

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 98 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**January 15, 2003**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, January 15, 2003 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor J. J. Berry Smith (In the Chair)  
Professor A. Johnston, Vice-Chair  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice President  
(Policy Development) and Associate  
Provost  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost,  
Faculty  
Ms Honor Brabazon  
Mr. Adam Chapnick  
Professor Mary Chipman  
Dr. Inez Elliston  
Ms Ranjini Ghosh  
Professor Anthony Haasz  
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh  
Professor Ellen Hodnett  
Professor Lynne C. Howarth  
Mr. Josh Hunter  
Professor David Jenkins

Ms Vera Melnyk  
Mr. David Melville  
Professor Cheryl Regehr  
Professor Robert Reisz  
Mrs. Susan Scace  
Professor Dennis Thiessen  
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor David Farrar, Vice-Provost  
Students  
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard, Secretary  
Ms Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Mr. Syed Ahmed  
Professor Derek Allen  
Professor James Donaldson

Professor Keren Rice  
Mr. Vivek Sekhar

In Attendance:

Professor Joan Foley, Chair, Program and Curriculum Subcommittee, University of Toronto  
at Scarborough  
Professor Marc Gotlieb, Chair, Department of Fine Art  
Mr. Peter Harris, Assistant Dean and Faculty Secretary, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Mr. Rick Hayward, Student Information Systems  
Professor Brad Inwood, Chair, Department of Classics  
Professor Shashi Kant, Faculty of Forestry  
Professor Bernhard Katz, Associate Dean, Division I, School of Graduate Studies

**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Professor Robert MacGregor, Faculty of Pharmacy  
Mr. Alex Nishri, Computing and Networking Services  
Professor Carol Percy, Department of English  
Professor Lisa Steele, Department of Fine Art

PART OF ITEM 4 AND ITEM 6 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER 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**

A member asked that under Business Arising, Item 8: Direct-entry PhD Program, the word “currently” be inserted before the number “37”.

Report Number 97 of the meeting of November 27, 2002, as amended, was approved.

**3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

Notice of Motion

The Chair reported that the agenda planning group had dealt with one item of business arising, namely the notice of motion concerning CAUT’s proposed Canada Post-secondary Education Act. Under business arising, a member had given notice of motion that a forum be created to discuss the CAUT document. Notices of motion were dealt with by the Chair of the Committee on the advice of the agenda planning group (including the Chair, Vice-chair, and the assessors). The Chair’s options for action include putting the motion on the next Committee agenda, referring it to another body or deciding that no action be taken. Based on the agenda planning group’s advice, the Chair had decided to ask the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board to deal with the matter. He believed the matter to be outside the jurisdiction of this Committee.

At the same time, the Chair had also learned that the member had given a slightly revised notice of motion on the same topic to the Executive Committee of the Governing Council on December 2. The expanded motion called for the creation of an ad hoc committee to examine the proposal.

The Chair noted that the membership of the Agenda Committee consisted of the chairs of the Board and its two committees plus two teaching staff and one student member and the senior assessors of the Board and its Committees. It had a broad representation in the academic affairs area. After a detailed discussion, the Agenda Committee had agreed to take no further action with respect to this motion. The CAUT document was from a body external to the University and its subject was federal funding of post-secondary education, currently a provincial government matter. For these reasons the Agenda Committee decided that it was not within the jurisdiction of the Governing Council.

**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

**4. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Calendar Changes 2003-04**

The Chair welcomed Professor Foley and asked Professor Tuohy to introduce the proposed programs that would be offered jointly with Centennial College. Professor Tuohy said that the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) continued to develop joint programs with Centennial College in areas of mutual and reinforcing strengths. The proposed joint programs, a Specialist Program in Environmental Science and Technology, a Specialist Program in Industrial Microbiology and a Major Program in Health Informatics, the latter also in co-op format, brought to seven the total number of joint programs. The programs were targeted to areas of strength and were consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding between the College and the University, a copy of which was distributed to the members of the Committee for information.

Professor Foley stated that the development of joint programs with Centennial College was part of the strategy for enrolment growth as was the development of co-op programs. UTSC was seeking a stronger applicant pool over a continuing time period, not just for the short term of the expected enrolment bulge. These programs and others like them were the means to sustain a high quality student body. Discussions about these programs had been ongoing for several years and the programs were enthusiastically supported by those involved at both institutions.

In response to a question about enrolment levels, Professor Foley said it was expected that 10 students would be enrolled in each of the first two programs and 5 or 6 in the Health Informatics programs. In the second year, enrolment would be approximately 20, with direct entry from high school and second-year university. There was a high demand for the diploma programs and UTSC expected the joint programs to be attractive to students.

A member noted that two thirds of the program was provided by UTSC and one third by Centennial and the graduates would get both a degree and a diploma. He asked how quality would be maintained. Professor Foley reported that UTSC had assessed the faculty from Centennial that would be involved in the programs and was impressed by them. She noted that if any concerns were to arise, they would be dealt with, and the Memorandum of Understanding allowed the parties to withdraw from the agreement. She said that at least one half of the Centennial College students in these areas had university degrees. The Chair suggested that student course evaluations could be used partly as a monitoring device for quality, since they would send signals if something was amiss. Professor Foley agreed and said it was something to consider. The joint programs were just beginning and there were currently three students enrolled in the New Media program.

A member noted that 10.5 courses were required for one of the programs, and he asked whether the usual requirement of 15 or 20 courses was in place for these degrees. Professor Foley noted that the requirements presented were those for a specialist or major program and that there was flexibility for the students to choose other courses to fulfill the degree requirements. Ms Swift noted that the Faculty of Arts and Science allowed five transfer credits from students applying with a three-year College diploma.

A member asked if UTSC had approached any potential partners for its Health Informatics program. Professor Goel said that he was aware that UTSC was working on such linkages including links through the Faculty of Medicine. He referred to the Canadian Institute for Health Information and several hospital programs as potential partners.

**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

**4. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Calendar Changes 2003-04 (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the new joint programs with Centennial College, as described in the submission from the University of Toronto at Scarborough, dated December 18, 2002, effective for the academic year 2003-04, be approved. (See Appendix "A")

Professor Tuohy introduced the other proposed programs, noting that they built on courses currently offered.

A member asked if students currently in the neuroscience program could transfer into the co-op specialist program. Professor Foley said that students could transfer into second year, not later years, because of the preparation required for the co-op placements. It was a limited-enrolment program and entry was very competitive. All co-op programs were offered on a full-time basis and the students were required to maintain a 2.5 GPA. Initially there would be 10-15 students enrolled.

In response to a question, Professor Foley indicated that enrolment in the French as a Second Language program was open to anyone in second year.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The new Specialist (Co-operative) Program in Neuroscience and the new Minor Program in French as a Second Language, as described in the submission from the University of Toronto at Scarborough, dated December 18, 2002, effective for the academic year 2003-04.

**5. Faculty of Arts and Science: Calendar Changes 2003-04**

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

Professor Tuohy noted that there were relatively few changes proposed and she highlighted the participation of professional faculties such as Forestry and Pharmacy. The Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design as well as the Faculty of Medicine were currently involved in Arts and Science programs.

A member referred to the American Studies programs, in particular the list of elective courses, and asked how they fit in with the program. Mr. Harris explained that an advisory committee in the Centre for the Study of the United States vetted all courses. Department representatives from all the departments designated were involved in the choices. The film course, for example, examined mostly American films. The art course was dominated by American artists. Permission from department chairs was obtained before the courses were offered.

A member was saddened by the deletion of the classical civilization specialist program and of the Greek and philosophy specialist program. He wondered whether this foreshadowed the end of classical languages, the so called "dead" languages, at this University. Professor Inwood clarified that no programs involving the teaching of languages were being deleted. The major

**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

**5. Faculty of Arts and Science: Calendar Changes 2003-04 (cont'd)**

programs in these areas remained intact. Indeed, the deletion of the programs freed resources to make the language programs stronger.

A member noted the deletion of the drama and French specialist program and asked whether there was still a strong French presence at the University. Mr. Harris said that the combination program was not attractive to students; there was only one student enrolled. Both French and drama programs continued to flourish.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The new programs and program deletions, as described in the submission from the Faculty of Arts and Science, dated December 20, 2002, effective for the academic year 2003-04.

**6. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed New Master of Visual Studies Program**

The Chair welcomed Professors Katz, Gotlieb and Steele and invited Professor Tuohy to introduce the proposal. He noted that the proposal would be reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committee.

Professor Tuohy said that the proposed Master of Visual Studies (M.V.S.) was a professional master's program to be offered by the Graduate Department of the History of Art. It would cover a range of media and would include a three month internship.

A member remarked that only two of the faculty had supervised one master's student each. Was it common practice to begin a graduate program with that level of supervisory experience in the faculty? Professor Tuohy re-iterated that this was a professional master's program and that original research was not a requirement of the program. Professor Gotlieb added that the proposed program was a terminal degree and would not lead to a doctoral program. It would not be pertinent for faculty with doctorates to supervise the students in this program. Those faculty who would be involved in the program were well qualified to supervise the M.V.S. students.

In response to a question about student financial support, Professor Gotlieb indicated that he was working with the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science to provide support for the students. It would be a small, selective program, and appropriate support would aid in recruitment. He was looking at a number of options, both locally and nationally, and he was confident that support could be found.

A member, noting that this was a research-intensive university, asked whether some types of professional programs might be more suited to colleges. Professor Gotlieb responded that creative professional development was an accepted form of scholarship. Many research universities such as Harvard, Yale and a number of Canadian universities offered these programs. This University supported programs in music, architecture and creative writing. Professor Goel explained that scholarship could be shown in many ways other than by research. Creative scholarship was peer reviewed and could include prizes and commissions.

A member said that a number of faculty members would be entering new relationships with graduate students as first-time supervisors and he asked about support. Professor Gotlieb said

**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

**6. School of Graduate Studies: Proposed New Master of Visual Studies Program  
(cont'd)**

that there was a graduate program committee, reporting to the Chair, and a clear structure for bringing problems to the attention of the supervisor of the program.

A member commented that there were a number of professional master's programs in the health sciences. The programs began as those geared to practitioners and sometimes changed into research programs. Programs had the potential to change over time. The University needed to take risks with new programs.

A member asked about professional master's degrees and noted that some were terminal degrees without the usual opportunity for a student to grow through further study. Professor Tuohy explained that there was a broad range of professional master's degrees that excluded only the M.A., the M.Sc. and the M.A.Sc. They were intended to prepare students for professional practice and they varied in the degree to which they could be used as preparation for further study. Professor Katz confirmed that these programs were provided as preparation for a profession and usually not as preparation for doctoral study. Professor Gotlieb said the program would prepare students for a career in the visual arts; he would, however, be delighted if some students wanted to enter a doctoral program.

A member noted that "terminal" did not mean there were no opportunities to explore. This area could create a research base on which to build a research program. She suggested, for example, collaboration with the Knowledge Media Design Institute. She thought this was a positive beginning. Professor Tuohy was pleased with the extent to which the program reached out to the various cultural organizations and communities in Toronto.

Several members asked about the name of the degree, asking whether it was the standard name and why it was not a Master of Visual Arts Studies. Professor Steele said that the University was showing leadership with this very new program. It was highly interdisciplinary and was not studio sequestered. It would interact with many parts of society. She said that she anticipated no misunderstanding of the title and noted that she had received a number of calls expressing interest in the program. The visual culture was not confined to a single discipline. All faculty members in the program were practising artists. Professor Katz confirmed that it was standard terminology. Professor Gotlieb explained that the master's program had grown out of the excellent undergraduate Visual Studies program.

In response to a question about the scholarship activity of the faculty, Professor Steele said that it would be measured by such things as exhibitions and public commissions. The faculty had shows in Europe and across Canada.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

**THAT the proposal for a new Master of Visual Studies (M.V.S.) program, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated November 29, 2002, effective September 2003, be approved. (See Appendix "B".)**

**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

**7. Policy on Student Email**

Ms Swift introduced her colleagues who were in attendance to help answer questions. She referred to the policy and noted that email was meant to be “a” means of communication, not the exclusive one, with students. Communication was currently a challenge and other methods included mail and telephone. The ROSI system was used by students, and they were expected to update their address, their email address and their telephone number. She believed the UTORmail address would be an effective way of communicating because each student was given a UTORmail account. Faculty and administrative staff could communicate with the students by knowing the student number.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT the Policy on Student Email be approved, to be effective September, 2003.

A member asked how this would impact divisions such as UTM and UTSC with their own systems. Mr. Hayward indicated that he had discussed this issue with both divisions and with the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering and they were supportive of this initiative. UTORmail allowed forwarding to another email account. Communications could be sent to students using ROSI and UTORmail and the student could make arrangements to forward the message, if they wished.

The Chair understood that the student would be responsible for ensuring that messages were forwarded. A member asked if it could be done on a division-wide basis if all students in the division were currently using another email system. Mr. Nishri confirmed that the onus would be on the individual student to set up the forwarding address.

A member expressed her strong support for this initiative. She had used many email addresses for her students, a number of which did not work.

A member stated that he personally had no problem with the policy and noted the number of different email addresses used throughout the University. One system would be much better. He asked how the messages could be flagged to indicate their importance. Ms Swift said that this was an important point and stressed the entry on the subject line. She assured members that the proposal would not subject students to unwanted mass distribution (“spam”) because the system of addressing each student would be useable only by University personnel. The flood of possible emails should be controlled. She reminded the Committee that students were also responsible for information received by mail. The member noted that mail forwarded to “hotmail” or “yahoo” sometimes bounced back and he asked if there was any way to avoid this problem. Mr. Nishri noted that the message would return to the sender if not received. It would be the students’ responsibility to keep the forwarded email address current.

A member stated a number of concerns. He had asked Ms Swift prior to the meeting if there had been students on the committee drafting this policy and had learned that there had not been. He believed that there should have been, for proper consultation. Students were required to open their email account and were responsible for all information sent to them at that address. He wondered how often students should check their email. Ms Swift noted that if she were a student subject to this policy, it would be incumbent on her to check her email regularly and she asked whether a timeframe would be necessary in the policy. She explained that the policy had originated in the ROSI Steering Committee, which had no student members. A similar project was planned for faculty and administrative staff.

**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

**7. Policy on Student Email (cont'd)**

The Chair noted that there was no policy on the timeliness for opening mail. Professor Goel indicated that this policy represented another method of communicating with students. In the case of Academic Appeals, for instance, many methods of communication were used because it was important notice be given and received. A member asked when students provided the University with their mailing address, were they told they were responsible for all information received. Ms Swift said that there was no official policy stating that students were responsible for acting on the information they received. The member suggested that the free UTOmail account was not a gift but rather a means of keeping tabs on the students. Professor Goel suggested that students, when they registered, made an implied contract with the University. The member noted the difference between the implied responsibility and a stated one. Students had a great deal of information sent to them; it could be too much to handle.

The Chair noted that it was approaching the time of adjournment. He asked members whether they wished to continue to debate the matter now or adjourn debate to the next meeting. A member noted several additional concerns: access to computers for those students without their own; current non-user students would be obligated to learn to use computers; and problems with attachments. Another member wanted a clear definition of the word “responsible”. She also believed the timeline was important and could it mean instantly (within a day, for example.)

The Chair invited members to send their concerns by email to Ms Swift and to consult outside the Committee. He asked members if they wished to make any further brief comments. A member wanted information on other policies regarding contact with students and the legal interpretation of “responsible”. She agreed with the potential problem with attachments. In response to a comment about using the student number, Ms Swift said that it would not appear on the email and only those who had legitimate access to them could use them. Concerns about the volume of emails and the lack of student input were re-iterated. Possible exclusion of certain groups was re-stated and clarification was sought about any provision to limit the content of the emails. Finally a member suggested that the policy be less obligatory and more informative.

The Chair indicated that Ms Swift would gather the comments and send them to all members for their consideration prior to the next meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded

THAT debate on this matter be adjourned.

The motion was carried.

**8. Item for Information**

**(a) SGS: Department of Italian Studies – Direct Admission to PhD Program**

There were no questions.

**9. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

Professor Tuohy reported on the academic planning process. She recalled that members had expressed an interest in discussing the green paper reports and she hoped this could be arranged for the February 5 meeting. The green papers had been published in the Bulletin on January 13 and they could be found on the Provost's website. A series of town hall meetings had been



**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

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

arranged and, to date, three had been held at which very good exchanges had occurred. Professor Goel reported that members of the University community could submit comments on the green papers in writing and by email. There was also an on-line discussion forum. Those interested could complete a survey on ranking the importance of the characteristics of a research university. With respect to the timelines, town hall meetings and meetings with various groups including the student leadership would continue to the beginning of February. A draft plan would then be presented for another round of consultation and the final plan would proceed through governance in late spring. Professor Goel also referred members to the “name-the-plan” contest.

Professor Goel said that the issues that were arising from the town hall meetings included interdisciplinarity – how to recognize, foster and promote it. A member said that the town hall meetings were being held in the larger faculties and in the colleges and not in a location convenient for those in the smaller faculties. Professor Goel reported that attendance at each town hall meeting was not confined to a particular group. They had been scheduled to cover different days of the week and different times and had to be held in large venues.

Professor Farrar had nothing to report at this time. Ms Swift took the opportunity to thank the members for their input with respect to the Policy on Student Email.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting was Wednesday, February 5, 2003.

**11. Other Business**

Provost’s Accessibility and Career Choice Study in the Faculty of Law

A member indicated that she was speaking on behalf of the alumni members of Governing Council in raising the concerns conveyed in a letter from the Law Alumni Coalition to the Law Society of Upper Canada dated January 5, 2003. She was encouraged by the statement in the Provost’s memorandum on the methodology, dated November 25 and revised December 15, that recognized that flexibility would be required to take account of what the data allowed and what modification would be required as the analysis proceeded. She had two questions arising from the letter:

- How would each of the concerns raised in the letter from the Law Alumni Coalition, and which persisted regarding the methodology, be addressed in the study, and especially in the first phase of the data gathering process?
- Will consideration be given at some stage of the design of the study to the collection of additional information on the student characteristics beyond statistical profiles?

The member said that the reason for the on-going questions was the need for reassurance that the data would be adequate for the purpose of making an informed decision about fee increases. She noted that other studies suggested that high tuition fees dampened expectations and affected performance. Financial aid was important but so was the need for reliable information and outreach to the community.

**Report Number 98 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 15, 2003**

---

**11. Other Business (cont'd)**

Provost's Accessibility and Career Choice Study in the Faculty of Law (cont'd)

The particular questions included:

Access: Could the data source be extended to include years preceding 1999 before fee increases began?; Was it possible to gather data about students in other disciplines that would enable comparison among groups?; and could admission data on family income of "independent" graduates be collected in order to better assess the impact of fee increases on applicants with differing needs?

Career Choice: Could the study be extended so that data collection would include isolating other factors that might have influenced the career choice and destination of graduates?

The member said that she was pleased that the study was underway and she did not wish to raise inappropriate issues in an untimely way. It was a long-term study.

The Chair said that the member's comments would be communicated to the Provost. As part of the assessors' reports, the Committee would receive updates on the study's progress.

A member asked that the letter from the Law Alumni Coalition be circulated to members of the Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

---

Secretary  
January 16, 2003

---

Chair