

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 93 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

February 6, 2002

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, February 6, 2002 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Ruth Gallop (In the Chair)
Professor Kumar Murty (Vice-Chair)
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President
- Policy Development and Associate
Provost

Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost,
Faculty

Mr. Adam Chapnick
Professor Mary Chipman
Professor Sherwin Desser
Dr. Inez Elliston
Professor Luigi Girolametto
Professor Lynne C. Howarth
Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Keren Rice

Professor Robert Reisz
Ms Heather Schramm
Ms Catherine Seymour
Professor Arthur Sheps
Professor J. J. Berry Smith

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-
Provost, Students
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard

Regrets:

Ms Rakhi Bhavnani
Professor Frank Cunningham (teaching)
Professor James Donaldson
Professor David Jenkins

Professor Annelise Jorgensen
Professor Michael Marrus
Mr. Janakan Satkunasingham
Mr. Arnon Vered

In Attendance:

Dr. Robert Bennett, member, Governing Council
Professor Ray Cummins, member, Governing Council, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Mr. David Melville, member, Governing Council
Professor David Cook, Principal, Victoria College
Mr. Peter Harris, Assistant Dean and Secretary, Faculty of Arts and Science
Mr. George Hawken, Department of Fine Art, Faculty of Arts and Science
Mr. Ted Lutz, Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Meg Miller, Department of Fine Art, Faculty of Arts and Science

**Report Number 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
February 6, 2002**

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Professor Andre Schmid, Department of East Asian Studies, Faculty of Arts and Science
Mr. Jorge Sousa, President, Graduate Students' Union

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Time of Adjournment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was agreed

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

2. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 92 of the meeting of January 16, 2002 was approved.

3. Business Arising

The Chair reported that the documentation from Professor Munroe-Blum on the Task Force on Internationalization had been sent to members following the previous meeting by e-mail.

The Chair also noted that at the previous meeting, under Other Business, the members had commented on the business items. Professor Tuohy had undertaken to consider the points raised and to report to this meeting.

Professor Tuohy commented on the changes in master's programs that had recently been brought to the Committee. The master's program in the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology had been shortened from a two-year program to a one-year program. At the previous meeting, one-year course-only master's programs had been proposed in Geology and Biostatistics. The questions were: was this a trend and, if so, what was driving it, and secondly, was it the result of the design of the University's guaranteed funding for doctoral-stream students. Professor Tuohy expected to see a few more such proposals but she did not believe it constituted a wave. The Orchard Task Force on Graduate Student Financial Support had encouraged departments to review their master's programs to ensure that they were designed in line with those at peer institutions. The Task Force had believed that some master's programs had more demanding requirements than others. Several new proposals might arise as this process of review continued.

Professor Orchard agreed that there would not be a rush to change programs but rather a steady evolution. There would be disciplinary diversity based on comparisons with peer institutions. He confirmed that the Task Force Report had encouraged review but this was not based on funding but rather on comparisons with other programs and appropriate evolution in the individual disciplines.

4. Faculty of Arts and Science (St. George Campus): Calendar Changes 2002-03

The Chair welcomed the guests from the Faculty of Arts and Science.

**Report Number 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
February 6, 2002**

4. Faculty of Arts and Science (St. George Campus): Calendar Changes 2002-03 (cont'd)

Professor Tuohy noted that the changes proposed included:

- reorganized programs in East Asian Studies, Music and Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations
- deletion of the minor program in French Media
- limitation on enrolment in the programs in Semiotics and Communications Theory, and in Visual Studies

A member asked about the proposal from the Faculty of Music to offer a new “ensemble” option within the existing major and specialist program offered for Arts and Science students. He noted that there was already a successful program at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) and he asked why there was a proposal for duplication. Mr. Harris responded that without such an option on the St. George campus, students who wished to enrol in ensembles had to transfer to UTSC. There has been a music program offered for Arts and Science students on the St. George campus for the past 20 years. It was a popular program in which the students focused on music history and culture. The addition of an ensemble component would allow St. George students access to ensembles in the Faculty of Music.

A member noted that the list of required courses to fulfill the major program in East Asian Studies listed the requirements for the upper-year courses before those required from the lower years. He suggested that it might be preferable to list the course requirements in the order in which the students would take them, starting with the lower-level courses. Professor Schmid responded that the courses in the first group were the language requirements where a higher level of achievement was necessary. Professor Tuohy suggested that the Department take the comments under advisement.

A member noted that the East Asian Studies calendar entry referred to students with an adequate knowledge of Mandarin Chinese, Japanese or Korean. He was concerned about the absence of Cantonese. Professor Schmid too was concerned about the absence of this language but noted that the Department did not have the requisite faculty to offer courses in Cantonese.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal for re-organized and discontinued programs, as described in the Faculty of Arts and Science submission for 2002-2003 to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs dated January 15, 2002, effective for the academic year 2002-03.

5. Faculty of Arts and Science (University of Toronto at Mississauga): Calendar Changes for 2002-03

The Chair welcomed Professor Ray Cummins to the meeting and she noted that Professor Reisz would also be able to respond to questions about the University of Toronto at Mississauga’s (UTM) submission. Mr. Harris also remained for this item.

Professor Tuohy indicated that the proposed changes were three new programs in Forensic Science (Chemistry Specialist Program), Geology Specialist Program and Paleontology Major Program.

**Report Number 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
February 6, 2002**

5. Faculty of Arts and Science (University of Toronto at Mississauga): Calendar Changes for 2002-03 (cont'd)

A member noted that the paleontology program on the St. George campus had been discontinued and asked why it was being proposed at UTM. Professor Reisz confirmed that the Department of Geology on the St. George campus had discontinued all paleontology programs. At UTM, the geology and biology programs were in close proximity and it was believed that such a program would be successful. The proposal was restricted to a major program and it could be offered using current resources.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal for new/re-organized programs in the Faculty of Arts and Science (University of Toronto at Mississauga), as described in the Faculty's Submission for 2002-03 to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs dated January 23, 2002, effective for the academic year 2002-03.

6. Report on Student Financial Support, 2000-01

The Chair invited Professor Orchard to present his report to the Committee.

Professor Orchard recalled that this was the third year he had presented his report to the Committee. He acknowledged the work and support of Ms Karel Swift and Mr. Hung Sun Chan from the Office of Admissions and Awards. He also thanked the financial aid counsellors throughout the University.

As background, he noted that the Policy on Student Financial Support contained the statement of principle that no student offered admission to a program at the University should be unable to enter or complete the program due to lack of financial means. The implementation of that guarantee was based on the Ontario Student Assistance Plan (OSAP) needs assessment with appropriate modifications. The Policy required that an annual report be made to this Committee on student financial support.

Professor Orchard gave a presentation on his report and a copy of the presentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A". Some of the highlights included:

- funding distributed through the University of Toronto Advance Planning for Students (UTAPS) program had grown from \$1.8 million in 1996-97 to \$10 million in 2000-01
- funding for need-based grant support had increased from \$1.5 million in 1990-91 to \$30 million in 2000-01, helping about 16,000 students
- in the undergraduate student first-entry programs survey, the number of students who self-identified as visible minorities was 50 percent in 1999-2000 and 47 percent in 2000-01, those from families with parental income below \$30,000 increased 2 percent to 19 percent over the same period, and those from families with parental income below \$50,000 remained constant at 38 percent
- in the professional faculty survey, the number of students who self-identified as visible minorities remained the same from 1999-2000 to 2000-01, those from

**Report Number 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
February 6, 2002**

6. Report on Student Financial Support, 2000-01 (cont'd)

families with parental income below \$30,000 went up 3 percent to 19 percent over the same period, and those from families with parental income below \$50,000 went down 4 percent

- \$9.4 million has been reserved in the budget model for graduate student funding through 2003-04 and \$1.2 million added to OISE/UT base funding for support
- guaranteed funding packages for graduate students had been successfully established in most divisions and grants for years five and six of the PhD program had been implemented
- the use of the Cognos software package had allowed the gathering of data from various sources to produce a more accurate picture of the funding available to graduate students
- a convocation report indicated that 56 percent of the graduates from first-entry programs, graduated with no OSAP debt; for those with debt, the average debt was \$15,000 while 2 percent graduated with a debt over \$30,000
- in the professional programs, 72 percent expected to graduate owing less than \$70,000.

The Chair invited Mr. Sousa, President of the Graduate Students' Union, to address the Committee. Mr. Sousa said that his experience in working with Professor Orchard to improve the financial situation of graduate students had been fulfilling and enlightening. A pilot survey of a small sample of graduate students had been conducted this year but the results were not included in the report. With the lessons learned, he hoped a better survey of graduate students would be possible next year. He said that the guaranteed funding package for graduate students (\$12,000 plus tuition per year for five years) was a welcome and much admired initiative. The administration had maintained its commitment but there was more work to be done. There had been a substantive improvement in graduate funding but the G.S.U. would continue to monitor the situation and to work with the administration.

He made a number of observations and expressed some concerns. He noted the decrease in the number of undergraduate OSAP applicants and suggested a review might be necessary. There was an increase in grants to non-OSAP applicants; he wondered who they were and why the increase. He suggested that the debt load at the undergraduate level was a barrier to continuing with graduate studies. Overall, improvements had been made but some areas needed further attention. He thanked Professor Orchard for including graduates students in the survey. Professor Orchard in turn thanked Mr. Sousa for his contributions and agreed that there was further need for monitoring and improved data and he would continue to work with the G.S.U.

A member congratulated Professor Orchard on his report and for the advances made in student support. He recalled that the first academic planning white paper had recommended strengthening graduate studies and, at the time, faculty had been concerned about how additional students would be supported. Available support had been uneven and, in some cases, non-existent. He said there had been a tremendous effort to rectify the situation. He was very impressed with the progress that had been made.

A member also congratulated Professor Orchard and applauded the efforts to raise student awareness of the financial aid programs available. She asked particularly about financial

**Report Number 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
February 6, 2002**

6. Report on Student Financial Support, 2000-01 (cont'd)

workshops for students. Ms Swift said that workshops had been offered for a number of years but their intensity had increased with the establishment of the policy in 1998. Workshops for students in the Transitional Year Program were mandatory because of the special needs of those students. Workshops held in conjunction with the family care office were well attended but budget workshops for undergraduates were not. Some faculties were considering mandatory financial counselling with the students having the option to not attend.

A member referred to the statement of principle and the question of accessibility. He wondered how accessibility was defined. He noted that on page 5 of the Report there was a statement that just over 80 percent of survey respondents said that their sources of support were sufficient to meet their needs. Did 80 percent equate with an acceptable level of accessibility? On page 6, it was noted that about 72 percent of professional faculties students would have a debt load under \$70,000. He asked what were the targets, were they consistent and who had established the targets. In response, Professor Orchard explained that the administration had been asked to monitor the changes and to determine whether there were detrimental effects on accessibility. At the time the Policy had been established, tuition fees were rising and some individuals predicted that accessibility would be affected. The current situation was measured against what existed in 1998. The administration was satisfied that the greatly improved student financial support program has mitigated the effects of rising tuition fees, and that the various indicators of accessibility have remained stable. Perhaps stability was not enough; perhaps the University should be instituting programs that would try to reduce the size of OSAP debt or reduce the professional students' debt load. He said that it was hard to predict how much additional funding would be needed to meet these goals. The whole question of goals needed to be considered.

The member noted that the guaranteed graduate funding package allowed graduate students to budget for five years. At the undergraduate level, there was no such stability and he suggested a little more clarity at the undergraduate level would prove to be an excellent recruitment tool. Professor Orchard noted that at present \$30 million was distributed on the basis of need. A further \$8 million was distributed in merit scholarships, but the President was proposing a program whereby the size of the merit scholarships would depend on the students' needs. Some of these funds might become available. He suggested the University might consider a model in which the University perhaps paid OSAP debt above \$25,000. The University needed to look at imaginative ways of using support funding.

A member joined in congratulating Professor Orchard and reported that at a recent conference, graduate students had commented very positively on the new support packages. Students were able to focus more effort on academic matters rather than financial ones, and in the process enhanced their academic experience. The students did better in their studies and improvement in time to completion was noted. The additional funding for the fifth and sixth years in the doctoral program was a very positive step. She hoped that graduate students would be added to the survey next year. Ms Swift said that they had hoped to be able to administer the same survey to the graduate students and, following discussions with the leadership of the G.S.U., a group of graduate students had participated in a pilot survey. However, she was not certain that the same questions were relevant to graduate students and they were in the process of reviewing the survey instrument.

A member noted that the graduate funding package of one year for master's program plus four for doctoral studies was not congruent in terms of the time required to complete all doctoral-stream programs. She wondered what was the shortfall in support. Professor Orchard noted that the shortfall for the guaranteed cohort was \$14 million but he did not have a value for these students in years 5, 6 or 7 of their program. The Task Force had decided to choose a value and time limit for

**Report Number 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
February 6, 2002**

6. Report on Student Financial Support, 2000-01 (cont'd)

the guaranteed package that would be achievable. He agreed that some students finished faster while others, slower. Analysis of time to degree gave results that ranged from 3.8 years to 6.1 years or more. Data for students who did not complete their doctoral programs were also important. Some non-completers leave early in their programs while others stay for a long time. This area needed review. It was a question not only of funding, but also of the quality of supervision. In September 2003, when it was anticipated that all graduate students would be receiving the guaranteed package, the University would revisit this question and set a new target. The member applauded the grants for fifth and sixth years.

A member suggested that the survey should explore the differences in financial needs of those who lived with their families versus those who were independent. Also a family where both parents were students would have special needs. Ms Swift explained that undergraduates who applied for OSAP in their first four years of University and who lived within 40 kilometers of the University were assumed to live at home, whether or not they actually did. Graduate students, even if they lived in their parental home, were assumed to be independent.

A member commented on barriers to accessibility. Referring to the tables in the Report, he noted that a number of the indicators had declined from 1998 to the present. Professor Orchard cautioned members about the 1998 data for undergraduates which had been collected from a mailed survey. In the two recent years, surveys had been conducted by telephone. He believed that sampling error explained the small difference in results. He preferred to compare the results in the two telephone surveys. In his opinion, there was not a large pattern of change and the results should continue to be monitored. He was particularly interested in the data on parental income which he believed were quite solid. Ms Swift stated that the University was interested in maintaining access and that more yearly surveys would be necessary before trends could be discerned accurately. Professor Tuohy noted that in some cases, completely different questions had been asked in the 1998 mailed survey from those that were asked over the telephone.

In response to a member's question, Professor Orchard said that the provincial government had mandated that 30 percent of increased tuition fees income over the 1997 fee level were to be used for needs-based student financial aid.

A member said she was looking forward to the full implementation of the guaranteed graduate student support package and the removal of barriers for students from around the world. Professor Orchard said that the package applied to all graduate students, including international doctoral-stream students. The differential fee had been taken into consideration when the amount of the package had been established as \$12,000 plus tuition fees. Their higher fees would be covered. The member did not think that the eligibility of international students for the funding package was well known in her department. Professor Goel suggested that each department needed to engage in enrolment planning to determine what mix of domestic and international graduate students it could support. He noted that some federal and provincial agencies placed restrictions on the use of their research grant funds, particularly with respect to graduate student support.

The Chair, Professor Orchard and Professor Tuohy thanked the members for their insightful comments and engagement in the issues of student financial support. Professor Orchard again congratulated the graduate studies coordinators, the departmental chairs and the deans for making the programs so successful.

**Report Number 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
February 6, 2002**

7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Tuohy, Professor Goel, and Professor Orchard had nothing additional to report.

Professor Munroe-Blum reported on the latest competition for Canada Foundation for Innovation (C.F.I.) funding. The University had been awarded a total of \$60 million in C.F.I. funding. There had been some wonderful successes and some disappointments. The next call for proposals would be in May with submissions due in December. Work had begun to analyze the past competition and to prepare for the next round.

Professor Munroe-Blum also reported that the Task Force on Internationalization had had a very productive meeting at which it had begun work on a preliminary framework. She predicted that in approximately a month, she would be able to report to this Committee and ask for advice on the work of the Task Force.

In response to a question, Professor Munroe-Blum said that this had been the third C.F.I. competition. The University had done extremely well in the first round and it was important to guard against complacency when preparing new proposals. In the next round, there would be increased co-ordination with the hospitals in preparing the projects for submission. She noted that she had discussed the outcome with Dr. David Strangway, President of C.F.I., and that she and the President would be meeting shortly with Dr. Strangway to discuss the proposal selection process and means of increasing the University's success. A member noted that the University should guard against burn-out in the proposals' authors. If an excellent proposal that took considerable time and energy to produce was unsuccessful, faculty might become discouraged; some revitalization of the faculty and staff would be necessary.

8. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting was Wednesday, March 6, 2002.

9. Other Business

The Chair reported that the agenda planning group had considered a request, addressed to Governing Council, from the students of the Qualifying Year Program in the Faculty of Dentistry to have the program changed from the current certificate program to a two-year degree program.

Professor Mock had provided a response from the Faculty which the planning group had also considered. He said that at the time of the program's creation in 1999, the Faculty had considered a degree completion program but had rejected it in favour of the current qualifying program format. The Faculty wished to continue in the current direction.

The Chair explained that requests for program changes were usually sent to this Committee with the approval of the divisional council. In light of the response from the Dean and respecting appropriate process, the agenda planning group had decided that the Committee should not deal with a request from the students to change the program. A response would be sent to the students indicating that the agenda planning group had considered their request but that such requests for change were normally received from divisional councils.

**Report Number 93 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
February 6, 2002**

9. Other Business

In response to a member's question, the Chair noted that there were student members on the Faculty of Dentistry's divisional council.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Secretary
February 7, 2002

Chair