

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 111 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**December 8, 2004**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, December 8, 2004 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 Cheryl Regehr  
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,  
Academic  
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost and  
Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Rona Abramovitch  
Professor Stewart Aitchison  
Professor Derek Allen

Professor Mary Chipman  
Professor David Clandfield  
Professor Luc De Nil  
Dr. Inez N. Elliston  
Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh  
Professor Ronald H. Kluger  
Ms. Vera Melnyk  
Miss Maureen Somerville

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary

**Regrets:**

Ms. Janice Bayani  
Professor Pamela Catton  
Ms. Maple Chong  
Ms. Leigh Honeywell  
Mr. Senai Iman  
Professor David Jenkins

Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar  
Mr. Raza M Mirza  
Mr. Stefan A. Neata  
Professor John Scherk  
Professor Dennis Thiessen

**In Attendance:**

Professor Kenneth Bartlett, Director, Office of Teaching Advancement  
Professor Donald Cormack, Vice-Dean, School of Graduate Studies  
Professor Umberto de Boni, Associate Dean, School of Graduate Studies  
Ms. Pamela Gravestock, Assistant Director, Office of Teaching Advancement  
Ms. Helen Lasthiotakis, Director of Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union

ITEMS 4 AND 5 ARE RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report 110 of the meeting of September 22, 2004 was approved.

## **Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs - December 8, 2004**

---

### **2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

The Chair informed members of the responses to questions raised during discussion of the “Items for Information” (Item 11), namely:

- In response to a question as to why the School of Continuing Studies was offering a program for English for postdoctoral fellows (and not for other groups), the Chair informed members that programs existed for English language training for undergraduate and graduate students offered through other means, but that such programs were not otherwise available to postdoctoral fellows.
- In response to questions concerning the flexible-time Ph.D. option within the Higher Education and Educational Administration Programs, the Chair noted that one year of residency would be required for the program and that it was not targeted at international students, but rather, at professionals currently working within the educational system.

### **3. Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC): Report of the Auditors (2001)**

The Chair informed members that, as one element of the accountability framework for academic programs in Ontario, the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC), formed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), was charged with auditing review processes at Ontario Universities. Although the report was initiated in 2001, it was presented to the University in 2004.

Professor Hillan stated that UPRAC guidelines provided for two tests: conformity of process with best practices, and conformity of the review process with institutional procedures. She then noted that the report indicated that the University of Toronto had a fundamentally sound process, with several useful features, but did make ten recommendations and ten suggestions on how to improve the review processes. Most importantly, the University of Toronto had no overarching policy on reviews, but rather, the guidelines in force were embedded within the *Raising Our Sights* (the previous academic planning framework) process. She then noted that the recommendations, while valuable, were to some extent superseded by new UPRAC guidelines published in the spring of 2004, and that the administration’s efforts to respond to both the UPRAC audit report as well as the guidelines newly in force would be discussed under the next agenda item.

There was a brief discussion, during which a member asked for clarification that second-entry undergraduate program reviews were within UPRAC’s mandate; Professor Hillan confirmed that they were.

### **4. Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units**

The Chair welcomed Ms. Helen Lasthiotakis, Director of Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost, to the meeting.

Professor Hillan summarized the proposed policy, noting that there was no single policy to govern reviews of existing programs and units and assessment of new programs. She noted that the UPRAC Audit Report (as discussed in item 3, above) had recommended the development of such a policy and that it should be entering governance processes by December, 2004. The Office of the Vice-President and Provost had convened a working group on the subject (the membership of which was distributed to Committee members) and had as a mandate the task of reviewing existing guidelines and suggest revisions, taking into account the changing landscape of review expectations. The working group had developed an overarching policy (submitted for approval) and guidelines (which were presented for information). Two sets of guidelines were attached to the policy – those regarding divisional submissions

## **Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs - December 8, 2004**

---

### **4. Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd.)**

of new academic programs and units and those dealing with reviews of existing academic programs and units. She noted that the guidelines would continue to undergo fine-tuning based on feedback received, and would be submitted to the Committee for information when finalized. Any future revisions would be presented to the Committee for information.

The Chair noted for emphasis that the Committee was being asked to approve the policy portion of the documentation before members, and that procedural aspects (some of which currently held the position of approved policy) were being removed from the orbit of governance approval and, instead, delegated to administration. Ms. Lasthiotakis noted in response that the current *Guidelines for Divisional Submissions* contained three parts – restatement of elements of the Committee's terms of reference, grading policies duplicated elsewhere, and a template for new program proposals – and that removal from policy was, in the opinion of the Office of the Provost, appropriate.

During discussion, a member asked if the *Stepping UP* (the current academic planning framework) process was reflected in the policy, given that the current policy had arisen during a previous planning framework. Professor Hillan responded that *Stepping UP* did address the review process, and one of the purposes of the policy redevelopment was to solidify the various roles of central administration and the units under review, given the extensive demands for information in review processes and a potentially enhanced role for the Office of the Provost to relieve units' burdens during review processes.

A member thanked Professor Hillan and the staff in the Office of the Provost for their sensitivity to the onerous workload frequently demanded by review tasks; the member noted that some units would undergo separate but parallel reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs in succession, and that professional programs would also undergo accreditation reviews. The workload in each case would be similar but only rarely would the demands 'line up,' resulting in a costly, resource-intensive series of processes. He then indicated that his understanding was that the policy was detailed for undergraduate programs and Extra-Departmental Units (EDUs), but not for graduate programs, and asked if the omission of graduate programs was deliberate.

Professor Hillan responded that graduate reviews were generally covered by the OCGS process, and that her office was in discussions with the School of Graduate Studies. EDUs presented a challenge because frequently programs crossed traditional disciplinary boundaries; as a result, the Office of the Vice-President and Provost had established a task force to review the recommendations of the Marsden Report on EDUs in order to link the issues facing EDUs and the question of reviews of academic programs and units.

The Chair summarized the role of the Committee in the review process and discussed possible enhancements to ensure that a thorough review of program reviews was undertaken by governance. He suggested that one possibility was to assign subgroups of the Committee to conduct thorough examinations of reviews and report to the Committee. Ms. Lasthiotakis noted the importance of looking at systemwide issues facing reviews.

A member asked about the possibility of developing long-term longitudinal data on reviews. Professor Farrar noted in his affirmative response to the question that the concept of Key Performance Indicators would likely be made even stronger by the Rae Review report, and that the development of an overarching policy would assist the Committee and governance more generally in fulfilling its oversight functions. The Chair noted that the summaries of reviews would also include a synopsis of information gleaned from previous reviews of the same unit to help ensure that earlier major recommendations had been implemented.

**Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
December 8, 2004**

---

**4. Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd.)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the the Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs, and Units attached to Professor Hillan's memorandum dated December 1, 2004, and as set out in Appendix 'A', be approved effective for proposals submitted as of September 2005 and for reviews that will be conducted after September 2005.

**5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal to Establish an In-Program Master of Philosophy (M.Phil) Degree**

The Chair welcomed Professor Donald Cormack, Associate Dean, School of Graduate Studies; Professor Umberto de Boni, Associate Dean, School of Graduate Studies; and Mr. Mahadeo Sukhai, President, Graduate Students' Union, to the meeting.

Professor Hillan informed the Committee that the proposal to establish an in-program Master of Philosophy (M.Phil) degree had been substantially revised and clarified, as per the Committee's instructions, since it had been referred back at the May 14, 2004 meeting of the Committee. In particular, she noted, the criteria for completion of an M.Phil. had been clarified and were in the documentation before members. Each unit would decide whether it would set an M.Phil within the auspices of its Ph.D. programs in accordance with its own disciplinary culture. Professor Hillan informed the Committee that Principals and Deans had endorsed the proposal on November 25, 2004, and that the Planning and Budget Committee had considered the modest costs that would accrue with the advent of the M.Phil. at its meeting of December 7, 2004.

Professor Cormack reported that the School of Graduate Studies, in addition to providing more detailed criteria for what would constitute sufficient qualification for the M.Phil., had provided additional information on Universities' existing M.Phil. degrees.

A member thanked Professor Cormack for the improvements evident in the revised proposal, but noted that the proposal used the word 'normally' in describing what would constitute sufficient work for an M.Phil. and indicated his concern with the possibility that the requirements should be as specific as possible with as few exceptions as possible. Professor Cormack acknowledged that the proposal did not define specific requirements but that the School of Graduate Studies was confident that the proposal provided sufficient clarity to units contemplating an M.Phil. while simultaneously allowing discretion in unusual cases, which, given the variety of requirements for Ph.D. programs across the University, might well arise. The member asked if the School was prepared to provide advice to units contemplating the introduction of the M.Phil. prior to the development of a proposal for the Council of the School of Graduate Studies; Professor Cormack responded in the affirmative.

A member asked if the introduction of the M.Phil. might provide a disincentive to completion for Ph.D. students, or even increase the dropout rate. Professor Cormack responded that there was no evidence to suggest that such an increase might occur, but also noted that numerous Ph.D. students continued their registration in the program despite a lack of likelihood of completion; indeed, if students were not going to complete, it would be preferable for both the University and the students that they leave earlier rather than later. Professor Cormack stated that in some cases, a very long time to attrition was a problem, with some students remaining in a Ph.D. program for six to eight years prior to leaving.

The Chair asked about the fairness of awarding two degrees for the same work completed, noting that the academic policy of the University was not to grant credit for the same work twice. Professor Cormack

**Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
December 8, 2004**

---

**5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal to Establish an In-Program Master of Philosophy (M.Phil) Degree (cont'd.)**

responded that the M.Phil. would be an 'in-program' degree, marking the completion of a substantial portion of the Ph.D. program, and would represent a new type of degree at the University of Toronto. The Chair noted his concerns with the possible inequity of the M.Phil., asking about the possibility of granting both degrees at the conclusion of a Ph.D. program. Another member asked if Ph.D. programs with M.Phil. components could be split into two distinct degree programs, each with its own requirements, and to make the Ph.D. in such instances a thesis-only program, given that the M.Phil. otherwise might appear as a 'failed Ph.D.' Professor Cormack responded that to pursue these options would eliminate the benefits of the M.Phil., and that the program was not intended to represent a consolation degree for failure to complete a Ph.D.

The Chair then asked again if the in-program nature of the proposed degree constituted 'double counting', and indicated his concern.

A member noted that the documentation before members cited the model used by Yale University would be the one most similar to that proposed by the School of Graduate Studies. He asked for information as to how long the Yale M.Phil. had been in place, and what that University's experiences had been in dealing with the issues raised by committee members? Professor Cormack responded that the Yale program had been in place for decades, but that an answer to the second part of the question would be forthcoming at the Academic Board if the proposal were to pass the Committee stage. He added that the main thrust of the proposal was to allow each unit to determine whether implementation of the M.Phil. degree made sense within the context of its own disciplinary and departmental culture.

A member stated that the M.Phil. seemed to be like an in-program designation, not a 'degree' in the usual sense of the term. The implementation of the M.Phil. seemed to resemble the option given to students who had pursued (prior to its elimination) a three-year Bachelor of Arts degree and then opted to complete the requirements for a four-year program, effectively replacing and enhancing the value of the three-year degree. A member asked if it would be appropriate to remove the M.Phil. designation once the Ph.D. requirements were complete. In response, members noted that to do so would be inappropriate and would turn the M.Phil. into the unintended 'failed Ph.D.' degree.

A member asked how many departments would be interested in submitting proposals for an M.Phil. Professor Cormack responded that the greatest interest was in Division I, with approximately 12 units expressing interest, with smaller levels of interest in Division II, with six units interested. He noted that a small number of programs in Division III might be able to make proposals also. The total number of students per year who would be eligible assuming full implementation would be approximately 350.

The Chair invited Mr. Sukhai to speak to the Committee. Mr. Sukhai emphasized for members that the GSU considered the proposal to be a student-friendly one, and that he felt it had undergone considerable debate at the School of Graduate Studies. He stated that the M.Phil. was not thought to be a 'consolation prize', but would be a valuable addition to Ph.D. programs where implemented. He then argued that, given the diversity of programs and requirements, the establishment of an M.Phil. should not be taken as an inequitable arrangement. Lastly, he noted that the Ph.D. represented a significant, long-term investment and that the M.Phil. would represent an appropriate 'milestone' in the completion of a doctorate.

A member asked if there would be any impact on student funding. Professor Cormack answered that there would be none. A member asked who could get an M.Phil. if it were to be implemented. Professor Cormack responded that implementation would not be retroactive, but that students currently registered who met the requirements would be eligible for the degree.

**Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
December 8, 2004**

---

**5. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal to Establish an In-Program Master of Philosophy (M.Phil) Degree (cont'd.)**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies for an In-Program Master of Philosophy Degree (M.Phil.) letter from the School dated November, 2004 and as set out in Appendix 'B' be approved.

**6. Office of Teaching Advancement: Annual Report, 2003-2004**

The Chair welcomed Professor Kenneth Bartlett, Director, Office of Teaching Advancement, and Ms. Pam Gravestock, Assistant Director, to the meeting. Professor Farrar briefly noted the importance of the Office of Teaching Advancement (OTA) to the University's success as a teaching institution, and summarized the strong growth of the Office since its creation almost three years earlier.

Professor Bartlett reported that the 2003-2004 year saw a doubling of activity within the OTA, and that his hope was that the OTA would help engender a cultural change at the University that would see teaching expertise given significant recognition. He stated that excellence in teaching was a fundamental element of the University's mission and that he found it gratifying to head an Office central to improving it.

Noting that the written report before members was comprehensive, he concluded by thanking his staff for their hard work and dedication to the Office's success, even though the Office had only a small staff.

A member asked if the OTA had any repeat attendees of workshops and events. Ms. Gravestock noted that people frequently returned to OTA events. The member asked if future years' reports could indicate not only the number of people who attended events, but also the number of attendees, in addition to the academic rank.

A member applauded the work of the OTA and noted his hope that teaching would be evaluated with the same care and diligence as research; he noted, however, that the techniques used in laboratory teaching were substantially different than for lecture halls, and asked if the Office assisted with different strategies for different environments. Professor Bartlett responded that his Office encouraged all faculty members to develop teaching portfolios to reflect their ability and to examine their teaching expertise *in toto*; he added that faculty members should not be dissuaded from 'taking chances' in developing new forms of teaching expertise.

The Chair applauded the OTA for their willingness to assist faculty members in developing good teaching portfolios, and noted that for an office of 2.5 FTE staff, their workshops, individual consultations, and assistance to faculty members and administrators throughout the University in a variety of teaching 'cultures', the Office was a very valuable element of the teaching mission of the University of Toronto.

**7. Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost: Annual Report, 2003-2004 and Plan for 2004-2005**

The Chair invited Professor John Challis, Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost, to present his report.

Professor Challis began by reporting some baseline information on costs of research: the direct costs of research at the University of Toronto and affiliated hospitals totaled \$1 billion per year, which amounted

**Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
December 8, 2004**

---

**7. Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost: Annual Report, 2003-2004 and Plan for 2004-2005 (cont'd.)**

to approximately \$3 million per day. Approximately two-thirds of the direct costs went to medical research, and two-thirds of that amount went to research in the teaching hospitals. The affiliated hospitals, therefore, represented a major element of the University's research enterprise and partnerships with them needed to work as effectively as possible.

Professor Challis then summarized the sources of grants to University researchers: while Tri-Council funding from the federal government (from SSHRC, NSERC, and CIHR) continued to favour the University of Toronto, Professor Challis did report that there was a decline over time. In addition, 20% of funding came from not-for-profit sources, and 25% from other sources such as the Canada Research Chairs Program and the Canada Foundation for Innovation. International sources, such as the National Institute for Health (NIH) in the United States, were, in Professor Challis' opinion, underutilized and therefore represented an excellent opportunity for the University of Toronto.

Grants from tri-council sources differed by age from the differing granting councils: SSHRC and NSERC recipients tended to obtain more grants with greater age, while CIHR grantholders tended to have low grants during their early careers, peak in mid-career, and level off afterwards.

Of the 267 Canada Research Chairs allocated to the University of Toronto, 180 had been filled, and recruitment continued to proceed successfully; in particular, the University of Toronto's Chairholders reflected a better gender ratio than the national norm. Professor Challis warned, however, that the Canada Research Chair program was (on an individual basis) a time-limited program, and that 'graduation' from Tier I Chairholders to Tier II that some faculty members and administrators seemed to be planning was unlikely to occur except in extraordinary situations.

The funding of indirect costs of research continued to be a major issue for the portfolio, with a national 40% recovery target; however, the actual figure remained a low 18.4%. One of the major elements of the University's advocacy efforts was to tie the cost recovery to the size of grants received, but that the University was alone in Ontario in advocating such an approach.

Professor Challis reported that the Ontario Innovations Trust (OIT) program had been discontinued, and that the new Ontario Research Fund (ORF) was being initiated. The ORF would be operated out of the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, and the University was attempting to influence its construction appropriately. For example, commercialization of research was going to be a critical criterion for funding, which would be difficult to achieve for many research projects.

In terms of research output, the University of Toronto continued its strong showing among North American Universities, especially in citation indices. Professor Challis acknowledged the weaknesses of citation index models for the social science and humanities disciplines.

The Manley Review on University Commercialization had recently been completed and would engender significant policy change in the upcoming period of time, especially regarding two areas: Intellectual Property policies would require amendment to meet Mr. Manley's recommendations, and the culture of disclosure at the University would need to be examined closely while maintaining the University's academic integrity.

The Chair thanked Professor Challis for his report.

A member asked if smaller Faculties could rely on the Vice-President's Office to assist in the nomination and vetting process for major research nominations, given the relative differences in personnel. Professor

**Report Number 111 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
December 8, 2004**

---

**7. Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost: Annual Report, 2003-2004 and Plan for 2004-2005 (cont'd.)**

Challis noted that his Office was working on templates to assist smaller units; he noted that if his Office had the ability to assist the improvement of a research culture, it should do whatever was possible.

A member summarized his Department's processes for ensuring that excellent researchers were recognized, and encouraged the formation of Awards Committees or other similar bodies to identify and celebrate the excellence that already exists within units.

**8. Items for Information**

The following items were reported for information:

- (a) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal from the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning to offer the Master of Education (M.Ed.) Curriculum Program as a coursework-only program, effective September 2005
- (b) School of Graduate Studies: Proposal from the Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology for a Flexible-time Ph.D. option within the Adult Education and Community Development Program, effective September 2005

There was no discussion.

**9. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

There were no reports from the Administrative Assessors.

**10. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting was scheduled for January 12, 2005.

**11. Other Business**

There was no other business.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

December 16, 2004  
32620