

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 84 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

December 6, 2000

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, December 6, 2000 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Ruth Gallop (In the Chair)
Professor Derek Allen (Vice-Chair)
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost
Professor Paul Gooch, Vice-Provost
Professor François Casas
Professor Raisa Deber
Professor James Donaldson
Mr. Arvin Hariri
Professor Lynne C. Howarth
Mr. David Kaplan
Professor Angela Lange
Professor Michael R. Marrus
Professor Ian McDonald
Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor V. Kumar Murty
Professor Keren Rice
Ms Catherine Seymour

Professor J.J. Berry Smith
Ms Adelene Tan
Professor Donna Wells

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Heather Munroe-Blum, Vice-
President, Research and International
Relations
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
Students
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard

Regrets:

Ms Joy Fitzgibbon
Mr. Rob Foote
Professor Alexander R. Jones

Professor Emmet Robbins
Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels

In Attendance:

Mr. William Bateman, Program Director, Woodsworth College
Ms Judith Chadwick, Program Director, Connaught Fund
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Joan Foley, Chair, Subcommittee on Academic Programmes and Curriculum,
University of Toronto at Scarborough
Ms Susan Isbister, Director, Professional and International Programs, Woodsworth College
Dr. Jody Macdonald, Faculty of Nursing, Academic Coordinator of the Certificate in Case
Management
Ms Cristina Oke, Assistant Vice-Provost, Professional Faculties

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Professor Dan Ondrack, Rotman School of Management, Academic Co-ordinator of the
Certificate in Human Resource Management
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Time of Adjournment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was agreed

THAT the meeting adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m.

1. Reports of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 81 of the meeting of August 29th, 2000, was approved.

Report Number 82 of the meeting of September 6th, 2000, was approved.

Report Number 83 of the meeting of October 4th, 2000, was approved.

2. Woodsworth College: Certificate Program in Case Management - Revisions

The Chair explained that the Committee's role was to consider changes to existing programs. This certificate program documentation also contained a request, in section III, that admission to the program be suspended. That was a matter for the Planning and Budget Committee to decide. She also noted that although the next three items were slated to be for Committee approval, if the resource implications were such that they required a motion for approval by the Planning and Budget Committee, the items would be transmitted to the Academic Board for approval.

The Chair welcomed Mr. William Bateman, Program Director, and Ms Susan Isbister, Director, Professional and International Programs, Woodsworth College, and Dr. Jody Macdonald, Faculty of Nursing, Academic Coordinator of the Case Management program.

Professor Tuohy introduced the proposal to revise the Certificate in Case Management, noting that the Planning and Budget Committee, at its next meeting, would consider a proposal to phase out the program. During the phasing out process, the College wished to make several changes to the program. This Committee had approved the Certificate program in 1998 but the expectations of the program had not been met. It had not attracted the students nor the faculty support it needed to be viable. The program would continue to be offered at McMaster University, also in a revised format. The revisions proposed would bring this program in line with that at McMaster. Approval would be subject to a review of the resource implications.

A member noted that the program was being suspended apparently because of a lack of resources. He asked why this had not been foreseen in 1998. Ms Isbister explained that Woodsworth College had established the program in conjunction with the Faculty of Nursing

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

2. Woodsworth College: Certificate Program in Case Management - Revisions (cont'd)

at the urging of the Home Care Program of Metropolitan Toronto. The program was new and multidisciplinary and there was not a lot of experience in this area. The College had struggled to staff the program and had worked with both the Faculty of Social Work as well as the Faculty of Nursing. Both Faculties had other priorities in their academic plans and could not contribute to the staffing of this program. Enrolment was currently 38 students although 92 had been admitted, indicating a number of students were not continuing with the program. There were about 14 students per course.

A member asked for clarification concerning the proposed course revisions. Ms Isbister said that it would take about 18 months to phase out the program. The students who began in September would complete the new program. The new courses were formed from collapsing together a number of old courses.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the proposal for revisions to the Certificate in Case Management program, as described in the submission from Woodsworth College dated November 8, 2000, be approved, effective immediately, subject to a review of resource implications.

4. Woodsworth College: Certificate Program in Human Resource Management - Revisions

The Chair said that in addition to Mr. Bateman and Ms Isbister, Professor Dan Ondrack, Rotman School of Management, Academic Coordinator of the Human Resource Management program, was a guest for this item.

Professor Tuohy explained that there were two changes proposed to this program. The number of courses required to complete the program was being reduced from six to five and students would now be required to have completed an undergraduate degree for admission. Under the *Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs*, the proper nomenclature for a program requiring an undergraduate degree was a diploma program. The College has asked that the program continue to be called a certificate because of its long history and because this was the common usage in the field. She also noted that the non-credit courses in the program were being replaced by Arts and Science courses offered through Woodsworth College.

In response to a question, Mr. Bateman said that the students currently in the program would continue under the old format. With respect to the decrease in the number of courses, Professor Ondrack explained that the program was being streamlined and the students would complete the requirements faster. Those who completed the program qualified for certification in the field but the course requirements for certification were fewer than those the students were currently taking. The new courses were tailored to improve efficiency and to meet certification standards. In response to a question, Mr. Bateman said that the Woodsworth College Council was responsible for overseeing the quality of the courses offered.

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

**4. Woodsworth College: Certificate Program in Human Resource Management -
Revisions** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the proposal for revisions to the Certificate in Human Resource Management program, as described in the submission from Woodsworth College dated November 8, 2000, be approved, effective immediately, subject to a review of resource implications.

5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Curriculum Changes 2000-2001

The Chair welcomed Professor Joan Foley as a guest for this item.

Professor Tuohy said that this proposal for two new co-op programs was consistent with the increased emphasis on co-op education at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSc). International studies and public policy were both areas of strength at UTSc. These proposals were being brought to this Committee in advance of the main calendar changes in order to begin advertising. She noted that the non-co-op versions of these major programs would be considered by the Committee next term.

A member asked about the payment of co-op fees. Professor Foley explained that students could enter a co-op program directly from high school or in the second year. The fees would be spread over the period of the students' enrolment in the program, paying eight installments if the students were there for four years or six installments if they started in second year. The fee covered the cost of providing and monitoring the work placements. It covered staff time to find the placements, train the students to make applications, keep in contact with the students and employers during the placement, and debrief the students at the end of the placement. The fees were levied under ministry guidelines.

A member asked about the difficulty of finding good placements. Professor Foley said that UTSc had a number of prospects but not as many as would be needed. However, the placements would not be required until the end of the second year so there was some time to compile a list of placements. The programs would have limited enrolment and UTSc had a good record in finding good placements.

A member asked about the benefit of having both a co-op and a non-co-op version of the same program. Professor Foley replied that there were students who did not wish to enter a co-op program. The non-co-op version had the same course content without the work placements. Students in the co-op program were required to maintain a 2.5 GPA. Some students might fail to maintain the required GPA but they could complete the program in the other version.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the proposals for new Major co-op programs in International Studies and in Public Policy, as described in the University of Toronto at Scarborough submission dated November 20, 2000 be approved, subject to a review of resource implications.

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

6. Student Financial Support: Report of the Vice-Provost, Students 1999-2000

The Chair noted that this item was presented for information. Section 7 of the *Policy on Student Financial Support* required an annual report to be submitted to this Committee.

Professor Orchard gave a presentation of the highlights of the report. A copy of the presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A". He began by reminding the members of the statement of principle in the *Policy*, namely, that no student offered admission to a program at the University of Toronto should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means. The needs assessment was based on a modified OSAP assessment. For first-entry and doctoral-stream students whose needs exceeded the OSAP maximum, the balance was met by a UTAPS (University of Toronto Advance Planning for Students) grant. For second-entry professional program students, the need exceeding the OSAP maximum was met by a mixture of grants and loans. There was also an income-sensitive loan remission program for graduates who pursued low-income careers within their professions.

With respect to part-time students, Professor Orchard noted that students whose course load was less than 60 percent were ineligible for OSAP. The University had created a refined OSAP assessment that provided grants through the Noah Meltz part-time financial aid program. First Nations students were given grants to augment funding they received from their bands. There were also programs for students with special needs. As an example, students in the Transitional Year Program were participating in a pilot project for an enhanced student aid program.

Professor Orchard explained that financial counselling was an integral part of the student aid program. Counselling was provided centrally through Admissions and Awards and also locally by the individual divisions. Information could also be found on the web and in brochures, one of which was directed at parents.

UTAPS was funded centrally in 1999-2000 leaving the divisions to use their resources for individual student needs. The unmet OSAP need last year exceeded \$12 million, of which over \$9 million was met by UTAPS grants.

Professor Orchard gave a brief overview of survey data. In the convocation class of 1999, of the first-entry students, over 50 percent said they were graduating without OSAP debt. The average debt load for the remaining graduates was about \$15,000. In the undergraduate survey, the percentage of students born outside Canada fell slightly in 1999-2000 (40% versus 42%) and the number who self-identified as minorities was 50%. Also in the undergraduate survey, the percentage of students whose parents had less than post-secondary education was similar to the previous year while the percentage of those with parental income under \$50,000 rose six percent. In the professional faculties survey, the percentage of students born outside Canada remained constant while the number who self-identified as minorities rose nine percent. Both percentages concerning parental education less than post-secondary and income under \$50,000 rose in the professional faculties survey.

In conclusion, Professor Orchard believed that the survey showed the University's financial aid program was working, that students were able to attend the University and that the appropriate level of financial support was being provided. He noted that a table, Appendix 2, Table 2A, had not been included in the report; he had placed it on the table.

The Chair said that Mr. Jorge Sousa, President of the Graduate Students' Union, had asked to speak to this item. Mr. Sousa expressed his appreciation and congratulations for the very

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

6. Student Financial Support: Report of the Vice-Provost, Students 1999-2000
(cont'd)

positive program of student aid. He was encouraged that the number of students requiring OSAP was decreasing. This was in sharp contrast to the study done by the Canadian Federation of Students which found the opposite. He believed the University was doing something right. However, it was not possible to know how many students did not even apply because of the financial burden they would incur. He asked whether there was information on the distribution of aid by faculty or college. He found the number of UTAPS recipients encouraging. With respect to the number of non-UTAPS grants, he wondered how the percentage compared to previous years. He also asked about the number of OSAP awards as a percentage of applicants. He said that the lack of data in the report about graduate students was a concern. He hoped that graduate students would be part of the survey next year.

Professor Orchard thanked Mr. Sousa for his comments. He noted that the recently-released Report of the Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support had contained data on graduate student funding. The Report was referenced but the data were not reproduced. The graduate student report was available on the web and it had been reproduced in *the Bulletin*. He said that the question of whether students did not come to the University because of financial constraints was more difficult to answer. He felt that the data showed that students from low income families did attend the University. This would continue to be monitored. The data by faculty and college was available in Tables 1 and 2. Ms Swift noted that the amount available for non-UTAPS grants in 1999-2000 was \$13.6 million. Although no comparison to previous years was provided, she recalled that it would have been about \$8 million last year. Students were more aware of the availability of the grants. Professor Orchard said that he would be pleased to add some comparative data in next year's report.

Throughout the discussion, many members congratulated Professor Orchard on his report.

A member raised four points. First, he noted that a number of students were borrowing money from other institutions than Scotia Bank. He suggested that it might be important to obtain that data. With respect to the data on minorities and low parental income, he commented that the University might be doing well in this area because many students in the Toronto area could not afford to live elsewhere and were, therefore, staying at home and attending UofT. Thirdly, he congratulated the University on performing a second needs assessment when the OSAP one did not meet all needs. However, this did not help those who did not meet the OSAP requirements in the first instance. They would not then be eligible for UTAPS. Their only recourse was a bank loan. Finally, he had received disturbing feedback on the quality of the counselling in the Faculty of Medicine. He gave an example of a student who was given inappropriate advice. He said that the Faculty was understaffed in this area.

Professor Orchard welcomed constructive criticism about counselling. Training was an important part of the program and counsellors were taught to be sensitive to the needs of students. With respect to the data on bank loans, Professor Orchard said that the figures were estimates of what would be required and were not actual bank data. The Scotia Bank had been chosen after a call for proposals and its proposal was deemed the best. Maybe other banks would give some medical students better rates. At the Scotia Bank, the University could guarantee low interest rates for all students.

A member noted that the University's academic aspirations should be a prime component of any program on student aid. A great deal of work to date has been concerned with providing the minimum support necessary to attend the University. He suggested that it was important to

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

6. Student Financial Support: Report of the Vice-Provost, Students 1999-2000
(cont'd)

focus on multi-year packages that would be competitive with those of richer universities competing for the same students. The question of student aid should not be detached from academic priorities and he added that the Campaign was poised to focus on increasing the endowment for student support.

A member added her congratulations to Professor Orchard and asked about the funding provided for financial counselling. Ms Swift responded that the \$400,000 referred to the support provided by Admissions and Awards to divisions and was mostly for salaries and office costs. There were also other divisional resources used for counselling activities.

The member was surprised that the students in dentistry had had the highest average Scotia Bank loan. She had expected medical students to be the highest. Professor Orchard said that the reasons for dentistry's position was the cost of instruments and the fact that their fee had been deregulated earlier and had increased more quickly than that for medicine.

A member asked how many students had been helped by UTAPS funding. Professor Orchard noted that Table 1 in Appendix A of the report showed that the percentage of the full-time enrolment to receive UTAPS funding rose from 7.6 percent in 1998-99 to 11.8 percent in 1999-2000. The number of students was not provided in the report.

A member asked if there was an appeal mechanism if students were not satisfied with the amount of student support given them. Ms Swift explained that UTAPS was distributed centrally and was tied to the OSAP assessment. Non-UTAPS funding was distributed by divisions and also centrally. Students could appeal to Admissions and Awards.

A member asked about the predictability of fees and about a retroactive change in a program fee. Professor Orchard was unaware of the matter to which the member referred and said that the member should follow-up on this matter outside the meeting.

Ms Swift commented that there was a great deal of data available from which the report had been drafted. She would be pleased to receive comments on data that members would wish to see in future reports.

The Chair commented that as a matter of process, she would ask that if members have specific questions about an item, that they advise the Secretary before the meeting in order that the assessors might be better prepared to answer the questions at the meeting.

7. Research and International Relations: Annual Report of the Vice-President, 1999-2000

Professor Munroe-Blum expressed her pleasure in being able to share with the Committee the past accomplishments and future goals of her portfolio. The highlights of her presentation were the following.

- **mandate.** The mandate of the Research and International Relations division was "to support the strategic development and efficient, accountable, administration of research and international resources, activities and partnerships, to serve the University of Toronto's mission to be among the leading public research universities of the world."

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

7. Research and International Relations: Annual Report of the Vice-President, 1999-2000 (cont'd)

- the following performance indicators were highlighted:
 1. **research revenue.** In 1999-2000, the University's total external research support amounted to \$334-million. The sources were the Government of Canada providing 36% of the total, consisting of 16% from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, 11% from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, 2% from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and 7% from other federal programs; the Government of Ontario 11% ; U.S. and other foreign governments and not-for-profit bodies 6%, including the U.S. National Institutes of Health; research contracts and grants from industry 18%; Canadian societies, foundations, associations and other not-for-profit organizations 23%; other institutions 6%.
 2. **research support compared to other institutions.** The University of Toronto, including its affiliated teaching hospitals, was the leading recipient of research funding from all three of the federal research granting councils (with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research replacing the former Medical Research Council). Even controlling for the size of the faculty, the University's faculty had outperformed. She noted that the support provided to all universities for research in the physical and life sciences exceeded by a wide margin the unfortunately low level of support for research in the humanities and social sciences.
 3. **North American standing.** Professor Munroe-Blum said that in terms of research funding, the University was 30th among public institutions and 43rd overall. In medical science funding, UofT was 10th among public institutions and 15th overall. The University was consistently second only to Harvard in Medline citations.
 4. **faculty awards.** The faculty continued to do very well winning prestigious awards such as the Steacie Prize, the Killam Research Fellowships and Fellowships in the Royal Society of London. Next year, there would be a concentrated effort on improving UofT researchers' visibility in competing for international awards such as the Nobel prizes.
 5. **GRIP awards.** Through the Government Research and Infrastructure Programs, the University received \$34.9 million from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (C.F.I.); \$84.9 million from the Ontario Innovation Trust (O.I.T.); \$78.8 million from the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund (O.R.D.C.F.); and \$6.4 million through the Premier's Research Excellence Awards (P.R.E.A.). \$70.8 million in private sector matching funds were leveraged for a total of \$275.8 million.
 6. **technology transfer.** The University and its affiliated teaching hospitals had earned a total of \$53.8-million in 1998-99 from all sources for research contracts and grants from the private sector. It had leveraged that private-sector revenue to earn a further \$20.1-million in government funding from the federal Networks of Centres of Excellence (\$6.8-million), the Ontario Centres of Excellence (\$7.6-million), and three federal research granting councils (\$5.7-million). With respect to commercialization, for 1999-2000, the University had earned \$2.75-million in licensing revenue. There were 100 active spin-off companies with a reported 3,700 employees and total revenue of \$421-million in the previous year. From January 1998 to September 30, 2000, a cumulative amount of \$17-million in venture or seed capital had been invested in those spin-off companies.

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

7. Research and International Relations: Annual Report of the Vice-President, 1999-2000 (cont'd)

- **Government of Canada.** The federal budget of February, 2000 had contained a great deal of welcome support for research: the Canada Research Chairs program would supply \$900-million, over five years, to create 2,000 research chairs, of which more than 250 chairs would be located at the University of Toronto and its affiliated teaching hospitals; the Government of Canada had also committed an additional \$900-million to the Canada Foundation for Innovation, bringing its total investment in research infrastructure projects through the C.F.I. to \$1.9-billion; finally, the Government had established Genome Canada, with a \$160-million investment to fund the activities of five regional genome science centres to provide laboratory services to university and other researchers and to accelerate genomics research in Canada, an area of research in which the University of Toronto had a great deal of interest and strength.
- **Government of Ontario.** The Provincial Government's budget of May, 2000 contained a doubling of the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund to \$100-million per year; a new Research Performance Fund with \$30-million per year to cover the indirect costs of research funded by the Province; funding for the Premier's Research Excellence Awards would be increased from \$50-million to \$85-million over the next ten years; the budget of the Ontario Innovation Trust was tripled to \$750-million; finally, the number of Ontario Graduate Scholarships was increased by more than 50% and the value of each increased from less than \$12,000 per year to \$15,000 per year.
- **technology transfer.** The University participated in all fifteen Networks of Centres of Excellence operating in 1998-99 and would participate as well in two of the three new networks awarded funding in July 2000.
- **Accomplishments of the Research and International Relations portfolio.** The University of Toronto had played a key role in the success of lobbying efforts for new and increased federal and provincial support for research initiatives. However, support provided to research in the Humanities and Social Sciences was still wholly inadequate. The University had generated significant new partners and investment in research and in the commercialization of research and internationalization. It had strengthened the services provided to the University's researchers. That was very important in view of the fact that the research environment was a key factor in the University's success in the competition for the best new faculty. It had established UTech Services, a single source of technology-transfer assistance for faculty. The Research and International Relations portfolio had also established the International Programs Development Office. Finally, the portfolio had taken a number of steps to enhance the University's research and international profile, such as the creation of a new publication *Edge*.
- **Research and International Relations objectives for 2000-01.** The objectives for 2000-01 included
 - advocate federal support of full costs of research, including indirect costs
 - advocate increases to CIHR, NSERC, and especially SSHRC
 - advance implementation of and successes in CRC program
 - increase provincial support for young investigators, health research
 - advance international development projects
 - increase funding from key foundations

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

7. Research and International Relations: Annual Report of the Vice-President, 1999-2000 (cont'd)

- strengthen and expand services in communications, education and information; services and support; establish UTech as commercialization expertise centre; increase invention disclosures
- strengthen UofT profile with government, industry, media, and broader community
- set international benchmarking.

A member referred to the performance indicator concerning the number of Medline citations and asked if it was on a per capita basis. Professor Munroe-Blum indicated that it was the number of citations, presented on a field by field basis. It was not a yield measure but was a good measure nonetheless. The member said that in order to be meaningful, the measure should be controlled for size.

A member said that the goals for the portfolio for this year were exciting and she expressed her admiration for the publication *Edge*.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Munroe-Blum expanded on her comments on UofT researchers' level of recognition in the international arena. She re-iterated that Canadians did not feature prominently in the list of Nobel prize winners. UofT's impact was field specific and in some areas UofT's researchers were at the top of their fields where they were recognized by national prizes and internationally by the Royal Society of London, for example. However, comparison to the United States researchers' awards showed a real gap. In order to improve the international showing, researchers must participate in international research projects strategically. The international partners might then recognize and nominate UofT researchers. It was important to be known and to network. There was also the problem that there was no dedicated provincial or federal program whose aim was to fund participation in these big international research projects. Invitations have been received but there was no support. She believed that in time, researchers from Japan, Germany and France would nominate UofT's faculty for prestigious international awards.

8. Items for Information

Connaught Fund: Annual Report 1998-99 and Annual Report 1999-2000

The Chair asked Ms Chadwick if she wished to comment on the reports. Ms Chadwick said that the reports would be familiar to members. The University was very fortunate to have such a unique internal resource that could be used to support promising research. Professor Munroe-Blum said that the humanities and social sciences received special support through the scholarship program. The Chair added that it was an important resource for new faculty setting up their research programs.

Ontario Secondary School Admissions Requirements for 2003

Ms Swift explained that the information distributed to members formed the University's submission for a Council of Ontario Universities' publication to be sent to students in grades 9 and 10. The term O.A.C. (Ontario Academic Credit) would no longer be used. The new terminology referred to courses as U (University preparation), U/C (University/College preparation), C (College preparation), W (Work placement preparation), and O (Open courses). A significant validation process was undertaken of the U and U/C courses involving university

**Report Number 84 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
December 6, 2000**

8. Items for Information (cont'd)

Ontario Secondary School Admissions Requirements for 2003

faculty members. The submission translated the requirements using the former O.A.C. notations to the new notations. The University would require six U or U/C courses for admission to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, for example. U/C courses would be accepted as equivalent to U courses since the arts courses such as music or drama would only be available as U/C courses. In response to a question, Ms Swift said that a number of other universities would do what this University was proposing, that is giving the courses equal weight. Some had added a minimum number of U courses. The government has encouraged the universities to give the courses the same weight, particularly since they had been validated by faculty members.

A member asked about the differences between the U and U/C courses and wondered whether in several years' time, after some experience with them as preparation for university, there might be a distinction made between the courses. Ms Swift said that the intention was to test whether the U/C courses were rigorous. The question might well be whether the University should require a minimum number of U courses.

A member asked whether all high schools would offer U courses. Ms Swift noted that some disciplines such as mathematics, physics and life sciences were only taught as U courses. If a high school currently delivered O.A.C. courses, it should be able to mount U courses.

A member asked about the purpose of the two-page document presented to the Committee. In his opinion it implied that a number of programs had no prerequisites, only English. Ms Swift re-iterated that that document was the University's submission for a publication. It mentioned a web site where further information could be obtained about prerequisites for individual programs.

9. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Tuohy noted that next term the Committee would be busy with curriculum revisions and on January 31st, with academic reviews. Professor Gooch indicated that he would be bringing forward a number of items of business next term. Professor Orchard and Ms Swift had no additional items on which to report.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting was Wednesday, January 17th, 2001. As mentioned by Professor Tuohy, the January 31st meeting would be devoted to consideration of the next batch of academic reviews.

The Chair and the assessors wished the members a happy holiday season.

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

Secretary

Chair

December 11, 2000