

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 102 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**May 14, 2003**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, May 14, 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)	Mr. David Melville
Professor Alexandra F. Johnston (Vice-Chair)	Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice President (Policy Development) and Associate Provost	Mr. Vivek Sekhar
Professor Vivek Goel, Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Faculty	Professor Dennis Thiessen
Professor Derek Allen	Non-Voting Assessors:
Professor Mary Chipman	Professor David Farrar, Vice-Provost Students
Dr. Inez Elliston	Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar
Ms Ranjini Ghosh	Secretariat:
Professor Anthony Haasz	Ms Susan Girard
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh	Ms Silvia Rosatone, Secretary
Professor Ellen Hodnett	
Professor Lynne C. Howarth	
Ms Vera Melnyk	

Regrets:

Ms Honor Brabazon	Professor Keren Rice
Mr. Adam Chapnick	Mrs. Susan Scace
Professor David J.A. Jenkins	Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos

In Attendance:

Professor Bernard Katz, Associate Dean, Division I, School of Graduate Studies

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**Report Number 102 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
May 14, 2003**

---

**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 – March 19, 2003**

Report Number 101 of the meeting of March 19, 2003 was approved.

With the permission of the Committee, the order of the Agenda was changed and Item 5, the Guidelines for Developing Written Assessment of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions, became the first item of business. As well, the Committee agreed to add the Annual Report of the Connaught Fund as Item 7 on the Agenda.

**3. Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions**

The Chair invited Professor Goel to introduce the item.

Professor Goel noted that the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments* called for the development of divisional guidelines on evaluation of teaching that required approval by the Provost and this Committee. The provostial guidelines had not been revised since 1980 and Professor Goel presented the updated provostial guidelines which divisions could then use as a framework to develop their own guidelines. The Committee had previously delegated authority to the Provost to approve divisional guidelines based on the provostial framework document.

He added that the guidelines were developed in consultation with the Office of Teaching Advancement, principals and deans and the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA). Some of the revisions included sections on teaching dossiers and portfolios, and criteria to assess teaching competence and excellence.

He noted that UTFA commented on section 3.6 “course enrolment data”, observing that many factors affected enrolment in elective /senior courses. Professor Goel said that all the sources of information for the evaluation listed in section 3 were important in evaluating teaching effectiveness and no one particular source should be taken individually or out of context.

The Chair agreed to read the comments and two concerns of a member who, unable to attend, had sent the comments by email. In the email the member had applauded the University for recognizing the importance of teaching and he thought highly of the suggested methods of demonstrating teaching competence and/or excellence. The member had further stated in the email that one of his concerns was the wording in Section 1 where it suggested that the teaching dossier might include “all course outlines, bibliographies and assignments, etc”. He noted that the word “all” was excessive. Professor Goel responded that the list of suggested material was headed with a sentence that included the words “as appropriate”, which permitted users of the document to use their discretion. He added that it might be best, in some cases, to keep all evaluations and documents. It would be easier

**Report Number 102 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
May 14, 2003**

---

**3. Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions (cont'd)**

to remove items from a dossier than to try to reconstruct the information at a later date. A series of evaluations facilitated the assessment of change from year to year.

The second concern of the member was the fact that the proposal did not have a companion proposal for graduate students with a provision to help them assemble teaching dossiers. Professor Farrar noted that stronger pedagogical training for graduate students was an important theme in the Provost's green papers. He added that next door to the Office of Teaching Advancement was the teaching assistant training program which held workshops on dossier preparation. As well, some graduate programs included courses on teaching.

The Chair asked if the "all course outlines" could be revised and suggested "all or representative course outlines". There were several comments and suggestions from members. Professor Goel noted that these Guidelines were to assist divisions to develop their own guidelines and agreed that the word "representative" replace all.

A member praised the document and noted that item 3.3 on the last page included "classroom visit" and asked about virtual courses noting that one of her courses was completely web-based. She asked if "virtual visit" could be added to the document. Professor Goel replied that the classroom visit was for the purpose of tenure and it was so noted in the document. He re-iterated that these Guidelines were to assist the divisions in drafting their own and he suggested that this point be left to the discretion of the individual divisions.

Another member applauded the document. He then noted that section 2(b) regarding the evaluation of teaching excellence in tenure decisions seemed open for interpretation and added that publication of innovative textbooks would normally occur later in a faculty member's career. Professor Goel replied that section 2 had two components: section 2(a) listed eight criteria to evaluate competence and all should be met, and section 2(b) listed criteria to evaluate excellence, not all of which needed to be met. The latter was not an exhaustive list because the variability across divisions was recognized and divisions might have their own criteria to add to the list. A discussion followed with respect to words, such as 'superlative' and it was noted that these Guidelines were developed to provide a framework that could assist divisions to develop their own guidelines which could take into account their unique requirements.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The Provostial Guidelines for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness of Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Decisions, as amended.

**4. School of Graduate Studies: Changes to Regulations**

The Chair recalled that the Committee had considered two items of business by email when the meeting scheduled for April 9 had been cancelled. A majority had supported the proposals and he asked that the motions be confirmed and recorded in the report of this meeting.

**Report Number 102 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
May 14, 2003**

---

**4. School of Graduate Studies: Changes to Regulations (cont'd)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THE proposal for changes to the Admission Regulations of the School of Graduate Studies regarding Three-Year Bachelor's Degrees as the Basis of Admission to Master's Degree Programs, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated March 25, 2003.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THE proposal for changes to the Degree Regulations of SGS for the Doctor of Philosophy Regarding Transfers from the Ph.D. to Master's, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated March 25, 2003.

A member noted that she had had questions about the application of these regulations. She expressed her appreciation of the responses she had received from the School of Graduate Studies.

**5. School of Graduate Studies: Guidelines for Five-Year Ph.D. Programs ("Direct Entry Programs")**

The Chair welcomed Professor Bernard Katz, Associate Dean, Division I, School of Graduate Studies (SGS), and invited Professor Tuohy to introduce the item.

Professor Tuohy noted that this was another case of establishing a framework that, if approved, would allow SGS to approve all direct-entry programs. These programs would then come to the Committee for information only. She added that direct-entry programs attracted highly talented individuals who in the past were drawn to other institutions that offered such programs.

A member questioned the wording in section 1(b), which required students seeking admissions to demonstrate capability of independent research at an advanced level. He wondered whether the word "advanced" was too strong considering that most applicants would have a baccalaureate degree. As such, they could have some research experience, but perhaps not at an advanced level. Professor Katz replied that the applicants should be able to provide evidence that they were capable of research at an advanced level. After a lengthy discussion, Professor Tuohy added that the entire section should be read as a whole and other requirements in the section should be considered, such as 1(c) "at least two strong supporting letters of recommendation attesting to the applicant's research potential".

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The Guidelines for Five-Year Ph.D. Programs ("Direct Entry Programs"), as proposed in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies, dated March 25, 2003, effective immediately.

**Report Number 102 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
May 14, 2003**

---

**6. Report on Student Awards Established, Amended and Withdrawn: July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002**

The Chair noted that the report was presented for information and invited Ms Swift to comment.

Ms Swift noted that the total value of new endowment funds was \$37 million and the total value of withdrawn awards was \$50,000.

She added that she had received an email from the President of the Students' Administrative Council in which he had expressed dismay that 318 days had elapsed from the time awards were established to the presentation of the report. The Vice-Chair noted that this report was presented for information. As well, Ms Swift confirmed that the report could be accessed at any time if individuals wanted to view it and that they could contact her to arrange this. Ms Swift noted that if serious problems arose in this area, she would bring the item to the attention of the Committee immediately, as provided for in the *Policy on Student Awards Established in the University of Toronto*.

In reply to a member's questions, Ms Swift added that the awards were listed in divisional calendars and would eventually appear on the web.

**7. Connaught Fund Annual Report, 2001 – 02**

The Chair noted that the report was presented for information.

The Chair asked if recent decreases in the value of investments had influenced the Fund and if the figures for designated endowment capital in Appendix D, which showed a decrease from \$108 million to \$98 million, reflected the current market situation. Professor Tuohy replied affirmatively to both questions. She noted that the payout rate in 2002-03 had been reduced by 30% (as with other funds) and expendable funds had been used to raise the level of the awards; she confirmed that the capital of the endowed funds had not been used.

In response to questions about reduced funding across the board for matching programs, Professor Goel noted that a decision was made to provide more awards at a lower level rather than to provide fewer awards at the same level.

**8. Items for Information**

The following items were presented for information. The members had no questions.

- (i) New Combined J.D. / M.I.St. Program
- (ii) New combined J.D. / Ph.D. in Political Science Program
- (iii) Graduate Collaborative Program Guidelines
- (iv) Discontinuation of the Master of Arts in Teaching M.A.(T.)

**9. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

Professor Tuohy informed the Committee that in November 2001, The University's process for reviewing academic programs had been audited by the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) and a report on the Committee's findings should be received shortly. She added that she would bring the final report forward to the Committee in the next academic year.

**Report Number 102 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
May 14, 2003**

---

**9. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

She noted that the annual report on academic programs and units reviews for this year would be included in the report for next year and that that report would cover the two-year period.

Professor Tuohy thanked all members for their dedicated service and their attendance throughout this year. She wished members a pleasant and productive summer.

Professor Goel reported on the disruption to the academic programs due to the outbreak of SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome), as required by the *University Grading Practices Policy*. The Provost had declared the disruption on March 31 and this allowed changes to be made in academic programs which maintained their integrity without negatively affecting students. All major changes to grading practices were implemented in consultation with the students. As required by the Policy, the University community was informed through email, the University web-site, and direct divisional communications to their students. The disruption mainly affected the students in the health sciences, particularly those with a hospital-based component to their programs. Containment measures imposed by public health authorities had closed hospitals to non-essential visitors and services. He added that the hospitals had just re-opened earlier this week. Professor Goel described the changes made to all the affected programs, divisions and faculties. This included the School of Graduate Studies (especially Division IV, Life Sciences), the Faculty of Medicine, Postgraduate Medical Education, the Faculty of Pharmacy, the Faculty of Nursing, the Faculty of Social Work, and the Faculty of Dentistry. He noted that students in any faculty or division, who had missed exams as a result of SARS control measures would be provided the opportunity to sit exams at another date without fee or penalty. Students should not have incurred any extra academic charges due to the disruption. He added that it was expected that all students in the affected programs would meet the necessary requirements for licensure examinations. A detailed report of the disruption and the program changes is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

Professor Goel conveyed thanks to the faculty and staff in the affected divisions for their heroic efforts that ensured students completed their programs. He thanked all the students in these programs who were very understanding of the significant changes in their programs as a result of the SARS outbreak. The Committee thanked Professor Goel for the report.

**10. Other Business**

The Chair raised the issue of conducting business by email. He recommended that minor items of business, that were time-sensitive and that only required Committee approval, be voted upon by email and the item(s) be brought forward for confirmation at the next meeting of the Committee. He noted this process would normally be used to assist faculties and divisions to meet deadlines when there was not enough business to justify calling a meeting. The decision would be made by the Committee's agenda planning group. He also described the process that would guide the Committee in this respect. Noting that quorum for this Committee was eleven, he suggested that if six members replied in the negative to dealing with the proposal by email, then a meeting of the Committee would be called. After a couple of questions for clarification and a brief discussion the Committee agreed to accept this process.

The Chair thanked the Vice-Chair for her assistance. He thanked the Senior Assessor and other assessors for their dedication and invaluable assistance in guiding members in carrying out their responsibilities. He thanked the members for their thoughtful

**Report Number 102 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
May 14, 2003**

---

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

contributions and attendance, especially at this last meeting. He wished all members a good summer.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

May 15, 2003

26499