

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 76 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

December 8, 1999

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, December 8, 1999, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Wendy Rolph (In the
Chair)
Professor Ruth Gallop
(Vice-Chair)
Professor Carolyn Tuohy,
Deputy Provost
Professor David Cook, Vice-Provost
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Clare Beghtol
Professor Rorke Bryan
Professor Francois Casas
Mr. Michael Derzko
Ms Joy Fitzgibbon
Professor Gerald Goldenberg
Professor Hugh Gunz
Professor Gretchen Kerr
Professor Angela Lange
Professor Ian McDonald
Professor Emmet Robbins
Professor J.J. Berry Smith

Non-Voting Assessors
Professor Heather Munroe-Blum,
Vice-President, Research and
International Relations
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
Students

Secretariat:
Ms Patti Seaman, Secretary
Ms Susan Girard

Regrets:
Dr. Claire Alleyne
Mr. Jason Baker
Ms Rakhi Bhavnani
Mr. Eric Brock
Professor Philip Byer
Ms Debbie Chachra
Professor Carl Corter
Professor Raisa Deber
Mr. David Kaplan

In Attendance:

Professor Ron Venter, Member of Governing Council, Department of Mechanical and
Industrial Engineering.
Professor Larry Bourne, Acting Chair, Department of Geography
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Daniel Cushing, Associate Director, Executive MBA Program, Rotman School
of Management
Professor Umberto De Boni, Associate Dean, Division IV, School of Graduate Studies
Professor Rudolphe el-Khoury, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design
Professor James Fisher, Associate Dean, Executive Programs, Rotman School of
Management
Professor Meric Gertler, Department of Geography
Professor Susan Howson, Associate Dean, Division II, School of Graduate Studies

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

In Attendance: (cont'd.)

Dr. Peter Munsche, Assistant Vice-President, Technology Transfer
Professor Larry Richards, Dean, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design
Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels, Director, Biomedical Communications Program

ITEMS 4, 5, 6 and 7 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER
ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 75 of the meeting of September 15, 1999, was approved.

With the agreement of the Committee the Chair moved Item 10, Report of the
Administrative Assessor: Research and International Relations, to the next item on the
agenda.

2. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

(i) Report of the Vice-President, Research and International Relations

Professor Munroe-Blum gave a slide presentation on the Research and International
Relations: 1998-99 Report and 1999-2000. She noted that the Report presented highlights
of the University's research and international achievements of the past year and outlined
plans for 1999-2000. The Report had been prepared as an internal University document,
but could be useful externally. In January a new semi-annual publication, *Edge*, intended
for distribution to the government and the public, would highlight research development at
the University of Toronto.

Professor Munroe-Blum gave a presentation that focused on the following points.

The mandate of Research and International Relations (RIR) was to support the strategic
growth, effective development, and efficient and accountable administration of research and
international resources, activities and partnerships, consistent with the University of
Toronto's mission to be an internationally significant research university.

Operating Themes

The five RIR operating themes comprised:

- service to the University
- strengthening government research resources and the science and research policy
framework
- increasing success in research competitions
- enhancing information and analysis in support of research and international activities
- enhancing the research and international profile of the University of Toronto.

Professor Munroe-Blum stated that the University had performed exceptionally well in the
competitions of the Government Research and Infrastructure Programs (GRIP). These
programs included the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), the Ontario Research and

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

2. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd.)

(i) Report of the Vice-President, Research and International Relations (cont'd.)

Development Challenge Fund (ORDCF), and the Premier's Research Excellence Awards (PREA). In talks with the provincial and federal governments, she had emphasized to them the importance of maintaining government investments.

The amount of research grants awarded to the University was an indicator of the University's success. She noted that research grants to faculty were valuable for improving the quality of student experience. Her office would be involved in looking at the research grants that were being awarded to the University as one of the measures for assessing performance and compiling accountability data. She also noted the importance of celebrating the successes of colleagues and departments. The University's mission was to be recognized as an international research institution. There was a connection between success and the recognition of that success. The University could do more to enhance its profile.

Research Support

The outlook for research support was positive and included the following:

- Creation of Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR)
- Increased funding for three federal granting councils Medical Research Council (MRC/CIHR), Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC)
- Further budget increases to:
 - Networks of Centres of Excellence (NCE), Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI), Canadian Space Agency (CSA), and the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation (CHSRF)

Professor Munroe-Blum reported that there were new programs at the provincial and federal levels that would increase budgets for Centres of Excellence. Although it was reasonable to expect further funding increases, there were some caveats to enthusiasm for the new programs. The new programs focused on the physical and life sciences and undervalued the social sciences and the humanities.

The CFI research infrastructure funding would contribute to the competitive ability of the University. However, there was still a major gap, in that there was no meaningful form of recovery of the indirect costs of research. She noted that several provinces did provide funds to cover the indirect costs of research. Lack of funding for indirect costs became more of a problem as the University became more successful in grants awarded. Low operating grants were a negative stimulus to research activity.

Performance Indicators

Professor Munroe-Blum reported that total research revenue for the University of Toronto and its affiliated hospitals was \$297 million in 1997-98. The University, in collaboration with the teaching hospitals, was the second highest ranking research institution in Canada, behind Nortel Networks, in terms of research expenditure. The University received \$2 million a day in externally funded grants. 40% of the funds came from the federal

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

2. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd.)

(i) Report of the Vice-President, Research and International Relations (cont'd.)

government; this was in contrast to the United States, where 80% of funds came from the government. In Canada the government encouraged private sector support of research as an alternative to government funding. Professor Munroe-Blum said that it was vital to have increased opportunities and support for research from the federal government. The University had ranked first for the fifth year running in awards received from the three federal granting councils. The highest amount was received from the MRC, followed by NSERC, and then SSHRC. Many of the grants were for smaller amounts. She noted that the 21st century chairs would be granted on the basis of a proportional share of the granting council funds previously awarded and consequently it was important to have the maximum success with these grants.

She noted that the University had received 95 GRIP awards for a total of \$327 million, as follows:

- CFI: 45 awards (\$72 million)
 - Over \$350 K: 14 awards (\$67 million)
 - Under \$350 K: 2 awards (\$205,000)
 - New Opportunities: 29 awards (\$4.7 million)
- ORDCE: 20 awards (\$81.4 million)
- PREA: 30 awards (\$3 million)
- Private Sector matching funds leveraged: \$98.8 million

Professor Munroe-Blum noted that the following programs in Technology Transfer helped to ensure that the investments continued to grow:

- Restructuring of the Innovations Foundation
- Industrial Research Revenue: \$51.1 million
- Networks of Centres of Excellence: \$4.7 million
- Ontario Centres of Excellence: \$8.3 million
- NSERC university/industry programs: \$4 million
- MRC university/industry programs: \$1.3 million
- SSHRC university/industry programs: \$10.5 K
- NSERC Intellectual Property Management Program grants (doubles the University's seed funding for commercially promising projects)
- Licensing revenue: \$1.2 million
- Spin-off companies:
 - 3 new spins-offs reported
 - 89 known active companies
 - \$419 million gross annual reported revenue

Professor Munroe-Blum explained that in the previous year the University had done very well; a conservative estimate listed 89 active spin-off companies. Substantial economic development had occurred. She noted that there was a need to work to shape the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR).

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

2. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd.)

(i) Report of the Vice-President, Research and International Relations (cont'd.)

Highlight of RIR Plans, 1999-2000

Professor Munroe-Blum summarized her division's plans for the year. Areas of focus included:

- Effective Implementation of CIHR
- Increase successes with granting councils
- Create new provincial support for attracting and retaining outstanding faculty and graduate students, and for recovery of research infrastructure and administration costs
- Increase CFI, ORDCF and PREA successes
- Achieve significant new international development initiatives to build on the 17 international agreements in 1998-99
- Support of University of Toronto internationalization and secure new strategic international partnerships
- Implement Phase I of the international Activity Development database
- Coordinate Innovations Foundation with Research Partnerships (RP) and technology transfer in University of Toronto Research Services (UTRS) and increase successes in commercialization
- Encourage and facilitate intellectual property disclosures
- Increase industry contracts and grants
- Achieve significant new opportunities in Social Science and Humanities
- Celebrate success and increase profile
 - Launch *Edge* magazine
 - Reengineer RIR website
 - Increase media profile
 - Increase nominations for major research prizes

Professor Munroe-Blum reported that in the coming year the RIR focus would include the following: RIR hoped to help shape the culture of the CIHR and the role of the health sciences in the Institutes. RIR would strive to achieve maximum success in awards and to build on the success of international agreements. Professor Munroe-Blum made note of the intent to implement the main elements of the new Innovations Foundation strategic plan. The University would increase service to divisions in support of commercial patents and licensing. Strategic planning would be undertaken with the new President. RIR would highlight the achievements of colleagues in the Social Sciences and Humanities. RIR would also undertake to expand and enhance the University's research and international profile.

A member congratulated Professor Munroe-Blum on the RIR report. He asked about the fate of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in Ottawa. Was there any information on the role that the IDRC would take in the future? Professor Munroe-Blum stated that the IDRC was in a state of transition as an organization. The organization's mandate had changed internally. The IDRC was in the process of defining its mission, and the outcome was unknown at this point. Professor Munroe-Blum had invited the President of the IDRC to visit the University of Toronto campus to explore possible future directions for the organization.

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

2. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd.)

(i) Report of the Vice-President, Research and International Relations (cont'd.)

A member asked what the focus of the CIHR was? He remarked that the American institutes tended to focus on specific areas of health care, such as cancer or heart disease. Professor Munroe-Blum responded that the role of the CIHR was not delimited, but that the intent was to create eight to twelve virtual institutes. Initially it had been planned that these would be disease-focused. However, that model did not lend itself to addressing the broad combination of health themes and disease. A working group that included divisional representatives would report its recommendations on the CIHR. There was a concern that biomedical research would be under-supported if the focus of the CIHR was on other disciplines. Professor Munroe-Blum reiterated the need for increasing interest in and levels of support for research. The CIHR would have a small administrative budget.

3. School of Graduate Studies: Executive Master of Business Administration Program
- New Second-Year Global Option

The Chair welcomed Professor James Fisher, Associate Dean, Executive Programs, and Professor Daniel Cushing, Associate Director, Rotman School of Management (RSM); and Professor Susan Howson, Associate Dean, Division II, School of Graduate Studies (SGS).

Professor Tuohy explained that this proposal was a formalization of arrangements that had developed within the Executive MBA program in recent years. It covered topics identical to those currently offered in the Executive MBA program but provided a focus on global business. It was offered in a modular format that allowed for study in Asia and Europe, and would eventually have ties with Latin America.

A member asked how credit and grades were determined in the modules. Courses were a series of lectures with examinations and the production of reports. If the supervisor deemed it appropriate, projects or essays could be required. Was this consistent with current practice? Professor Fisher explained that courses followed the lecture format with examinations at the end, as was consistent with current practice. In some cases examinations would be given to students simultaneously over the Internet, with the respective institutions invigilating. In some courses group projects were required. The course work for the Global Option would go through the same administrative approval process as all course work in the Rotman School of Management.

A member asked how spending two weeks in China would be of greater benefit to a student than having a professor from China come to the University of Toronto to teach the module? Professor Fisher noted that the purpose of the Global Option was to provide an educational experience for those who worked in a global environment. Many industries had global components. The cross-cultural experience was an integral part of the program. Students participating in the two- or three-week overseas component were provided with a valuable opportunity to work in cross-cultural groups. At this point Asian institutions had supplied faculty and field opportunities but had not accommodated student participation. It was hoped that this situation would be remedied.

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

3. School of Graduate Studies: Executive Master of Business Administration Program
- New Second-Year Global Option (cont'd.)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal for the establishment of a new Second-Year Global Option in the Master of Business Administration Program, effective July 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 1999, subject to a review of resource implications.

4. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Planning Program - New Field in
Urban Design

The Chair welcomed Professor Larry Richards, Dean, and Professor Rudolphe el-Khoury, of the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design; and Professor Larry Bourne, Acting Chair, and Professor Meric Gertler, Department of Geography. She noted that the guests were available to speak to items 4, 5, and 6, and that these items would be forwarded together to the Academic Board.

Professor Tuohy noted that this proposal was for a new field in Urban Design within the existing Master of Science in Planning (MScPl) program offered by the Programme in Planning, Department of Geography. This was one of three new initiatives for teaching Urban Design at the University, as recommended by the Provost's Task Force on Graduate Programs in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Planning and Urban Design. The other two programs were on the agenda as well, the Master of Urban Design (MUD) in the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design (FALD), and a Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) in the Programme in Planning, Department of Geography. These programs were inter-related and drew upon similar resources but served a different clientele. These proposals would enhance the existing programs, strengthening resources in this area.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new field in Urban Design in the Master of Science in Planning (MScPl), effective September 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A," be approved.

5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design Studies
(MUDS) Program

Professor Tuohy explained that the Master of Urban Design Studies was a one-year degree directed at students from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds related to planning who

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) Program (cont'd.)

wished to enhance their understanding of urban design issues as a complement to their career interests. It would effectively increase their literacy in urban design issues.

A member noted that the MUD program was a two-year degree and the MUDS was a one-year degree. What was it that distinguished one from the other? Professor Bourne explained that the MUDS degree was not a professional degree in that it did not grant certification. It would serve those who needed some training in urban design but who did not need to be professional planners. Professor Tuohy noted that the MUD presupposed a prior professional degree. Professor Richards explained that the MUD was a two-year post-professional program designed to include an intensive studio component as part of its core courses. This would qualify students as professional urban design practitioners. The program was full time for two years. The other two programs in the suite were designed to be more flexible in order to accommodate those who were employed in their field and wished to enhance or update their skills.

A member stated that he was concerned that employers would find the designations confusing. How would the programs be distinguished outside of the University? Professor Richards stated that he did not see this as posing a significant problem. There was as yet no formalization of credentials for urban designers as the profession was relatively new. The graduates themselves would present their qualifications to potential employers. The MUDS degree was more policy oriented, while the MUD degree would provide increased qualifications for a student to work as a design practitioner. In the United States there was an established tradition of two-year urban design programs. Professor el-Khoury noted that urban design was offered through architecture schools in the United States. There was a need to create bridges between architecture and planning. The one-year MUDS stemmed from the need to provide a dialogue between these professions. The MUDS degree would offer exposure to architecture for designers, and was open to many individuals. The MUD degree had strict admission requirements as a professional degree in the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design.

A member asked why MUDS was to be designated as a master's degree program and not a certificate or diploma program, given the lesser extent to which it was specialized? Professor Bourne noted that most master's programs in his department were one year or one and a half years in length. The only two-year program was the MScPl. He noted that the academic standards for the MUDS were of equally high quality as that of the MUD, although without the studio component. The content was at the master's level; the program was being offered in a condensed format.

Professor Tuohy asked if there were MUDS programs available at other institutions? Professor Bourne said that there were a range of options available for professional study in architecture and planning or a combination of the two. Institutions with urban design programs offered more than one route into the discipline. A member supported the initiative noting that providing the versatility of parallel streams into a discipline was a positive approach. A member asked if the MUDS program, being of lesser duration, lessened the esteem of the MUD program? Professor el-Khoury emphasized that the two programs shared core courses, including history and theory, and that the major distinction between them was the studio course with its practical orientation.

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) Program (cont'd.)

A member raised a general question regarding the contact hours for master's programs. He noted that the length of programs varied considerably across the University. He asked if standards had been defined as to what constituted a master's level workload. Professor Howson noted that he was correct in his observation that master's degree programs varied in length, with some being as little as eight months, while others were three and half years in duration.

A member reiterated that the MUDS was for non-practicing designers, and the MUD for practicing designers. Given that, what distinguished the new field in MScPI? Professor Bourne noted that many students became employed in planning departments in both the public and private sectors. The MScPI provide an analytically rigorous program that would provide students with a more advanced level of qualifications from which to offer consultation and to advise on design issues. Having a variety of programs would strengthen the discipline. The member requested further clarification on the need for three degrees in the same discipline. Professor Bourne noted that innovative planning departments incorporated an urban design component, as did many good architecture schools. These programs provided several routes into urban design, as well as providing an interdisciplinary link. The programs were built on the same courses, provided high standards, and offered students options and bridges within the disciplines.

A member asked if there was a program for rural design, to which Professor Richards answered in the affirmative. He cited the Dalhousie University Department of Urban and Rural Planning.

A member asked if the Planning and Budget Committee would also see this proposal in respect to the resource implications? The Chair noted that it was not in the terms of reference for the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs to look at resource implications. The Planning and Budget Committee would look at the proposal in that regard. The member asked if it were also likely that the Planning and Budget Committee would have access to the discussion of this Committee regarding the need for three new programs? The Chair noted that the report of this Committee and the report of the Planning and Budget Committee would be submitted to the Academic Board. The Academic Board would have the benefit of the reports of both Committees in making its recommendations to Governing Council. Professor Tuohy explained that in this instance Professor McCammond would report to the Planning and Budget Committee on the resource implications for these three items. She stated that the resources underlying these programs had been approved within the divisional academic plan of the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design. The item would go forward to the Planning and Budget Committee for information. Professor Howson noted that a new faculty member who would be active in these programs had been hired and that some resources were already in place.

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) Program (cont'd.)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new Master of Urban Design Studies (MUDS) program, effective September 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B," be approved.

6. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a New Master of Urban Design (MUD) Program

Professor Tuohy noted that the Master of Urban Design was a two-year post-professional degree. Individuals with a prior professional degree in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, or a graduate degree in Urban Planning with a design specialization and/or professional experience, would be eligible to apply.

A member noted that no academic credit would be given for the student's Professional Experience Year (PEY). He asked what kind of student would benefit from a PEY in this program? Professor Richards noted that the program had been modeled after one in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering at the University of Toronto. He noted that an individual's participation in the PEY would be recorded on his or her transcript. It was an option that would be attractive to some students, giving students the opportunity to earn a salary, to bring their experience to bear on their program, and to make valuable connections with leading firms that could have a bearing on their future career options. Invited to comment, Professor Venter noted that although the students did not receive credit for the PEY, approximately half the students in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had chosen the option for the benefits of work experience and improved employment opportunities. In answer to a question, Professor Richards said that the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design would assist students in finding placements. In answer to a question, Professor Venter noted that the students in the PEY did not pay tuition fees for the year but were responsible for paying incidental fees in order to keep their registration current.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new Master of Urban Design (MUD) program, effective September 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 26, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C," be approved.

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

7. School of Graduate Studies and the Advanced Design Manufacturing Institute:
Proposal for a New Joint Master of Engineering Degree Program in Design and
Manufacturing (MEngDM)

The Chair welcomed Professor Ron Venter, a member of the Governing Council and of the Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering.

Professor Tuohy stated that the program was innovative and creative. The program was a result of the collaboration among four Ontario universities - Toronto, McMaster, Waterloo, and Western Ontario - in partnership with Materials Manufacturing Ontario, an industrial association. It involved the creation of a joint administrative entity, the Advanced Design Manufacturing Institute (ADMI) to coordinate and promote the program. Admission to the program and completion of degree requirements were to be approved by the home department.

A member asked what the benefits were of having four universities involved in the program? Professor Venter noted that design manufacturing was a broad area and a driving force of the Ontario economy. The intent was to create a program of as high a stature as the Executive MBA to attract engineering professionals who wanted management expertise and credentials. No one university had the resources or facilities to offer the program. The intent was to pool the considerable resources in design and manufacturing of all the participants to provide a cohesive challenging graduate program. The program would be offered in a module structure. Components of the program would be offered by all the units, including engineering, business and industry.

A member drew attention to the cross-disciplinary nature of the program. He asked what the responsibilities of the director were and how the director would be appointed. Professor Venter noted that a representative from the graduate teaching faculty of each of the four departments of engineering, chosen by the Chairs of the departments, together with two academic colleagues from the business schools, and two representative from industry, through Materials Manufacturing of Ontario (MMO), would be selected as members of the program committee. The program committee would be responsible for curriculum development, quality of courses, recruitment and external marketing of the program. The program committee would also be responsible for recommending a director who possessed links to both the academic and research sides of the program. To facilitate the marketing and administration of the program, a dedicated Advanced Design and Manufacturing Institute (ADMI) would be established, including the program director, the program committee, and minimal administrative support.

The four universities would uphold the academic standards of the program. He noted that the MEngDM was planned to operate as a full cost-recovery program. A member noted that the program proposal indicated a minimum of twenty registrants. What was the maximum number of registrants? Professor Venter noted that in order to maintain the caliber of the program, and to offer a program to complement the Master of Engineering, it had been projected that seventeen to twenty would be the preferred number of registrants. A member offered his support for the program. He asked what qualifications were being sought in the director? Professor Venter said that the program sought a director who was an expert in the field.

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

7. School of Graduate Studies and the Advanced Design Manufacturing Institute:
Proposal for a New Joint Master of Engineering Degree Program in Design and
Manufacturing (MEngDM) (cont'd.)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a Joint Master of Engineering Degree Program in Design and Manufacturing (MEngDM), effective July 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated September 1, 1999, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "D," be approved.

8. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Biomedical Communications
Program (MScBMC) - Minor Program Change

The Chair welcomed Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels, Director, Biomedical Communications Program and Professor Umberto De Boni, Associate Dean, Division IV, School of Graduate Studies.

Professor Tuohy stated that this proposal would allow students two options for the completion of the program requirements for the MScBMC degree. Currently, students completed seventeen half-course equivalents, including two electives and a Master's research project and paper. The proposed change would give students the option of completing either the previous option or, seventeen half-course equivalents, including four electives and a Master's project. This change was to allow students the option of focussing on innovative software applications rather than the production of a research paper.

A member noted that students with the four electives and Master's project, and those with two electives and a Master's project and paper, graduated with the same degree. How would the two options be distinguished? Professor Wilson-Pauwels answered that all students would be required to do the research methods course. The students who chose the two-elective option would produce a more fully developed Master's project and paper. Those students who chose the four-elective option would not produce a paper out of their research, but would write a research proposal. Students choosing either option would receive an exceptional education given that the program was course intensive.

A member reiterated his previous concern regarding the wide spectrum of workload requirements across the scope of the University's master's level programs. This program required seventeen half-courses.

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

8. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Science in Biomedical Communications
Program (MScBMC) - Minor Program Change (cont'd.)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal for the establishment of an optional program of study within the Master of Science in Biomedical Communications Program, effective July 1, 2000, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated August 10, 1999, subject to a review of resource implications.

9. Items for Information

School of Graduate Studies

(a) A flex-time option PhD in Nursing Science

Professor Tuohy noted that this item was for information. The School of Graduate Studies had approved a flex-time option for the PhD in Nursing Science in the Graduate Department in Nursing Science. The graduate Department of Community Health, and more recently the graduate Department of Information Studies, had adopted this type of program.

Professor Gallop drew members' attention to the summary of the proposal that provided information on the many ways that a flex-time option would facilitate PhD study for nursing students. A member asked how a flex-time program would affect course selection. Professor Gallop noted that students would be taking the same number of required courses and electives, and that students would attend the courses at the University. Students would be required to complete their courses in a specified number of years. She stated that the program did not anticipate scheduling problems as most of the required and elective courses were offered on a regular/yearly basis because of the large master's enrolment.

10. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

(ii) This item was continued from earlier in the meeting.

Teaching Assistants' Strike

Professor Tuohy invited Professor Ian Orchard to update the Committee on the potential CUPE 3902 teaching assistants' strike in relation to the information pertaining to disruptions in the *University Grading Practices Policy*. Professor Orchard noted that it was vital to keep open the lines of communication with faculty, staff and students. An open letter directed to students had been published in *The Varsity* and *The Independent*. The potential strike was a serious matter; the University valued the contribution of teaching assistants. A letter had also been sent to the Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs (PDAD&C) which provided information in the event of a disruption, in general, and on academic issues, on the *Grading Practices Policy* and on classroom procedures. It was the intent of the administration to ensure that students were treated in a fair manner. The

**Report Number 76 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 8, 1999**

10. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd.)

Teaching Assistants' Strike (cont'd.)

Union had given December 22 as the strike date, with pickets going up on January 3, 2000. A further memorandum went out to PDAD&C, the Senior Management Group (SMG) and others, regarding business operations and academic issues in the event of a disruption. The University was still in negotiation with the Union and had met with the mediator earlier in the day. The administration was making preparations in case of a strike and was working with departments to ensure that students were provided with the programs they deserved.

A student member noted that approval was required in order for his professor to change the marking scheme in mid-year. Professor Orchard drew members' attention to section 11.3 *Procedures in the Event of Disruptions* in the *University Grading Practices Policy* for information on classroom procedures. Different procedures were followed depending on whether the class was able to meet or not. In regard to courses that had teaching assistants and those that did not, a member asked if all classes would be cancelled, or just those with teaching assistants? Professor Orchard noted that decisions regarding the continuation of classes were to be made on the local level of the PDAD&C. Students were to be treated fairly, and teaching should be reassigned or accommodated where possible. The member asked for clarification. Was he to understand that if one section of a course was cancelled due to the strike, and the students from that section could not be accommodated elsewhere, then all sections would have to be cancelled? Professor Orchard noted that this was a possibility.

The Chair noted that a motion that the meeting adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m. had not been made at the beginning of the meeting. With the Committee's concurrence, the Chair noted that the meeting would not extend beyond 6:00 p.m.

11. Date of Next Meeting – January 19, 2000

12. Other Business

The Chair wished members a happy holiday season.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary
December 21, 1999

Chair