


GOVERNING COUNCIL SECRETARIAT

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 12, 2001
TO: Members of the Governing Council
FROM: Louis R. Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council 
RE: Reviews of Academic Programs and Units

Item Identification Reviews of Academic Programs and Units

Sponsor Vice-President and Provost

Jurisdictional Information

In 1994, the Governing Council approved in principle a recommendation of the Broadhurst Task Force on Ontario University Accountability that governing boards should receive a report on all program reviews.

Previous Action Taken

In 1994/5, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs instituted a process whereby each review report was referred to a panel of Committee members, who read the full text of the review, met with the academic leader of the relevant unit, and forwarded a summary of the review to the full Committee. This process was revised in 1999 to provide for an annual program review report, summarizing all reviews conducted during the year according to a common template, to be considered by the full Committee, then forwarded to the Agenda Committee of Academic Board, the Executive Committee and the Governing Council (see attached).

Under this process, the Executive Committee is the locus of responsibility for ensuring that the review process has been appropriately conducted and reported to governance. The summary reports are forwarded to Governing Council for information.

In April 2001, three volumes of Review reports were considered under this new process:

- Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 1995/6 – 1997/8 (July 1999);
- Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 1998/9 – 1999-2000, Volume 1 (October 2000);
- Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 1998/9 – 1999-2000, Volume 2 (January 2001).

The attached Review of Academic Programs and Units, October 2001 is the fourth volume to be considered under this process. Included in this Volume are reviews of five Departments in the Faculty of Medicine: Family and Community Medicine, Ophthalmology, Paediatrics, Radiation Oncology and Speech-Language Pathology; The Department of Psychology in the Faculty of Arts and Science; the Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics in the School of Graduate Studies; and three Departments of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT): Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology, Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, and Theory and Policy Studies in Education.

Included with the Review is the report of the meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at which the Review was considered. The discussion of the Reviews by the Executive Committee is summarized in Report Number 342. The record of the Executive Committee's discussion and that of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs is meant to provide the Governing Council with assurance that appropriate review processes are in place.

Action Sought

These Review Reports are provided for information.



Memorandum

To: Members of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs
From: Carolyn Tuohy
Re: Reviews of Academic Programs and Units
Date: April 21, 1999

As recommended in the Broadhurst report on University Accountability and in the guidelines for undergraduate programs reviews established by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), the University has undertaken to ensure that summaries of all academic program reviews are provided to Governing Council. The route for reporting these summaries is through the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

In 1994/5, AP&P instituted a process whereby each review report was referred to a panel of Committee members, who read to the full text of the review, met with the academic leader of the relevant unit, and forwarded a summary of the review to the full Committee. This process, however, proved to be too labour intensive to be workable within existing resources – as evidenced by the fact that a back-log of over 35 reviews has built up.

I attach a proposal for another approach. On this new model, the full Committee would hold one meeting a year devoted entirely to the discussion of program review summaries. The Committee would receive summaries of all review reports submitted to the Provost in the previous academic year, as well as an overall summary highlighting common or recurring themes and administrative actions taken. The full text of the review reports would be available in the office of the Governing Council secretariat for consultation by any Committee member who wished to do so. Each dean or principal whose unit(s) had been reviewed would be invited to attend the relevant portion of the meeting.

This method would provide all members of the Committee with a comprehensive overview of program reviews in an accessible format, and with an opportunity to pursue questions relating to particular reviews as well as broader issues suggested by the overview. This approach is similar to the one which has been successfully implemented by the Planning and Budget Committee with regard to the academic plans which it receives for information as background to its approval of APF allocations.

I propose that we schedule the “academic reviews” meeting in July. (AP&P is not accustomed to meet in July; but the Planning and Budget Committee routinely does so. Indeed, most of the P&B meetings dealing with academic planning have been held in July.) This would provide an overview for new members of the Committee, and would allow the summaries to be sent on to the Executive Committee for its first meeting in September. I’d suggest that we think in terms of a three- or four-hour meeting, including lunch or a light supper. In 1999 and 2000, we might require two July meetings, given the large number of reviews to be dealt with.

I seek the Committee's endorsement of this proposal, which would then be presented to the Executive Committee of Governing Council for approval. I therefore ask the Committee to approve the following motion:

That the Committee endorse the Provost's proposal for an Accountability Framework for Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, as described in the memorandum from the Deputy Provost dated April 21, 1999

Carolyn Gusky

Accountability Framework for Reviews of Academic Programs and Units

Responsible Agent	Responsible for:	Mechanism
Governing Council :	Ensuring that University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements	Receive annual program review report (including summaries of all reviews) and record of AP&P and Executive Committee discussion
a) Executive Committee	Monitoring overall review audit process; identification of any changes required in process; discussion of any major unresolved issues with President and Provost	Receive annual program review report (including summaries of all reviews) and record of AP&P discussion
b) Agenda Committee of Academic Board	Identifying any general academic issues raised by the overview of reviews that warrant discussion by the Academic Board	Receive annual program review report (including summaries of all reviews) and record of AP&P discussion
b) Committee on Academic Policy and Programs	Undertaking a comprehensive overview of review results and administrative responses	Receive annual program review report including summaries of all reviews, identifying key issues and administrative responses. Discuss annual report at dedicated program review meeting with relevant academic leadership; forward to Executive Citee
Provost	Monitoring quality of all academic programs and units in the University and taking necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements	Commission and respond to reviews of faculties and colleges Prepare summaries of reviews of faculties and colleges, including administrative response Receive reviews of units within multi-departmental faculties Prepare overall summary of all reviews, for forwarding to Governing Council
Dean/Principal of multi-departmental faculty	Monitoring quality of all academic programs and units in the Faculty and taking necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements	Commission and respond to reviews of academic programs and units within the Faculty Prepare summaries of all reviews within the Faculty Forward reviews and summaries, including administrative responses, to Provost

REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS

Annual Report to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

October 2001

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

Revised

REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND UNITS

Table of Contents

	<u>Page No.</u>
Introduction	1
<u>Faculty of Medicine</u>	
Department of Family and Community Medicine	3
Department of Ophthalmology	8
Department of Paediatrics	11
Department of Radiation Oncology	15
Department of Speech-Language Pathology	20
<u>Faculty of Arts and Science</u>	
Department of Psychology	24
<u>School of Graduate Studies</u>	
Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics	28
School of Graduate Studies – Reviews/Responses Deferred	31
<u>OISE/UT</u>	
Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology	33
Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning	35
Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education	38

INTRODUCTION

As a result of the extensive number of external reviews conducted for the *Raising Our Sights* planning process in 1999-2000, far fewer reviews were required in 2000-2001. In many units in which a review would normally have been triggered by the end of term of the academic head, the existence of a recent *Raising Our Sights* review was deemed to obviate the need for another review.

Among the multi-departmental faculties, the largest number of reviews was conducted in the Faculty of Medicine. The process followed in the Faculty of Medicine for *Raising Our Sights* – namely, a “Review of Reviews” – differed somewhat from that in other faculties in that it did not involve newly-commissioned reviews of individual units. The Faculty has therefore continued on its normal review cycle, and conducted reviews of five departments in 2000-2001. (In one other department – Medical Biophysics – a Chair search was conducted without a review because the search resulted from a mid-term resignation.) In all cases the overall assessment of the department was very positive. Four of the reviews are of clinical departments. Issues highlighted in these reviews are similar to those raised in recent reviews of other clinical departments – the recognition of the need to re-work the role of clinicians in undergraduate medical education, as is currently being done by the Faculty; the budgetary and administrative complexities of multi-site clinical departments, and in some cases concern about inadequate numbers of residency places. The fifth department reviewed in this cycle, Speech-Language Pathology, while not a clinical department *per se*, has a strong clinical component. In that case the reviewers recognized the need to expand enrolment and faculty and to find appropriate space for the department. Plans for expansion are underway, and new space has recently been identified. The Dean has provided a detailed and considered response to each of these reviews.

In the Faculty of Arts and Science, only one department – Psychology – was reviewed. In four other cases – Classics, Geology, Physics and Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations – it was judged that the *Raising Our Sights* provided a sufficient basis to waive the end-of-term review. In the School of Graduate Studies, one unit – the Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics (CITA) – was reviewed on the normal five-year cycle. In three other cases – the Joint Centre for Asia Pacific Studies, the Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama, and the Institute for Policy Analysis – reviews or review reports have been deferred for reasons set out in the SGS section below. In OISE/UT, three Chair searches were conducted without reviews because of recent accreditation and OCGS reviews. For the Committee’s information, the Dean has provided summaries of issues identified in these reviews by outside bodies, as well as the administrative response, according to the standard template for review summaries. In the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, Chair searches were conducted without reviews in the Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry and the Institute for Aerospace Studies, again because these units had just been reviewed for *Raising Our Sights*. Finally, no reviews were conducted at the University of Toronto at Mississauga or the University of Toronto at Scarborough because there was no change in academic leadership. The Committee can nonetheless expect to receive summaries of reviews conducted at UTM and UTSc for *Raising Our Sights* once the administrative response is in place, as discussed below.

Among single-department faculties, searches for deans were conducted without reviews in Dentistry and Nursing because these faculties had been reviewed in 1999-2000 for *Raising Our Sights*.

There are six divisions for which the *Raising Our Sights* planning process is not yet complete, and for which the Committee has therefore not received reports of the relevant reviews: the Faculties of Information Studies, Law, and Physical Education and Health, the Rotman School of Management, the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the University of Toronto at Scarborough. It is anticipated that this process will be completed in the 2001-02 academic year.

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Family and Community Medicine Faculty of Medicine
DATE OF REVIEW:	September 13-14, 2000
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	- undergraduate medical program
Graduate	- MHSc program offered through Graduate Department of Community Health
Postgraduate	- postgraduate clinical training - fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	- continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. Larry Green Center for Policy Studies in Family Practice and Primary Care Washington, D.C.
Canadian	Dr. Ruth Wilson Queen's University Kingston, Ontario
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1995
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Members' Report Student Reports Education Report International Dev't Program Report Research Report Departmental Budget Previous External Reviews/Responses Departmental Communications Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENTATIONS

Overall Assessment:

The reviewers state that the department is "a contender for the preeminent department of Family Medicine in North America" by virtue of its academic and research profile.

Specific Issues:

1. Undergraduate Medical Education

The reviewers note a substantial increase in the teaching role of DFCM since curriculum reform and renewal in 1991. This has placed major pressures on departmental members who do not have the same ability to generate clinical revenue at the levels enjoyed by some in specialties. Furthermore, community-based practitioners are not eligible for hospital/institutional support.

The reviewers note correctly that the Dean has put a process in place to reconsider the undergraduate teaching load of the department and reduce the number of hours taught. They state that this approach is "not well understood and/or accepted throughout the department". They accordingly recommended that the issue be revisited and that another solution be found that meets the interest of students and either gives more resources to the department or re-balances teaching modes on a basis that is better understood.

2. Postgraduate medical education

The reviewers state: "The situation of the department in the multicultural, vibrant metropolis of Toronto would seem to offer many opportunities for production of well-trained urban generalist family physicians who might also have additional skills in inner city issues." They suggest that the Department define some core competencies for UofT postgraduate trainees and develop additional PGY3 positions to create a stronger specialization in family medicine for some trainees. The reviewers also suggested the possibility that some units might be consolidated.

3. Research

The reviewers offer highly positive appraisals of the department's progress in research under the Chair, Walter Rosser. They indicate that "there is already an enviable record of MRC and other funding [and] publications" and they see the department as "poised, perhaps like no other department of family medicine, to take advantage of the new resources that are flowing into Canadian health sciences research." They recommend continued support at higher levels.

4. Fellowship programs

The reviewers recommend that the third year clinical fellowships be expanded, as noted above. They also recommend that the current Master of Health Sciences in Family Medicine could be enhanced by quantitative and qualitative methods courses. They urge that the research enterprise be more closely linked to the academic fellowship program.

5. Continuing Education

The reviewers indicate that "the discipline [of family medicine] has matured to the point where it is seen as appropriate for the academic department to offer continuing education to family physicians rather than relying solely on specialists from other disciplines," and they saw the increasing interest in linking research findings to continuing education as a "promising development."

6. Relations with the Dean's Office and Other Departments

The reviewers identified a 'counter-culture' self-perception in the department that lends itself to alienation from the rest of the Faculty, and highlighted the need for closer communication with the DFCM executive and the Dean's office.

7. Organizational Structure

The reviewers described the structure of the department as a "federal/provincial" model with a relatively small central operation and strong sub-units. They recommended that the Department meet more often as a whole, and that there be more transparency in the budgetary process.

8. Morale

The reviewers found very high morale among undergraduate students, residents and faculty, but noted that "the department may be facing challenges associated with differentiation within a generalist department."

Administrative Response

The Dean is encouraged by the very positive overall assessment of the department. His response to specific issues is as follows:

1. Undergraduate medical education:

The departmental executive argues that the undergraduate medical education situation is evidence that the capacity and value students ascribe to DFCM teaching is not appropriately understood or regarded within the faculty. They also claim that other departments do not understand the challenges of teaching from a community or family medicine base. The current chair's view is that the solution is "not to reduce the amount of undergraduate teaching in the department of family and community medicine but to support it more fully than has been the case to date".

At the outset, the record needs clarification. The Executive of the DFCM advised the Dean's Office several months ago that, absent a base budget increase for DFCM, the various sites would effect a reduction in pre-clerkship teaching by fifty percent. I am gratified that many in the Department now want to see a reasoned compromise. The fact is that the Faculty and the University greatly value the special teaching role of DFCM in general and in the PBL curriculum specifically. We are aware that the Department was heavily loaded when small group learning was given greater emphasis in the early 1990s. Our intent is to retool the curriculum so as to enhance mid-sized group teaching by content experts, in keeping with the shifting frontier of post-genomic medicine, the vision of the McLaughlin Centre, the research-intensiveness of the Faculty, and our vision of the Faculty as a training ground for academic leaders. This approach may also reduce some of the variability in content exposure that has been highlighted in other external reviews as a common side-effect of small-group PBL teaching.

We need time to get on with these changes in curriculum. The Task Force on Clinician Teachers has emphasized the need to strengthen the role of clinical departments in delivery of the undergraduate curriculum. Therefore, there will be a greater opportunity for department chairs to compare and contrast their teaching loads as curriculum retooling occurs. For these reasons, I think that we will arrive at a fair compromise that meets the objectives of all concerned.

2. Postgraduate medical education

The departmental executive rejected the concept of consolidating units. The departmental executive also expressed concern about focusing trainees on urban practice and suggested this would put the program in jeopardy with accreditors. The current percentage of residents focused on rural training was felt to be appropriate. The only issue on which there seemed to be agreement between the executive and the reviewers was that thirty to forty percent of second year positions should extend to R3 positions. However, from the executive's perspective, the R3 years should be focused on enhancing skills of those "planning to work in more rural areas" rather than on producing a more specialized and differentiated stream of trainees.

The current chair suggests that adherence to accreditation standards and the Provincial Coordinating Committee on Community and Academic Health Science Centre Relations

(PCCCAR) basket of services vitiates any further need for a core curriculum. Chair Rosser rejected the concept that there should be any reduction in the number of rural trainees and suggested that, if anything, the number of rurally-oriented trainees might increase. Last, he highlighted the importance of R3 training programs.

I am not entirely comfortable with the position taken by either the departmental executive or the chair. I understand that DFCM residents are assigned to a particular site for more or less the entirety of their training. This contrasts with specialty programs in other departments where there is movement across institutions to ensure a breadth of exposure to various mentors and settings. While I do not think that an R3 program needs to focus primarily on urban health, I also question the wisdom of expanding our training of rural-oriented practitioners. We shall always play a major role in preparing Ontario physicians for rural and northern practice, but our comparative advantages rest elsewhere. I could readily envisage an R3 program with different streams, e.g. urban/inner city health, HIV/AIDS, maternity care, child health care, etc. If this Department is to achieve its potential of becoming the world leader in primary care research and education, some changes in the postgraduate training program seem to be indicated. Last, I should note that I have already indicated to the Ministry of Health that with enrollment expansion occurring in MD programs across the province, we are keen to see expansion of our postgraduate programs, including R3 slots for DFCM.

3. Research

I completely agree with the reviewers' assessment and recommendations. No other department has the same number of patients flowing through its members' clinical practices. No other department is in the same position to do high volume clinical research of a nature that could fundamentally change decision making on the front lines of clinical service provision. I have articulated this view to the departmental executive and I hope to continue working with the Department to pursue this agenda. The requisites are info-structure as well as investments in training evaluative scientists who can be primary care research leaders for the world. PGY3 positions that permit clinical fellowships and graduate training would be valuable in this regard.

4. Fellowship programs

I agree with the recommendations. I also wonder if the MHSc program is sufficiently research intensive for the Department to fully realize its research potential. Hence as the reviewers have rightly noted, there may well be a need to strengthen the research methods component of the current training program. An alternative is to look at switching from the MHSc to a standard MSc/PhD stream and swing the department more into alignment with other clinical departments as regards graduate training.

6. Continuing Education

The reviewers offer no specific recommendations on continuing education. This is in any case an area of investment for the Faculty through the new knowledge transfer program funded through the Academic Priorities Fund and led by Professor Dave Davis, Associate Dean for Continuing Education.

6. Relations with the Dean's Office and Other Departments

I think the reviewers have correctly highlighted the need for closer communication with the DFCM executive and my office. Even when relations with the Chair are sound (as they have been with Professor Rosser), the Department is large and diverse. I have met once with the DFCM executive, and I intend to do so again intermittently until the new Department Chair is settled in. I also urge the Department to work more closely with the Department of Paediatrics on child health issues and with other departments (such as obstetrics and gynaecology, psychiatry, medicine, and surgery) in defining a joint agenda for specialism within family medicine.

7. Organizational Structure

I think more frequent meetings of the full department would be difficult to organize. More frequent communications by e-mail and fax may help. But in fairness, I believe there will always be some centrifugal forces at work because of the difficulty in developing a common vision that will pull the Department together. DFCM combines community-based practitioners who are strongly dedicated to clinical teaching and preparing family physicians for small-city or rural practice, with downtown family physician-researchers who have subspecialized in particular research areas and may even have circumscribed their clinical practice.

On the other hand, I was struck by the reaction of the faculty at large who found the reviewers' relatively bland comments regarding organizational structure to be 'probably the most controversial in the entire report'. There are presumably some issues simmering in the departmental budgeting process, both as regards the structure and function of practice plans, and the allocation of University dollars. Practice plan issues ultimately rest with the group of self-employed colleagues who form the plan; however, I am supportive of a policy of "open-book" practice plans, with explicit and transparent rewards for academic activity. I also would prefer to see greater transparency in general about the allocation of University dollars in clinical departments.

The reaction from a minority that the central Department is somehow overdeveloped strikes me as misplaced. I have already indicated my view that the assignment of residents exclusively to sites must be re-assessed. I also believe that the departmental executive structure needs more Faculty members with cross-cutting portfolios as a complement to the site chiefs. The latter will help diffuse some of the tensions that the reviewers note and that are reflected in the disparate faculty responses (some favouring an even more decentralized model, and others believing the sites function too much as separate silos).

8. Future Directions

I indicated to the reviewers my belief that the Department requires "coherent pluralism" to succeed. There are many challenges articulated above. On the other hand, the progress that DFCM has made in the last decade under Walter Rosser's leadership is extraordinary. I agree with the reviewers that DFCM is already a major force in the University and nation, and has international profile as a result of its research activities. Now we must all work to position DFCM for even greater success in a rapidly-changing health care environment. I am confident that Professor Rosser's successor will be able to move the Department forward in the years ahead.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Ophthalmology Faculty of Medicine
DATE OF REVIEW:	June 12-13, 2000
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	- undergraduate medical program
Graduate	- graduate programs offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	- postgraduate clinical training - fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	- continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. Richard Parrish University of Miami Miami, Florida
Canadian	Dr. Miguel Burnier McGill University Montreal, Quebec
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1995
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Members' Report Student Reports Education Reports Research Report Departmental Budget Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENTATIONS:	
Overall assessment:	
The reviewers judged that the retiring Chair, Dr. Graham Trope, had "done a superb job in bringing their Department ... to a high level of teaching and research."	

Specific Issues:

1. Undergraduate Medical Education:

The department was judged to offer "the best undergraduate medicine program in Ophthalmology in Canada." Ophthalmology was now involved in all four years of the MD program.

2. Post-graduate Medical Education:

The reviewers judged the residency program to be "very good," covering all sub-specialties. They recommended, however, that "emphasis should be given to establishing a more coordinated clinical research program," involving greater collaboration with basic science departments.

3. MD/PhD program:

This program also should emphasize collaboration with other disciplines.

4. Research:

Reviewers noted the establishment of the Vision Science Research program with sufficient funding. They emphasized the importance of inter-departmental collaboration, with particular emphasis on Ophthalmic Pathology.

5. Faculty:

Reviewers recommended the recruitment of clinician scientists with cross-appointments to the basic sciences.

6. Continuing Medical Education:

This area was judged to be "flourishing."

7. Departmental structure:

The reviewers recommended emulation of the McGill model under which the Chair of the University department is also Chief of Ophthalmology at each of the affiliated teaching hospitals.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Dean's response to reviewers' recommendations, which relate primarily to inter-disciplinary linkages and to administrative structure, is as follows:

1. Strengthening inter-departmental linkages regarding ophthalmic pathology: Dr. Trope's letter notes that he has made efforts to move Dr. Yeni Yucel's laboratory from 1 Spadina to St. Michael's Hospital, with a view to strengthening and integrating ophthalmic pathology with other disciplines. I am committed to working with the next chair and the hospitals in whatever moves are required to strengthen not only ophthalmic pathology but the full range of fundamental sciences linked to the department's activities.
2. Recruitment of clinician-scientists with cross-appointments to Basic Science disciplines: The department is training a growing cadre of clinician scientists through its Vision Science Research Program. It will be important for the next chair to continue raising the profile of vision science research so that more scientists with primary appointments in other departments take an active interest in ophthalmological issues, and can be drawn into the department's activities. Leverage of funds to create external recruitment opportunities will also be vital.
3. MD/PhD Program to emphasize inter-disciplinary collaboration: Agreed. I believe this is already the case with the Vision Science Research Program. Perhaps an equal challenge rests in the need for the Vision Science Research Program to be a resource not just for students and supervisors at UHN, but across the Toronto academic health science complex.

4. Creation of a multi-site Chief/Department Chair model of leadership, with rationalization of hospital roles: I have received only very limited feedback on the multi-site chief/chair model, but it is mixed. The current discussions take us in the direction of a joint chief for UHN and SMH who will also be department chair, leaving site chiefs at MSH, SWCHSC, and HSC. This appears to be a reasonable compromise that allows us to assess the feasibility of integrated leadership. Last, I should emphasize that regardless of which site leadership roles the next chair does or does not hold, s/he must work with all sites to rationalize clinical roles and to ensure that the service portfolios of each site are matched as closely as possible to the academic mission of the department, the site, and the Faculty.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DATE OF REVIEW:	October 31 - November 1, 2000
DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Paediatrics Faculty of Medicine
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	- undergraduate medical program
Graduate	- graduate programs offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	- postgraduate clinical training - fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	- continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. Thomas Boat University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio
Canadian	Dr. Marie Gauthier Universite de Montreal Montreal, Quebec
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1995
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Members' Report Student Reports Education Reports Research Report Departmental Budget Departmental Communications Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENTATIONS:

Overall Assessment:

The reviewers' judgment is that "the Department of Paediatrics at the University of Toronto continues to be the pre-eminent academic pediatric program in Canada." Academic productivity is "at a leadership level internationally," as noted below.

The reviewers also note progress in dealing with issues identified in the 1995 review of the Department. The incumbent Chair, Dr. Hugh O'Brodovich, has brought the Department closer to the HSC research institute and strongly supported research in the Department. He has also improved relations between the Department and the hospital management team and turned around the Department's finances. During the first year or two of his term Dr. O'Brodovich had the difficult task of working with the hospital to reduce expenses, necessitating the release of ten Faculty members. By working effectively with the Research Institute, Ministry of Health and hospital, he has since generated new resources that have allowed recruitment of nearly fifty Faculty members.

The reviewers also commented on the on-going implications of the L1/deferiprone controversy, as elaborated below.

Specific Issues:

1. Undergraduate Medical Education

The UME programs "are effective and continue to be a strength of the Department." Paediatric faculty were praised by students.

2. Post-Graduate Education

"The Impact of the residency program is limited by size. Training of sub-specialty fellows, however, is carried out quantitatively and qualitatively at a high level." The main issues identified by the reviewers were that the faculty in some subspecialties are over-stretched by heavy clinical loads, and that the funding for the research component of subspecialty fellowship training is not stable. Further, the number of residency positions has declined in the subspecialty and clinical fellowship realm.

Interviews with sub-specialty residents and fellows, however, revealed high levels of satisfaction with the quality of teaching and the commitment of program directors.

Greater levels of cross-training and collaboration with the Department of Family and Community Medicine were recommended.

3. Continuing Education

The reviewers comment favourably on a number of improvements and initiatives, including Tele-health Outreach. They suggest that CE events targeted specifically towards family physicians might be useful.

4. Clinical and Basic Research

The reviewers judge the academic productivity of the Department in terms of peer reviewed publications to be "at a leadership level internationally. Extramural research funding is considerably less than that of the top three Children's Hospitals in the US, but is none the less impressive." The total funding for research in the Department of Paediatrics now exceeds \$18 million -- up fifty percent over the last five years. There have been approximately nine hundred publications in peer reviewed journals per year for the Department over the last four years.

5. Faculty:

The quality of the faculty is judged as "stellar."

6. Relationship with other Cognate Departments

As the reviewers note, the Chair is seen as a team player and enjoys positive interactions with various other department chairs and leaders across the Faculty. Enhanced linkages with the Department of Family and Community Medicine are recommended, as noted elsewhere.

7. Organizational structure

The reviewers praised the career development and composition program set up to allocate resources under the HSC alternative funding plan and also noted the cross linkages that have been strengthened between the HSC administration and departmental executive. They recommended possible streamlining of faculty review processes including the dual departmental and institute evaluations. The Chair was praised as well for creating an effective departmental executive that has gained the confidence of most of the Faculty members.

The reviewers do highlight the concern that the broader child health network, which draws in members of the Department of Paediatrics outside of the Hospital for Sick Children, is still not cohesive. As a result, they note that many of these faculty "feel isolated and perhaps less highly valued. Additional steps will be needed to integrate these faculty members into a truly extended Department of Paediatrics, to document their contributions and to ensure that they perceive their contributions to be of value." The reviewers specifically recommend that the population health sciences program be a catalyst for the promotion of child health throughout the community.

8. L1/Deferiprone Controversy:

Because of the unresolved controversies around L1/Deferiprone, the reviewers received a substantial volume of material critical of the Chair from some faculty members. The reviewers expressed the view that judgments about the particulars of this dispute were beyond their mandate. They did, however, note the following: that the letters and materials critical of the Chair appeared to represent opinions of a small minority of the faculty; that overall the Chair had performed outstandingly in the face of extremely difficult circumstances; that this episode should be "a catalyst for ensuring that standard policies and procedures are in place to unambiguously govern industry interfaces and clinical trial issues; and that there was a need to "diligently and creatively manage the disaffection of a segment of the pediatric faculty."

9. Morale of faculty and students

Notwithstanding the very high profile of the L1 controversy and the associated criticism of the leadership of the hospital by some, the reviewers state: "Overall, the morale of the faculty is better than five years ago". Reviewers note that that the departmental career development and composition program has "emphasized fairness, transparency and collegiality among peers". They spoke positively about the relationships between the Department and the research institute and between surgical and medical specialties in the hospital. Last, as regards the L1 issue, the reviewers wrote, "Globally, Department members want to move on, are proud of their departmental accomplishments and have confidence in its short and long term future".

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The reviewers had few specific recommendations for change. Most related to the need for greater inter-departmental linkages, particularly with the Department of Family and Community Medicine, and to the need for greater integration of paediatric faculty outside the Hospital for Sick Children. The Dean's response to reviewers' recommendations is as follows:

1. Greater interaction with the Department of Family and Community Medicine, in post-graduate and continuing medical education: I agree, and have dealt with this issue in the response to the review of the Department of Family and Community Medicine. I would

add to this that there is considerable potential for linkages to the Department of Family and Community Medicine in building a comprehensive network for child health and child health promotion within the Greater Toronto Area.

2. Departmental Structure and Process: With regard to streamlining of faculty review processes, I would support the Chair in working with colleagues in the alternative funding plan and the research institute to find ways to reduce paperwork and enhance a simplicity and transparency of peer review processes for research capacity and academic productivity more generally in the Department.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DATE OF REVIEW:	October 12-13, 2000
DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Radiation Oncology Faculty of Medicine
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate	- undergraduate medical program - undergraduate radiation sciences therapy program (B.Sc., Radiation Science)
Graduate	- graduate programs offered through Institute of Medical Science
Postgraduate	- postgraduate clinical training - fellowship subspecialty training
Continuing	- continuing medical education
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:	
International	Dr. James Cox University of Texas, Houston, Texas
Canadian	Dr. Carolyn Freeman McGill University, Montreal, Quebec
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1995
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Members' Report Student Reports Education Reports Research Report Departmental Budget Departmental Communications Previous External Review Report Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall Assessment:

The reviewers' general appraisal is extremely positive. They highlight progress in terms of improved control and management of the clinical load, a resulting increase in research activity and teaching capacity, and much greater cooperation and collaboration between the two sites of the Department.

Specific Issues:

1. Undergraduate Education

The reviewers claim that the "teaching of Oncology is uncoordinated and almost certainly quite uneven from student to student" given the current division of responsibilities for oncology teaching across medical and surgical specialties. The reviewers are also concerned that this situation reduces the exposure to and awareness of radiation oncology as a potential career track for students.

With regard to the B.Sc., Radiation Sciences program, the reviewers note that it is too early to evaluate the success of the program, but congratulate "all of those involved in getting this program – the first of its kind in Canada – off the ground."

2. Postgraduate Medical Education

The reviewers comment on the "huge amount of clinical material and the large number of excellent mentors, coupled with outstanding educational expertise," to suggest the residency program could easily grow from the current two trainees to eight per year. "There is the expectation and the very real potential for the Department of Radiation Oncology at the University of Toronto to provide training for the future leaders in radiation oncology in Canada."

3. Research

The reviewers note that the scope of research and the levels of research funding and productivity have been increasing, and state that they are "favourably impressed by the breadth of particularly the clinical and translational research programs." They urged that researchers take up opportunities for collaborations between clinicians and clinician-scientists and with basic science research groups.

4. Relations with Cognate Departments

The reviewers suggest a need to strengthen the interaction between the physics faculty in Radiation Oncology and the Department of Medical Biophysics. To continue to strengthen clinical physics, the reviewers suggest the creation of an associate chair and possibly even a separate section within the Department of Radiation Oncology.

5. Organizational Structure and Budget

The reviewers recommend that consideration be given to naming an associate chair for the Department at the Toronto Sunnybrook Regional Cancer Centre. The reviewers also suggested - in contrast to the previous review in 1995 - that they see no objections to having the chair of the Department also be the chief of one of the two clinical sites.

The reviewers highlight the fact that there is no Department of Oncology at the University of Toronto and that the Interdepartmental Division of Oncology is primarily focused on continuing education activity. They note, however, that the University of Toronto is not unique in this regard, and make no recommendation for change.

The reviewers comment on the small size of the budget from university sources for this department, and recommend that substantially greater resources be made available to the department chair to promote the academic programs.

6. Continuing Education

The reviewers comment favourably on the "well-organized, needs-assessment-based CE programs for oncology specialists, and suggest that the Department consider a needs assessment for community-based physicians which would help enhance knowledge of contemporary care of patients with oncological problems and improve services for such patients.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Dean's response is as follows:

1. Undergraduate Education

I believe that the reviewers' characterization of the curricular exposure to oncology is not completely accurate. We do appreciate that the curriculum must be somewhat retooled for our MD students. The direction of that retooling is increasingly clear. We should be strengthening the role of the departments in organizing clinical teaching, reducing any excess reliance on small group learning and instituting more seminar-based teaching by content experts (without necessarily giving up the problem-based format), and paying even greater attention to the integration of science at all levels of the MD program. Hence, the concerns of the reviewers will be drawn to the attention of the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education so that he may weigh them as curricular retooling proceeds. As the reviewers note, the Department itself will have to make some decisions as to its role in any retooled undergraduate MD curriculum. Although resources are extremely tight, I would not rule out provision of some limited resource to support increased involvement of faculty from the Department in oncology teaching in the undergraduate MD curriculum.

The reviewers took positive note of the new program between the Department of Radiation Oncology, other departments and the Michener Institute's Radiation Sciences Program. We are still facing some challenges with this program, including attainment of adequate enrollment in streams other than for radiation therapy, as well as adequate compensation of involved sites for hosting students. Proposals for a re-structuring of the program are proceeding through University governance. I agree, moreover, that there should be a continuing effort to develop a Masters' stream for radiation therapists. In itself, this could become a very nice bridge between the Departments of Radiation Oncology and Medical Biophysics (see below).

2. Postgraduate Medical Education

I was pleased that the reviewers took specific note of the great strengths of postgraduate medical education in the Department and paid tribute to the leadership role played by Dr. Catton and other members of the faculty. I agree with the reviewers that the residency program could expand to eight trainees per year. We added 13 MD students per year as of 2000-2001 and another 8 as of 2001-2002. Furthermore, I have made a request to the Deputy Minister of Health for the University of Toronto to accept responsibility for postgraduate training for the majority of the 80 "unattached" slots that will be put in play if the Report of the Task Force chaired by Professor Peter George is accepted. Assuming capacity grows as planned in the postgraduate programs generally, I foresee an expansion in the Radiation Oncology residency program. I cannot commit in advance to a specific number of slots as there are several other departments and programs that have been similarly categorized in terms of service needs for the province and country; but if feasible, residency growth for this department is a priority given service loads and ongoing pressure to import specialists from other nations.

3. Relationship with Cognate Departments

I agree that there is a need to strengthen the interaction between the physics faculty in Radiation Oncology and the Department of Medical Biophysics. The new chair of the Department of Radiation Oncology, Prof. Mary Gospodarowicz, will pursue this goal with the still-to-be-appointed chair of Medical Biophysics. I think decisions regarding the creation of an associate chair and

possibly even a separate section within the Department of Radiation Oncology are best left to the incoming chair.

4. Organizational and Budget Issues

The incoming chair and I have discussed at some length the possibility of naming an associate chair for the Department at the Toronto Sunnybrook Regional Cancer Centre. In the Faculty response there is some ambivalence about the concept. In the worst case scenario, the appointment of an associate chair could be seen as reinforcing the concept of two solitudes in the Department. Hence, in the first instance Dr. Gospodarowicz plans to establish a strong presence at TSRCC and she will, over time, give serious consideration to the appointment of an associate chair.

We spent considerable time in the current search exploring the possibility that the chair might be chief at both the PMH/UHN and the TSRCC sites. It was also concluded by the search committee and by the CEOs of the relevant sites that we could indeed proceed with a single site chief and chair model. In that respect, Prof. Gospodarowicz will be the Chief of Radiation Medicine at the Princess Margaret Hospital as well as Chair of the Department starting July 1, 2001.

With regard to the reviewers' observation about the fact that there is no Department of Oncology at the University of Toronto, I agree that many years hence it is possible that we would organize more of the faculty along disease-specific lines rather than by discipline; but at present I can see absolutely no rationale for organizing a Department of Oncology. Indeed we have just disbanded the Interdepartmental Division of Oncology. Many faculties of medicine are moving in the same direction and collapsing their departments into broader structures. At the University of Edinburgh there are only a handful of departments now. At the University of Cape Town, they have recently closed more than 15 departments, going so far as to subsume their Department of Anesthesia under the Department of Surgery. Given the pace of change in both medical science and clinical service organizations, it is arguable that no particular departmental structure is optimal or defensible for more than a few years, and there will always be inconsistencies and diseconomies of scope and scale in any set of departmental structure.

One countervailing force not noted by the reviewers, moreover, is the emergence of site groups in the city that tend to integrate clinical research across medicine, surgery and radiation oncology. Furthermore, if links between the Department of Radiation Oncology and the Department of Medical Biophysics were enhanced, and if there were stronger links to other fundamental science departments, there could be an integrating research theme in control of cellular differentiation and duplication. Last and not least, it is conceivable that a "meta-structure" might re-emerge in future for the oncological field. One example is the Heart & Stroke Richard Lewar Centre of Excellence in Cardiovascular Research which is developing an integrated research program and is likely to extend its activities into education. However in that instance, the creation of the Centre was funded by a very large donation and matching grant from external sources.

Put simply, then, the thrust of the Dean's Office is to reduce the number of departments and units in the faculty and to clear up some of the tangled lines of accountability and authority that currently exist, not to multiply them through the creation of additional departments and units or institutes. Any restructuring of departments and extra-departmental units will have to proceed in that light. Specifically, any interdepartmental thrust in oncology would have to be organized under multiple departments, be accountable to a council of department chairs, and be catalyzed by major external funding. Otherwise, there is no reason why such a structure cannot be created by the involved individuals or departments on a less formal programmatic basis.

Finally, with regard to budget, the reviewers suggest that there should be a major expansion in the "hard" funding available to the Department. Virtually every external review of every department understandably tends to recommend that University funding be increased. I only wish it were possible. The Faculty's budget is very tightly balanced and there is no capacity for major increases in base budgets for any department. The best way to improve the financial situation for

the Department would be for the next Chair and the leadership at TSRCC and PMH to work with the University in seeking better funding for the academic staff of the two sites (including appropriate enhancement of funding for research time and for medical physics) as well as an improvement in the core grant from the Ministry of Health which supports the University budget.

5. Continuing Education

I think the reviewers' recommendation with regard to community-based physicians is an excellent idea and leave it to the Department and the office of continuing education led by Associate Dean Dave Davis.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT:	Department of Speech-Language Pathology, Faculty of Medicine
DATE OF REVIEW:	October 16-17, 2000
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean
PROGRAMS OFFERED: Graduate	MSc/PhD Program MHSc Program
REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:	1 Canadian, 1 American
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY: International	Dr. Ray Kent University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin
Canadian	Dr. Paul Hagler University of Alberta Edmonton, Alberta
DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW:	1994
DATE OF MOST RECENT OCGS REVIEW:	1999
DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:	Dean's Review Guidelines External Review Schedule Chair's Report Faculty Members' Report Graduate Student Reports Graduate Education Reports Research Report Departmental Budget Department Communications Previous External Review Report/Responses Curriculum Vitae of departmental faculty
CONSULTATION PROCESS:	2-day site visit - reviewers met with the Dean, department chair, and representatives of the faculty, staff and students

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENTATIONS:**Overall Assessment:**

The reviewers describe the department as one of "much accomplishment and great promise," having experienced considerable growth since the last review in 1994. They describe the strengths of the Department as "a resourceful and diligent chair; a creative and hard-working

faculty; capable students; successful degree programs; a good reputation among cognate departments; and excellent community resources," Nonetheless it faces significant challenges related to resource constraints, as outlined below.

Specific Issues:

1. Graduate Education:

Professional stream (MHSc): This program attracts excellent students and has a very good graduation rate. Typically, graduates attain outstanding scores on external certification exams. Recent changes in the curriculum, emphasizing coursework prior to clinical practica, were appropriate and have been well received.

Doctoral stream: The MSc and PhD programs began in 1995 and 1996 respectively. They attract excellent students with a strong record of success in external awards competitions. The reviewers strongly endorse the creation of these programs as consistent with the University's research mission.

Teaching and supervisory responsibilities are heavy compared to other departments in the rehabilitation sector and the Faculty more generally. Clinical supervision workloads were also heavy, although this should be mitigated by changes in the MHSc curriculum.

Expansion of enrolment would be justified for both these streams, but cannot be accomplished with the current level of faculty and other resources.

2. Research:

"Faculty research productivity is commendable, particularly in view of limited resources and heavy workloads of teaching and service." Research is generally well-balanced across sub-areas, with exception of hearing, which involves personnel without full-time tenure-stream appointments. The department's total research funding doubled between 1995-96 and 1998-99. The reviewers also commend the excellent partnerships that the Department has forged with other cognate departments and institutions across the Academic Health Sciences Complex.

3. Faculty

The reviewers note that the Department's success reflects the hard work of the 8 full-time tenure-stream faculty members as well as the excellent contribution made by thirteen status-only academic faculty members who are employed as full-time clinicians.

4. Space and Budget

The reviewers highlight the pressure that the Department faces with regards to space and facilities in the Tanz Neurosciences Building, the tight budget that has severely constrained the administrative support for the Department.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The dean's response is as follows:

1. Curriculum Reform

I am pleased that the reviewers suggest the new curriculum is working well and that all that is required now is some fine-tuning. I should note that the Dean's Offices provided a modest sum on a one-time-only basis to assist in curricular development this year.

2. Enrolment Expansion

I agree with the reviewers that there is a very definite need for enrollment expansion that must be accompanied by a major increase in numbers of faculty. A comprehensive plan has in fact been developed by the rehabilitation sector working with Associate Dean Cathy Whiteside. Each

department has had comprehensive input to this plan that includes a detailed blueprint for expansion of the faculty, hiring of additional administrative staff, hiring of senior tutors as appropriate to maintain the professional programs, and growth in the MSc/PhD stream.

3. Space and Budget

Prof. Square in her response commented on the need for the Department to have non-salary operating expenses equal to fifteen to twenty percent of the total salaried budget as well as adjustment to the salary level to add tenure stream faculty members and two additional support staff. No such post hoc adjustments to the departmental budget can be made at this time, but the blueprint for the Department's future takes into account BIU and tuition revenue from enrollment expansion and would permit major changes along the lines sought by the current Chair.

Effective March 2001, the University has purchased 500 University Avenue as a new home for the rehabilitation sector. The building has been chosen to accommodate the entire sector, assuming enrolment expansion. It will be crucial for the next chair to take a major hand in fund-raising to support the capital redevelopment of this site, both through private giving and through infrastructure applications to agencies such as the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Ontario Innovation Trust.

Last, I am pleased to report that Prof. Luc De Nil will be the new chair of the Department. Prof. De Nil and I have negotiated bridge funding to help the Department through this period of transition to new space and, it is hoped, new levels of administrative staffing and faculty coverage. I am confident that he will carry on the tradition of leadership established by Prof. Paula Square.

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts and Science
DATE: December 2000
COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate: Specialist, Major & Minor in Psychology
Graduate: Master's and Ph.D. in Psychology

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION:

Four external reviewers selected by the Dean of the Faculty

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:**INTERNATIONAL:**

Professor Peter Salovey, Yale University
 Professor Rose T. Zacks, Michigan State University

CANADIAN:

Professor Bryan Kolb, University of Lethbridge
 Professor Hildy Ross, University of Waterloo

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: April 1999 (*Raising Our Sights* "Cluster 11" external review)

DATE OF OCGS REVIEW: Fall 1995

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

Chair's Report (35 pages); *Raising Our Sights* "Cluster 11" external review report, which covered Psychology, Computer Science and Philosophy); 1990 external review report for the Department of Psychology; Undergraduate and Graduate Brochures

CONSULTATION PROCESS:

Committee spent two days on campus, starting first with a meeting with a Vice-Dean and Associate Dean of the Faculty, and then meeting with various representatives of research and student groups through the following two days. They met separately with groups of researchers from each subarea of the Department, with members from each of the campuses, and with graduate and undergraduate students. Overall, the committee felt that, within the context of the two-day review, there was "sufficient time to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Department's programs and resources."

A final meeting was held with the Dean and a Vice-Dean.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall assessment:

The review committee concluded that “the University has a good, generally well-functioning psychology department.” The committee was “impressed by the funding and productivity of the faculty,” and found that the students “were happy with the program in general, and the faculty in particular.” The committee did express concern over the undergraduate teaching load placed on the Department, and cautioned the Department on too great a reliance on sessional teaching. The graduate program appeared “to be in good shape.”

Specific Issues:

The committee made eight specific recommendations on issues related to the development of a “vision of the future of the field and of itself,” that the Department must “have adequate space in which all groups can be housed together,” that the complement of the Department should increase in specific areas, and that the roles of researchers at the Rotman Research Institute (RRI), OISE/UT and the Clarke Institute be better understood in the context of the Psychology Department. The committee made a number of recommendations related to the characteristics of the next chair of the Department, and on retention of key junior faculty.

These recommendations can be summarized as follows:

1. The Department should develop a vision of the future of the field and of itself.
2. The Department’s faculty complement should be increased not only by the Canada Research Chairs allocated to the Neuroscience cluster but in the existing areas as well.
3. The next Department chair should be someone who has a clear understanding of both the breadth of psychology and the role of biology in psychology.
4. The Department must have adequate space in which all groups can be housed together.
5. There should be a thorough discussion on the role of the Rotman Research Institute in the Department.
6. The Department should explore better connections as well both with OISE/UT and the Clarke.
7. The administration of the Department needs to be made more transparent.
8. There must be a clear plan for the retention of faculty.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Faculty recognizes the importance of these recommendations, and has taken steps to begin implementation of many of them. We believe that the development of the future vision for the Department and changes in governance can be best resolved once a permanent chair is in place to lead the unit. This has been the highest priority in the Faculty, and negotiations continue between the Dean and the best available candidate. A very able acting chair (Professor Jonathan Freedman) has agreed to serve for one year.

We recognize the importance of securing the appropriate space for the Department, and this has been elevated to become the Faculty’s most urgent capital project. A proposal for funding from the Canada Foundation for Innovation for a “Centre in Cognitive and Behavioural Neuroscience” has been resubmitted in May 2001. The Faculty is working closely with the Department to realize this initiative.

The Faculty agrees with the review committee that there must be positive relationships between the Department and the various campuses on which graduate research in psychology is performed. The Dean's office and the Department have initiated regular contact with the Director of the RRI, and mechanisms are being established to foster the ties between RRI, the Clarke and the three other campuses of the Department of Psychology.

The one recommendation of the review committee where the Faculty respectfully differs is on the complement levels in the Department, especially when the multi-campus scope of the Department is appropriately placed in the context of the Faculty's fiscal challenges over the last six years. We do believe that the Department's graduate research and undergraduate programs would benefit from additional complement, but are not convinced that Psychology has a much stronger case than several other units that have had to reduce complement significantly over the last decade.

Retention of junior faculty is a key challenge for the Department over the next few years, as is the recruitment of two additional Canada Research Chairs to the Department in the "Neuroscience" cluster.

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION/UNIT: School of Graduate Studies,
Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics

DATE OF REVIEW COMPLETION: May 2001

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean Michael Marrus, SGS

PROGRAMS OFFERED: None. CITA is a national institute specializing in theoretical astrophysics, hosted by the University of Toronto.

Other: CITA provides pre- and post-doctoral training and its research activities span most of the areas of modern theoretical astrophysics.

REVIEW COMMITTEE COMPOSITION: Internal

Professor Rashmi Desai, Associate Dean, Division III – SGS, Chair
 Professor Charles Dyer, Director, Astrophysics Collaborative Program
 Mr. Patrick Green, a Physics graduate student
 Professor Lev Kofman, a CITA faculty member
 Professor Pctor Martin, Chair, Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics
 Professor Norman Murray, Associate Director, CITA
 Professor Pekka Sinervo, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts & Science
 Professor Henry Van Driel, Chair, Department of Physics
 Dr. Joseph Weingartner, CITA Research Associate
 Ms. Edith Fraser, School of Graduate Studies (*secretary*)

EXTERNAL REVIEWERS, HOME UNIVERSITY:

None – see below for recent external reviews

DATE OF PREVIOUS REVIEW: 1996 SGS Review

DATE OF OTHER REVIEWS: 1998 NSERC (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council)

External Reviewers, Home University:
 Mitchel Begelman, University of Colorado
 Edmund Bertschinger, MIT
 Gregory Fahman, UBC
 Alan Astbury, TRIUMF

1999 Physical Sciences Cluster (ie Cluster 8) of the
Faculty of Arts and Science external review

External Reviewers, Home University:

Louis Brus, Columbia University

Ian Carmichael, University of California

Gregory Fahlam, UBC

John McDonald, University of Alberta

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED TO REVIEWERS:

CITA Director's report (March 2001)

(Appendices include the reports from all completed
reviews mentioned above)

CONSULTATION PROCESS

The committee received the CITA Directors report detailing the activities and accomplishments of CITA during the period 1995-2000, (including the Appendices containing the reports of all completed reviews mentioned above) and focused on 9 specific areas of activity: faculty, funding, research productivity, pre- and post doctoral training, interactions with cognate departments, other programs, high performance computing, outreach and administrative staff.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall assessment:

The review committee concluded that CITA has continued to excel and remain eminently successful during the past five years. It is, as the NSERC visiting committee concluded in its 1998 review, "a jewel in the University of Toronto's crown".

CITA has achieved top international stature, competing with major centres such as Princeton, Cambridge, Berkeley and Caltech for the very best students and postdocs in the broad area of theoretical astrophysics. CITA is the nexus for the development of astronomy and astrophysics at the University and defines the benchmark against which recruitment into the departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics and Physics must be measured.

Specific Issues:

The committee urged continued strong support by the University for CITA in order to maintain and enhance the high international level of excellence achieved by CITA in a highly competitive international scene. In all, six recommendations were made, which in summary form are:

1. Continued support of the Institute for a further period of five years
2. the extension for another five-year term of the leadership of CITA by its current director, Professor J. R. Bond
3. that the University and SGS continue funding of CITA at least at the current level
4. that the academic administrators of the University should continue to exhort and commend NSERC for its support of fundamental research, citing CITA as an example of successful leveraging of NSERC resources
5. that the academic administrators of the University should stress to CIAR the contributions made by CITA members towards the success of the Canadian Institute for Advanced

Research (CIAR) program in Cosmology and Gravity and the importance of its funding to the mutual success of CITA and the CIAR's Cosmology and Gravity program

6. the development efforts of the University and the SGS should put a high priority for fundraising for the Astrophysics related needs of the three occupants of the Burton Tower.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

The Committee of Deans of the School of Graduate Studies greatly appreciated the work of the Review Committee. The SGS Deans agree that CITA should continue for a further five years and proposed that the Review Committee be reconvened as a search committee for the next director.

The Dean will continue to advocate the merits of CITA's contributions as indicated in the report and will follow the three recommendations which concern the vigour with which CITA's interests might be represented within the University and with research funding institutions such as NSERC and CIAR.

With respect to the development efforts for the Astrophysics related needs of CITA and the Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics and Physics, the SGS Deans agree that such efforts should be given a high priority within the University and the SGS development strategies.

Astronomy and Astrophysics has been identified as a cluster within the Canada Research Chairs programs at the University of Toronto, and four Canada Research Chairs have been allocated to this cluster.

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES – REVIEWS/RESPONSES DEFERRED

1. Joint Centre for Asia Pacific Studies:

This joint centre of the University of Toronto and York University was reviewed in January 2000. Discussions are currently underway between the two universities as to future arrangements for collaboration in this area; and the review and response will be reported to governance once these discussions have been concluded.

2. Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama:

This review will be incorporated into an augmented OCGS review scheduled for 2001-2002

3. Institute for Policy Analysis:

A mini-review was completed in 2000-2001, which led to a decision to undertake a more comprehensive review in the fall of 2001, which will be reported to governance.

OISE/UT

The following templates summarize the results of reviews by outside bodies, on the basis of which University of Toronto reviews were waived.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION: OISE/UT -- Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate: Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Technical Education (Institution-wide)

Graduate: M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in Adult Education
M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in Counselling Psychology

Departmental Review Waived due to External Ontario College of Teachers and OCGS Reviews as Follows:

Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Technical Education (Institution-wide)

Date of Review by Ontario College of Teachers: 1999-2000
Result and Date of Decision: Initial Accreditation Granted, June, 2000

Adult Education

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99
Result and Date of Decision:
M.Ed. - Good Quality, June 25/99
M.A. - Good Quality, April 16/99
Ed.D. - Good Quality with Report, November 19/99. Report, to be submitted by May 15, 2002, should provide: (i) information on the times and rates of completion of students in the program and a clear assessment of attrition rates, and (ii) a list of core faculty enabled to supervise at the doctoral level including past and present thesis supervision in this program.
Ph.D. - New program approved for 1997-98, April 16/97.

Counselling Psychology

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99
Result and Date of Decision:
M.Ed. & Ed.D. - Good Quality, June 25/99
M.A. & Ph.D. - New program approved for 2000-2001, June 16/00.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:Adult Education (Ed.D)

- (i) Times to completion: Our last brief reported on mean and median times to completion for Ed.D. students in the Adult Education program for the years 1991 to 1997. The mean time to graduate for all Ed.D. students was 6.1 years (range = 1.2 - 9.0) and the median was 6.3 years. Preliminary data for the years 1998 to 2001 indicates that the times to completion have decreased significantly. The current data indicate that the mean time to completion is 3.40 years and the median is 2.82 years.
- (ii) Thesis supervision: There are twelve full-time and two part-time faculty members in the Adult Education program. Eleven have full supervisory privileges. This current faculty complement represents an increase of 40% from the previous report of eight full-time and two half-time core professors, and can adequately meet the supervision demands of the Ed.D. in Adult Education.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION:	OISE/UT -- Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
COMMISSIONING OFFICER:	Dean
PROGRAMS OFFERED:	
Undergraduate:	Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Technical Education (Institution-wide)
Graduate:	M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in Curriculum M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in Measurement and Evaluation M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in Teacher Development M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in Second Language Education M.T. (Master of Teaching) in Human Development and Curriculum (joint program with Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology, also leads to teacher certification)

Departmental Review Waived due to External Ontario College of Teachers and OCGS Reviews as Follows

Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Technical Education (Institution-wide)

Date of Review by Ontario College of Teachers: 1999-2000
Result and Date of Decision: Initial Accreditation Granted, June, 2000

Curriculum

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99
Result and Date of Decision:

M.Ed., Ed.D., M.A., Ph.D. - Good Quality with Report, June 25/99. Report, to be submitted by May 15, 2002, should provide: (i) a staffing plan that takes into account future enrolment trends since almost half of the faculty listed in 1998-99 as active supervisors of students in the Curriculum program will have retired before the next appraisal; and (ii) information relating to time to completion and attrition in the M.A., Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs that demonstrates that the department has reviewed its supervision practices and established new practices and policies to encourage more timely progress. The department should also provide a rationale for the changes proposed and some evidence that more timely progress can be expected in the future.

Measurement and Evaluation

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99
Result and Date of Decision:

M.Ed., Ed.D., M.A., Ph.D. - Good Quality with Report, April 13/00. Report, to be submitted by February 1, 2003, should provide information on: (i) faculty renewal, through replacement of the upcoming retirements, sufficient to maintain the viability of the program, and demonstration of the scholarly productivity of the newly-hired faculty; and

(ii) clarification of the distinction between, and integration between, measurement and evaluation, including the difference in expectations concerning the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees.

Teacher Development

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99

Result and Date of Decision:

M.Fd., Ed.D., M.A., Ph.D. - Good Quality with Report, April 26/99. Report, to be submitted by January 31, 2002, should provide: (i) a list of faculty available to supervise in the program; (ii) the names of any new appointments with the c.v. of the appointee(s); (iii) information on enrolments (and graduations wherever appropriate) in each of the degree programs between 1996-97 and the date of the report; and (iv) information on student financial support.

Second Language Education

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99

Result and Date of Decision:

M.Ed., Ed.D., M.A., Ph.D. - New program approved for 1998-99, October 31/97.

Master of Arts in Teaching

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99

Result and Date of Decision:

MA(T) - Good Quality with Report, May 26/00. Report, to be submitted by March 1, 2003, should provide information on: (i) the effectiveness of administrative changes recommended by the consultants, and improved administrative support; (ii) the effectiveness of contemplated recruitment initiatives; and (iii) the program's consideration of the recommendation that a thesis or research paper option be introduced, given the academic orientation of the program.

Master of Teaching in Human Development and Curriculum

Date of OCGS Review: 1999-2000

Result and Date of Decision:

M.T. - New program approved for 2000-2001, April 18/00.

Also being reviewed by Ontario College of Teachers, 2001-02 and 2002-03.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

Curriculum

- (i) Faculty renewal/supervisory resources: Nine new tenure-stream faculty have been appointed to the Curriculum program since 1998-99. Three of these are expected to have full SGS status within the next two years. It is expected that four new tenure-stream appointments will be made to the Curriculum program by 2002-03. One search is currently underway and three will be initiated in the fall of 2001.
- (ii) Time to completion and attrition: This year, the systematic review of the progress of all doctoral stream students was instituted as a component of the awarding of scholarships to continuing students.

Measurement and Evaluation

- (i) Faculty renewal and scholarly productivity of newly-hired faculty: One new faculty member was appointed in 1999. A search is underway for another tenure-stream position to be filled in 2002.
- (ii) Distinction between Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees: A systematic review of the program was initiated in 2000-01 in response to OCGS concerns. This has resulted in several course changes including the development of a new seminar series and the development of a joint course with the Department of Theory and Policy Studies. The distinction between the two doctoral degrees is under consideration as part of the on-going review of the program.

Teacher Development

- (i)&(ii): Supervisory/faculty resources: Two faculty members listed in the last OCGS review with associate SGS status now have full SGS status and are full-time in the Teacher Development program. Another new faculty member has been appointed to this program and is expected to have full SGS status within two years.
- (iii) Information on enrolments and graduations: Data will be compiled this fall.
- (iv) Student financial support: OISE/UT has significantly increased the amount of student financial support available which has benefited this program as well as other OISE/UT graduate programs.

Master of Arts in Teaching

- (i) Effectiveness of administrative changes: The new program changes reported in the last OCGS review have resulted in greater integration of MA(T) students into this Department. The MA(T) Coordinator in the Department has been working closely with the MA(T) Coordinator in the English Department to assist MA(I) students enrolling in English graduate courses. It's been reported that these changes have resulted in greater student satisfaction.
- (ii) Effectiveness of recruitment strategies: Enrolment has been increasing in the program. There are also more applications because of an Ontario-wide mailing to English Department Heads informing them about the program.
- (iii) Program's consideration of a thesis option: The MA(T) courses were updated to take into account current research and knowledge. New courses are under development. All faculty teaching in the program are full-time, tenured, or tenure-track faculty. A recommendation concerning the introduction of a thesis or research paper option has not been made but is expected by December 2001.

REVIEW SUMMARY

DIVISION: OISE/UT - Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education

COMMISSIONING OFFICER: Dean

PROGRAMS OFFERED:

Undergraduate: Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Technical Education (Institution-wide)

Graduate: M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in Educational Administration
M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in Higher Education
M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., and Ed.D. in History and Philosophy of Education

Departmental Review Waived due to External Ontario College of Teachers and OCGS Reviews as Follows:

Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Technical Education (Institution-wide)

Date of Review by Ontario College of Teachers: 1999-2000
Result and Date of Decision: Initial Accreditation Granted, June, 2000

Educational Administration

Date of OCGS Review - 1998-99
Result and Date of Decision:

M.Ed., Ed.D., M.A., Ph.D. - Good Quality with Report, September 17/99. Report, to be submitted by May 15, 2002, should provide: (i) information related to time to completion and attrition in the program that demonstrates that the department has reviewed its supervision practices and policies to encourage more timely progress and a rationale for the changes proposed and some evidence that they are having the desired effect; and (ii) evidence that the faculty members hired in 1996 are participating actively in thesis supervision.

Higher Education

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99
Result and Date of Decision:
M.Ed., Ed.D., M.A., Ph.D. - Good Quality, June 1/00.

History and Philosophy of Education

Date of OCGS Review: 1998-99
Result and Date of Decision:
M.Ed., Ed.D., M.A., Ph.D. - Good Quality with Report, March 16/01. Report, to be submitted by October 1, 2003, should provide: (i) information on student funding; and (ii) faculty renewal (i.e., retirement replacement).

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:Educational Administration

- (i) Time to completion/Attrition of doctoral students: The Educational Administration Program initiated a major program review in 1999-2000 that will conclude in late 2001 or early 2002. This program review has included a survey of graduates, and a review of program requirements and foci. Issues related to time-to-completion and attrition (including practices related to the monitoring of students in this program) are components of this review and we expect to be able to report important changes by the May 2002 reporting date for this program.
- (ii) Participation in graduate supervision of new faculty: Three relatively new core faculty at the rank of Associate Professor who are appointed to the Educational Administration program are increasingly active in graduate supervision at both the master's and doctoral levels.

Three additional faculty have been appointed to this graduate program since the OCGS review. One was appointed as a full Professor and is already active in doctoral supervision. Two were appointed as Assistant Professors (and Associate Members of SGS) and their graduate supervision activities have focused primarily at the masters level to date.

History and Philosophy of Education

- (i) Student funding: The History and Philosophy program is benefiting from OISE/UT's new graduate student financial arrangements that were introduced in this past year in response to the Orchard Task Force. The amount of funding available to students in this program has already increased and we believe that this issue will be fully addressed by the time of the report to OCGS on this Program
- (ii) Faculty complement: An appointment was made to the Philosophy of Education specialization within this program in 2001. The Department has approval for two new appointments in this academic year, one in Philosophy of Education and one in History of Education.