilities of the Department and the Faculty). There were, therefore, no issues requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of English

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the highly positive review report and the administrative response addressed all of the issues identified. The questions arising from the review that required attention were not specific to the Department of English but were more general questions for the University's consideration. Those questions included tri-campus coordination and dealing with rapid enrolment growth, particularly in the number of undergraduate and Master's degree students.

Professor Klausner replied that the Department and the Faculty were closely monitoring the rapid growth of enrolment in the Master's degree program. There was concern that the growth might well be disturbing the balance between the M.A. and Ph.D. programs.

Professor Klausner observed that the question of tri-campus relations was one that had arisen in a number of reviews, and it should be of very high priority for the Provost's Office. He noted that in some cases, such as the Department of Chemistry, the relationships were working very well.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

In the course of discussion, a member asked whether the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs should have a role in the consideration of these broader matters, given their important implications. Ms Lasthiotakis noted that one of the reasons for presenting the reviews to the Committee in groups was to enable it to discern any more general issues that might be emerging. In some cases, for example concerns about funding for the units, there was no action the Committee could take. In other cases, the issues were in fact being addressed, and the matter of tri-campus relationships was one of those. Professor Hillan's memorandum to the Committee covering the reviews made reference to "the complex nature of tri-campus relationships," the recognition of the issue in the *Towards 2030* planning process, and the actions that had been taken to deal with the matter, in particular the biweekly meetings of the Tri-Campus Deans Committee to ensure consultation and coordination. Professor Averill observed that there was an issue of time lag. The reviews reflected attitudes expressed to the reviewers in their discussions with department members that had taken place over a year ago.

The Chair observed that any general matters that remained and required the Committee's attention would no doubt be brought to it by its assessors. It was clear that there were no specific matters regarding the Department of English that required the attention of the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Equity Studies Program, New College

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review of the program (described as "unique and highly sought after"). The administrative response had addressed all of the issues raised, and there were no matters requiring the Committee's attention.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Forestry Conservation Program

The Committee's lead reader said the summary accurately reflected the review report. (The programs were described as well run and reflecting a very appropriate marriage between liberal arts and professional education.) The administrative response had addressed all of the issues raised, and there were no matters requiring the Committee's attention.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Music Program

The Committee's lead reader reported that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (It stated that programs were taught by an "extremely dedicated and qualified faculty" offering a very "well designed curriculum.") The administrative response had dealt with all issues identified, and there were no matters specific to the review that required the Committee's attention. The lead reader did note that a number of reviews, including this one, had identified concerns about inter-divisional teaching that would require University attention. Professor Hillan noted that the University's

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

Interdivisional Teaching Task Force had reported in October 2008 with recommendations for dealing with the matter.

Professor Elliott said that the Faculty was very pleased with the review. The external reviewer had succeeded in one day in developing a very good understanding of the program. The concerns he had noted, which included those concerning inter-divisional teaching, space and finances, were the subject of on-going discussions.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Philosophy

The reading team found that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (It stated that the Department was unrivalled in North America for its “extensive array of philosophical expertise at such a level of eminence.”) The administrative response had addressed two major issues raised: concerns with respect to the position of faculty members in Philosophy at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and concerns about funding for graduate students, especially international graduate students. Given the administrative response, there were no issues requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

A member commented that the Committee should take note of the fact that Philosophy was one of the areas where tri-campus issues were most significant, manifesting themselves in morale and faculty retention problems.

The Chair concluded that the matter should be included in the broader issues that emerged from consideration of the reviews. There were, however, no specific concerns with respect to the Department of Philosophy that should be drawn to the attention of the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Sexual Diversity Studies Program

The Committee’s lead reader referred to the summary of the review. (It found the program to be “among the finest of undergraduate sexuality studies programs in existence.”) The lead reader was concerned that the summary did not adequately express the strength of the review’s concern that the Program was unable to hire faculty. The concern was not merely one of resources. Rather, in the absence of a permanent faculty member to teach in the Program, it was at real risk of collapse. The administrative response did deal with many of the specific issues raised, but it did not deal adequately with that fundamental question. The concern, both a broader one and one that was of specific importance to this program, was one of responsibility for funding core teaching in a relatively small program housed in a College. The Mark S. Bonham Centre for Sexuality Diversity Studies had recently been established as an EDU:B. Such units had the authority to make faculty cross-appointments. However, it remained unclear how it might be able, in practical terms, to do so.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

Professor Klausner said that the desirability of having a faculty complement for the Program was the very reason for the Centre's establishment as an EDU:B. While it was true that there was no opportunity for a budget allocation for such a cross-appointment, the Program had been very successful in its advancement activities in the past, and it was anticipated that it could succeed again in future efforts. In addition, there had been agreement to pursue a joint appointment for the Program with the Department of English. The lead reader noted that this information, which was not provided in the administrative response, appeared to take care of the major concern raised by the review.

The Chair concluded that, on the basis of the additional information provided by Professor Klausner, there was no need for the matter to be considered further by the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Women and Gender Studies Institute

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (It stated that the Institute was "rightly acclaimed as a top ranking women's and gender studies department in North America and internationally.") The administrative response did deal with the issues raised in the review. They included faculty workload, the Institute's need for additional space, and the desirability of some access to the Institute's courses for students registered in other academic units. This review, among others, stressed the general need for the University to strengthen its diversity and equity programs. With the administrative response having addressed those points and others, the lead reader did not think that there were outstanding issues that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

Professor Klausner observed that the need for additional space was an on-going one noted in virtually all reviews.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Economics

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (That report described the U.T.M. Department of Economics as one of the top few Economics research departments in Canada.) The administrative response dealt with the issues raised, which had also arisen in other reviews. However, some of the matters remained unresolved, in particular the search for three tenure-stream faculty members, the recommendation for an addition(s) to the administrative staff, and certain space issues. Therefore, the lead reader thought it would be helpful for Dean Averill to provide an update.

Professor Averill said that U.T.M. had authorized searches for three-tenure stream faculty members in Economics. Two searches had succeeded and the faculty members

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

would be joining the Department in 2009-10. The third search had not succeeded and had been reauthorized for 2009-10. A new member of the administrative staff had been appointed to be shared by two departments, and 60% - 65% of that person's time would be devoted to the Department of Economics. The Department had received some additional funding through graduate-expansion funds, and the improvement would benefit undergraduate as well as graduate students. No new space was currently available for the Department, which was currently located in a highly overcrowded building. Space in the previous Library would be used to accommodate new faculty and administrative staff until planned new buildings were available. Those buildings would alleviate general space problems on the Campus. In response to the lead reader's question, Professor Averill said that the problem in relation to providing "significant hands-on applications" of Economics to students arose from the shortages of both faculty and space.

The Chair concluded that there were no issues arising from the review that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of English and Drama

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (The report commented on the Department's "first-rate faculty, and its teaching and research profiles make it compare very favourably with departments much larger in size on both the national and international scene.") The review's concerns arose from the Department's being "gravely understaffed" with 78% of its courses being taught by sessional instructors. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified, and none needed to go forward to the Academic Board.

A member said that he found it shocking that 78% of the program's courses were being taught by people other than tenured / tenure-stream faculty. Professor Averill agreed that there was a very substantial shortfall in this Department as well as some others. Depending on how faculty:student ratios were calculated, the ratio at U.T.M. was as high as 39:1. U.T.M. had, however, launched searches for two new faculty members for the Department of English. It continued to look at various factors, including performance indicators and the length of waiting lists for filled courses, and it accorded a very high priority to finding means to deal with this problem.

The member asked whether there was any plan to change the way sessional instructors were used and to improve their position at U.T.M., or whether it was planned to reduce their numbers in favour of tenure-stream faculty. Professor Averill replied that U.T.M. would work to create an improved climate for sessional instructors, but it would be appropriate to update the complement plan and to reduce reliance on sessional instructors for so high a proportion of teaching. Ms Snowden added that the Chair of the

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

Department did not accept the review's conclusion that sessional and tenure-stream faculty operated in two solitudes. On the contrary, there were harmonious relations between the two groups. In addition the high proportion of courses taught by sessional instructors in 2007-08 was anomalous, with a large number of faculty members on leave and others seconded to the St. George Campus English Department to fill administrative positions. While the reliance on sessional instructors was still high, it was declining from the proportion cited in the review report.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Management

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (The review characterized the students as generally satisfied with the Department's programs, which were of high quality. The faculty was described as very high quality, enthusiastic and committed, although the programs were over-reliant on non-tenure-stream faculty. The review expressed concerns about the Department's relationships within U.T.M and with the Rotman School of Management.) The administrative response had dealt with all of the issues. Because some of the administrative process to address the review were still in progress, the lead reviewer suggested that it would be valuable for Dean Averill to provide a brief update report.

Professor Averill said that there had been dramatic change over the past year. U.T.M. had authorized searches for three tenure-stream faculty members in Management, leading to one appointment, with two offers outstanding. Aggressive action had been taken to promote retention of existing faculty members. Administrative staff for the program had been added, and facilities had been improved with the addition of the new Li Koon Chun Finance Learning Centre (a simulated securities trading laboratory), two state-of-the-art classrooms and a new lounge. With respect to relationships with the Rotman School of Management, the Deans on the three campuses were meeting regularly and working together closely on issues, including comparability of faculty compensation. The plans for the expansion of the Rotman School of Management's facilities included the provision of shared space for faculty from U.T.M. and U.T.S.C.

The Chair concluded that, on the basis of the updated information provided by Professor Averill, there were no items that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Mathematics and Computational Sciences

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary provided to the Committee accurately reflected the review report. (The reviewers praised the variety of faculty research and the faculty's collegiality and dedication to teaching. They had a very positive view of U.T.M.-

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

specific initiatives, including programs in bioinformatics, mathematical finance and forensic computing. They expressed various concerns including apparent over-reliance on non-continuing instructors and inadequate space.) The administrative response addressed all of the issues raised. The lead reader asked for further information in response to the reviewer's comments about the Professional Experience Year and the possibility of a co-operative program structure at U.T.M.

Professor Averill replied that U.T.M. had an Experiential Learning Office, which was being brought into the Dean's Office. That Office, working with the Career Centre, coordinated placement efforts for about 350 students, matching them with potential employers in the community. Those opportunities were mixed in nature, with some providing remuneration for students and others not. U.T.M. had not adopted the co-operative education model, which was provided at the University by the University of Toronto Scarborough. While experiential learning had been made most broadly available to students in Mathematics and Computational Sciences, U.T.M. wished to accept the considerable challenge of making such opportunities broadly available across many programs.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Sociology

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary did accurately reflect the review report. (The review commented that senior and intermediate faculty were highly productive with national and international reputations, and junior faculty were publishing regularly in excellent venues. Students were satisfied with the quality of teaching and the structure of the program.) Various concerns were expressed including apparent low morale among faculty, arising from the tri-campus graduate framework and from Departmental governance. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified. There were no residual questions requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

The lead reader asked whether the concerns with respect to Departmental governance had been addressed through the appointment of a new Chair. Professor Averill said that a new Chair had been appointed who had adopted a very pronounced collegial and democratic approach to Departmental governance.

A member observed that this review was one of a number that had referred to the perception of unrealistic expectations being placed on junior members of the faculty. Professor Hillan replied that the University had in the fall of 2007 participated in a collaborative study on pre-tenure faculty and had during the past year initiated a program for junior faculty and had increased communications in order to de-mystify the tenure process. Professor Hillan would continue to monitor the matter carefully.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)****University of Toronto at Scarborough: Department of Social Sciences**

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (The review report spoke highly of the wide array of innovative interdisciplinary programs, the diversity of the student body, the quality of the faculty and the availability of co-operative programs in a number of areas. However, it also expressed, concerns about various matters including: the structure of the Department, certain of its programs, certain aspects of the student experience including the rate of attrition in some programs, low faculty morale, and insufficient faculty input into Departmental decision-making.) The administrative response had dealt with all of the issues raised.

The member thought it would be worthwhile for Professor Buchweitz to comment further on one matter. The reviewers had suggested that some of the Department's challenges had originated from its introduction of a number of new programs while it was at the same time seeking to cope with a very substantial growth in enrolment and while it faced limitations on its faculty complement and resources. Did that indicate some general problem with respect to the process of approval of new programs? Professor Buchweitz replied that a number of interdisciplinary programs had been introduced eight or nine years previously in an effort to provide stronger links among the four traditional disciplines within the department. However, some of the assumptions underlying the new programs had proven to be too optimistic. U.T.S.C. had sought to put into place innovative programs that were responsive to student demand. In some cases, the programs were very successful, but in others they were not. In the latter cases, U.T.S.C. would acknowledge the outcome and either remedy the problems or discontinue the program.

A member observed that the U.T.S.C. administration was very clearly acting to deal with issues that had been drawn out by the review. He asked if the Committee might be given an update report. Professor Buchweitz replied that the administrative response was a very recent document and that there was not, therefore, a great deal of progress to report at this time. The Chair was continuing to work on the question of appropriate administrative structure for the disciplines in the Department of Social Sciences. The answer to that question would have to take into account, among other things, the extraordinary growth of the Department in the past decade. It was clear that the structure would have to change, and Professor Buchweitz hoped that there would be a proposal ready in the fall.

The Chair concluded that U.T.S.C. and the Department were actively working on appropriate changes and that proposals would come forward in the fall. There were, therefore, no matters that would require the attention of the Academic Board at this time.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)****U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Environmental Science and Technology**

The lead reader commented that there were common themes that appeared in the reviews of all four of the programs offered jointly with Centennial College. The underlying cause appeared to be the lack of a real understanding of the appropriate administrative interactions by the two institutions. (Professor Hillan's covering memorandum referred to the decision by the two institutions to revise their Memorandum of Understanding with respect to the programs, clarifying their "senior academic administrative leadership, setting up a Joint Programs Steering Committee and a Joint Programs coordinator, and coordinating a new marketing and recruitment campaign to raise program awareness.")

With respect to the joint program in Environmental Science and Technology, the lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. In spite of the general issues with respect to the joint programs, this particular program had real academic value and potential as a vehicle for "preparing graduates with a combination of key theoretical and practical skills to work in the environmental field." The administrative response discussed the general concerns pertaining to all of the jointly offered programs and it also addressed the specific recommendations relating to this particular program. There were, therefore, no matters requiring the attention of the Academic Board.

Professor Buchweitz commented that U.T.S.C. had learned a great deal through the review process, and it was committed to continue and improve the joint programs with Centennial College, which had been initially offered in 2003-04. For example, it would undertake marketing and communications efforts to promote those programs that were undersubscribed with strong students. It had been remarkable that demand for some of the joint programs had been very strong in spite of the complete absence of marketing efforts previously. The two institutions were putting joint committees into place. Professor Buchweitz would within a week be commencing discussions with his counterpart at Centennial College concerning other areas for collaboration.

A member observed that in this case and perhaps others, the review process itself appeared to have played a substantial role in bringing about improvement. It was not surprising that problems would be brought to the surface in an initial review of particular programs. That decisive action was being taken to deal with those problems represented a real triumph for the process of reviews. Professor Buchweitz agreed with the observation, and he noted that the success of the process was even more remarkable in the case of the joint programs. It had been difficult to identify appropriate reviewers, who would both evaluate the programs as university-level academic programs and who would also

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

understand and evaluate the elements of the programs providing training in the applied and technological aspects. Once appropriate reviewers had been identified, they had found it difficult to appreciate and evaluate both elements.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Industrial Microbiology

The lead reader commended the summary very highly, stating that it was exemplary and was very helpful in that the review report itself was difficult to understand. The administrative response had dealt with all of the review's recommendations. In particular, it had dealt with the pivotal issue of lack of commitment to the program on the part of U.T.S.C. faculty in biological science, who had not played a role in the genesis of the program. The U.T.S.C. administration planned decisive action and, if the program could not be appropriately redesigned with full faculty support from both institutions, it might well be closed. There were no remaining issues that would require the attention of the Academic Board. The member reinforced the importance of rigorous review of joint programs to ensure the commitment by the faculty of both institutions; in the absence of such commitment, the students in the program would not be well served.

Professor Scherk said that the review had found many aspects of the joint program to be very promising. He noted, for example, that graduates with good training in applied laboratory techniques would be better prepared for graduate study than those from typical science programs. Given that faculty members in Biological Science had not exhibited great interest in the program, it had been suggested that U.T.S.C. position the program more in the area of Environmental Microbiology, because there was a higher level of faculty interest in the Environmental Science Department. U.T.S.C. would work to reposition the program in that manner and would review the curriculum carefully. Professor Scherk anticipated that the program would be retained and would have a very worthwhile future.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Journalism and New Media Studies

The Committee's lead reader reported that the review outlined very real potential for the two recently established joint programs as well as areas of serious challenges. This was accurately reflected in the summary. The administrative response had demonstrated a substantial commitment to address the challenges, and several important improvements had already been made. The reviewers and the administrative response had dealt with a number of the general themes with respect to the joint programs with Centennial College, and the response had reiterated the steps being taken to improve the programs.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Paramedicine

The lead reader said that the summary of the review was an excellent one, which had organized the content of the review very well and had provided observations in a highly coherent

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

manner. The reading team was concerned that the administrative response did not completely address all of the issues raised in the review. First, the review stated certain concerns about the design of the curriculum for the joint program. While the administrative response indicated that the joint program curriculum committee would examine the concerns, the outcome was unclear. It was proposed that a new choice of major programs or streams might be available for the academic part of the revised curriculum to replace the current mix of courses in biology, chemistry, psychology, anthropology and health studies. It was, however, not specified in the response what the revised curriculum would be. It was also noted that students ran into problems progressing through the program because they completed their qualification for their paramedic certification following their third year of study, and they were required by the certifying body to begin work immediately following that certification. They could therefore complete their degree requirements only through part-time study, sometimes including summer study before completion of their third year. Second, the review raised questions concerning communications between faculty at the two institutions and communications with students. Improved communications would be important to break down the current barriers and to promote understanding between the faculty involved in offering the program. For example, the reviewers proposed the initiation of orientation activities for students and “meet and greet functions” involving faculty from U.T.S.C. and Centennial College. The administrative response did not deal with the specific suggestions. Third, the review spoke of a lack of understanding by the U.T.S.C. faculty of matters having to do with the levels of qualification within the profession of Paramedicine. Clearly, such understanding would be required to make the joint program work. The reading team was concerned that there be clarification of these specific matters and that there be a clarification of the overall goal of program.

Professor Scherk said that he regretted that the administrative response had not specifically addressed all of the questions raised. The U.T.S.C. administration did, however, take the matters raised in the review very seriously and was addressing them. In order to address all of the specific questions, however, it was important to deal with the major problem which was the overall goal and the appropriate structure of the program. U.T.S.C. and Centennial College had established joint curriculum committees for all of the joint programs and had asked that they report to the Steering Committee by the end of May. In this case, however, the people involved in the Paramedicine program said that it would take longer to resolve the issues. The key was to develop a structure that would deal with the current requirement of the certifying body that students must begin their work in Paramedicine immediately after qualifying for their certificate – now after their third year. They were still one year from the University degree at that stage. It was important, therefore, that the program be structured in such a way that students could both complete their professional requirements and their academic requirements in a suitable progression. While it was clear that restructuring must take place, it was not yet clear how it would be achieved. Professor Buchweitz added that, in spite of the problems in program design, Paramedicine had attracted many very good and very enthusiastic students, who had greatly enriched life at U.T.S.C. He was confident that the problems of program design would be solved.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)****Faculty of Medicine: Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology**

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (It described the Department as "a preeminent department on the Canadian national and broader international scenes.") The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified, and there were no questions requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board. The member was pleased to note the addendum to the summary, reporting on the successful recruitment and appointment of a new Chair as of January 1, 2009. Professor Whiteside said that the appointment had been the outcome of an international search.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Nutritional Sciences

The Committee's lead reader commented on the review (which described the Department as "dynamic with a high quality faculty and students.") The summary had omitted one key recommendation of the review team: to expand the space of the Department and to provide the state-of-art research facilities needed to attract high-quality faculty and students. The administrative response dealt with all of the issues identified, including that concerning the Department's space. The member thought it would be useful for the Committee to receive an update report on the search for a new Chair and on any action being planned with respect to the question of space and facilities.

Professor Whiteside said that the Faculty had carried out a successful international search for a new Chair, and a highly qualified individual had been identified and would be recommended to the Agenda Committee for appointment. The matter of space for the Department was a very significant one. Researchers in Nutritional Sciences were located primarily in the FitzGerald Building, one of the oldest and most decrepit buildings on campus. The Faculty had very nearly completed a new master plan for the reorganization of the Medical Sciences Building, and Professor Whiteside anticipated that new laboratory space would become available to researchers in Nutritional Sciences. Professor Whiteside hoped that the renovation would be complete within the next eighteen months.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report (which said that the Department was considered to be one of the top ten Obstetrics and Gynaecology departments in the world). The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified in the review and in fact had gone beyond the review report to deal with certain other issues that were important to the Department. There were therefore no matters requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

Professor Whiteside said that the Department was an exceptionally successful one. Its work was fully integrated with the affiliated hospitals and their research institutes as well as with the Department of Physiology on campus, providing a very strong basis for its educational and research mission.

A member asked about problems noted by the reviewers concerning appointments of junior faculty to clinical departments who would work in one of the hospital-based research institutes. Professor Whiteside replied that the matter arose with respect to various clinical departments. Substantial work had been completed to address the matter since the completion of the review. The problem had primarily been one of communication. It had been agreed that the clinical departments would not make appointments into the research category until those appointments had been approved by the Vice-President, Research of the relevant hospital.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Occupational Sciences and Occupational Therapy

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review. (The reviewers had concluded that "in comparing with top U.S. schools, the School would be in the top three – based on the quality of the faculty and the volume of their research, the curriculum model and the quality of their students; it certainly stands as a top ranked school in Canada.") The administrative response had dealt with all of the major issues. Discussion arose concerning two matters.

(a) **Prerequisite requirements.** The lead reader noted that one detailed matter had not been addressed in the administrative response. Students in the Master of Science in Occupational Therapy program had reported that the absence of specific course prerequisite requirements for the program had caused some difficulties. Some students lacked sufficient preparation in the life sciences to handle material in the program while others found that the same material was not sufficiently challenging. The students had suggested reinstatement of the prerequisite requirements in the life sciences. Professor Whiteside undertook to raise the matter with the Chair of the Department. She noted that the Department's reputation was stellar, and the matter had not arisen in two other recent reviews: the accreditation review and the review by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

(b) **Inter-professional education.** The lead reader said that in this review and a number of others, the reviewers had noted that students had expressed the desire for more inter-disciplinary learning and had suggested the development of an interdisciplinary rehabilitation clinic in cooperation with the programs in Physical Therapy and Speech / Language Pathology. Professor Whiteside said that the matter of interdisciplinary learning had been receiving very close attention in all of the health professions. The University was planning to launch a core

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

curriculum for all ten health professions. The faculty in Rehabilitation Medicine had been real leaders in that development, which clearly represented the future direction of education in the medical sciences.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report (which spoke of “enthusiastic and productive faculty and a satisfied and proud cohort of trainees.”) The administrative response had addressed all issues raised in the review, and there were no questions that would require the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board. Professor Whiteside commented that the Department was regarded as one of the top departments of otolaryngology globally.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Surgery

The Committee’s lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (That report concluded that the “stature of the department remains extraordinary as the leading Canadian University Department of Surgery and amongst the top ten internationally.”) The administrative response had dealt with all of the issues raised, and there were no matters that would require the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board. The lead reader noted that this review and others had stressed that it would be important to take steps to ensure that the new Academy, to be developed in cooperation with the community hospitals in Mississauga, provided opportunities for a comparably good student experience.

Externally Commissioned Reviews

The Chair noted that the compendium of summaries of the reviews included a list of externally commissioned reviews, which were not within the purview of the Committee. They included one professional accreditation review and a large number of appraisals by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. Those reviews were listed for information.

General Observations

In the course of discussion, a member observed that the summaries of the reviews had been very well prepared and very helpful. The compendium of summaries had helped a great deal to tie the process together. The Chair noted that the grouping of reviews had been of great value in helping the Committee to deal with the reviews and to discern particular themes. On behalf of the Committee, the Chair and Professor Hillan thanked Ms Lasthiotakis for her excellent work in preparing the review summaries.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

The Chair thanked all members for their diligent work in participating in the Committee's discharge of the very important responsibility for monitoring the process of internal review of the academic units and programs. She commented that the process, and the Committee's review of the process, was improving over time.

4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report

Professor Young presented the Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research, dated March 2009. The highlights of his report included the following.

- **Mission.** Research at the University was conducted by the University's outstanding faculty and graduate students. The mission of the Office of the Vice-President, Research was to enhance the University's impact in research and innovation through enabling new strategic initiatives that promoted fundamental scholarship, discovery and multidisciplinary cultural, social and technological innovation.
- **Office of the Vice-President, Research: Reorganization.** To achieve that mission most effectively, the Office had been restructured over the past year. Its work was now based on three administrative pillars. The new Research Services Office combined the Tri-Council funding group and the Government Research Infrastructure Programs group, adopting the best practices of each. The Innovations Group dealt with research contracts, commercialization of the products of University research, and all aspects of innovation. The new Research Oversight and Compliance Office combined into a single office the groups providing assistance with research-grant accounting, ethics compliance, and legal services. Each of the three new units was headed by an Executive Director, who reported to the Vice-President, Research. The outcome was a cleaner and more effective structure.
- **Support for research.** The role of the Vice-President's Office was to support the University's faculty. The University led all others in Canada in funding from the federal research-granting Councils - the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the Natural Sciences Research Council, and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research - typically receiving 16% of total funding. That share was very important, in part because it was the basis of other research support including the University's share of Canada Research Chairs (currently 256 Chairs) and of payments to cover a part of the indirect costs of research. It was very important for the University to maintain its share of federal grant funding because its proportion of Canada Research Chairs and indirect funding support had declined

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

over the past five years. That had been the case because of the establishment of new universities and allocation formulae that provided a larger share for smaller institutions.

The University's faculty had made applications primarily for discovery grants and focus scholarships. There were, however, a number of targeted areas for research funding, particularly those associated with the Federal Government's science and technology strategy, for which the University had not been as competitive. For example, while the University had received 16% of funding from the federal research-granting councils, it had won only five of 140 Industrial Research Chairs. Such awards were also included in the allocation mechanism for such other funding as that for the indirect costs of research. Therefore, improving the University's performance in those targeted areas was very important. The Vice-President's Office had prepared a market-share report, which had been presented to the group of Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs, with a view to developing a strategy to increase the University's funding share.

- **Canada Foundation for Innovation.** University of Toronto researchers had won 18.3% of funding for research facilities from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (C.F.I.) since the inception of the Foundation in 1998. However, competition had increased recently with more applications being submitted, and the University had not fared as well in the most recent competition held two years ago. The University had, therefore, established a process for external peer review to pre-screen applications before their submission to the C.F.I. The University had invited 100 individuals from outside of Canada to serve as referees. The outcome had been very positive, with the University and its affiliated hospitals having submitted strong applications for nearly \$170-million of support. By working with the affiliated hospitals and other institutions, the applications had avoided duplication. The results would be announced in June. Most principal investigators had supported the pre-screening process, although there had been some initial concern about the additional time required. The receipt of comments from the peer reviewers had, however, enabled applicants to strengthen their submissions substantially, leading to real recognition of the value of the process. The recent Government of Canada budget had added \$150-million to the funding for the C.F.I. competition; therefore, the timing of the University's strengthening its internal process had been ideal. Funding for the next year's C.F.I. competition would be increased by \$600-million, and the University's internal process would already be in place.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

- **Canada Excellence Research Chairs.** The University had also applied the pre-screening process in its submission of its applications for the new Canada Excellence Research Chairs. The program had been established to enable Canadian institutions to attract outstanding international researchers, and it focused on areas of strategic importance to Canada. Twenty Chairs, valued at \$10-million each over seven years, would be awarded nationally. Based on its share of funding from the federal research granting councils, the University of Toronto had been invited to apply for fourteen chairs in the first phase of the competition. Invitations to apply for the second phase of the competition would be issued in April, 2009, with final decisions announced in 2010. There would be very substantial prestige attached to the Chairs. The University was eager to perform well in this competition and was confident with respect to the outcome.
- **Research and innovation catalogues.** There was, at this time, virtually no growth in government funding to support basic discovery research. Almost all new funding was devoted to supporting the federal government's science and technology strategy. The priority areas included: environmental sciences and technologies; natural resources and energy; health and related life sciences and technologies; and information and communications technologies. Therefore, to assist the University's professoriate in achieving that new funding, the Office of the Vice-President, Research had initiated catalogues of the University's research strengths in those areas, where the University indeed had considerable strength across the three campuses. The University had also partnered in sponsoring fora in one of those areas – digital technology; those fora had involved other institutions and businesses in the community. A second catalogue had dealt with the area of space research. In the spring of 2009, catalogues would be developed in the areas of life sciences and technologies; health and related life sciences; and energy and the environment. Researchers at the University of Toronto ranked first in the world in the number of citations in the area of Environmental Engineering – a fact that was not widely known. The University would seek to build communities in that and other targeted areas to obtain funding and to conduct research.
- **Program to foster partnerships.** The University had initiated a new program to bring together researchers in the University with collaborators in the community: industry, government agencies, other universities, and other agencies in the not-for-profit sector. The University would, for example, bring in relevant civil-service officers to show them the research work that was being done. The University had a number of strong projects in the area of space research, but they were operating independently across the University. The Canadian Space Agency had noted the receipt of a number of different applications for support from the University and had suggested the idea of a coordinated approach. From time to

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

- time, companies in the private sector would initiate approaches, seeking the completion of research on interesting problems. The Office of the Vice-President, Research would seek to bring together the company with relevant researchers to enable them to determine if they would share an interest in working together on the matter. Industry Canada was often a participant in the discussions.
- **Recognizing faculty excellence.** Professor Young displayed a chart showing the share of various honours held by University of Toronto faculty members as a proportion of those honours held by university faculty nationally for the period 1980 to 2008. For example, University of Toronto faculty held 63% of the Canadian awards of membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The chart displayed both international and national awards. In general, the more competitive and prestigious the honour, the greater the University of Toronto share. The University clearly had many exceptionally talented researchers. The need was to complete the work required to identify areas of opportunity and to put forward nominations. The Vice-President's Office had therefore established an Office of University Awards and Honours. The officer worked with appropriate people in the various Faculties and across the three campuses to assist with the preparation of nominations. The awards not only brought recognition to the researcher and the University, they also frequently provided a contribution to the individual's research funding. Professor Young identified a number of faculty members who had won major awards over the past year.
 - **Impact of University of Toronto innovation.** University of Toronto research had a major impact on the Canadian economy. That research had generated patents and licenses for the use of University-developed technology. It had led to the formation of 120 spin-off companies employing between 4,000 and 5,000 people and generating economic impact of about \$1-billion per year. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology had gone further to determine its economic impact by also calculating the impact of its alumni on the economy, which it had found to be the equivalent of the Gross Domestic Product of a small European country. The economic and social impact overall of the University of Toronto had been very substantial, but the University had not sought to quantify that impact. The Office of the Vice-President, Research would seek to do so over the next year.
 - **MaRS Innovation.** The MaRS Innovation Group had won \$15-million of support from the federal government's Centres of Excellence for Commercialization. With partial matching funding, that would amount to \$25-million. MaRS Innovation was a commercialization collaboration involving the MaRS centre, the University, its affiliated hospitals, Ryerson, the Ontario College of Art and Design, BioDiscovery Toronto, and the Ontario Institute for Cancer Research. Those

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

institutions would be working together to transfer the technologies they had discovered to the private sector for commercial development. Professor Young would report in the next year or the year thereafter on the progress and benefits of that major commercialization development.

- **Celebration and promotion of University of Toronto research.** The previous year's annual report was focused on an external audience and had been widely distributed. (In view of the current economic circumstances, the annual report now before the Committee, was a much smaller and less expensive document.) The previous report had contained extensive statistical information as well as twenty profiles of faculty researchers. It had dealt with certain questions such as how the University's researchers were contributing to a solution for the AIDS problem. The report had received considerable acclaim, including two major prizes from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, District II – the largest of the CASE districts which included 600 institutions including Princeton and Carnegie Mellon University. The report had received the Gold Prize for its visual design and the Silver Prize for overall institutional reports. The other external medium produced by the Office was *Edge* magazine. That magazine targeted the areas to which the Office had been giving particular attention. The issue dealing with digital media was distributed to all relevant government ministers and other political officers. Another issue focused on the commercialization of University research. The Office was currently working on an issue on the social impact of University research. *Edge* magazine too had won major CASE awards: the Silver Prize for newsletters and the bronze prize for staff writing. The work on *Edge* would lead up to the next annual report, which would celebrate the special research work being carried out at the University.

In response to a member's question, Professor Young said that he had decided to include only basic information on the Connaught Fund in the report. The only element he wished to add to the report was that, in the light of the very poor state of the securities markets, there would unfortunately be no disbursements from the endowment funds, including the Connaught Fund, for the current year.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

5. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the final regular meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, May 12, 2009 at 4:10 p.m..

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 21, 2009

50542



AGENDA COMMITTEE

Tuesday, April 14, 2009 at 1:30 p.m.

Forster Room, Simcoe Hall, Room 229

Agenda

1. [Report of the Previous Meeting – March 17, 2009](#) *
2. Business Arising
3. Review of Academic Programs and Units: Annual Report, 2007-08, Part II *
([Cover](#)) ([Item](#))
4. Academic Board Agenda – Thursday, April 30, 2009 at 4:10 p.m. *
5. Date of Next Meeting – Reserve Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2009 at 2:00 p.m.
6. Other Business

In camera session

7. Academic Administrative Appointments **

* documentation attached

** confidential documentation attached for members only

47138

Simcoe Hall, 27 King's College Circle, Room 106, Toronto, ON M5S 1A1 Canada

Tel: +1 416-978-6576 • Fax: +1 416 978-8182, e-mail: governing.council@utoronto.ca • www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT 153 OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE

April 14, 2009

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, April 14, 2009, at 1:30 p.m. in the Forster Room, Room 229, Simcoe Hall.

Present: Professor Michael Marrus (Chair)
Professor Brian Corman
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Professor Avrum Gotlieb Chair, Planning and Budget Committee
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost
Professor Rick Halpern*
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Chair, Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Secretary

Regrets: Ms Pamela Santora

In Attendance: Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost

* Absented himself for the Committee's consideration of one appointment under item 7, Academic Administrative Appointments.

The Chair congratulated Professor Hillan on her appointment as Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life, for a term from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2014.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 152 of the meeting held on March 17, 2009 was approved.

2. Business Arising

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

3. Review of Academic Programs and Units 2007-08 - Annual Report Part II: Divisional Reviews

The Chair stated that the Agenda Committee was responsible for determining whether there were any issues of general academic importance arising from the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units that should be considered by the Academic Board. Members had received Part II of the 2007-2008 summary of the reviews and the administrative responses.

3. Review of Academic Programs and Units 2007-08 - Annual Report Part II: Divisional Reviews (cont'd)

Professor Sass-Kortsak reported that, at its meeting of March 31, 2009, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) had considered twenty-five reviews of programs or units that had been commissioned by the University's academic divisions. In many cases, the external reviewers had declared the University's programs to be outstanding ones which were among the best in Canada, in North America, and internationally. Upon close examination, AP&P had been satisfied that, in every case, any issues that had been raised by the reviewers were being addressed appropriately by the divisions. Some of the issues which had been flagged included concerns about interdivisional teaching, workload and the need for a greater number of faculty members, and questions of tri-campus co-ordination. AP&P had concluded that there was no need for action by the Academic Board or the Governing Council.

Members discussed the advantages of having a protocol which would outline a framework for the reviews that might improve their utility. Such a protocol might provide direction for steps to ensure that a) the selection process of reviewers is satisfactory, b) individual and group meetings with key members of the division, including the financial officer, are arranged for the reviewers, c) all constituencies within divisions have an opportunity to contribute to the self-study report, and d) widespread distribution of the completed reviewers' report occurs within the division. One member commented that the heterogeneity of the University's academic programs and units might pose some challenges in the development of a protocol which could be consistently followed for all reviews. Professor Misak reiterated that a major priority of the incoming Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, would be to assess the review process, evaluating the manner in which reviews are conducted, as well as their outcomes. Members decided that there were no matters arising from the reviews that required consideration by the Academic Board.

4. Academic Board Agenda – Thursday, April 30, 2009

The Committee reviewed and approved the draft agenda for the April 30th Academic Board meeting.

5. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair stated that the next regularly scheduled meeting would be held on Thursday, May 21, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. in the Forster Room. A reserve date of Tuesday, April 28th at 2:00 p.m had been set aside, and the Secretary would inform members at a later time as to whether or not a meeting on that date would be necessary.

6. Other Business

The Chair noted that the Committee had approved an academic administrative appointment to the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy at the last meeting of March 17, 2009. At the request of the appointee, the details had not been reported at that time. The Chair read the approved motion in order to officially record the approval.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

the following academic administrative appointment:

6. Other Business (cont'd)

LESLIE DAN FACULTY OF PHARMACY

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Professor Henry Mann | Dean |
| | July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2014 |

The Committee moved *in camera*.

7. Academic Administrative Appointments

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

the following academic administrative appointments:

JOHN H. DANIELS FACULTY OF ARCHITECTURE, LANDSCAPE AND DESIGN

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Professor Richard R. Sommer | Dean |
| | July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2014 |

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Professor Robert Baker | Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Research |
| | July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011 |

Department of Political Science

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Professor David Cameron | Chair |
| | July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2012 (Re-appointment) |

Mark S. Bonham Centre for Sexual Diversity Studies

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Professor Brenda Cossman | Director |
| | January 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011 |

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Centre of Criminology

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Professor Anthony Doob | Acting Director, Centre of Criminology |
| | July 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009 |

FACULTY OF LAW

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Professor Bruce Chapman | Associate Dean, J.D. Program |
| | July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2011 |

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Department of Physiology

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Professor Stephen Matthews | Chair and Graduate Chair |
| | April 1, 2009 to June 30, 2014 |

7. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA

Department of Geography

Professor Amrita Daniere Chair
July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010 (Extension)

Professor Kathi Wilson Chair
July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2015

Department of Language Studies

Professor Michael Lettieri Chair
July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2013 (Re-appointment)

Professor Michel Lord Acting Chair
July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO SCARBOROUGH

Professor Rick Halpern Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean, UTSC
July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2014

Department of Management

Professor Jason Wei Acting Chair
July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010

The Committee returned to open session.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Secretary
April 20, 2009

Chair



GOVERNING COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, May 12, 2009 at 5:00 p.m.

Board Room, Simcoe Hall

A G E N D A

*Pursuant to section 28 (e) and 33 of By-Law Number 2,
consideration of items 11- 13 will take place in camera.*

- 1. Report of the Previous Meeting of the Executive Committee of April 6, 2009 ***
 - 2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**
 - 3. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting of April 16, 2009 ****
 - 4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting**
 - 5. Report of the President**
 - 6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council**
- (a) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design ***
(Arising from Report Number 162 of the Academic Board [April 30, 2009]- Item 5)

Be It Resolved

THAT the following recommendation be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council:

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the Faculty's programs at its present location, 230 College Street.
2. That the project scope for Phase 1, comprising an addition of approximately 1250 net assignable square metres or 2023 gross square metres be approved at a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding.
3. THAT the project scope for subsequent phases of renovations be brought forward to implement through the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate for components valued at less than \$2 million, and those exceeding \$2 million in accordance with the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 162 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

* Documentation is attached.
** Documentation is to follow.
+ Confidential documentation is attached for members only.
++ Confidential documentation is to follow for members only.

- (b) **Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Renewal for the St. George Campus ***
(Arising from Report Number 162 of the Academic Board [April 30, 2009]- Item 6)

Be It Resolved

THAT the following recommendation be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council:

THAT the Utilities Infrastructure Renewal program of projects be approved, at a total cost not to exceed \$15.9 million, and assuming receipt of funding from the government economic stimulus program:

- Government of Canada \$8.0M
- Government of Ontario \$7.9M

Documentation is attached to Report Number 162 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”.

- (c) **Capital Project: Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute Project Change of Scope ***
(Arising from Report Number 162 of the Academic Board [April 30, 2009]- Item 7)

Be It Resolved

THAT the following recommendation be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council:

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Civil Engineering Interdisciplinary Design Studios be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, comprising renovations to approximately 630 net assignable square meters and 1,130 gross square meters be increased to a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding, to include high priority repairs, maintenance and restoration and items addressing sustainability.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 162 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”.

- (d) **Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program ***
(Arising from Report Number 174 of the Business Board [April 27, 2009]- Item 3)

Be It Resolved

THAT the following recommendation be endorsed and forwarded to the Governing Council:

Subject to the understanding that there will be regular review and scrutiny of the model, with regular reporting to the Arts and Science Council and with adjustments as required,

THAT the proposal to charge tuition fees for full-time Arts and Science students on the St. George Campus on the basis of a program fee instead of a per-course fee be approved.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 174 of the Business Board as Appendix “A”.

* Documentation is attached.

** Documentation is to follow.

+ Confidential documentation is attached for members only.

++ Confidential documentation is to follow for members only.

- 7. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs 2007-08: Annual Report** (for inclusion on the agenda of the Governing Council) *

Be it Resolved

THAT the *Reviews of Academic Units and Programs 2007-08: Annual Report* be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting of May 20, 2009.

- 8. Reports for Information**

- (a) Report Number 173 of the Business Board (March 23, 2009) *
- (b) Report Number 151 of the University Affairs Board (March 17, 2009) *
- (c) Report Number 152 of the University Affairs Board (April 22, 2009) **

- 9. Date of Next Meeting – Monday, June 15, 2009 at 5:30 p.m.**

- 10. Other Business**
-

In Camera Session

- 11. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendation for Expulsion +**

- 12. Board and Committee Assignments 2009-2010 ++**

Be it Resolved,

THAT the proposal from the Chair for Board and Committee assignments for 2009-10 be recommended to the Governing Council for approval.

- 13. Senior Appointment ++**

* Documentation is attached.

** Documentation is to follow.

+ Confidential documentation is attached for members only.

++ Confidential documentation is to follow for members only.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
**REPORT NUMBER 422 OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, May 12, 2009

To the Governing Council,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, May 12, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. in the Boardroom, Simcoe Hall, with the following members present:

Mr. John F. (Jack) Petch (In the Chair)
Dr. Alice Dong, Vice-Chair
Professor David Naylor, President
Professor Varouj Aivazian
Ms Diana A.R. Alli
Ms Judith Goldring
Mr. Grant Gonzales
Mr. Gerald Halbert
Mr. Joseph Mapa
Mr. Timothy Reid
Professor Arthur S. Ripstein

Non-Voting Member:

Mr. Louis R. Charpentier

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall
Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Regrets:

Ms Susan Eng
Mr. David Ford
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles

In Attendance:

Dr. Anthony Gray, Special Advisor to the President
Professor Cheryl Misak, Vice-President and Provost, and Member of the Governing Council *
Mr. Richard Nunn, Chair, Business Board and Member of the Governing Council
Ms Catherine Riggall, Vice-President, Business Affairs *

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 421 (April 6, 2009) of the Executive Committee was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

3. Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting of April 16, 2009

The Chair indicated that the Minutes of the Governing Council meeting were in preparation and would be available in advance of the next meeting of the Council on May 20, 2009.

* Absent for consideration of Agenda Item #13.

4. Business Arising from the Minutes of the Governing Council Meeting

There was no business arising from the minutes of the Governing Council meeting.

5. Report of the President

The Committee moved *in camera*. The President briefed the Committee on a variety of human resources and government relations matters.

The Committee returned to closed session.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council

(a) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design

(Arising from Report Number 162 of the Academic Board [April 30, 2009]- Item 5)

Professor Aivazian introduced the three capital projects which would be considered by the Executive Committee. He stated that all three projects had been presented to the Academic Board for approval at the April 30, 2009 meeting. The projects were three of six proposals which the University had carefully selected for submission for the first round of government infrastructure funding. The other projects included two large projects at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and the University of Toronto at Mississauga, as well as one smaller project on the St. George campus; those three remaining proposals would be presented for governance approval in the near future.

Professor Aivazian said that the proposed projects could be quickly initiated and completed in order to meet the government's program requirements - projects must be materially complete by March, 2011. All three projects had been recommended for approval by the Academic Board with the understanding that their execution was contingent on the provision of government funding.

Professor Aivazian then explained that, in 1997, Governing Council had approved a Users Committee report of the then School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, which had contained a proposal for a \$10-million, multi-phased renewal and renovation of the existing building at 230 College Street. Some of the needed improvements had occurred, but much work still remained to be done. A reconstituted Project Planning Committee had been considering the increased space requirements of the Faculty's new Academic Plan since 2008, and the current proposed capital project, which would provide additional space needed for research offices and design studio space, was estimated to cost \$20-million.

Professor Aivazian noted that if the project was not selected for federal funding, the Project Planning Report would remain approved in principle until other funding or private benefaction could be obtained. At the Academic Board meeting, a member of the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design, Professor Barry Sampson, had stated that the Faculty was very excited about the proposed project and the opportunities for learning that it would offer to its students and faculty.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had approved the execution of Phase I of the proposed project, subject both to Governing Council approval in principle and subject to the confirmation of funding.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(a) Capital Project: Project Planning Report for the Expansion of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design be approved in principle to accommodate the activities and functions described for the expansion of the Faculty's programs at its present location, 230 College Street.
2. That the project scope for Phase 1, comprising an addition of approximately 1250 net assignable square metres or 2023 gross square metres be approved at a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding.
3. THAT the project scope for subsequent phases of renovations be brought forward to implement through the Accommodation and Facilities Directorate for components valued at less than \$2 million, and those exceeding \$2 million in accordance with the *Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects*.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 162 of the Academic Board as Appendix "A".

(b) Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Renewal for the St. George Campus
(Arising from Report Number 162 of the Academic Board [April 30, 2009]- Item 6)

Professor Aivazian reported that the proposed Utilities Infrastructure Renewal for the St. George Campus Capital Project consisted of a number of projects which had been combined into one and submitted through the federal Knowledge Infrastructure Program. Under that program, physical infrastructure, including utilities infrastructure, would be eligible for funding. The projects ranged from electrical upgrades to an improved chiller plant and a strengthened cogeneration facility which would ensure that any damage to buildings and research was minimized in the event of a power failure. Each of the projects outlined in the proposal would be needed in the future to support the growing demand for utilities services on the St. George campus.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had also approved the execution of the proposed project, again subject to Governing Council approval in principle. He noted that the matter of deferred maintenance and renewal had been an ongoing concern in the Business Board, and receipt of government infrastructure funding for this work would be most welcome.

The President commented that the University had intentionally submitted ambitious proposals for critical projects in the hopes that the Government would respond favourably to them. Funding decisions about the University's proposals were expected to be released in the near future.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(b) Capital Project: Utilities Infrastructure Renewal for the St. George Campus (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the Utilities Infrastructure Renewal program of projects be approved, at a total cost not to exceed \$15.9 million, and assuming receipt of funding from the government economic stimulus program:

- Government of Canada \$8.0M
- Government of Ontario \$7.9M

Documentation is attached to Report Number 162 of the Academic Board as Appendix “B”.

(c) Capital Project: Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute Project Change of Scope
(Arising from Report Number 162 of the Academic Board [April 30, 2009]- Item 7)

Professor Aivazian stated that the Interdisciplinary Design Studios within the Department of Civil Engineering and the Lassonde Institute Project Change of Scope Capital Project had originally been approved by governance in 2008. At that time, the estimated total cost of the project had been \$12,150,000 and had included high priority roof renovations. Since then, the project had been reviewed, and it had been determined that external deferred maintenance items should be added, along with a proposal for photovoltaic panels to increase the energy efficiency in the Mining Building. The additional items, together with the escalation in time of tender had increased the total project cost to \$20-million.

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had also considered the proposed project and had approved its execution, subject to Governing Council approval in principle.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

1. THAT the Project Planning Report for the Civil Engineering Interdisciplinary Design Studios be approved in principle.
2. THAT the project scope, comprising renovations to approximately 630 net assignable square meters and 1,130 gross square meters be increased to a total project cost of \$20,000,000, subject to funding, to include high priority repairs, maintenance and restoration and items addressing sustainability.

Documentation is attached to Report Number 162 of the Academic Board as Appendix “C”.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(d) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program***(Arising from Report Number 174 of the Business Board [April 27, 2009]- Item 3)*

Mr. Nunn reported that the Business Board had recommended approval of the proposal that the tuition fee for full-time students in the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus be a single program fee rather than a per-course fee. He noted that an excerpt from Report Number 174 of the Business Board had been placed on the table for members. The proposal had been thoroughly debated at the Board's meeting, and some excellent presentations from the major student groups and the University of Toronto Faculty Association had been given. Mr. Nunn stated that the practice of charging a program fee was a common one, both in many programs at the University of Toronto and elsewhere in Ontario. If approved, the program fee would be introduced gradually. Current full-time students would pay fees on the same basis as the present for the next four years, while the fee for new students would be carefully watched, with the arrangement adjusted if required.

The majority of the Board had been convinced that the proposal was appropriate. Members had been informed that additional financial aid would be available for students who needed it in order to take a full course load and that the program fee was used elsewhere, with no negative effect on academic engagement or extra-curricular involvement. Both program quality and faculty workload would benefit from the additional faculty hiring enabled by the financial benefits of the proposal.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSE AND FORWARD to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

Subject to the understanding that there will be regular review and scrutiny of the model, with regular reporting to the Arts and Science Council and with adjustments as required,

THAT the proposal to charge tuition fees for full-time Arts and Science students on the St. George Campus on the basis of a program fee instead of a per-course fee, a copy of which is attached to Report Number 174 of the Business Board as Appendix "A", be approved.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

a) Over-Enrollment in Courses

A member commented that some relevant points had been raised by students who had expressed their opposition to the proposed program fee at the April 27th Business Board meeting. Professor Misak acknowledged that, at the beginning of a term, students sometimes enrolled in more courses than they intended to take. They often sampled courses with the intention of withdrawing before a financial or academic penalty was imposed. By over-enrolling, students attempted to assess which courses they wanted to take and in which courses they were most likely to perform well. Unfortunately, over-enrollment in courses by some students sometimes resulted in increased waiting lists, affecting other students who hoped to register in their preferred courses before the deadline to add courses. Professor Misak stated that, with the implementation of a program fee, there would be a limited number of courses in which students could "over-enroll", which could help to alleviate the waiting list problem.

b) Limited Program Fee Implementation Period

A member expressed his support for the implementation of a program fee, but suggested that it only be put in place for a period of two years (2009-10 and 2010-11). In his view, it would be essential to evaluate the impact of the program fee at the end of that period, before determining any further steps. The member noted that both the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)**(d) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (cont'd)**

Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had abstained from submitting similar proposals, preferring to study the implications for their programs over time. Professor Misak disagreed with the member's suggestion for a two-stage approval process. She stated that a number of other universities had successfully implemented program fees and that seeking re-approval from Governing Council in two years would again result in damaging and unnecessary discussion of a proposal which was not out of the ordinary.

c) Program Costs and Fees

A member observed that there were both fixed and variable costs associated with program delivery at the University. The current practice within the Faculty of Arts and Science of charging fees based on the number of courses taken was actually somewhat inequitable. Students taking a full course load were essentially subsidizing those taking fewer courses. Another member argued that, under the proposed program fee system, students taking 3.0 courses would be subsidizing those taking more than 5.0 courses. The member suggested that students taking 5.5 or 6.0 courses could perhaps be charged for their heavier load and the threshold for the program fee could then be raised to 3.5 courses from 3.0. Professor Misak stated that it was the University's desire to simplify fees charged to its students, rather than to create more complex systems, but that it was also required to operate within the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities' guidelines with respect to tuition assessment. She also noted that the University's definition of a full-time student within the Faculty of Arts and Science as one who is registered in 3.0 or more credits was similar to those used by government agencies such as the Ontario Student Assistance Program which provided funding to students.

d) Oversight

A member referred to the provision that there be "regular review and scrutiny of the model, with regular reporting to the Arts and Science Council and with adjustments as required." The member proposed an amendment to the motion that would provide for regular reporting to the Governing Council on the implementation of the program fee within the Faculty of Arts and Science. Both Professor Misak and President Naylor expressed a willingness for updates to be provided by the administration. However, such reporting was not required from other divisions which charged program fees, and the Faculty of Arts and Science should not be distinguished from them in that regard. The administration fully intended to monitor how well the program was operating, including whether sufficient student aid was being provided and evidence for any adverse impacts on life outside the classroom. The administration would reconsider the thresholds for inclusion (4 versus 3.5 versus 3 full course equivalents) as well the program's continuance, as necessary. Other members also stated their support of the provision of a differentiated report of program fees across divisions; it was important to ensure that student life outside of the classroom was not negatively affected.

It was duly moved and seconded
 THAT the motion be amended to read:

Subject to the understanding that there will be regular review and scrutiny of the model, with regular reporting to the Arts and Science Council and to the Vice-President and Provost, with updates to the Governing Council during the implementation phase, and adjustments as required,

THAT the proposal to charge tuition fees for full-time Arts and Science students on the St. George Campus on the basis of a program fee instead of a per-course fee be approved.

The vote to amend the motion was taken.
 The motion carried.

6. Items for Endorsement and Forwarding to the Governing Council (cont'd)

(d) Tuition Fees: Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus – Assessment of Full-time Tuition Fees by Program (cont'd)

The vote on the main motion was taken.
The motion carried.

7. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs 2007-08: Annual Report

Professor Aivazian stated that the review process was a crucial component of accountability for the University. In accordance with the *Accountability Framework for Reviews*, the Agenda Committee had considered the relevant Reports of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, as well as the Review Summaries and had determined that there were no matters arising from the reviews that required consideration by the Academic Board.

In response to a request from a member, Professor Misak elaborated on the University's plans for improving the review process. She noted that a major priority of the incoming Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, would be to assess the process, evaluating the manner in which reviews were conducted, studying the outcomes, and examining any concerns which had been repeatedly identified over time. Steps would also be taken to align the University's review process with revised external requirements as they were communicated.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the *Reviews of Academic Units and Programs 2007-08: Annual Report* be placed on the agenda of the Governing Council meeting of May 20, 2009.

8. Reports for Information

Members received the following reports for information.

- (a) Report Number 173 of the Business Board (March 23, 2009)
- (b) Report Number 151 of the University Affairs Board (March 17, 2009)
- (c) Report Number 152 of the University Affairs Board (April 22, 2009)
- (d) Report Number 162 of the Academic Board (April 30, 2009)

9. Date of the Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting of the Executive Committee was scheduled for Monday, June 15, 2009 at 5:30 p.m.

10. Other Business

The Chair reported that six speaking requests had been received from groups who wished to address the Governing Council at its meeting on May 20, 2009. After discussion, it was agreed that speaking privileges would be granted to the Students Administrative Council (SAC), the Graduate Students Union (GSU), and the Association of Part-time Undergraduate Students (APUS). The other groups that had submitted requests would be invited to provide their comments in writing.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT, pursuant to sections 28 (e) and 33 of *By-Law Number 2*, consideration of items 11-13 take place *in camera*, with the Board Chairs, Vice-Presidents, and Special Advisor to the President admitted to facilitate the work of the Committee.

In Camera Session

11. Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters: Recommendation for Expulsion

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the recommendation for expulsion contained in the Memorandum from the Secretary of the Governing Council dated May 12, 2009, be placed on the agenda for the May 20, 2009 meeting of the Governing Council; and

THAT pursuant to Sections 38 and 40 of *By-Law Number 2*, this recommendation be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

12. Board and Committee Assignments, 2009-2010

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation

THAT the proposal from the Chair for Board and Committee assignments for 2009-10, dated May 12, 2009 be approved.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, this recommendation be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

13. Senior Appointment

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED AND FORWARDED

to the Governing Council for consideration the recommendation for a senior appointment contained in the memorandum from the President dated May 12, 2009.

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT, pursuant to Section 38 of *By-Law Number 2*, the recommendation for the senior appointment be considered by the Governing Council *in camera*.

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Secretary
May 13, 2009

Chair



TO: Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

SPONSOR: Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

CONTACT INFO: vp.academicprograms@utoronto.ca

DATE: August 6, 2009

AGENDA ITEM: 11

ITEM IDENTIFICATION: Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) - Report of the Auditors on the 2008 U of T Undergraduate Program Review

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

The Committee has monitorial responsibility for annual reports on reviews of academic programs and units.

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

The Council of Ontario Universities (COU) has mandated that each Ontario university undertake periodic appraisals of its undergraduate programs. These undergraduate program reviews are required to follow guidelines established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV). Each university is subject to a periodic audit of its processes by the provincial Undergraduate Program Review and Audit Committee (UPRAC) to ensure compliance with its guidelines for development of new undergraduate programs and review of existing programs.¹ The UPRAC audit report is distributed to other universities and to the ministry, providing accountability at a high level.

The first University of Toronto UPRAC Report was presented to the Committee on Academic Policy and Program on December 8, 2004.² Following receipt of the report and through consultations with academic divisions, the University *Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Units and Programs* was approved by Governing Council on February 10, 2005. At the same time, the Office of the Vice-President and Provost developed procedural Guidelines for the assessment of proposed new programs and units and the review of existing programs and units at the University.

52882

¹ The process was designed to satisfy the needs for accountability identified in the 1993 Task Force on University Accountability (Broadhurst Report), and by the Ontario Council on University Affairs in its Advisory Memorandum OCUA 93-VI Academic Audit Review, while preserving the principles of university self-regulation and autonomy.

² Available online at <http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/policy/academic/uprac.htm>

HIGHLIGHTS:

In 2008, UPRAC audited the University of Toronto's undergraduate program approval and review system by selecting a sample consisting of a new program submission and four reviews of existing programs. The audited samples were compared to processes outlined in the University's own *Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units* and the associated Provostial Guidelines for the assessment and review of academic programs. The Audit Committee presented its Report to the University in June 2009 (see attached).

The *UPRAC Audit Guidelines* apply two tests: the conformity of institutional policy, procedures, and practices (i.e., the review process as a whole) to the UPR process, and the conformity of institutional procedures and practices to institutional policy. The auditors concluded that the University had made "major progress in developing its policy and procedures more in line with *UPRAC Guidelines*" since its first audit. The Auditors found that the new program approval process was "commendable". However, the Auditors found that the undergraduate program review process was lacking in several respects related to implementation of the guidelines by academic divisions; ensuring that unit reviews commission a thorough review of its undergraduate programs; developing the process for specifying and monitoring the actions to be taken following review recommendations. Since the time of the auditors' visit in early 2008, degree level expectations have been incorporated into our Guidelines for review of programs and units.

A number of recommendations and suggestions for further improving the conduct of reviews are included in the report. In framing their report and presenting their findings, the Auditors distinguish between recommendations and suggestions. Instances where the Auditors considered the policies and procedures not to be in conformity with the UPR Process are cast as recommendations. Suggestions are offered in cases where, although the institution's measures are in conformity with the Process, those measures could, in the opinion of the Auditors, be improved.

The UPRAC recommendations and suggestions are constructive and particularly helpful as they came at a time when the University and other Ontario institutions have begun the process of aligning the quality assurance processes for undergraduate and graduate programs. A new quality assurance body, the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) has been established under the direction of OCAV. The mandate of the Quality Council is to ensure that Ontario continues to have a rigorous quality assurance framework acknowledging that academic standards, quality assurance and program improvement are, in the first instance, the responsibility of universities themselves. The Quality Assurance Task Force, a sub-committee of OCAV is currently drawing up a Quality Assurance Framework. According to the Task Force, universities will use their processes to ensure the academic standards of their undergraduate and graduate programs, and to assure their ongoing improvement.

The University takes the recommendations of the Audit Committee seriously. One of the main tasks for the Office of the Vice-President and Provost in the coming year will be to address the recommendations of the audit while at the same time endeavoring to align our processes with the emerging Quality Assurance Framework. The creation of the position of Vice-Provost, Academic Programs in the spring of 2009 reflects the University's commitment to ensuring high-level, ongoing engagement of the Vice-President and Provost's office in areas of program quality assurance. We will be working with deans and principals over the course of the year to revise our policy and guidelines in line with our institutional structure and the Quality Assurance Framework.

FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS:

There are no new/additional financial resources required to receive the UPRAC audit report and implement the recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information.

**Report of the UPRAC Auditors on
Undergraduate Program Reviews at the
University of Toronto**

February 2008

Prepared under the authority of the
Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee,
a committee of the
Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents,
an affiliate of the
Council of Ontario Universities
180 Dundas Street West, 11th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M5G 1Z8
Tel: 416-979-2165 Fax: 416-979-8635

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| Glossary of Acronyms and Terms | ii |
| 1 Introduction..... | 1 |
| 2 Methodology and Verification Steps | 2 |
| 3 Response of the University of Toronto to the Previous Auditors' Report | 4 |
| 4 New Program Approvals at the University of Toronto..... | 5 |
| 5 Program Reviews at the University of Toronto | 5 |
| 6 Conformity of the University of Toronto's Process for the Approval of New Undergraduate Programs to the UPA Process for New Programs..... | 7 |
| 7 Conformity of the University of Toronto's Review Process for Undergraduate Programs to the UPR Process for Program Review | 10 |
| 8 Relationship of Undergraduate Program Reviews to Professional Accreditation | 22 |
| 9 Review of Multidisciplinary and Interdisciplinary Programs..... | 22 |
| 10 Conclusion..... | 23 |
| 11 Summary of Recommendations and Suggestions..... | 23 |
| Appendix 1 Schedule for Program of Audits in the Second Cycle: 2003 - 2010..... | 25 |
| Appendix 2 List of the Names of the Auditors..... | 26 |
| Appendix 3 List of the Principal Documents Provided by the University of Toronto | 27 |
| Appendix 4 Schedule for the Site Visit..... | 30 |
| Appendix 5 List of Recommendations from the First Audit..... | 32 |
| Appendix 6 Toronto's <i>Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units</i> | 35ff |
| Appendix 7 Toronto's <i>Guidelines for the Assessment of Divisional Submissions</i> | 36ff |
| Appendix 8 Toronto's <i>Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units</i> | 37ff |
| Appendix 9 Schedule for Reviews of Existing Undergraduate Programs..... | 38ff |

Glossary of Acronyms and Terms

Related to Audit:

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| COU | Council of Ontario Universities |
| MET | Ministry of Education and Training |
| MTCU | Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities |
| OCAV | Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents |
| OCGS | Ontario Council on Graduate Studies |
| UPRAC | Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee |
| <i>UPRAC Guidelines</i> . . | Refers to <i>UPRAC Review and Audit Guidelines</i> established by OCAV |
| UPA Process | Refers to “Approval Process for New Undergraduate Programs” found in <i>UPRAC Guidelines</i> , Section 2 |
| UPR Process | Refers to “Undergraduate Program Review Process” and its “Objective, Structure and Elements” found in <i>UPRAC Guidelines</i> , Section 3 |

Related to the University of Toronto

| | |
|----------------|---|
| AP&P | Committee on Academic Policy and Programs |
| CTEP | Concurrent Teacher Education Program |
| UTM | University of Toronto Mississauga |
| UTSC | University of Toronto Scarborough |
| VPA | Provost and Vice-President, Academic |

1 Introduction

In October 1996, the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) approved the establishment of a procedure for the systematic auditing of the policies and processes in place at all Ontario universities for the conduct of periodic quality reviews of undergraduate programs. The procedure and guidelines specify that auditing of processes includes the examination of a representative sample of the quality reviews. Subsequently, in February 1997, the guidelines were amended to include the auditing of the mechanisms used by the universities for the implementation of new undergraduate programs. Authority for the organization and management of the audits is vested in the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV). The detailed oversight of the audit procedure is devolved to a committee of OCAV, the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC), whose responsibilities are set out in Bylaw 1 of the OCAV Constitution. One of UPRAC's duties is to recommend to OCAV the seven-year schedule of audits. The first cycle of audits started in 1997 and continued until 2003. The schedule for the current, second cycle is set out in Appendix 1.

The audits themselves are conducted at arm's length by at least three Auditors who are appointed by UPRAC according to the criteria in the bylaw: "Auditors shall be chosen for their recognized strength in the development and operation of undergraduate programs. They shall not hold an administrative appointment in an Ontario university during their terms as Auditors." (See Appendix 2 for the names and affiliations of the Auditors for this audit.) The procedures to be followed by the Auditors are spelled out in *UPRAC Audit Guidelines: Methodology for the Audit of Undergraduate Program Reviews*, hereafter called *UPRAC Guidelines*. It describes in some detail "the objective, structure and elements" that "any credible periodic undergraduate program review procedure undertaken by an institution must include." For convenience, these key review components of *UPRAC Guidelines* will be referred to as the UPR Process.

UPRAC Guidelines applies two tests: the conformity of institutional policy, procedures, and practices, i.e., the review process as a whole, to the UPR Process, and the conformity of institutional practice, as evidenced by the conduct of its actual reviews and implementation of new programs, to institutional policy. Even though these two tests were applied in the first audit round, they continue to be important and provide the primary focus for this second cycle. Additionally however, the Auditors now also undertake a verification of the institution's implementation of the UPRAC Recommendations which emerged from the first audit.

In organizing their report and presenting their findings, the Auditors find it helpful, as in the first cycle, to distinguish between Recommendations and Suggestions. Instances where the Auditors consider the policies and procedures not to be in conformity with the UPR Process are cast as Recommendations. Suggestions are offered in cases where, although the institution's measures are in general conformity with the Process, they could, in the opinion of the Auditors, be usefully improved.