

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

February 26, 2008

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, February 26, 2008 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Jan Angus
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Professor Robert Gibbs
Ms Bonnie Goldberg
Ms Emily Gregor
Ms Milka Ignjatovic
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Professor Cheryl Regehr

Miss Maureen Somerville
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor R. Paul Young,
Vice-President, Research
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant
Vice-President, Research
Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Vice-Provost,
Graduate Education and Dean, School of
Graduate Studies
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Taufik Al-Sarraj
Professor Gage Averill
Professor Katherine Berg
Ms Tiffany Chow
Professor Douglas McDougall

Professor Cheryl Misak
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Professor Audrey Laporte
Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson
Ms Lorenza Sisca

In Attendance:

Mr. Jason Bechtel, Counsel, Office of the Vice-President, Research
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President
and Provost
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Office of the Vice-President, Research

ITEM 3 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report 133 (January 22, 2008) was approved.

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - February 26, 2008**2. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2006-07**

Professor Young said that the annual report from the Vice-President, Research, was presented in a different format for the current year, consisting of two major components. The first, entitled “By the Numbers,” provided statistical information about the University’s research activities. The second, with the title “In Profile,” provided information about the impact made by some of the University’s leading researchers. The document would be used not only for the usual purpose of reporting on the University’s research activities but would also be used by the President and others for purposes of advocacy.

Professor Young highlighted the initiatives to be taken by the Office of the Vice-President, Research in the coming year.

- **Awards and honours.** The University’s researchers, while receiving considerable recognition, had the collegial capability to receive many more awards, especially international ones. The University had a large number of very accomplished scientists and scholars. The need was to provide greater support to the Faculties and Departments to generate nominations for awards so that the University’s scholars could receive the appropriate recognition. For example, notwithstanding the extraordinary achievements of the University’s scholars, the Gold Medal of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council had never been awarded to a member of the University’s faculty. Given the very real scope for improvement, the Office of the Vice-President, Research would devote five percent of its resources to supporting the work of the Faculties and Departments to generate nominations. It was essential that the central Office and the Faculties and Departments collaborate on this effort and not duplicate each other’s work. To that end, Professor Young would ensure a high level of liaison with the Deans across the three campuses and among the various Faculties.
- **Canada Foundation for Innovation.** In the previous year’s competition, the University’s researchers HAD received only 7% of the funding requested. There was every reason why they could, with improved applications, have received 30% of funding requested. Researchers in the University’s teaching hospitals had received 34% of the funding requested. The University would therefore enhance its efforts to support applications to the Canada Foundation for Innovation. It was likely that the Foundation would make grants for research infrastructure amounting to \$1-billion, with the University of Toronto eligible to request \$178-million of that amount. Every effort would be made to assist researchers in the development of exciting proposals.
- **Web-based information.** The Office of the Vice-President, Research would work with the Faculties and Departments across the three campuses to make the University’s website a source of more accessible and exciting information about

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - February 26, 2008**2. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)**

the University's research activities. First, there would be changes to enable users of the website to gain easier access to information. Rather than having to navigate through various departmental sites to obtain information about research in the area of "arts and culture," for example, there would be an opportunity use one central page to lead to all relevant information on the topic. Second, the Office would create unique stories about the extraordinary work of University researchers, with the objective of generating excitement about the research being carried out at the University. Third, information would be provided through several kinds of web-based media rather than only written information. Professor Young stressed again that there was exceptional work being carried out on the University's campuses; the need was to celebrate that work.

Discussion focused on the planned improvements to web-based information. In response to a question, Professor Young said that the audience for the enhanced website would be both the public, especially certain parts of the public, and the University's peers. There was currently considerable celebration of the University's research successes, but it was scattered among the many websites of each Department and each Campus. The objective would be to make that celebratory information readily accessible. A member noted that the "Web 1" model concentrated solely on the provision of information through the web. The "Web 2" model, in contrast, enabled knowledge transfer and collaboration with peers. Was use of the "Web 2" model planned? Professor Young replied that such use was intended, but at a later stage. At this time, the objective was to ensure easier access to information, including such mundane but essential information as the application forms used by faculty and staff for research grants and honours. While only the "Web 1" phase was now being planned, the outcome would be a web presence that was much more exciting than at present.

3. Research Policies: Collections Policy

Dr. McTiernan said that the Committee had in the 2006-07 year received several updated policies for consideration and recommendation to the Academic Board. This proposed new policy was among those developed in the research-policy review, but it had not been completed in time for it to come forward along with the others. The Collections Policy dealt with the manner in which the University acquired, managed and (where appropriate) disposed of collections used in its research, scholarship and teaching. The University had many valuable collections, and the objective of the proposed Policy was to ensure that they were catalogued and made accessible. The Policy set out the duties of the University Officers who were responsible for naming administrators or serving as administrators for the collections. The proposed Policy had emerged from the work of a committee that had been established in 2006. It had produced an array of recommendations in a very detailed report. That report had led to a review of the matter in the divisions and in the Office of the Vice-President, Research,

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - February 26, 2008**3. Research Policies: Collections Policy (Cont'd)**

which had resulted in the formulation of a framework policy. That framework defined what would be designated as a collection under the Policy, how a collection would be formally accessioned, who would be responsible for it, and how it would be deaccessioned when appropriate. The proposed Policy required that decisions be made in accordance with legal requirements, appropriate ethical and regulatory standards, the University's stewardship role and the highest academic standards, all in a manner that deployed the University's resources responsibly. The Deans and Chairs would have a special role in approving the accessioning of a collection and monitoring its management. The Policy provided means for pre-existing collections to be managed. Most importantly, the proposed Policy would empower the Vice-President and Provost and the Vice-President, Research to approve specific, detailed procedures to provide guidance and to encourage best practices for the management of collections.

In response to a question, Dr. McTiernan said that there was no provision in the Policy requiring a centrally maintained catalogue of collections, but the general thrust within the University was to coordinate information and to make it readily available.

On motion duly made and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Collections Policy, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved.

4. School of Graduate Studies / Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work: Advanced Diploma in Social Service Administration

Professor Hillan said that the proposed Advanced Diploma in Social Service Administration would be a new graduate program to provide training in the key values, skills and knowledge required by managers in social service organizations. It was geared to people who had already earned a Master's degree in social work and were working in the field. The proposed program was designed to be accessible to people who were working full time and it would therefore use an executive manner of delivery, so that each course would be offered one full day per month. Students who entered the program on a full-time basis could complete the Diploma in three terms over one year and those who entered part-time could complete the program in two years over 6 terms. The program had been endorsed by the Council of the Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work and by the Graduate Education Council, and it would not require the allocation of additional resources to the Faculty.

In response to questions, it was noted that approval of the proposed program by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies was also required, and an application for

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - February 26, 2008

**4. School of Graduate Studies / Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work:
Advanced Diploma in Social Service Administration (Cont'd)**

approval had been filed. The program would be classified as a “Type 3” program which would be eligible for public “basic income unit” funding based on its enrolment.

On motion duly made and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal from the Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work for an Advanced Diploma Program in Social Service Administration, commencing September 1, 2008.

5. Student Financial Support: Annual Report of the Deputy Provost, 2006-2007

The Chair stated that the Report on Student Financial Support was an annual accountability report. The Committee should make known any concerns it might have about the efficacy of the student financial support programs to achieve the goal of the Policy on Student Financial Support – that no student offered admission to a program should be unable to enter or complete that program due to a lack of financial means.

Ms Swift said that University expenditures on need-based financial aid had amounted to about \$45-million in 2000-7, an increase from about \$40-million the previous year and from \$1.5-million in 1992-93. It was clear that the University was in compliance with its Policy on Student Financial Support and it was more than in compliance with the Government of Ontario’s requirements for student aid.

Discussion focused on aid to international students. A total of only \$2.8-million had been provided for both merit- and need-based assistance to international students, apart from graduate students (who were eligible for the graduate student funding guarantee). Yet, international students might well have substantial financial need. Ms Swift replied that the Policy on Student Financial Support dealt exclusively with domestic students. International students, to acquire a student visa, were required by the Government of Canada to declare that they had the financial resources needed to complete their studies. For undergraduate students, that requirement was generally met by their own resources and family support. Graduate students could rely on the University’s graduate student funding guarantee. The University’s Statement of Commitment Regarding International Students recognized that students, who had been granted student visas and who had demonstrated the availability of the necessary resources, might encounter financial emergencies once in Canada. In such circumstances, the University would provide such “financial assistance as needed and where possible.” A member observed that Appendix 1, table 5, showed that assistance to international students

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - February 26, 2008

5. Student Financial Support: Annual Report of the Deputy Provost, 2006-2007
(Cont'd)

(exclusive of graduate students) in 2006-07 had declined in both number and amount from 2005-06. That contrasted with the substantial increase in need-based aid overall. Ms Swift said that she could not account for the reduction, especially in the light of the increase in international undergraduate enrolment. She noted, however, that the University had had only two years of experience under the Statement of Commitment Regarding International Students.

6. Student Awards: Report on Established, Amended and Withdrawn Awards, 2006-07

Ms Swift said that the list of awards that had been established, amended and withdrawn was also an annual compliance report. It was very re-assuring to review the list of 169 new awards, with the total number of awards continuing to increase. In many cases, donations to establish endowments to fund awards had been matched by grants under Ontario government programs, the Ontario Trust for Student Support and the Graduate Student Endowment Fund.

In response to a question, Ms Swift said that the Ontario Government had made a commitment to continue to provide matching funds under the Graduate Student Endowment Fund until 2010. A member proposed that the Committee add its thanks to the donors of these very valuable endowed funds.

7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC)

Professor Hillan reported on the visit on February 7 and 8 by four assessors from the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC). The assessors had met with members of the senior administration, Deans, faculty members and students and with members and past-members of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Professor Hillan thanked the members who had participated in the process: Professor Sass-Kortsak, Professor McDougall, Ms Goldberg, Miss Somerville and former members Mr. Ryan Campbell and Ms Linda Gardner. The assessors had promised to provide their report within a year. They had held a debriefing meeting with Professor Goel, Professor Hillan and Ms Lasthiotakis, and they had provided valuable information on their views following the audit. They had considered, and found to be exemplary (a) the University's Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units, and (b) the Guidelines established pursuant to that Policy. The Policy and the Guidelines dealt with both proposals to establish new programs and to review existing programs. They had looked specifically at the process for the University's approval of the establishment of the Concurrent Teacher Education Program involving the Ontario Institute for Studies in

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - February 26, 2008**7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (Cont'd)****Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) (Cont'd)**

Education and a number of undergraduate divisions. They had concluded that the approval process had been thorough and well documented. The assessors had also audited the process for the review of several undergraduate programs, including programs on all three campuses. They had raised certain questions concerning the review process. In particular, they had questioned whether it was possible to conduct a thorough review of undergraduate programs at the same time as a review of units. The assessors had also raised issues concerning the general level of awareness of the UPRAC process across the University. The outcome of the audit could have implications for the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs given its important role in the review process. The assessors appeared to take the view that the University might want to consider the ways in which it could strengthen its review process, especially for undergraduate program reviews. The visit from the audit committee had in general been an interesting one.

A member noted that the University of Toronto had over 800 undergraduate programs that would be reviewed. That number was much smaller at other universities. Each institution was free to use its own definition of a program. The member asked whether it would be advisable to reconsider how the University defined a program for the purpose of reviews. Professor Hillan replied that the UPRAC assessors had been well aware that the program structure at the University of Toronto was complex. They had been to the University for a preliminary visit to make themselves familiar with the structure and governance of the University. Ms Swift noted that any process to reduce the stated number of offerings defined as programs would have to take into account the fact that the University had advertised widely the availability of over 800 programs.

A member asked whether the anticipated recommendations of the UPRAC assessors would require any specific changes in the University's procedures. Professor Hillan replied that it would be inappropriate to speculate about what the report might contain, but the University would have an opportunity to respond to the recommendations and suggestions. Invited to add her comments, Ms Lasthiotakis said that UPRAC was looking at various matters from a province-wide perspective, and the outcome of their broader review might well have implications for the University of Toronto.

The Chair expressed her hope that the outcome of this study would not be two separate series of reviews for undergraduate and graduate programs. The current process was already a very taxing one to administer. Professor Hillan said that UPRAC did recognize the general burden that the process placed on any university. Ms Lasthiotakis stressed that the current process for graduate reviews was different from reviews of academic units including undergraduate programs. The University had stressed its view that it should continue to complete undergraduate reviews, with an audit of that process

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - February 26, 2008

7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (Cont'd)

Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) (Cont'd)

being quite appropriate. That contrasted to the conduct of reviews of graduate programs which were undertaken by an external agency – the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

8. Next Meetings: Review of Academic Programs and Units

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meetings were scheduled for Tuesday, April 1st and Tuesday, May 13th.

The Chair said that the oversight of the review process was one of the very important roles of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the Committee would devote a substantial portion of its time to this responsibility over the next two meetings. The annual report from the Vice-Provost, Academic on the Review of Academic Programs and Units would come to the Committee in two parts, one at each meeting. The Governing Council Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units stated that “reviews are important mechanisms of accountability.” The “Accountability Framework” that guided this process stated that governance should ensure “that University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements.” The terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs placed that governance responsibility primarily on this Committee.

The Chair said that all members would be asked to read the summaries of all eighteen reviews and the administrative responses to them, as prepared by the divisions and the Provost’s Office. It was the Committee’s practice that each member was also asked to read at least a couple of reviews and administrative responses in totality. The lead readers would be asked to make a very brief report to the Committee on process and major issues. One of the duties of the Committee’s lead readers would be to attest to the fairness of the summary of their reviews.

At the meetings, the Deans or other senior officers would be present to respond to members’ questions. A record of the Committee’s discussions would be forwarded to the Academic Board’s Agenda Committee. It would determine whether there were issues of academic importance that should be drawn to the attention of the full Board.

The Chair said that Secretary would be in touch with members to confirm their attendance at the next two meetings. The Secretariat would subsequently contact members to ask that they undertake responsibility as the one of the lead readers of a number of reviews. The Chair therefore asked members to notify the Secretary both of their availability and of any change of plans. The April 1st meeting would consider three Provostial reviews: The Faculty of Dentistry, the Faculty of Physical Education and

REPORT NUMBER 134 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - February 26, 2008

8. Next Meetings: Review of Academic Programs and Units (Cont'd)

Health and Woodsworth College. The Provost's Office would make every effort to have the reviews and the summaries in the hands of the lead readers by mid-March.

The Chair urged lead readers to pay special attention to the discussion of undergraduate programs. The Governing Council, led by this Committee, was the only body with responsibility for monitoring the review process for undergraduate programs. For graduate programs, that responsibility was shared by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (the O.C.G.S.) The Woodsworth College review would also contain a discussion of the non-academic aspects of the College's work, which was not within the Committee's responsibility.

The Chair concluded that this was a very important function, and she urged members to make every effort to attend the Committee's final two meetings and to participate in the monitoring of the review process.

A member said that two kinds of questions might arise in discussions: one concerning the process of reviews and the second concerning their substantive content. The second category of questions might include, for example, the adequacy of enrolment in particular programs and the lack of faculty in particular areas. Was the Committee expected to deal with the second kind of question? Professor Hillan replied that the Committee would receive not only the review but also the administrative response to it. The Dean, Chair or other division head would be present. Therefore, substantive questions could be raised and addressed. Ms Lasthiotakis noted that reviews were forwarded to the Committee on a slip-year basis precisely to enable the Committee also to receive an administrative response and to question how the divisions had in fact dealt with the matters raised by the reviewers. The Chair agreed that it would be entirely appropriate to deal with questions both of process and of substance. Having said that, the lead readers would not be asked to provide long and detailed observations about the content of each review and the administrative response to it.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 17, 2008