

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 97 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

November 27, 2002

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, November 27, 2002 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 Alexandra Johnston, Vice-Chair
Dr. Thomas Simpson, Chair, Governing Council
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice President (Policy Development) and Associate Provost
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost, Faculty
Mr. Syed Ahmed
Professor Derek Allen
Mr. Adam Chapnick
Professor Mary Chipman
Professor James Donaldson
Dr. Inez Elliston
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
Mr. Vivek Sekhar
Professor Dennis Thiessen

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Shirley Neuman, Vice-President and Provost
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Interim Vice-Provost
Students

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard, Secretary
Ms Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Ms Honor Brabazon
Ms Ranjini Ghosh
Professor Robert Reisz

Professor Keren Rice
Mrs. Susan Scace
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos

In Attendance:

Mr. Claude Davis, member, Governing Council
Mr. Sean Mullin, member, Governing Council
Mr. Colm Murphy, member, Governing Council
Dr. John Nestor, member, Governing Council

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

In Attendance: (cont'd)

Mr. Elan Ohayon, member, Governing Council
 Mr. Josh Paterson, member, Governing Council
 Mr. Chris Ramsaroop, member, Governing Council
 Mr. Tim Reid, member, Governing Council
 Professor Rona Abramovitch, Director, Transitional Year Program
 Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, Vice-Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough
 Mr. Aaron Delaney, student
 Ms Françoise Ko, member, University Affairs Board
 Ms Erin McGinn, Director, Operations and Government Relations, Office of the Vice-
 President, Research and International Relations
 Ms Amy Porteous, student
 Mr. Robert Sanders, member, Academic Board
 Ms Geeta Yadav, member, University Affairs Board

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 96 of the meeting of October 23, 2002, was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

(a) Item 7: CAUT Proposed Canada Post-secondary Education Act

Professor Levy indicated that he had spoken about the Canadian Association of University Teachers' (CAUT's) document at the last Academic Board meeting. He had reviewed the document and suggested that in general terms, the administration could agree that stable and secure funding for post-secondary education system was desirable. However, there were a number of aspects to the Act that would have major negative implications for the University, particularly with respect to governance. While CAUT's proposal was one route of advocacy for improved funding, it was not something the University's administration could recommend supporting.

In response to a member's question, the Chair reported that the document supplied by the member had been given to the Committee's assessors. It had not been distributed to the members. The member asked that it be distributed.

The member distributed a sheet to members which outlined the background of the Act and posed a number of questions. He asked for a response from the administration in writing, if possible. Dr. Levy explained some of the concerns with the CAUT document, including the lack

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)

(a) Item 7: CAUT Proposed Canada Post-secondary Education Act (cont'd)

of definition of terms used in the document such as access on a uniform basis, the exclusion of administrative staff from the governance process, and the suggestion that all universities be comprehensive, something that would be very difficult for the smaller universities to achieve. He believed that a comprehensive review of this document would be time consuming for very little gain and indicated at this time he would not undertake such a review.

The member gave a notice of motion that a forum be created to discuss the proposed legislation for post-secondary education. The Chair said that he would take the matter to the agenda planning group and asked the member to provide some written background for the motion.

(b) Item 8: Direct-entry PhD Program

Professor Tuohy noted that at the last meeting a question had been asked about the number of direct-entry doctoral programs. The School of Graduate Studies had provided data which indicated that there were 37 in total, 10 in the humanities, 5 in the social sciences, 8 in the physical sciences and 14 in the life sciences.

4. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Revised Academic Regulations

The Chair welcomed Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, Vice-Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC).

Professor Tuohy explained that the impetus to revise the academic regulations at UTSC arose from the introduction of the trimester system. She noted that four major changes had been identified in Professor McDonald's covering memorandum, namely,

- academic standing would be assessed for all students at the end of every session;
- academic standing would not be assessed until the session in which a student completed his or her third full credit;
- students who were admitted on condition would be refused further registration if they did not achieve a grade point average of at least 1.6 by the end of the session in which they attempted their third full credit;
- there were new limits on the number of courses that might be taken on other campuses of the University.

The Chair noted that although only the sections of the academic regulations with the major changes had been circulated to members, the complete 41-page document was being recommended for approval.

A member referred to the change in the number of courses that could be taken at the other campuses. The regulation had changed from the current ability to take up to half the courses in a program in other arts and science divisions to a new limit of five with only one in the first year. Professor Buchweitz explained the reasons behind the change. He noted that the old rule was cumbersome and unclear. In the mid-1990s, not all courses were offered at UTSC. For example, a student in a physics program would take the first two years at UTSC and the final two years on the St. George campus. UTSC now offered all the courses. He said that a student could petition for an exemption to the rule. There was a financial incentive for UTSC to reduce the number of credits taken off campus; UTSC had to re-imburse the Faculty of Arts and Science for all courses taken there. The member asked about the maximum number of courses

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

4. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Revised Academic Regulations (cont'd)

for which a transferring student could receive credit and graduate with a University of Toronto degree. Professor Tuohy undertook to check with the University Registrar but indicated that she believed it was five. The member noted the congruence of the two situations. (Secretary's note: When asked, the University Registrar said that the Faculty of Arts and Science allowed up to 10 transfer credits but it depended on the student's chosen program as to whether all credits could be used toward the degree. The more appropriate comparison would be courses taken on a letter of permission and the St. George limit is 5.)

A member noted a trend in recent events and continued in this proposal that could lead to the separation of the east and west campuses from St. George and wondered whether there was a danger of creating three separate universities. Professor Tuohy noted that in the recent exercise to create a new administrative structure for the three campuses, the question had arisen. She emphasized, though, that there were no plans to sever the constituent parts of the University. However, in order to build vibrant and coherent campuses, the individual parts must be able to grow with some degree of autonomy. There would continue to be tri-campus graduate departments.

A member noted that with budgetary constraints and enrolment growth there might be problems hiring faculty to teach courses offered on all three campuses. Would this be a matter that would be studied in the academic planning process? The Chair noted that the questions were straying from the topic of academic regulations. Professor Tuohy explained that in the past, students had taken courses for their programs which were available only on the St. George campus. This made the program offerings at UTSC less coherent than was desirable.

A member asked whether students had been asked for comment on the proposed changes. Professor Buchweitz said that the regulations had been approved by the Academic Affairs Committee at UTSC. Students on the Committee had raised questions but the resolution had passed with a majority of the students supporting it.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The revised academic regulations for UTSC as attached to the memorandum from Professor Ian McDonald, dated November 18, 2002.

After this item, and with the approval of the Committee, the Chair varied the order of the agenda and completed items 6, 7 and 8 below before beginning discussion of the next item.

5. Provost's Accessibility and Career Choice Study in the Faculty of Law

The Chair welcomed the guests in attendance for this item. He explained that the item was being presented for endorsement by the Committee. The item was not being approved because it was neither a policy nor a procedure. A vote for endorsement would mean that the Committee agreed that the proposed methodology was appropriate for answering the questions (that the methodology should actually answer the questions if the data existed); optimal (these appeared to be the best methods); reasonably complete (there were not any methods that should be used but were missing); and feasible. The questions were the ones posed in the Governing Council motion, although in good research, such general questions had to be tackled by posing

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

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

specific questions or hypotheses that led to good experimental design and that could be evaluated statistically. He suggested that a vote for endorsement meant that the Committee was satisfied that the questions in the Provost's proposal were the appropriate ones for addressing the general questions and signalled the Committee's support for the methodology which now appeared optimal. Endorsement did not mean that the proposal was perfect and could not change. In research, initial answers often required refining the methodology. He said that the Provost would welcome constructive suggestions.

The Chair laid out the procedure for the discussion of this item. Following the introduction by the Provost, the motion would be put on the floor. Guest speakers would be invited to address the Committee and the Provost would respond to the comments made. Then the Committee would debate the issue and vote on the motion.

Professor Neuman referred to her memorandum outlining the methodology, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A". She recalled that Governing Council had asked two questions. One referred to accessibility which she said the administration cared deeply about and the other asked about career distortion due to debt load the graduates might be carrying. The study requested by the Governing Council was an elaboration of the annual report on financial accessibility provided each year to this Committee. The question on accessibility had been enlarged as a result of discussions she had had. Socio-economic data from the Faculty of Law could be accessed for about two thirds of the first-year class each year – the group that requested financial aid. This information was reliable and could be checked against Revenue Canada records. Thirty percent of the students did not apply for financial aid; it was assumed they did not need it. Other admissions data could be used to determine the number of women and visible minorities applying, with information about blacks and aboriginal students being broken out. Some critics had been concerned that the study would not capture the number of those who did not apply because of the fees. For this aspect, she would be using as the pool of candidates eligible to apply to Law school those who wrote the Law School Admission Test (LSAT). She suggested that the University's share of the LSAT pool would be an appropriate proxy for that question. She would be analyzing trends for students with parental income in three groups; under \$50,000, \$50,00 - \$90,00, and over \$90,000. Data about applications, offers and acceptances of offers would also be observed.

For the second question on career choice, data would be reviewed at two points, the first at the articling stage and the second in the career chosen. The main data source for this part of the study would be the Law Society of Upper Canada. Its data could show what people do and where they go. The data on articling positions included information on year of graduation, the university from which the person graduated and the type of law in which they articulated. These data would be provided in two groups – University of Toronto and all other universities – for 1995 to 2001. Eighty percent of Law graduates from the University stayed in Ontario. She said that she had asked the Law Society to continue to supply these data until 2012. She also noted that a literature search on this topic had been completed and the report would be made available.

Professor Neuman explained that lawyers were required to register with the Law Society yearly. The data provided an indication of the percent of time spent on the different types of law and whether the lawyer accepted legal aid matters. She would be using practice in areas such as environmental law, family law, immigration law and workplace health and safety, as well as the likelihood of taking legal aid as proxies for public interest law. Although data on tuition fees paid was not collected, the year of graduation would be used as a proxy for identifying tuition. Tuition levels at other universities were also known. In closing, she noted that people hear

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

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

questions differently. A question about career choice could be interpreted as how much money did one make. It was difficult to obtain data on salaries but she noted some data might be available from the Canadian Bar Association. She expressed her gratitude to the Law Society for its assistance.

After the motion had been put on the floor, the Chair invited Mr. Patterson to address the Committee. Mr. Patterson commended the Governing Council for recommending that the study be undertaken. The first major increase in the tuition fees was in 1999 when they rose from \$5,000 to \$7,000 a year. The students who entered then had graduated this year and would be articling. He said that it might be difficult to demonstrate a link between fees and career choice on the one increase which might not have been big enough to cause concern. He understood that the study would continue to 2012 and he commended that decision. However, if the next increase was based on the results of this first graduating class, any problems might not be detected until it was too late. He suggested that it might make more sense to hold the tuition fees at their current level until a better database could be produced.

Mr. Aaron Delaney, External Chair of the Student Caucus of the Faculty Council in the Faculty of Law, said that he had been a participant in last year's discussion of the five-year academic plan where accessibility had been debated *ad nauseam*. His biggest concern with the study was the process. The discussion of the methodology at the Faculty was not reflected in the document. He said that the study treated the students as objects rather than active participants. He noted that the composition of the applicant pool was important, but more important was the composition of those who did not apply. Perhaps the Faculty was already inaccessible. He pointed to the absence of comparator data from competitor schools. He asked the Committee not to endorse the methodology and to engage the Faculty more fully in the design of the study.

Ms Amy Porteous echoed the point that the career choice data would be based on only one year of increased tuition fee levels. She pointed out that the Law Society only had data for those who stayed in the province. It could not provide data on those who took jobs in Boston or New York, perhaps because of the debt load they carried. The Career Services Office at the Faculty would be a useful source of information for those employed outside the province. She was concerned about how public interest law was being interpreted. Some people could spend their whole career in environmental law and not have any cases that would be public interest ones. When she graduated, she would be working for the government but she would not consider that public interest law. She indicated that she was mildly offended by the Provost's comment about checking the data provided by the Faculty on family income.

Mr. Colm Murphy distributed a commentary on the methodology prepared from statements made by the authors of the Medical School Tuition Study. A serious limitation of the study was that the full effects of the tuition increases were not known at this point in time. He suggested that a qualitative study could be conducted. He referred members to the comments on visible minorities and warned that if the data were used from LSAT, it would likely be based on the American definition of race (White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian-American). The final comment he highlighted concerned the validity of income data obtained through the requests for student aid. He asked whether they were accurate and did the data represent the student's or the parents' income.

The Chair noted that this was the list of speakers that had asked to address the Committee. He asked whether other guests present wished to speak. No one else asked to speak.

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

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

Professor Neuman said that several speakers had alluded to the biggest problem in the career choice study. Governing Council had asked for a study on career distortion due to previous substantial increases in tuition fees. The first large increase was \$2000 in 1999. Students affected by that increase were now articling and that data could be compared to the 1995 class. More data were needed and that was why she had asked that the study continue to 2012. Data on financial aid could be accessed, particularly at the points where tuition had increased and the differential in debt load could be reviewed. The amount set aside for financial aid had risen from \$100,000 in 1999 to \$1.6 million in 2002. A number of students paid no tuition fees at all.

With respect to the comment about being objects and not participants, Professor Neuman explained that this was a study and not a survey. The issue had been politicized and it would be impossible to obtain good data from a survey.

The question of the Faculty's involvement in the study was raised, particularly with reference to the information already collected by the Faculty. However, Governing Council had asked the Provost's Office to conduct the survey. It should be an arm's length study, and she would honour that request. No distrust of the Faculty's data was implied.

In response to the point about comparative data, Professor Neuman said that the study would rely on trends in the data. Other law schools might not be prepared to share their data. With respect to those who take corporation law jobs in the U.S., Professor Neuman noted that it would be difficult to determine those who trained for it from those who felt it was necessary as a result of their debt load. The more important question would be how many stayed in public interest law. She would be pleased to use the data in the Faculty's Career Services Office but she believed it would be inconsistent with an arm's length study, in contrast to the current income data which could be verified by Revenue Canada.

With respect to the comment about a government job not being seen as public interest law, Professor Neuman noted that there was no agreement on what constituted public interest law. She suggested that salary levels in the public service might be an appropriate proxy.

Finally, on the comments from the medical study authors, she noted that other visible minorities did not raise the same issues as blacks and aboriginals which could be separated out in the data available. Some students had been away from the parental home for a number of years and information on their income would be appropriate. She agreed that some effect might be lost between student and family income and she was cognizant of this.

In response to the Chair's second invitation to other guests to speak before the Committee debated the matter, Ms Geeta Yadav referred to the thirty percent that did not apply for financial aid and asked whether the study would look at bank loan data. Professor Neuman said that she could not control the data since the reasons for taking out the loan would not be known. Mr. Ramsaroop asked whether Professor Neuman had done outreach with community or parent groups. Professor Neuman referred to her memorandum which listed those with whom she had met and said that she would meet with anyone who asked to meet with her.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the issue. A member raised a concern about variables which had changed over time with respect to determining who chose public interest law. One would be the changes in legal aid system which had reduced funding, reduced the hours and provided no funding for witnesses, all of which could affect the choice of a career in

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

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

legal aid. She urged the Provost to examine environmental variables. Professor Tuohy said that the Provost's Office would consult with colleagues in the departments of statistics and economics about controlling for such time-related variables.

A member commended the Provost on the study methodology. She suggested some changes in language and proposed that trends would be associated with rather than caused by variables. Professor Neuman agreed.

A member noted that the Provost had indicated that the data in the Career Services Office might be useful but that she had not used it because of the required arm's length nature of the study. He asked how the Committee might assist in this matter and proposed that the Committee encourage the Provost to look at these data. The Chair asked the Committee whether others agreed that the Provost should be encouraged to access these data. A member supported the idea and noted that although it was important to know how many jobs there were, knowing the number of applicants would also be instructive. There were no members opposed and Professor Neuman said that she would be glad to use the data.

A member said that the financial aid available would be used primarily by the students from lower income families but those from middle income families could be left out. He suggested that the proportionate change in the three income groups be considered rather than just the lower income group as suggested by the phrasing of the research question. Professor Neuman thanked the member for his very helpful comment.

A member commended the Provost on the open and consultative process. It was serving as a model on how issues of accessibility and the need for fee increases could be managed equitably. She particularly appreciated gaining clarity on the accessibility of specified groups. She thought the trend analysis of career choice data would be illuminating, including the impact of the choices made on various communities of interest. She posed a number of questions: would the accessibility data be available for a number of years so that the impact could be gauged over time; would information be collected on all categories of students, not just women, aboriginal peoples and visible minorities, so that the general trends would be seen; would there be information on debt load for students from moderate-income families; would the study on accessibility be based on existing information only or would there be opportunities for including information gathered from those directly affected; and finally, what was the time frame for the report. She mentioned the need for reassurance regarding the impartiality of the data gathering process and the validity of the outcomes. This was a very important study and the results would allow the University to strategically position itself.

In response to the questions, Professor Neuman said that some accessibility data available could be presented in terms of the three groups – black, aboriginal and other – but not for positions because it was not included in the Law Society data. She expected annual reports to be produced until 2012. Collecting information on debt load not related to financial aid requests was difficult as the reasons for incurring the debt were not known. In the case of financial aid applications, the funding provided would be based on requests related to tuition fees and living expenses. She expected to see the Law Society data by Christmas and a report to the Governing Council for the February or April meeting. Professor Neuman noted that an Assistant Vice-Provost was checking the data from the Faculty and that it was indeed an arm's length study.

A member asked for clarification that the accessibility numbers for women and minorities were controlled for the number of eligible applicants in the pool. Professor Neuman responded

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

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

that she believed these data were available. The member also noted that although there had been a large increase in the amount of student aid, it was distributed in the form of interest-free loans which was good but they had to be repaid. With respect to the students who did not apply for aid, he suggested that some did not apply because they knew they would not receive it although they needed the financial help. The study was retrospective and he cautioned against drawing conclusions going forward. Just because this study was being undertaken was not a reason for other studies to stop; they should continue. Finally, he noted that the study was a study and not a survey but perhaps it should be. He suggested that it would be helpful to talk to students in addition to obtaining information on what the career choice had been for the students in the one graduating class affected by a substantial increase in tuition fees. Professor Neuman referred to the Faculty's policy on back-end debt relief so that those entering public interest law could expect help in repaying their loan. She noted, however, that the pool for debt relief was fixed and was distributed based on the number of graduates applying for it. She had suggested to the Faculty that it change the policy so that students who enter knowing they want to do public interest law would know from the beginning that they would get debt relief assistance. The Faculty currently did accessibility studies and she said that it had felt slighted that it was not asked to undertake the Governing Council study and provide the information rather than the Provost's Office. She hoped that the Faculty would continue to collect its data. Finally, Professor Neuman commented on the value of surveys. In her opinion they were not reliable in highly politicized situations. There was an element of self-interest in responding to a survey and they revealed more about the discontented. They did not provide a solid basis for gathering consistent factual information.

A motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes was duly moved and seconded. The motion carried by the required 2/3 majority.

A member clarified some remarks she had made earlier. She felt it was important to share members' anxiety about the study. The study used only data in place. Were there other sources? Perception was important and there was a need for a high level of confidence in this issue. She suggested that if the study singled out blacks and aboriginals without the others, it showed the University was not concerned about all students.

A member noted a typographical error in the three income brackets noted on page 2.

A member asked whether the methodology would be presented to the Governing Council for approval. The Chair reiterated that the proposal was before this Committee for endorsement and that it would not proceed further. It was the Provost's study and this Committee, a committee of Governing Council, was being asked to endorse a general methodological framework so that the Provost could begin her study and draft her report. Dr. Simpson commented that the Executive Committee had indicated that the methodology would be considered and reviewed for action as appropriate. The Chair also noted that there was a timing issue if the report was to be ready early in the new year.

A member commented that she understood that there were comparative data from other universities in Ontario in aggregate form. She asked whether the other universities were raising their fees. Professor Neuman said that the other universities in Ontario had not followed the University of Toronto in raising their fees this year. They likely would rise but the universities would probably maintain a gap in fees. If the gap was retained, it would be easier to judge what was happening with respect to accessibility. If there was no gap, she expected the enrolment at the other schools would decline because the quality among the schools was variable.

**Report Number 97 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
November 27, 2002**

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

A member suggested a friendly amendment to the methodology and asked whether it would be possible to show data on family income in \$10,000 increments instead of the three broad categories as listed. Professor Neuman agreed that that would be possible up to \$250,000. Professor Tuohy alerted the Committee that disaggregating the data into very discrete categories could yield numbers so small that statistically significant results would be unlikely to be found.

The time for adjournment had again been reached. The vote was taken on the motion.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED

The general methodological framework for the Provost's study of Accessibility and Career Choice in the Faculty of Law, as described in the Provost's memorandum of November 25, 2002, and as amended above.

A copy of the amended documentation is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

6. Items for Information

(a) School of Graduate Studies (SGS): Ancient Studies Collaborative Program: Changes

This item was presented for information. There were no question.

(b) School of Graduate Studies: Collaborative MSc Program in Astrophysics: Five-year Review

A member noted that one of the recommendations in the report was that the collaborative program be extended to the doctoral level. Professor Tuohy did not know whether that was planned but indicated that the review would return with the compendium of reviews the Committee would review at a future meeting. Administrative responses to the recommendations would be included in the documentation.

7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Tuohy, Professor Goel and Dr. Levy indicated that they had nothing to report.

8. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting was Wednesday, January 15, 2003.

9. Other Business

Members had no other business.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary
November 28, 2002

Chair

Memorandum

To: Members of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs
From: Shirley Neuman
Date: December 15, 2002
Re: Study of Accessibility and Career Choice in the Faculty of Law (Memo of November 25, 2002 amended in light of commitments made at the meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs at which the methodology for the Law School Tuition and Accessibility Studies was endorsed)

What follows is the November 25, 2002 memo discussed and endorsed at the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and endorsed at its meeting of November 27, 2002, as amended in light of commitments made by the Provost at that meeting. The changes resulting from the discussion at AP&P are highlighted in bold italic type in the text.

At its May 2, 2002 meeting, the Governing Council approved the following motion:

That there be no further substantial increase in tuition fees for the JD program in the Faculty of Law until the Governing Council is satisfied that there has been no reduction in accessibility due to the 2002-03 tuition increase and no career distortion due to previous substantial increases based upon a comprehensive Accessibility and Career Choice Review to be conducted by the Provost's Office.

The Governing Council also made clear its expectation that governors also wished to approve the methodology for the conduct of this study.

The study requested by Governing Council represents an elaboration of the annual report of the Vice-Provost, Students, on financial accessibility, which is submitted to governance through the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. The Committee is therefore the appropriate governance venue for endorsement of the outline of the methodology proposed for this study. All governors have been informed that this methodology will be discussed at the November 27 meeting of the Committee and have been invited to attend. The Provost also held an information session for all interested governors. She has further consulted with the President of the Legal Aid Society and his assistant (at her request) and with four University of Toronto Law Alumni (at their request). And, at her request, she has held an information and consultation open meeting with law students and faculty and a meeting with the Faculty of Law Accessibility Committee.

What follows is a general outline of the methodology to be employed in the Accessibility and Career Choice study. It must be recognized that flexibility will be required to take account of what the data allow and what modifications are required as the analysis proceeds.

Financial Accessibility:

Research questions:

- *Has the proportion of students from lower-income backgrounds declined as tuition fees have increased in the Faculty of Law?*
- *Has the proportion of students who are women or members of visible minority groups declined as tuition fees have increased?*
- *Has the U of T share of the pool of Canadian students applying to law schools declined as tuition fees have increased?*

Source of data:

- Admissions Statistics, Faculty of Law. Data includes number of applications, offers made, deferrals (students admitted, but deferred taking up admission for one year), accepted/registered student numbers, and number of students turning down offers.
- “Other Admission Statistics, Faculty of Law.” Data includes Median LSAT, gender breakdown, number of visible minorities applying and admitted and number of aboriginals applying and admitted from 95/96 through 02/03; number of black students applying and admitted from 99/00 to 02/03
- Record of Application cycle, through mid-July of each of 4 years: 2001/02; 2000/01; 1995/96; 1992/93. Each record tallies individuals with a Canadian province as province of permanent residence or with a Canadian mailing address, who were eligible to apply to Law school, who had an LSAT score on file, and who applied to each of the following combinations of schools: U of Toronto + other Canadian schools + U.S. schools; other Canadian schools + U.S. schools; U of Toronto + U.S. schools; U of Toronto + other Canadian schools; U.S. schools only; other Canadian schools only; U of Toronto only; no Canadian or U.S. schools. Numbers in each category are broken down by LSAT score. The data allows comparison over a decade, of the share of the “pool” that is applying to the University of Toronto.
- Socio-economic data for First Year Class. Data is available for approximately two-thirds of the class in any given year; approximately one-third (who do not request financial aid) do not report income. Data is available for 1999-2000 through 2002-2003.

Mode of analysis:

- Observation of trends and test for statistical significance of differences in the proportion of students with parental income in the following categories: <\$60,000, 60,000 – 90,000, >90,000. *In a second observation of trends, and at the request of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs the data will be broken down by income increments of \$10,000, up to \$250,000. (The committee has been informed that “disaggregating the data into very discrete categories could yield numbers so small that statistically significant results would be unlikely to be found.”)* Data for the entering class of 2002 will be compared with data for the entering class of each of the three previous years. Data for the entering class of 2002 will also be compared with blended data for the previous three years.
- Observation of trends and test for statistical significance of differences in the proportion of women in the 2002 entering class with the previous years.
- Observation of trends and test for statistical significance of differences in the proportion of visible minorities in the 2002 entering class with the previous years.
- Observation of trends and test for statistical differences in numbers of applications, offers, and acceptances of offers over the period 1995/96 to 2002/03.
- Observation of trends and test for statistical differences in numbers of applications as a proportion of the eligible pool within Canada using the two most recent years and two years from a decade ago.

Career Choice:**Research question:**

- *Are increases in tuition fees paid over the course of the LL.B/J.D. program associated with the choice of (1) articling position (2) subsequent career?*

Sources of Data:

- Literature review of studies addressing the question of the impact of tuition increases on career choice.
- Law Society of Upper Canada (LSUC): annual records of articling students (1995-2002) for all positions in Ontario;
- LSUC Member’s Annual Report for 2002 for those who graduated between 1995 and 2001. (Note that this captures only lawyers licensed to practice in Ontario. About 70-80% of U of T Law grads practice in Ontario, according to Faculty of Law estimates.)
- *Databases in the Career Services Office of the Faculty of Law*

Mode of analysis:

- multiple regression: This mode of analysis allows us to look at the impact of tuition changes on choice of articling position and subsequent career choice, controlling for other factors that might also have an impact.
- Specifically, we will do regression analyses that include:
 1. **Association with place of articling** (large/small firm/non-law-firm i.e. government, NGO) of:
 - graduation from U of T (vs other Ontario law schools);
 - year of graduation (proxy for tuition);
 - other factors such as: number of articling positions available in each category; economic indicators.
 2. **Association with locus of ongoing employment** (large/small firm/non-law-firm i.e. government, NGO) of:
 - graduation from U of T (vs other Ontario law schools);
 - year of graduation (proxy for tuition);
 - other factors such as: number of articling positions available in each category; economic indicators; place of articling.
 3. **Association with likelihood of practicing in “public interest” law** (at least 20% of time in areas such as environmental law, refugee and immigration law, family law, labour law, workplace health and safety, criminal defense) of:
 - graduation from U of T (vs other Ontario law schools);
 - year of graduation (proxy for tuition);
 - other factors such as: locus of on-going employment; economic indicators;
 4. **Association with likelihood of accepting legal aid work** of:
 - graduation from U of T (vs other Ontario law schools);
 - year of graduation (proxy for tuition);
 - other **environmental** factors such as: locus of on-going employment, economic indicators, **changes to legal aid funding policy**.

The Law Society has undertaken to confirm the feasibility of and time-frame for providing these data by the end of November. The Provost’s Office will also seek to obtain additional data, such as those regarding starting salaries in various of the above categories, from sources such as the Canadian Bar Association.

In developing this methodology, I have consulted with the following groups:

- The President and an accompanying member of the Legal Aid Society (at my request)
- Four faculty of Law alumni (at their request)
- The Law Society of Upper Canada (following their offer to help with the Study)
- The Faculty of Law Accessibility Committee (at my request)
- Faculty of law students and faculty in an open meeting (at my request)
- 19 members of Governing Council in an “off-line” information session

I seek the Committee’s approval of the following motion:

That the general methodological framework for the Provost’s study of Accessibility and Career Choice in the Faculty of Law, as described in the Provost’s memo of November 25, 2002, be endorsed.