

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**January 12, 2010**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, January 12, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)  
Professor Douglas McDougall  
(Vice-Chair)  
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost,  
Academic Programs  
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost,  
Graduate Education and Dean, School  
of Graduate Studies  
Mr. William Crothers  
Professor Alister Cumming  
Professor Charles Deber  
Professor Miriam Diamond  
Professor Robert Gibbs  
Professor William Gough

Professor Christina E. Kramer  
Ms Lesley Ann Lavack  
Professor John R. Miron  
Ms Judith Poë  
Mr. Matthew Purser  
Ms Lynn Snowden  
Professor Suzanne Stevenson  
Mr. John David Stewart  
  
Professor Peter Lewis, Associate  
Vice-President, Research  
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar  
  
Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Konstantin Anosov  
Professor Gage Averill  
Professor Katherine Berg  
Mr. Ken Davy  
Miss Netila Demneri

Mr. Sybil J. Derrible  
Professor Hy Van Luong  
Professor Ito Peng  
Miss Sabrina Kun Tang

In Attendance:

Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth, member, the Governing Council; Vice-Dean,  
Programs, School of Graduate Studies  
Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Professor Grant Allen, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Faculty of Applied Science  
and Engineering  
Professor Anne-Marie Brousseau, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic  
Programs, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Professor William Cluett, Chair, Division of Engineering Science, Faculty of Applied  
Science and Engineering  
Professor Gretchen Kerr, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Faculty of  
Physical Education and Health  
Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Sioban Nelson, Dean, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing

Ms Karen Vu Nguyen, President, Physical Education Undergraduate Students' Association

Professor Elizabeth Peter, Associate Dean, Academic Programs, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing

Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate, University of Toronto at Scarborough

Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

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

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report 142 (September 15, 2009) was approved.

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

**Item 9 – School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Medicine: Master of Public Health – Degree Name Change – Amendment to Effective Date**

The Chair recalled that at the previous meeting, the Committee had recommended approval of a proposal from the Dalla Lana School of Public Health to change the name of its professional master's degree in public health from Master of Health Science to the currently-more-recognized Master of Public Health. That recommendation had subsequently been approved under summer executive authority. The proposal was to be effective from September, 2009. It was now proposed that the effective date be changed to "students graduating in 2009."

Professor Regehr said that it had not been recognized at the time of the original approval that one half of the 2009 graduating class would qualify for the new M.P.H. degree and the other half would be eligible to receive only the older M.HSc. degree. Several recipients of the older degree had asked to receive the M.P.H. degree, and it seemed only reasonable to enable all members of the 2009 class to have the opportunity to receive the same degree. In response to a question, Professor Regehr said that, with the Committee's approval, recipients of the M.HSc. in the 2009 spring convocation would have the opportunity to return their original parchments and to receive the newer degree.

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010**

**2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (Cont'd)**

**Item 9 – School of Graduate Studies and Faculty of Medicine: Master of Public Health – Degree Name Change – Amendment to Effective Date (Cont'd)**

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the change of name for the degree earned by students in the Public Health Science Program offered by Dalla Lana School of Public Health, from Master of Health Science (M.HSc.) to Master of Public Health (M.P.H.), be effective for students graduating in 2009.

The Chair stated that because the change of the name of the degree had already been approved and only the effective date would be changed, it was deemed that approval at the Committee level would be sufficient and that the proposal need not go forward to the Academic Board.

**3. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program and Proposed Revision to the Bachelor of Physical and Health Education (B.P.H.E.) Program**

Professor Regehr said that the Faculty of Physical Education and Health had undergone a curriculum review process over the past eighteen months and it had decided to propose a new degree program in Kinesiology. At about the same time, the Ontario Regulated Health Professions Act had recognized Kinesiology as a regulated health profession. As a result, the absence of a specific degree program in Kinesiology would be a disadvantage to University of Toronto graduates. Many of the undergraduate students in the Faculty of Physical Education and Health were not, however, primarily interested in Kinesiology. Many were interested in other professional fields of Physical Education, including teaching in the schools. The proposal therefore would revise the curriculum to enable students to opt for either program. Students would complete a common foundational curriculum in the first two years, and the Faculty was proposing some revisions to that curriculum. Students would then opt to pursue programs in either Kinesiology or Physical and Health Education. Students who opt for the Physical and Health Education program would continue to be eligible for the concurrent teacher education program.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

**(a) Relationship with the Faculty of Medicine.** A member asked about collaboration between the new program and the Faculty of Medicine. Dean Kidd replied that the

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010****3. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program and Proposed Revision to the Bachelor of Physical and Health Education (B.P.H.E.) Program (Cont'd)**

Faculty of Physical Education and Health had always enjoyed strong links with the Faculty of Medicine. The Faculty of Physical Education had been established in the late 1930s on the initiative of an Associate Dean of the Faculty of Medicine. Students took, and would continue to take, required courses in Anatomy and Physiology, and they had options to enrol in other courses in Medicine. The Dean of the Faculty of Physical Education and Health was one of the six participants in the University's Council of Health Science Deans. In short, there had always been several layers of collaboration between the two Faculties, and the proposed new program in Kinesiology would provide the opportunity to strengthen that collaboration.

**(b) Fit with the overall academic plan and direction of the Faculty.** In response to a member's question, Dean Kidd said that the proposed new Kinesiology program and the revised program in Physical Education and Health would continue and strengthen the long-standing objectives of the Faculty – to continue its proud tradition of teaching, research, dissemination of knowledge beyond the University, and community service. The proposed curriculum changes would strengthen the Faculty's ability to equip its graduates, first, to contribute to the changing health-care sector, giving them the requisite knowledge to gain accreditation in the new regulated health profession of Kinesiology and enabling them to contribute to prevention of disease related to inactivity and to rehabilitation from injury. The curriculum change would, second, strengthen the preparation of teachers for the school systems. It would, third, stimulate research and the dissemination of knowledge on physical activity, with a focus on health, drawing on the work of many disciplines within the University.

**(c) Faculty resources.** A member noted the Faculty's intention to have "a few of the new specialized courses in Kinesiology . . . covered by stipendiary instructors from the field of clinical kinesiology," and she asked about the implications for the program of reliance on such instructors. Dean Kidd replied that in general the Faculty sought to engage stipendiary instructors only for replacements for regular faculty on research leave or to fill other positions for a relatively short term. The Faculty sought, for the most part, to engage advanced doctoral students for such purposes. As a future practice, the Faculty was committed to provide as much instruction as possible by tenure-stream or other continuing faculty, and the accrediting body for the programs both in Kinesiology and Physical Education required that at least 75% of full-course equivalents be taught by such faculty.

**(d) Comparable programs offered at other universities.** A member asked whether it was common for other universities to offer degree programs in both Kinesiology and Physical Education. Dean Kidd replied that most universities offered one program or the other, but some offered both. The truly distinctive program at the University of

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010**

**3. Faculty of Physical Education and Health: Proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program and Proposed Revision to the Bachelor of Physical and Health Education (B.P.H.E.) Program (Cont'd)**

Toronto was its Concurrent Teacher Education Program, which enabled students to gain substantive knowledge in Physical Education at the same time as they developed their teaching skills over all five years of the concurrent program. In most other universities, students completed their undergraduate degree first and then had only one year to develop their teaching skills. The concurrent program provided instruction and community-based experience in all five years. Dean Kidd noted that the concurrent program was offered at the University of Toronto not only in Physical Education but also in several Arts and Science disciplines.

**(e) Student demand for Kinesiology and employment opportunities for graduates.**

Invited to respond to a member's question, Professor Kerr said that while the University had historically offered its Physical Education program with a strong health-science component, students and secondary school counsellors had perceived the absence of a separate degree in Kinesiology to be a detriment. They had seen the Bachelor of Physical Education program as one aimed primarily at training teachers rather than members of a health-care profession. That had been clear from surveys of applicants and of students who had been offered admission to the University of Toronto program but who had chosen not to accept their offer. Ms Nguyen added that she was aware of students who had chosen to study at other universities who would think it a great opportunity to be able to enrol in a Kinesiology program at this University.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

- (a) THAT the proposed Bachelor of Kinesiology (B.Kin.) Program, as described in [Appendix "A"](#) hereto, be approved commencing for students admitted for September 2009; and
- (b) THAT the proposed revisions to the Bachelor of Physical and Health Education (B.P.H.E.) program, as described in Appendix "A" hereto, be approved commencing for students admitted for September, 2009.

**4. Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing and School of Graduate Studies: Graduate Diploma in Anesthesia Care for the Nurse Practitioner Field**

Professor Regehr said that the Faculty of Nursing had a strong Master of Nursing program, with many students in that programs and many graduates of the program

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010****4. Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing and School of Graduate Studies:  
Graduate Diploma in Anesthesia Care for the Nurse Practitioner Field (Cont'd)**

completing studies to become nurse practitioners. Over the years, there had been a wish for nurse practitioners to have the opportunity for training in a wider range of skills, including those required to participate most effectively in the area of anesthesia care. Support for the idea of such training had been expressed not only by students and nurse practitioners but also by the Province and by health-care facilities. The result was the proposal now before the Committee for a new diploma program in anesthesia care in the nurse practitioner field. The program could be taken in one of two ways. Students in the nurse practitioner program could take the diploma program concurrently with their basic program. Alternatively, nurse practitioners who had completed their training could return to complete the diploma program.

Dean Nelson added that nurse practitioners were members of a regulated profession in Ontario, licensed by the College of Nurses of Ontario in the “extended” class. The proposed program would be available only to students training to be nurse practitioners, who would complete the anesthesia program towards the end of their training, or to currently licensed and practicing nurse practitioners who would return after completion of their nurse practitioner training. The program would not be available to other nurses, including those with Master of Nursing degrees.

A member commented that it appeared that students who completed the concurrent program would require less time to do so than would students who completed nurse practitioner training initially and then returned to complete the proposed diploma. Dean Nelson replied that the two programs had identical requirements. Students in the concurrent program would, however, be able to complete their theory courses in anesthesia at the same time as they completed the clinical portion of their work for the nurse practitioner program. Students completing their diploma program after their nurse practitioner training would, however, have to perform separate clinical work for both their initial nurse practitioner program and for their diploma in anesthesia. She stressed, however, that the sum of the work required for completion of the qualification would be the same for both groups.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

**YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED**

The proposed Graduate Diploma program in Anesthesia Care for the Nurse Practitioner Field (GDipNPAC), as described in the proposal dated January 2010, be approved, with enrolment commencing January, 2011.

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010****5. Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Major Calendar Change, 2010-11**

Professor Regehr said the program in Engineering Science attracted many of the very best students in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. Some of those students had expressed an interest in the program's providing additional challenge by adding to the program a major in Engineering Mathematics, Statistics and Finance. It was anticipated that graduates from the program would be in a position to provide outstanding leadership in the field of finance and financial engineering.

The following matters arose in questions and discussion.

**(a) Preparation of Engineering students for advanced courses in Statistics and Finance.** A member observed that the courses required in the third and fourth years of this major included advanced courses in disciplines other than Engineering disciplines. Entry into many of those courses had specific prerequisite requirements. Would students selecting this major have appropriate preparation? Professor Cluett replied that the working group to design the program had included faculty members from the Department of Statistics and from the Rotman School of Management. That group was comfortable that Engineering Science students entering the option, which would begin in the third year of students' programs, would have entirely satisfactory preparation for the required third and fourth year courses. There had been concern about students registering in advanced courses in the Department of Economics in the absence of specific prerequisites in that Department, but the Rotman School would open certain of its courses in Economics as elective courses for students in the proposed program.

**(b) Fit with the scholarly objectives of the Faculty.** A member asked how the proposed program would fit with the scholarly objectives of the Faculty. Did the Faculty have, or intend to begin, research in this area, or was it intended to collaborate with other divisions in research in this area? Dean Amon replied that the Engineering Science program was not associated with the faculty in a particular Department but was offered by the faculty members of various Departments. Students completed two years in a core program and then a further two years in a particular major program, of which the proposed program would be the eighth. The Department of Industrial Engineering was one of the Departments that contributed to the Engineering Science program, and research in the area of financial engineering formed a part of the work of that Department. The objective of collaborating with other Faculties in teaching and research was one of the major goals of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and such collaborative efforts represented one of the great opportunities of membership of the University of Toronto. In this case, students with a very strong foundation in Engineering would be able to use that preparation to complete further study in the areas of Mathematics and Statistics and to apply their knowledge in the area of Finance.

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010**

**5. Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Major Calendar Change, 2010-11 (Cont'd)**

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed major calendar change for the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, as described in the 2010-11 submission from the Faculty, effective for the academic year 2010-11.

**6. Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus: Major Calendar Changes, 2010-11**

Professor Regehr said that the Faculty of Arts and Science had been completing the process of reviewing curricula and considering the degree-level expectations for each of its programs in order to align the programs with those expectations. Among other things, the Faculty had considered whether various programs were unique or whether students would be able to undertake similar studies from another existing program. The outcome had been a very substantial number of program deletions, with the remaining programs giving students the opportunity to select programs that were meaningfully different. The Faculty proposed new major and minor programs in Environmental Studies to be offered by the Centre for Environment, consolidating previous programs developed independently by the former Division of the Environment and Innis College. It also proposed to offer a strong South Asian Studies Minor program, replacing the previous specialist, major and minor streams in that area of study.

Two matters arose from questions.

**(a) Deletion of two Minor Programs in French.** A member observed that the Minor Programs in French Cultural Studies and in French Translation were proposed to be deleted because of the absence of strong demand from students. The member asked whether the Faculty of Arts and Science had data concerning potential demand from students currently in their first year of studies or from students who were currently applying for admission to the University. Professor Brousseau said that the Department of French would, after the proposed deletions, continue to offer two specialist programs, two major programs and two minor programs. Those offerings would enable students to pursue their interests in French cultural studies and translation. The retirement of certain faculty members who gave courses in the translation program would make it inappropriate to continue to offer a minor program specifically in that area.

**(b) South Asian Studies.** A member asked why it had been concluded that the proposed Minor Program in South Asian Studies would be (as stated in the proposal)



**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010**

**6. Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus: Major Calendar Changes, 2010-11 (Cont'd)**

more “relevant, and useful in the workplace” than the Specialist and Major Programs in the discipline, which were being proposed for deletion. Professor Brousseau said that the proposal represented the first stage of the reworking of the programs in this area. Depending on the outcome of experience with that step, the major and specialist programs could be re-established. In response to a member’s question, Professor Regehr said that the combined enrolment in all of the current programs in South Asian Studies was 31 students.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed major calendar changes for the Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus, as described in the submission from that Faculty dated November 2009, effective for the academic year 2010-11.

**7. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Major Calendar Changes, 2010-11**

Professor Regehr said that the University of Toronto at Scarborough was following a process, like that of the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus, to examine all of its programs from the point of view of its degree-level expectations. UTSC proposed a new program in Biodiversity, Ecology and Evolution, to be offered by its relatively new Department of Biological Science (established as part of the restructuring of its previous Department of Life Sciences, which had comprised both Biological Science and Psychology). UTSC also proposed the deletion of four programs: two specialist programs and two minor programs.

**Minor Program in French as a Second Language.** A member asked how the Minor Program in French as a Second Language, which was proposed to be deleted, differed from the Minor Program in French, which would be retained and which might well be the destination of students who would otherwise have enrolled in the deleted program. Professor Stevenson and Professor Kraemer replied that in general programs in second-language acquisition, such as French as a Second Language, included courses on how people learned a second language and how the language could most effectively be taught. The Programs in French, in contrast, would deal simply with language and literature.

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010**

**7. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Major Calendar Changes, 2010-11**  
(Cont'd)

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed major calendar changes for the University of Toronto at Scarborough, as described in the submission from UTSC dated November 23, 2009, effective for the May 2010 Summer Session.

**8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

**Quality Assurance Framework in Ontario: Update**

Professor Regehr recalled that the University had, at the time of the previous meeting, anticipated receiving the final report on the proposed Ontario Quality Council in November. It had also anticipated that the University would be required to submit its Institutional Quality Assurance Plan by March, 2010. However, that schedule had not been met. The Task Force had submitted its report to the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) in November, and OCAV was currently revising the plan. It was now expected that a final report would be available in February, 2010. Institutional Quality Assurance Plans would then be required in July, 2010. There had been, as a result, a hiatus period, in which the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies was not continuing its usual operations and the new Quality Council was not yet established. Therefore, the O.C.G.S. authority to approve new graduate programs had been extended for one more year, and it was completing reviews that were already in process, i.e. those where self-studies had been completed and submitted. It was, however, undertaking no new reviews. In the meanwhile, the University was moving to complete pilot reviews pursuant to the anticipated new arrangements. Reviews of Faculties and Departments, including reviews of their programs, would be brought to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs in March. The University was discovering that the process of combined reviews of units and programs often worked well, but that there were other times when it was not fully successful. That had happened most often when significant issues in divisions and departments had taken a central position in the review. In those cases, the University had found it necessary to have subsequent reviews of the programs themselves. Professor Regehr would report further in March.

Professor Regehr advised a Working Group, chaired by Professor Corman and herself, had been established within the University to consider the quality-assurance process. That Working Group included the Deans of multi-Department faculties as well as a representative of the non-departmentalized Faculties. It had undertaken substantial consultation on the quality-assurance process. It had been looking at the process both at the level of individual Departments and Faculties and at the level of institution-wide governance. It was asking

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010****8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (Cont'd)****Quality Assurance Framework in Ontario: Update (Cont'd)**

whether there was need for enhancements to the University's current processes. As part of the review, Professor Regehr and Ms Lasthiotakis were consulting with governance leaders in the University to consider the scope for changes. She would report further to the Committee on the matter as it moved closer to conclusions and recommendations. One important area of change might be determining ways in which the Committee could engage in more substantial discussions of reviews in cases where there appeared to be problems or other matters of concern. The Working Group was considering how the Committee might give feedback to academic units in such cases. Might the Committee, in cases where there were significant concerns, be called upon to consider the cessation of admission to a program? Or, would that not be an appropriate function? The Working Group would welcome input, and Professor Regehr urged members to communicate any ideas to their Deans.

**9. Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for **Tuesday, March 2, 2010**. She recalled that at that meeting the Committee was scheduled to receive the **annual Report on the Reviews of Academic Programs and Units**. All members would receive summaries of all of the reviews on the agenda, as prepared by the divisions and the Provost's Office. They would be asked to read the summaries carefully. In addition, each member would be asked to serve on a small team as the Committee's lead readers of three or four reviews. Team members would be asked to read the full review and to discuss it amongst themselves. The lead readers would then have a spokesperson make a very brief report to the Committee on each review and any major issues in it. One of the duties of the Committee's lead readers would be to attest to the fairness of the summary of their reviews. A record of the Committee's discussion would be forwarded to the Academic Board's Agenda Committee. It would (on the basis of the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs) determine whether there were issues of academic importance that should be drawn to the attention of the full Academic Board. The Chair stressed that the process of monitoring reviews was a key element of the accountability framework for the University's academic programs, and she urged members to make every effort to attend the next meeting and to participate in the Committee's process.

In response to a member's question about the composition of the teams, the Chair, Professor Regehr and Ms Lasthiotakis said that the teams were formed not to assign members with most expertise to reviews in their particular area but rather to achieve a mix of perspectives. Some members would be from related disciplines and others would bring

**REPORT NUMBER 143 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 12, 2010**

**9. Next Meeting (Cont'd)**

different backgrounds. Members from very different disciplines often found it interesting to read reviews from unrelated disciplines and to bring their perspective to bear.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

January 25, 2010

54703