

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 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

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 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.



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

April 14, 2009

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:



GOVERNING COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

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

Board Room, Simcoe Hall

(Cover Memo)

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 * (Cover) (Item)**
(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 * (Cover)**
(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 * (Cover)**
(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 * (Cover) (Item) (Item)**
(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) * **(Cover) (Cover) (Item) (Cover)(Item) (Report) (Report)**

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.

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.

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

The Chair commented that the Guidelines for the Review of Academic Units and Programs stated that the "Governing Council is responsible for ensuring that the University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements." Members had received in their agenda packages a two-part summary of the reviews completed in 2007-08 and the administrative responses to those reviews. Members had also received copies of Reports Number 139 and 140 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. That Committee had considered the reviews in detail at two meetings in March. The heads of the relevant academic divisions had been in attendance at those meetings to answer questions. That same documentation had been reviewed by the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board.

Professor Corman reported that the Agenda Committee had considered the report on reviews at its meetings of March 17 and April 14, 2009. The Committee had agreed that there were no matters arising from the reviews that required discussion by the Academic Board. However, members had considered the importance of assessing the review process. Professor Misak had assured the Committee that such an evaluation would be one of the priorities of the incoming Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, Professor Cheryl Regehr.

The Chair invited any questions or comments on the process for monitoring the quality of academic programs and units, or about the Reviews themselves and the administrative responses. There was no discussion of the matter.

8. Reports for Information

The Governing Council received the items for information in the following four reports:

- (a) Report Number 162 of the Academic Board (April 30, 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 422 of the Executive Committee (May 12, 2009)

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the final meeting of the Governing Council for the governance year was scheduled for **Tuesday June 23, 2009**, at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber. He alerted members that the meeting was scheduled for one half hour earlier than usual.

10. Question Period

There were no questions for members of the senior administration.

11. Other Business

The Chair thanked the members of the staff at the University of Toronto at Mississauga for their excellent work in preparing for and hosting the meeting.



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

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.

Although no interdisciplinary programs under the authority of a “parent” program were included in this audit, the Auditors did have access to the reviews of the interdisciplinary programs in Peace and Conflict Studies and Ethics, Society, and Law as they were included in the review of Political Science on the St. George campus. Both of these interdisciplinary programs provided self-reports, though like their parent program, they were prepared by the Director, in the case of the former, and the Dean of Arts, Trinity College, in the case of the latter. While they were fairly comprehensive reports, there was no input from students or staff, and little evidence of any real analysis or reflection. It was noted that these smaller programs did receive appropriate consideration in the external reviewers report.

Toronto’s policy and procedures for multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary reviews as well as their implementation are in conformity with *UPRAC Guidelines*.

10 Conclusion

Since the occasion of the first audit the University of Toronto has made major progress in developing its policy and procedures more in line with *UPRAC Guidelines*, and has addressed, for the most part, the Recommendations and Suggestions drawn from that audit. The Auditors compliment the university for the changes made to the *Policy* and its accompanying two *Guidelines*, though the Auditors did find implementation of undergraduate program reviews was lacking in several respects. A number of recommendations and suggestions for further improving the conduct of reviews have been made. The new program approval process, however, was seen to be commendable.

The commitment of the University of Toronto to its undergraduate programs is well known, and the Auditors are confident that the institution will use this second audit Report to further its goals of improvement and renewal in the area of undergraduate education.

11 Summary of Recommendations and Suggestions

Recommendation 1: Toronto’s policy on the approval of new programs should be updated to include consideration of degree level expectations as set out in *UPRAC Guidelines*. (p. 9)

Recommendation 2: The various authorities responsible for reviews should ensure that to the quality of undergraduate education and students is explicitly addressed in reviews of established programs. (p. 12)

Recommendation 3: Undergraduate programs reviews must address the issues as required by *UPRAC Guidelines*. Programs might be assisted in this task if a more explicit statement of the requirement were included in Toronto’s *Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units*. (p. 13)

Recommendation 4: Commissioning Officers should communicate clearly to units undergoing review that self-studies must be conducted in accordance with the *Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units*, and must be the outcome of active involvement of faculty, staff, and students. Reviews should be timed to permit maximum participation of program members. (p. 15)

Recommendation 5: The University of Toronto should reconsider how it complies with the requirement of “appraisal by peers,” and specify in its *Guidelines* a procedure that includes substantive institutional peer review at a stage in the review process that would have an impact on the recommendations for the program. (p. 17)

Recommendation 6: Toronto should ensure that the Commissioning Officers more clearly specify at an earlier stage the action that will be taken on the final set of recommendations emanating from reviews, and establish a reasonable timeline for implementation. (p. 19)

Recommendation 7: The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs should develop a procedure for monitoring the actions taken following an undergraduate program review. (p. 19)

Recommendation 8: Toronto’s *Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs and Units* should be amended to include evaluation of the achievement of its undergraduate degree level expectations. (p. 20)

Suggestion 1: Consideration might given to offering a workshop or providing a manual to programs embarking on a review. (p. 15)

Suggestion 2: Commissioning Officers might consider requesting more information about prospective external reviewers, including evidence about any connection they may have had with the University of Toronto. (p. 16)

Suggestion 3: The University of Toronto should ensure that program reviews are completed in a more timely fashion, with special attention paid to the period between the external reviewers’ report and the AP&P review. (p. 18)