

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 90 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**October 24, 2001**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, October 24, 2001 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, Deputy Provost  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost,  
Faculty  
Mr. Adam Chapnick  
Professor Mary Chipman  
Professor Frank Cunningham  
Professor Sherwin Desser  
Dr. Inez Elliston  
Professor Luigi Girolametto  
Professor Lynne C. Howarth  
Professor David Jenkins  
Professor Annelise Jorgensen  
Ms Vera Melnyk  
Professor Robert Reisz

Professor Keren Rice  
Mr. Janakan Satkunasingham  
Ms Heather Schramm  
Ms Catherine Seymour  
Professor J. J. Berry Smith  
Mr. Arnon Vered

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost  
Students

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard  
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Regrets:

Ms Rakhi Bhavnani  
Professor James Donaldson  
Professor Michael R. Marrus

Professor C. Regehr  
Professor Arthur Sheps

In Attendance:

Professor Pam Catton, Director of the Academic Program in Medical Radiation Sciences,  
Faculty of Medicine  
Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council  
Professor Donald Cormack, Vice-Dean, School of Graduate Studies  
Professor Umberto de Boni, Associate Dean, Division IV, School of Graduate Studies  
Professor Bernard Katz, Associate Dean, Division I, School of Graduate Studies  
Professor David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Professor Cecilia Reynolds, Associate Dean Academic Programs, OISE/UT  
Professor Pekka Sinervo, Vice-Dean Research Infrastructure and Graduate Education,  
Faculty of Arts and Science

**Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 24, 2001**

---

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Professor Catharine Whiteside, Associate Dean of Interfaculty and Graduate Affairs,  
Faculty of Medicine

ITEM 5 IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL. THE REMAINING ITEMS, INCLUDING THOSE THAT WERE APPROVED, ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**Chair's Remarks**

The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting. She introduced the Vice-Chair and the assessors and invited the members to introduce themselves. She noted that a membership list and some information about the Committee had been included in the agenda package. She encouraged members to ask questions about the Committee's role as the meeting proceeded.

**1. Time of Adjournment**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was agreed

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

With the agreement of the members, the agenda was varied to reverse the Faculty of Medicine and the School of Graduate Studies items.

**2. Report of the Previous Meeting**

It was noted that Professor Smith was present at the meeting. Report Number 89 of the meeting of May 23, 2001, as amended, was approved.

**3. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed Changes to the M.A. and Ph.D. Program in History and Philosophy of Science and Technology**

The Chair welcomed Professor Bernard Katz from the School of Graduate Studies and invited Professor Tuohy to introduce the proposal.

Professor Tuohy noted that this proposal from the School of Graduate Studies had been submitted after the May meeting. Because the Committee was not able to deal with it in the last academic year, the recommendation for approval was retroactive to the beginning of this year. The proposal was to revise the master's program to a one-year degree and reduce the number of courses required and to institute a minimum number of course requirements in the first year of the doctoral program.

In response to questions, Professor Katz said that the same number of courses would be required but instead of taking them all in the two-year master's program, they would be split between a one-year master's and the first year of the doctoral program. Although it appeared that the master's students would now receive the degree for half the work, Professor Katz said that the workload for the current master's was excessive and out of line with other master's programs in the humanities and social sciences. The norm in those divisions, unlike the science divisions where a thesis might be required, was a course work master's with research papers as part of

**Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 24, 2001**

---

**3. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed Changes to the M.A. and Ph.D. Program in History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (cont'd)**

the course requirements. He also noted that students could not enter the doctoral program directly from the bachelor's degree. The master's degree was viewed as preparation for the doctoral program.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the program changes to the M.A. and Ph.D. program in History and Philosophy of Science and Technology, be approved, effective September, 2001.

**4. School of Graduate Studies: Graduate Academic Appeals Board**

The Chair indicated that Professor Katz would again be prepared to answer questions on this item and she invited Professor Goel to introduce the item.

Professor Goel noted that appeals at the School of Graduate Studies used to be dealt with by the Applications and Memorials Committee. Its name has been changed to the Graduate Academic Appeals Board and its procedures had been codified in the new terms of reference. It was proposed that information concerning the Appeals Board and the procedures for appeals be published in the calendar.

A member noted that the Board should not award costs of the appeal. He asked whether students were charged a fee to appeal. Professor Goel said that they were not but students might hire counsel to act for them and these were the costs that would not be awarded.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the terms of reference for the Graduate Academic Appeals Board, dated May 17, 2001, be approved, effective immediately.

**5. Faculty of Medicine: Proposed Revision and Renaming of the B.Sc. Program in Radiation Science**

The Chair welcomed Professor Catharine Whiteside and Professor Pam Catton to the meeting. She indicated that the resource implications of the proposal would be reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committee.

Professor Tuohy recalled that the B.Sc.(Rad. Sci.) program, offered jointly with the Michener Institute, was approved by Governing Council in 1998 and was begun in 1999. The program required two years of University study for admission followed by three years in the program. It was proposed that the program be revised to require one year of University study followed by three years in the program. The first year would be two terms and would consist of basic science and discipline-specific courses. The last two years would be three terms and would contain all the course content in the current program, plus new electives and courses providing more in-depth training in specialist fields. It was believed that the shorter program would be more attractive to students while its quality would be enhanced. All the courses would

**Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 24, 2001**

---

**5. Faculty of Medicine: Proposed Revision and Renaming of the B.Sc. Program in  
Radiation Science** (cont'd)

meet the academic standards of the University and a number of Faculty would be cross-appointed. The name of the degree would be changed to B.Sc.(Med. Rad. Sci.).

Professor Whiteside, invited to comment, said that the current program was well underway and was very successful. The changes were being proposed in response to a shortage of graduates in these fields and an opportunity to improve the quality of the program. In the past, graduates in this field were awarded diplomas. The bachelor's degree program was able to provide a significant increase in the knowledge of these students and was the first in Canada.

In response to questions, Professor Whiteside said that as the program was originally designed, all students were required to take a research methods course for 1.5 credits. It was now apparent that this course was not meant for every student. It had been changed to an elective for those with the aptitude and the interest in pursuing graduate studies. She noted that those in the current program would finish the program and not switch to the new one. However, the requirement to take the research course would be changed this year.

With respect to financial support, Professor Whiteside said that the summers in both the old and the new version of the program were spent in clinical settings, restricting the students' ability to finance their education. The program, however, would be reduced by one year. Students were eligible for both OSAP and UTAPS support and the program administration was currently trying to generate new bursary support. In response to a question about the fee level, Professor Whiteside indicated that the program administration wanted to levy a two-term fee for all years. The Chair noted that this matter would be discussed at both the Planning and Budget Committee and the Business Board.

Professor Catton explained that revising the program had produced the opportunity to not only reduce the number of years in the program but also improve the quality. More flexibility was possible in the course selectives at the end of the program that could enrich the educational experience and improve the future accreditation of the graduates.

A member noted that although some courses were common to all streams in the program, the courses were not given in the same years. Professor Whiteside indicated that this arose from a scheduling problem but that by the end of the second year, all students had completed the required courses. The courses did not have to be taken in a prescribed order.

Professor Whiteside confirmed that the Faculty had conducted a student survey and found that an earlier entry and therefore an earlier graduation were favoured. At present, a large number of the students in the program entered with three or more years of University education. It was expected that the age group of students in the program would be reduced.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

**THAT** the proposal for a revision and renaming of the B.Sc. (Radiation Science) program, as the B.Sc. (Medical Radiation Sciences) program, as described in the submission from the Faculty of Medicine dated October 2, 2001, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be recommended to the Academic Board for approval, effective September 2002.

**Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 24, 2001**

---

**6. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units**

The Chair said that this item was presented for information and that a number of guests had been invited to respond to any questions the members might have.

Professor Tuohy explained that the reviews of academic programs and units was an annual task for the Committee and an important one in terms of accountability. The University was required to conduct reviews and report to the governing body. This Committee was the point of entry into the governance system. In the past several years, the Committee has seen a large number of reviews, once to clear the backlog of reviews and the last time to consider the reviews arising from the Raising Our Sights academic planning process. There were fewer reviews this year and in a number of cases, reviews that would have been held at the end of an academic administrator's term had been waived because recent reviews had been held in the planning context. Although the workload of the Committee was reduced, fewer reviews meant that the Committee would not get a sense of the broad sweep of programs. Following consideration at this Committee, the report of the meeting and the review documentation would be submitted to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board which would determine if there were generally issues arising from the reviews that should be discussed at the Board. The documentation would then be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Governing Council. In conclusion, she noted that the summaries of the reviews had been presented using a template to ensure consistency in presentation to the Committee and that the full reports were available in the Governing Council Secretariat for those who wished to read them.

Faculty of Medicine

The Chair welcomed Professor Naylor.

(i) Department of Family and Community Medicine

A member noted that at the time of the review, the M.H.Sc. program was offered through the Graduate Department of Community Health and not the Institute of Medical Science as indicated.

(ii) Department of Ophthalmology

There were no questions or comments.

(iii) Department of Paediatrics

A member noted that the reviewers had described the organizational structure of the department as "not cohesive". Professor Naylor said that this department's structure was the typical one, namely, one large paediatric hospital at the centre and a number of dispersed small groups specializing in the neonatal area. This University had the same issues as others including Pennsylvania and Harvard. The massive concentration in one hospital made the other units feel isolated. He said that the outreach efforts need to be improved. This structure showed the usual tension but it was being ameliorated.

(iv) Department of Radiation Oncology

A member noted that although the overall appraisal of the department was extremely positive the tone of the comments was not. Professor Naylor explained that this arose in part from a difference in philosophy in the organizational structure in this discipline. Some

**Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 24, 2001**

---

**6. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units** (cont'd)

universities were organized along disease-specific lines rather than the discipline approach favoured by this University. Work in this area was conducted in a number of departments. The University had a number of world leaders in this field. There were two excellent clinical sites, namely the Princess Margaret Hospital and the Toronto Sunnybrook Regional Cancer Centre. Professor Tuohy read from the relevant section of the review report, noting the very positive comments on this department.

(v) Department of Speech-Language Pathology

There were no questions or comments.

Professor Naylor commented on the leadership transition in these departments. Four departments had or would soon have new chairs, and in the fifth, the chair has been appointed to a new term. He had the sense that all were energized and ready to move their departments forward.

Faculty of Arts and Science

The Chair welcomed Professor Sinervo. Professor Tuohy indicated that only one review had been completed. End-of-term reviews for four departments - Classics, Geology, Physics and Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations - were waived because of the recent reviews under the academic planning process.

(i) Department of Psychology

A member noted that the department was described as a “good, generally well functioning” one. This was not the usual language of reviewers. Professor Sinervo said that the department was undergoing a significant transition and there was some sense that the department was a little adrift. The reviewers suggested that it needed to draft a vision of the future of the discipline and the department. The quantitative data describing the department was very positive. It had a strong three-campus presence at the graduate level with a virtual fourth campus at Baycrest. There was an interim chair this year and the new chair would begin July, 2002.

A member noted the reviewers’ comment concerning reliance on sessional teaching and the administration’s comment that its case for additional complement was not much stronger than several other units. Professor Sinervo said that the response was a careful one. Psychology has been popular and the student:faculty ratio has risen. The question of sessional instructors was a difficult one but in the face of the financial constraints, the department was doing the best it could. Another member asked about plans in light of the expected double cohort and enrolment expansion. Professor Sinervo indicated that most growth would take place on the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses and that was where the complement growth would mostly occur. Professor Goel added that sessional teaching was a general issue throughout the University and would need to be looked at in terms of enrolment growth. He noted that the Provost had recently released Guidelines on Stipend Teaching.

A member commented that psychology teaching staff were dispersed on the St. George campus and he asked about plans to accommodate them altogether. Professor Sinervo said that such a facility was highest priority in the Faculty of Arts and Science and that a proposal had

**Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 24, 2001**

---

**6. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units** (cont'd)

been submitted to the Canada Foundation for Innovation for funding to support this initiative. The long-term plan was to move into the Pharmacy building on Russell Street.

School of Graduate Studies

The Chair welcomed Professor Cormack. Professor Tuohy noted that reviews or responses had been deferred in three cases, namely the Joint Centre for Asia-Pacific Studies, the Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama and the Institute for Policy Analysis.

(i) Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics

A member noted that this Institute was referred to as a “jewel in the University of Toronto’s crown”. Professor Tuohy confirmed that the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research did indeed hold the Institute in high esteem.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

The Chair welcomed Professor Reynolds. Professor Tuohy briefly commented on the process used in this case. Departmental reviews were waived because of an external review by the Ontario College of Teachers, with the initial accreditation being granted in June 2000. Reviews had also been conducted by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS). Since these departments were recently formed and this is the first opportunity to see the results of a review, a modified template of information has been provided to the Committee.

- (i) Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology
- (ii) Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
- (iii) Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education

There were no questions or comments on any of the departments.

In response to questions, Professor Reynolds said that good quality was the highest OCGS approval level. It could be granted with or without a report required. With respect to the Ontario College of Teachers, since it was new, it granted initial accreditation. It could also not grant accreditation or grant it with conditions. Two universities in Ontario in the recently completed round had been granted accreditation with conditions.

**7. Items for Information**

(a) Approval Under Summer Executive Authority

The following motion was approved under summer executive authority:

THAT the name of the Graduate Department of Community Health be changed to the Graduate Department of Public Health Sciences, effective July 1, 2001.

(b) School of Graduate Studies: Collaborative Master’s and Doctoral Program in Knowledge Media Design

The Chair indicated that the proposal for a new collaborative program to commence in September 2001 was presented for information. A revised page of the Memorandum of

**Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 24, 2001**

---

**7. Items for Information** (cont'd)

Agreement concerning the program was circulated. The change concerned point (b) in item 2 of the original Agreement.

Professor Tuohy explained that approval of Collaborative programs had been delegated to divisional councils with the proposals sent to this Committee for information. Collaborative programs were formed by drawing upon already existing programs and the students were registered in their home departments.

(c) Collaborative Program in Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Psychoactive Substances

A proposal to change the name of the Collaborative Program in Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Psychoactive Substances to the Collaborative Program in Addiction Studies was presented for information. Professor de Boni was present to respond to questions. There were no questions.

(d) School of Graduate Studies: Counting Years of Study

Professor Tuohy noted that the proposal for counting years of study was one that arose in the context of student registration and it was designed to facilitate the application of the graduate student support program.

A member pointed out that there was no reference to flex-time programs in this proposal. Professor Katz responded that the proposal was based on master's and doctoral programs. A doctoral program was expected to be completed in four years with the maximum being six years. Those starting from a bachelor's degree would be in a five year program with the maximum time being seven years. Flex-time programs would need to be expanded but he agreed that it was not reflected in the proposal. Professor Cormack suggested that each flex-time program would define its own timelines. He said that the proposal was for full-time students. It was also a definition of registration class and not a program. He agreed to look at this again and report back to the Committee.

**8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

The Chair commented that this was a regular feature of the Committee's meetings. It was an opportunity for the assessors to report to the Committee and to respond to questions members might have about the assessors' portfolios.

Professor Tuohy informed the Committee that this University's processes for conducting and reporting academic and unit reviews was being audited by the group of Vice-Presidents - Academic of the Ontario universities. The audit was to ensure that the universities were properly carrying out these reviews. The site visits would be conducted in November. The auditors might want to speak to some members of the administration, the faculty and students. They would choose two or three reviews to audit in detail. She was confident that the University's process was efficient and informed the Governing Council of the quality of the programs and units. The process for approving new programs would also be audited.

Professor Goel reported that faculty recruitment and faculty renewal, in connection with the projected enrolment increase, would be the major focus of his portfolio for the coming year. Indeed, this year, enrolment has risen by 1,300 students. There would be new challenges in meeting the needs of the increased student population. As referred to above, the Provost has



**Report Number 90 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
October 24, 2001**

---

**8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors** (cont'd)

recently released Guidelines on Stipend Teaching, which limited the number of courses that could be taught by an individual. The administration was seeking to ensure that these staff members were not exploited. There were plans to create policies for post-doctoral fellows and to make revisions to some existing policies. The Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters would be reviewed particularly with respect to guidelines for the timing of the various steps in the procedures.

A member commented that in light of the enrolment expansion, it was a struggle to recruit excellent faculty and mount the courses necessary for the increased number of students. Professor Goel said the University was on record that it would not undertake enrolment growth if quality was adversely affected.

In response to a question, Professor Goel affirmed that there were post-doctoral fellows in the humanities and social sciences. They were funded directly by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

Professor Orchard said that he would be presenting his annual report on student financial support. In addition to surveying the undergraduate students, including those in professional faculties, graduate students would be added to the survey for the first time. The survey would be conducted by the Hitachi Survey Research Centre at U.T.M. and the report would be available later this term.

**9. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting was Wednesday, December 5, 2001.

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

---

Secretary

October 26, 2001

---

Chair