

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

March 2, 2010

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, March 2, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)	Ms Min Hee Margaret Kim
Professor Douglas McDougall (Vice-Chair)	Professor Christina E. Kramer
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs	Ms Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean, School of Graduate Studies	Professor Hy Van Luong
Professor Gage Averill	Professor John R. Miron
Professor Katherine Berg	Professor Ito Peng
Professor Alister Cumming	Ms Judith Poë
Miss Netila Demneri	Ms Lynn Snowden
Mr. Sybil J. Derrible	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Miriam Diamond	Mr. John David Stewart
Professor Robert Gibbs	Miss Sabrina Kun Tang
Professor William Gough	

Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Konstantin Anosov	Professor Charles Deber
Mr. William Crothers	Mr. Matthew Purser

In Attendance:

Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Professor Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), University of Toronto
at Scarborough
Professor Glen Jones, Associate Dean, Academic, Ontario Institute for Studies in
Education
Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
Professor David Klausner, Decanal Advisor on External Reviews, Faculty of Arts and
Science
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-
President and Provost
Ms Leslie Lewis, Assistant Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Faye Mishna, Dean, Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work
Mr. Scott Moore, Quality Assessment Officer, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

In Attendance (Cont'd)

John Scherk, Vice-Dean (Undergraduate) University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Sioban Nelson, Dean, Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing
Professor Sandy M. Smith, Chair, Faculty Working Group, Faculty of Forestry
Professor Richard Sommer, Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture,
Landscape, and Design
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine*

* Participated by telephone.

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

1. Chair's Remarks

The Chair reported that one of the Committee's members, Mr. Ken Davy, had had to resign from the Committee because of a scheduling conflict. The Chair welcomed Ms Margaret Kim, who had been appointed to replace Mr. Davy.

The Chair and members congratulated Professor Alister Cumming, who in November had been awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Copenhagen.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting

With the correction of the inadvertent misspelling of the name of a member, Miss Sabrina Kun Tang, Report 143 (January 12, 2010) was approved.

3. University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science

Professor Regehr said that the exciting proposal before the Committee was for approval of the first tri-campus Ph.D. program that would be housed in the University of Toronto at Scarborough. It represented a very important step in the plan envisioned in the *Towards 2030* vision to increase the involvement of the Scarborough and Mississauga campuses in graduate education. The proposed Ph. D. in Environmental Science in the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences would align well with the current undergraduate program at UTSC and with the current Master of Environmental Science degree program, which was offered at UTSC although formally administered by the Centre for Environment. It was anticipated that the program would build a strong graduate presence in the discipline at UTSC. The University currently offered a number of doctoral programs in Environmental Science, including those in the Faculty of Arts and Science Departments of Chemistry and Geology, the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and the Faculty of Forestry. The proposed new

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

3. University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science (Cont'd)

program would, however, be different. It reflected the recognition that many significant environmental-science problems could not be considered within the boundaries of any single discipline. It would be available to students with a broad scientific background although not necessarily a sufficiently specialized background to pursue doctoral studies in an individual scientific discipline. The proposal followed extensive consultations with Deans and Chairs of programs that offered programs in Environmental Science elsewhere in the University, and the program had been endorsed by the relevant governance bodies at UTSC, by the Three-Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee and by the Graduate Education Council at the School of Graduate Studies.

Invited to comment, Dean Halpern affirmed that the process of consultation had been extensive, and that UTSC was very pleased to propose this first tri-campus graduate program to be housed on its campus.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

(a) Distinctiveness of the proposed program. In response to a question, Professor Gough said that the proposed program was different because of its broader focus. For example, students in the Department of Chemistry tended to focus their studies and research on environmental interactions at the molecular level. Students in Applied Science and Engineering tended to focus on engineering solutions to environmental problems. Students in this proposed program would be able to take a broader, more cross-disciplinary approach.

(b) Relationship of the proposed program to the re-organized Faculty of Forestry. A member referred to the Provostial review of the Faculty of Forestry – one of the reviews later on the agenda of this meeting – and enquired about the possible relationship of the proposed program and a reorganized Faculty of Forestry. Professor Gough replied that he had in November met with the Working Group of senior faculty members from the Faculty of Forestry. That Faculty had a doctoral program with some overlap with the proposed program. That program, however, focused on issues distinctive to Forestry. Should the reorganized Faculty of Forestry relocate to UTSC, which was one possibility the Faculty was considering, its faculty members would undoubtedly make a dynamic contribution to the proposed new doctoral program. However, that Faculty had yet to make a decision concerning its desired reorganization. The Faculty was charting its own course, and UTSC would be prepared to hold discussions with the Faculty if it determined that location at UTSC was appropriate.

(c) Policy study and research. A member noted that the proposal included, as one of the several areas of primary focus for the new program, environmental science and

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010**3. University of Toronto at Scarborough and School of Graduate Studies: Doctor of Philosophy in Environmental Science (Cont'd)**

transnational economies. He asked whether the scientific work of the program could be used as a basis for public policy studies in appropriate areas. He thought it very important that the outcome of the University's work in appropriate areas be of service to the making of good public policy. Professor Gough replied that some faculty members, both in science and social-science disciplines, completed work that was of considerable value to the formation of public policy in the area of the environment. For example, in the area cited by the member, there had been studies in environmental change in developing economies as the result of decisions concerning economic development. Another member observed that many faculty members in the area worked with governmental and international agencies, producing fine research that was of considerable academic value and of real practical applicability.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Ph. D. Program in Environmental Science, as described in [Appendix "A"](#) hereto, be approved, with enrolment commencing September 2010.

4. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Calendar Changes, 2010-11

Professor Regehr said that UTM proposed the deletion of the Major Program in Health Science Communication and the Specialist Program in Human Communication and Technology - programs offered by the Institute of Communication and Culture. That Institute's review would come before the Committee later in the meeting. The review, completed in October 2008, had recommended a number of structural and programmatic changes. The enrolment in the Major Program in Health Science Communications was currently twelve students across the four years, and the current enrolment in the Specialist Program in Human Communications and Technology was five students across the four years. Dean Averill added that the currently enrolled students would be able to complete their programs and that other students would be able wholly or largely to replicate the content of the deleted programs through other major programs.

A member commended the cleaning up of program offerings, especially when students were able to complete the substance of those programs by other means. Dean Averill said that the proposal was linked to larger plans to streamline and simplify program offerings.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

4. University of Toronto at Mississauga: Calendar Changes, 2010-11 (Cont'd)

On motion duly made, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed major calendar changes, as described in the submission from the University of Toronto at Mississauga dated November 27, 2009, effective for the academic year 2010-11.

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report

Chair's Remarks

The Chair reminded members that the “Accountability Framework” that guided the review process stated that governance, led by this Committee, was responsible for ensuring “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 outcome of the Committee’s discussion of the reviews would be forwarded to the Academic Board’s Agenda Committee, which would determine whether the full Board should discuss any issue(s) of academic importance. Each reading team had been asked to deal with the following three questions:

- (a) Did the summary before the Committee accurately reflect the review report?
- (b) Did the administrative responses address the issues identified or, for very recent reviews, did the responses present a plan to move forward to address those issues?
- (c) Were there any questions/comments/issues for the Committee?

The Deans responsible for the various units, or their delegates, were in attendance to respond to any questions or concerns that might arise. If the Committee’s lead readers were satisfied that the summary was complete and that all issues had been dealt with, they were asked simply to report those facts. There would be no need to comment further. If the Committee took the view that there were unresolved issues that should be considered by the Agenda Committee, the Chair would make that consensus clear so that it could be reflected in the Committee’s report and in her report to the Agenda Committee.

Vice-Provost's Remarks

Professor Regehr said that the external reviews were vital to ensure that the University was providing the best possible programs for its students and to assist it in planning new programs. The Provost’s Office had received nineteen reviews between

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)****Vice-Provost's Remarks (Cont'd)**

July 2008 and December 2009: (a) five Provostial reviews of academic divisions, and (b) fourteen divisional reviews of academic departments, centres and institutes that formed parts of academic divisions. Overall, the assessments were highly positive ones, with certain themes repeated: the excellence of the faculty and the emphasis on the quality of the student experience in the programs. The current set of reviews included four that focused on structural issues within the unit. The administrative responses to those reviews described plans for consultations to respond to the reviewers' recommendations. The current reviews included the first reviews of units from the University of Toronto at Mississauga, reflecting the establishment of the UTM department structure in 2003. The current reviews also included the second set of reviews of units in the University of Toronto at Scarborough. Those reviews often referred to the context of rapidly expanding enrolments and the establishment of new departments to serve rapidly expanding needs. In addition to the reviews before the Committee, there was also a list of accreditation reviews completed in the previous academic year by organizations for the various professions.

Professor Regehr recalled that the quality assurance framework in Ontario was changing. The Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (O.C.G.S.), which had been responsible for conducting reviews of graduate programs, and the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC), which had been responsible for auditing the universities' process for undergraduate program review, would no longer be in operation in a year's time. Although the new Quality Assurance Framework was not yet in effect, because there would be no new O.C.G.S reviews of graduate programs, the University had decided to begin moving forward to apply a new process. Professor Regehr outlined some of the changes. First, the administrative responses were now signed to make clear who had commissioned the review and who was undertaking to ensure that recommendations were followed through. Second, the timing of submission of reviews to the Committee was changing. In the past, reviews had been brought forward on a slip-year basis, meaning that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs would not see the reviews until a year or a year and a half after they had been completed. The reviews currently to come before the Committee were one of two kinds. The first kind, like the review of the Institute of Communication and Culture at UTM., had been conducted perhaps a year and one half previously. The Dean had therefore had an opportunity to respond to some of the review recommendations. In that case, the annual calendar changes had included the deletion of two programs offered by the Institute. As a result, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs would have an opportunity to see the review and to see the direction of change as items came forward for approval. On the other hand, the review of the Department of Humanities had been completed only very recently, with the Dean able only to formulate a response in terms of intended directions. Changes were not yet ready to come forward.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Vice-Provost's Remarks (Cont'd)

In that case, the Committee would look only at the plan for changes and see proposals for change at a later date. It would be important for the Committee to bear in mind the different timetables as it considered the administrative responses.

Professor Regehr said that the Committee would be asked at its next meeting to consider the direction the University should take in formulating its Quality Assurance Plan. The Committee would be asked in particular to look at the role it should play in the new process. First, the Committee might want to consider how frequently it should consider reviews. Should reviews be on the agenda twice yearly, once in the fall and once in the spring term, rather than annually, as at present? That would avoid the need to consider a very large number of reviews at the same meeting. Second, how soon should the Committee consider reviews? Should they be brought to the Committee as soon as possible, like the current review of the UTSC Department of Humanities, or should there be a longer time to enable the formulation of a more specific administrative response? Third, what should be the appropriate nature of the Committee's task? Should the Committee consider the same questions as planned for the current meeting? Or should its task be different? Might the Committee want the option of requesting a follow-up report in a year's time in cases where there were concerns and where there had been inadequate time for Deans to respond? Professor Regehr suggested that members think about those questions as the Committee considered the reviews on the current agenda. That would provide a helpful preparation for the discussion at the Committee's next meeting.

Provostial Reviews

John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design

The Committee's lead reader noted that the review had been completed about one year and a half previously, and the response had been prepared by the new Dean of the Faculty. The summary was an accurate reflection of the review report, the administrative response from the new Dean addressed the issues identified by the external reviewers, and there were no matters requiring the Committee's attention.

Faculty of Forestry

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary of the review of the Faculty of Forestry was full and fair. The terms of reference of the review had been expanded at its outset to include consideration of the possible options for reorganizing the Faculty, which had become a major focus for the reviewers. The key element of the administrative

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009:
Annual Report (Cont'd)****Faculty of Forestry (Cont'd)**

response was the Provost's decision to appoint a Working Group, supported by Professor Regehr, to consider future directions for the Faculty. That decision had been made in the light of the Faculty's enrolment issues, the history of attempts to resolve them, and the recommendations of the external review. The Forestry programs were thought to be no longer financially sustainable and consequently there was need for reorganization of the Faculty. Therefore, the review did not provide a traditional assessment of the Faculty's programs according to usual terms of reference for reviews – something that was still required and would take place at a future time. In addition, the administrative response gave no consideration to the specific recommendations of the external review because it would be necessary first for the Faculty to develop proposals for a new structure and new links to other divisions. Efforts to find an appropriate structure and links had been made since 1990, and it was therefore very important to arrive at the right solution at this time. The lead reader applauded the vigorous work of the Faculty, its Working Group, and the Provost's Office in their efforts to achieve that goal.

Invited to comment on the steps being taken by the Faculty of Forestry Working Group, Professor Sandy Smith said that the Group was consulting with faculty and students within the Faculty and with other University divisions. They included the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, and the University of Toronto at Scarborough. The Working Group has also consulted with alumni and with members of the external community with an interest in the Faculty's work. The objective was to seek out the best way to marry the University's interests and programs in environmental studies with the 103-year-old Faculty of Forestry. The Working Group would be holding a retreat in about two weeks' time. It had received a great deal of input. It would now seek to arrive at the model that both (a) would be the best outcome for the Faculty, and (b) would best help to strengthen environmental studies at the University. The task was a daunting one, but it also represented a real opportunity for the Faculty. Professor Smith agreed that after so many years of uncertainty, it was very important that the outcome be the right one.

Citing the long history of discussions concerning organizational arrangements for both the Faculty of Forestry and for environmental studies, a member asked how the institutional arrangements for the Centre for Environment would play into the decision concerning the Faculty. The question was particularly important in the light of the proposal for the new Ph.D. program in Environmental Science to be located at UTSC.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009:
Annual Report (Cont'd)****Faculty of Forestry (Cont'd)**

The member recalled that previous discussions had stressed the importance of increasing the visibility of environmental studies under a “single shingle.”¹ Achieving that objective should form an important part of the decision to be made. Professor Regehr replied that the answer to that question had not yet been determined. The Working Group, having met with the various Deans and Chairs, was looking at that very question. The University was highly committed to the excellent research and teaching programs offered by the Faculty of Forestry. The problem was that under the current arrangements, too few students took advantage of the opportunities offered by the Faculty. That was a continent-wide issue in the discipline. Therefore, it was very important to find a place where the programs offered by the current Faculty could grow in the context of environmental studies. That would give more students access to the programs and courses offered by the faculty members, and it would give those faculty members more students to teach and supervise. Affiliation with the Centre for Environment in the Faculty of Arts and Science was one option, among others, but it was too early to speculate on what the outcome might be. A member commented that the Committee was not the appropriate place to deal with the organizational arrangements for the Faculty. It was, however, appropriate for the Committee to ask for a report on the outcome when it was determined. That report would be important in enabling the Committee to know the ultimate response to the review. The Chair agreed.

The Chair summarized the Committee’s view. It clearly wished the Working Group well in its efforts, and it asked to hear the outcome when it was determined. It was important to bear in mind that, because the programs currently offered by the Faculty had not been fully reviewed, the Committee would receive reports of those reviews at the appropriate time.

Lawrence S. Bloomberg Faculty of Nursing

The Committee’s lead reader said that the summary was an accurate reflection of the review report, that the administrative response addressed all of the issues raised, and that there were no questions that needed to be drawn to the attention of the Committee. The review report was a very positive one, which gave the clear impression of a Faculty with a high level of achievement over the past few years.

¹ A member noted that there was one important initiative underway to help to enhance the visibility for environmental studies – a cross-University web page with links to all of the programs in the area.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009:
Annual Report (Cont'd)****Ontario Institute for Studies in Education**

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. The administrative response recognized the issues addressed in the review, but elements of the response were sometimes too vague to enable the reader to perceive a clear plan of future action. The recommendations of the previous review of OISE in 2003 had been described in the summary. It might well be the case that some of the matters raised in the 2003 review had been cleared up, but it appeared from the current review that other of those issues remained at the centre of on-going issues at OISE. For example, the summary stated that the previous review had recommended the establishment of a Teacher Education Council "to spread the ownership of teacher preparation more widely within OISE." The earlier review had also recommended a reassessment of the relationship between the Dean and the Departments, improving matters "either by some increase in the autonomy of its departments or by re-examination of the relationship between the Dean and the Department Chairs."

Professor Glen Jones replied that a Teacher Education Council had been formed, chaired by the Associate Dean, Initial Teacher Education. The Chairs of the Departments were seen as members of the active senior administrative team which met regularly every two weeks. The question of greater departmental autonomy was the subject of on-going conversations. The current Dean was in her last year of service, and the commencement of a new academic planning exercise would await the appointment of a new Dean. It was anticipated that the new Dean would take up the recommendations of the recent review.

A member observed that because the review came at the end of the term of the current Dean and a new Dean had not yet been appointed or taken office, it was too soon for the Committee to make any judgement of the administrative response to the review. Any actions to be taken in response to the reviewers' recommendations would fall to the new Dean. The member therefore questioned the value of looking at reviews at so early a stage. Professor Regehr replied that the member's general question was a very important one and one that the Committee would consider at its next meeting. One benefit of the Committee's early consideration of reviews was that it would provide context for the Committee where program changes arose as the result of reviews. On the other hand, the current review provided good reason why it was less satisfactory for the Committee to see reviews at so early a stage.

The Chair summarized the Committee's view. It was too early for the Committee to draw any conclusions on the basis of review and the early response. It would be appropriate in this case for the Committee to await developments and to assess the situation after the new Dean had an opportunity to address the reviewers'

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (Cont'd)

recommendations. In the meanwhile, it was essential to bear in mind that the reviewers had recognized that OISE was “a prestigious, unique and highly regarded educational institution” that was “internationally recognized as a centre for excellence in educational research, teaching and ‘third stream’ activity,” and there were no immediate program issues that required consideration.

Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work

The lead readers said that the summary accurately represented the review, and the administrative response addressed the issues raised. The review made it clear that the Faculty was a very strong one, and there were no substantial questions that would require the Committee’s attention. The lead readers did, however, request some clarification with respect to three matters.

(a) Practicum requirements for students in the M.S.W. program. The reviewers had noted that while the M.S.W. program was intended to train practicing social workers, students could select research internships and complete their training without experience in direct practice with clients. Dean Mishna said that the practicum requirement was being reviewed. It was likely that a research practicum would be available to advanced-standing students entering the program at the second-year level only if they had practical experience. Two-year students would generally complete a practice-related practicum in their first year and would be advised that a research practicum in second year would not help to prepare them for direct practice.

(b) On-line courses. The reviewers had noted the large increase in the Faculty’s enrolment and had suggested that “consideration be given to offering on-line courses using the Blackboard instructional platform.” That suggestion had not been addressed in the administrative response. Professor Mishna replied that the Faculty did plan to consider the suggestion.

(c) Administrative organization. The reviewers had noted that the current administrative structure worked well but had suggested strengthening the role of the Associate Dean in order to give the dean more time for “university-wide issues and external relations.” Dean Mishna replied that a large number of officers in the Faculty currently reported to the Dean, and the reviewers’ suggestion was clearly worth consideration.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Divisional Reviews

Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Department of Materials Science and Engineering

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the highly positive review and that the administrative response by and large addressed the recommendations. He noted with surprise that the reviewers had been unaware of the Department's 2004-10 Academic Plan, although it was apparently included in the documentation provided to them. There were two matters that might not have been addressed fully.

(a) Broad, fundamental courses. The reviewers had suggested that in the light of the rapid development of the field, it was important that students be broadly educated in fundamentals through core courses. That would prepare students not only for their first job but for subsequent ones as the field developed. The reviewers praised and encouraged the focus on nano-science and technology, but they also urged "more fundamental courses" in the undergraduate program and "a set of core courses" at the graduate level. The administrative response dealt only with the question of core courses at the graduate level. Dean Amon said that nano-engineering was an important direction in the area of materials engineering, which was increasingly moving from metallurgical processes more to nano-technology applications. Students in the undergraduate program did have the opportunity to take a selection of courses from the Nanotechnology option in the Engineering Science program. The suggestion of fundamental courses at the graduate level was a worthwhile one. The Department was moving to establish a set of core courses and to require core courses for entry-level students with undergraduate degrees in other areas of engineering.

(b) Hiring of University of Toronto Ph.D. graduates. The reviewers had observed the high proportion of University of Toronto graduates hired for faculty positions, and they had encouraged greater diversity. Dean Amon replied that the Department had found difficulty in identifying very strong candidates from other Canadian universities. It was therefore making an effort to recruit top candidates from the U.S. and other countries.

The Chair said that it was clearly the consensus of the Committee that there were no issues requiring the attention of the Academic Board or its Agenda Committee.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Criminology Program at Woodsworth College

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review and the administrative response addressed all of its recommendations. He stressed the reviewer's

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Faculty of Arts and Science: Criminology Program at Woodsworth College (Cont'd)

conclusion that the program was of “excellent quality.” The reviewer had praised the work of an “experienced, knowledgeable, dedicated and capable Program Director,” but he had encouraged greater faculty involvement in curriculum development and in the selection and supervision of sessional instructors. The administrative response had made it clear that Woodsworth College had established a committee to implement that recommendation.

A member noted that, in response to the review, the Faculty of Arts and Science and Woodsworth College had “entered into discussions with the Centre for Community Partnerships to introduce a service-learning internship component into some of the program’s courses.” They would be available to students within two years. The member expressed surprise that it would take so long to make such arrangements. Dean Stevenson replied that making good arrangements did involve significant cost and did require a significant amount of time; it was important that the internships be directly beneficial to students’ educational programs.

In the course of discussion, Professor Klausner noted that the graduate Centre of Criminology had very recently moved administratively from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Arts and Science, and it was intended that in future both would be reviewed at the same time. Because, however, the undergraduate program had not previously been reviewed, the Faculty had thought it important to move ahead with the review when it did in 2009.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology

The Committee’s lead reader said that the summary was an accurate reflection of the review report, and the administrative response dealt with most issues. There were, however, two matters where the reviewers’ concerns were not fully communicated in the summary or answered. First, the reviewers had called for an improvement of the Institute’s strength in the area of the history of medicine. The administrative response noted that the incumbent of the position in the history of medicine had retired, and the endowment recently established to support the position was “not yet sufficient to fully fund a replacement.” The review had called not only for a replacement but also for a second appointment in the area. The review did acknowledge the Institute’s “robust affiliation” with the Faculty of Medicine. Second, the review noted the low proportion of international students for an Institute of high international calibre. The proportion of international students was the outcome of the absence of public funding for such students.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Faculty of Arts and Science: Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (Cont'd)

Professor Klausner said that the retired incumbent in the history of medicine had provided the endowment for the Chair in the area, and there was some lack of clarity whether the endowment was meant to support that position or a second position. However, as the result of the recent financial crisis, the endowment fell short and there was no possibility at this time of making a second appointment in the area. The Faculty of Arts and Science did, however, hope that it would eventually be possible to have two appointments in the area, including one that would fit in well with the needs of the Faculty of Medicine. Professor Klausner agreed that it was unfortunate that there was not a higher level of international enrolment in the graduate program, but in the absence of provincial funding, it was difficult to increase that proportion. A member commented that the low level of international student enrolment was a common concern in the reviews coming before the Committee. The Committee was, of course, powerless to change the Province's funding rules, but it was important to recognize their very real and unfortunate impact.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of History

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the lengthy, provocative review, and the administrative response addressed all of the issues raised. There were no questions that should be considered by the Committee. Professor Klausner reported that a new Chair was in office, had taken the recommendations of the review to heart, and was leading a strong reinvigoration of the Department.

Faculty of Medicine: Banting and Best Department of Medical Research and Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary of the review was a fair one, but that one aspect of the summary could cause confusion. The summary reported the recommendation for the funding of a position of Director of Communications. While the review did recommend steps to improve communications to engage the faculty of the Centre and Department in planning growth and development, the primary focus of the new position was to be fund-raising for the Centre and for a new biotechnology development fund that would seed interdisciplinary research. It was important that that function be made clear, either by some information about the role of the proposed new position or by a more appropriate position title such as Director of Development. The lead reader also expressed surprise that the reviewers had not mentioned academic

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Faculty of Medicine: Banting and Best Department of Medical Research and Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (Cont'd)

programs or teaching responsibilities, had not met with the Centre's graduate students and had not been provided with the *curricula vitae* of the faculty appointed to the Donnelly Centre.

Dean Whiteside said that budgetary provision was being made to support fundraising within the Centre, including the appointment of a Director for that function. The Department and the Donnelly Centre were research units and not undergraduate or graduate teaching units. The faculty members of the units were generally cross-appointed to the Department of Biochemistry or to other academic departments and taught in those cognate departments. The graduate students working with faculty in those cognate departments would have had, or would have, the opportunity to make their views known in the reviews of those departments. The Faculty of Medicine supported the recommendation that the faculty members of the two units be included within a single EDU-A unit, with the authority to make appointments and offer programs. Dean Whiteside anticipated that a proposal for the formation of a new EDU-A would be forwarded in the near future. She was unaware that the reviewers had not received copies of the *curricula vitae* of the faculty appointees. Had they requested them, they would most certainly have been provided. She understood that the work of those individuals was well known to the reviewers.

The Chair said that the Committee took the view that there were no issues requiring communication to the Agenda Committee or the Academic Board.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Medicine

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the very complex review, that the administrative response addressed all of the issues identified, and that there were no questions requiring the Committee's attention. The lead reader said that she found both the review and the response to be particularly impressive.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Physical Therapy

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary provided a good representation of the review report, and the administrative response addressed the issues raised in the review. The lead reader noted three issues that had not yet been resolved. Dean Whiteside

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Physical Therapy (Cont'd)

replied that the Dean's executive team had met with Professor Berg, the Chair of the Department, and was satisfied with the actions that were underway to respond to the recommendations. She commented on each of the issues.

(a) University status appointments for clinical faculty. The lead reader referred to the reviewer's observation that clinical faculty, who played an important role in the process of educating students in the Physical Therapy program, were "in need of a clinical faculty promotion system in order to recognize them for their accomplishments and experience." Such a system would be comparable to the status appointments for physicians who participated in clinical training.

Professor Whiteside said that it was important to address the issue of appointments of clinical faculty in the Rehabilitation Sciences and also in such other areas as Nursing and Pharmacy. Discussions were on-going under the leadership of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and the Associate Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions. Professor Berg stated her support for the proposal.

(b) Proposal for a new Faculty of Rehabilitation Science. The lead reader referred to the reviewer's recommendation for consideration of a separate Faculty for the Department of Physical Therapy, the Department of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy, the Department of Speech, Language and Pathology and the Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Science. The lead reader asked about any steps being taken in response to that recommendation and asked whether there had been consultation with the Faculty of Physical Education and Health about the possibility of its inclusion.

Dean Whiteside said that she had begun discussion with past-Provost Vivek Goel of the possibility of forming of a new Faculty of Rehabilitation Science. A Task Force had been formed (of which Dean Whiteside was Co-Chair), had consulted extensively, and had recommended such a development. The proposal had been raised with the Vice-President and Provost. Whatever the outcome, Dean Whiteside stressed that the Faculty of Medicine strongly supported the Department of Physical Therapy, which the reviewer had recognized as one of the premier such departments in North America.

(c) Opportunity for collaborative planning and engagement. The lead reader referred to the reviewer's recommendation for a new academic planning exercise and for the development of a structure that would engage the faculty members in developing a collaborative vision. Such efforts would be valuable in themselves and would foster strong faculty morale.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009:
Annual Report (Cont'd)****Faculty of Medicine: Department of Physical Therapy (Cont'd)**

Dean Whiteside agreed with the recommendation, noting that a higher level of involvement of faculty would be of great value in developing the future leadership of the Department. Professor Berg said that she had established a broadly representative Department Executive Committee. A strategic planning initiative had been commenced and it would include consideration of governance structures for the Department. It planned broad consultation, including consultation with the Council of Health Science Deans, which included the Faculty of Physical Education and Health.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Psychiatry

The Committee's first lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report, and the administrative response had addressed all of the issues raised in the review. She had identified no issues that would require the attention of the Committee or the Agenda Committee. The Committee's other lead reader noted the reviewers' observation that the Department, as with other Departments in the Faculty of Medicine and other major medical schools, would require "increasing capacity to respond to the rise of medical school enrolment." That increase would mean that the Department's faculty would have to provide "more classroom teaching, more supervision and more mentorship . . . in coming years." The reviewers had also noted the need for enhanced funding to enable the new Chair to maintain the Department's successful initiatives.

Dean Whiteside said that the Government of Ontario had improved funding for training undergraduate students in Medicine. Negotiations concerning funding for graduate students were still underway. She agreed that it would be important to ensure that the Department would be able to deal with growth. The Faculty was in the process of recruiting a new Chair, and the need to facilitate good mentoring for students had been identified as an important factor to be taken into account.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: Institute of Child Study

The Committee's lead reviewer said that the summary provided in general an accurate reflection of the full review report, although it did not give full expression to the reviewer's concerns about the expectation that the Institute and its laboratory school would be financially self-sufficient. The review indeed included financial problems as a continuing theme.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: Institute of Child Study (Cont'd)

Questions and discussion focused on three matters raised by the lead reader and by another Committee member.

(a) Province's new early-childhood initiative. The lead reader noted that the reviewer had observed that the Institute for Child Study was "in a unique position within the province and the university to play a central role in early childhood education." It could therefore take advantage of opportunities that would arise in the next few years from the "new provincial early childhood initiative in Ontario." The lead reader noted that the administrative response did state that the Institute "continues to explore the potential opportunities in early learning initiatives," but she was disappointed that it did not deal more fully with this opportunity.

(b) Financial self-sufficiency and accountability. The review noted the expectation that the Institute and especially its laboratory school would be financially self-sufficient. It also observed the "overcrowded and limiting" space for the lab school and the space limitations for the Institute in general. The administrative response, however, linked the two issues, and also raised the issue of accountability. The response noted that plans for renovation and expansion were in place and that another building adjacent to the Institute's site had been purchased. However, accomplishment of the plans for renovation and expansion would require success of the Institute's capital campaign, which had been negatively affected by the current economic climate. The response went on to state that the Institute and the lab school "have taken seriously the need to be accountable and have already begun to plan for financial self-sufficiency through a combination of tuition fees and fundraising."

Professor Jones noted that the question focused primarily on the lab school: should it be self-sufficient, paid for by student fees, or should it have some funding in the same manner as laboratories in the programs in science or medicine? The general conclusion, reflected in the administrative response, was that the lab school, like other early-childhood schools, should be financially self-sufficient, and the Institute should be accountable for decisions that would achieve that self-sufficiency.

(c) Philosophy of the lab school. A member stated his view that the root of the debate was the role of the lab school and its philosophy of education. The reviewer had said that the role exceeded that of other pre-schools in that it supported "the research agenda of the faculty members," provided a model for the "concept of teacher-researcher," and provided professional development opportunities. Professor Jones noted that the lab school and other facilities in Ontario provided educational and research opportunities, but he agreed

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: Institute of Child Study (Cont'd)

that the question of the special role of the lab school was an appropriate one to consider. The question of improving and adding to the space of the lab school was an important one to enable its further development. The faculty and staff of the school itself certainly supported that goal.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Chemical and Physical Sciences

The Committee's lead reviewer said that the summary did, in his view, adequately reflect the substance of the review report, although the other lead reader (who was out of the country) had noted real differences. Those differences were primarily ones of tone, with the language of the summary smoothing over the description of certain contentious issues, in particular the issue of inadequate space. The review spoke highly of the Department, noting particularly the "dynamic and synergistic" nature of the Biological Chemistry and Biophysics clusters. The lead reader concluded that the review had been well done and the issues raised were being dealt with. He thought the Committee should be aware of two issues.

(a) Space and laboratory safety. The review cited inadequacy of space to accommodate growing enrolments and a growing faculty. It also cited overcrowded undergraduate laboratories lacking adequate venting and causing air quality problems. The administrative response described plans to renovate the teaching laboratories and to add office space for faculty and graduate students as an outcome of new construction. Subject to the receipt of provincial funding, a new Science Building was planned. The main problem that remained was that the new facilities would not be available until the 2010-11 academic year. Dean Averill said that about \$5-million was being invested to deal with the problems cited in the review, and he was confident that the Department would have state-of-the-art facilities.

(b) Access to St. George Campus courses. The reviewers had noted that some of the Department's programs required the completion of courses on the St. George campus, but students were encountering problems in gaining access to them. Ms Snowden replied that UTM had been unaware of the problems, apart from those in the Geology program, but the issue was now being addressed.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Institute of Communication and Culture

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review – a real achievement given the complexity of the review. The administrative response reflected a vigorous addressing of the questions raised in the review. The Committee had earlier in the meeting approved UTM's decision to discontinue two of the programs in the Institute that the reviewers had identified as underperforming: the Health Science Communication major program and the Human Communication and Technology specialist program. The Planning and Budget Committee would, at its meeting the next day consider a recommendation from UTM, again in response to the review, to disestablish the Institute of Communication and Culture and to establish in its place an EDU:A – the Institute of Communication, Culture and Information Technology and a separate Department of Visual Arts. One more general question that arose as a result of the review was that of the relationship between the University and the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology with which the University collaborated in offering programs.

Dean Averill said that the question was a timely one in the context of the Government of Ontario's "Pathways" initiative, and the matter was currently under discussion at the Council of Ontario Universities and the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents. Dean Averill had worked with colleagues at Sheridan College to promote improved coordination. There would be meetings of program coordinators at least every semester and annual meetings of the UTM Deans and the Sheridan Provost. Coordination of two of the three collaborative programs was proceeding very well, and UTM would work closely with Sheridan to improve the coordination in the case of the programs in Art and Art History. It had originally been intended that students would complete their studio courses at Sheridan and their theory courses at UTM. However, as the reviewers had noted, students had expressed concern about the "ever higher level of theoretical content" in Sheridan courses, leading to "growing overlap in course material." As part of the discussions with Sheridan, the program coordinators would seek to deal with the matter. Dean Averill noted that the University of Toronto at Scarborough had only recently undergone discussions of its collaborative programs with Centennial College of Applied Arts and Technology, and its leaders had shared information to assist UTM in achieving improvements.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Geography

The lead reader said that the summary provided an accurate reflection of the review report. The administrative response dealt with all of the issues identified in the review.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Geography (Cont'd)

The lead reader noted that the reviewers had made reference to “some difficulties with the geography graduate program at UTM, arguably because it is not under the control of UTM and students must split between campuses.” The review spoke of (a) “lingering concern over how research overhead funds, graduate funds, teaching assistants and teaching assistance funds are allocated between the campuses,” and (b) further concern that “the excellent faculty at UTM continue to have access to a critical mass of graduate students,” especially a problem in the case of Human Geography students. While the review itself did not propose solutions, the administrative response noted that the Department had worked hard to “encourage graduate participation and presence at UTM,” (social events, new office and laboratory space for graduate students, and extra travel and research funding), and “increasingly more graduate courses” were offered there. The lead reader noted that the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies had recently completed a review of the graduate program in Geography, and it would have been helpful if the reviewers of the UTM Department had been provided copies of that review.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Language Studies

The Committee’s lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report, and the administrative response dealt with the issues identified, with one exception. The reviewers had proposed long-term funding, including a tenure-track position, in Spanish. That recommendation had not been taken up in the administrative response. Dean Averill noted that the Chair of the Department would return from leave in July, and Dean Averill would take up the question of language training with him. There was clearly a substantial interest in the additional languages being offered on a three-year trial basis at UTM, including Spanish, but it would be important that the course offerings enjoy a rich interaction with other aspects of the curriculum.

University of Toronto at Scarborough: Department of Humanities

The lead reader noted that the review had been completed very recently, on December 16 – 18, 2009, leaving little time for the administrative response or for action based on the review. The summary by and large reflected the review report, although there were significant differences in tone, with the summary perhaps not fully reflecting the depth of the reviewers concern about the Department’s “competing visions for the

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

University of Toronto at Scarborough: Department of Humanities (Cont'd)

humanities and . . . extreme conflict about governance.”² The reviewers recommended four possible models for restructuring the current department. The administrative response did not recommend the adoption of any of those solutions but instead called for collaborative discussions involving all members of the Department in an effort “to find solutions that are meaningful and inspire enthusiasm and commitment.” The lead reader was concerned that the administrative response did not deal with many of the concerns that had been raised by students. In part, that was probably the case because the reviewers had felt it necessary to deal with the problems arising from divisions within the Department and they had not therefore focused on the quality of the Department’s programs. The lead[] reader noted that some of the same problems had been highlighted by the 2005 review of the Department but they had apparently not been addressed. It was of particular importance that issues raised by the students in the Department’s programs be addressed quickly so that students would not be disadvantaged. It would also be important that there be a new review(s) that would focus on the Department’s programs.

Professor Regehr observed that this review again raised interesting questions for discussion at the Committee’s next meeting about the timing of its consideration of reviews. She noted that it had become apparent very quickly that because of the size of the Department and because of its divisions it would not be possible to devote sufficient time to review the individual programs. She had been working with UTSC to develop a schedule of reviews of all programs in the Department within the next two years.

Dean Halpern recalled that the review visit had taken place in December 2009 and the report had been received early in January 2010. The administrative response had been submitted early in February. Dean Halpern had met frequently with the affected groups but had not yet arrived at a course of action that would answer all of the questions raised by the review. Nonetheless, he had thought it appropriate to submit a response and valuable that the review and response were tabled at today’s meeting of the Committee. That made it clear that the Dean was required to take decisive action, and that such action should be seen as legitimate. While the reviewers faced an emotionally charged situation, the Dean’s Office had been well aware of the situation in advance of the review. It was moving forward to deal with the issues in a manner intended to restore collegiality amongst all concerned. The reviewers’ recommendation concerning restructuring of the Department had not been set aside. Faculty members in English and Philosophy had expressed the clear wish to form separate departments, and UTSC would, as a transitional step, move to

² Summary, page 155. The summary described the divisions partly as centering on (a) support for “new and emerging fields of scholarship,” including interdisciplinary fields, versus (b) adherence to a more traditional approach, and also partly centering on disagreement about administrative structure.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

University of Toronto at Scarborough: Department of Humanities (Cont'd)

establish those Departments. Dean Halpern was very grateful for the support of the Office of the Vice-President and Provost with respect to the procedures required to establish those departments. The remaining members of the Department of Humanities wished to remain as members of a single Department. Collaborations within the Department to date had resulted in some excellent interdisciplinary programs, which would in many cases continue to require the participation of colleagues in English and Philosophy. UTSC was working to form a framework that would facilitate continued collaboration. It was also moving to deal with concerns about the nature of the faculty complement and the curriculum. It was doing so in a growing environment of respectful collegiality. Planning would continue, and would be helped along by rigorous program review, which would be commissioned in the near future.

In response to a question from the lead reader, Dean Halpern said that the reviewers' concerns would be addressed. Graduate teaching on the St. George campus had resulted in a lower level of faculty presence than desirable, but more recently appointed faculty especially had demonstrated not only a very high level of achievement but also a high level of commitment to the UTSC campus. UTSC would seek to reduce the level of its reliance on stipendiary instructors and rely more on tenured, tenure-stream and teaching-stream faculty, who would provide a continuing presence for students. Students had expressed concern that a significant proportion of the large number of Humanities courses described in the Calendar were not reliably available in any particular year. That reflected in part a reliance on a print calendar. UTSC would move to an on-line Calendar where course offerings would be more up to date. A number of the co-op programs offered at UTSC attracted outstanding students, but others were less successful in doing so. UTSC planned to concentrate its resources on the most successful co-op programs. At the present time, the co-op programs fell into two groups: those offered to students in business administration and others. UTSC would move to realize synergies between the two groups to improve the experience of all co-op students. It was important to bear in mind that the co-op programs were a feature that distinguished the UTSC campus. UTSC took great pride in assuring all students that co-op work-terms would be directly related to their field of study.

A member referred to the reviewers' observation that many key academic administrative positions in the Department were currently filled by teaching-stream faculty and their recommendation that in future research-stream faculty assume all administrative positions. The member observed that the University's Policy on Appointment of Academic Administrators defined the tenure-stream and teaching-stream positions alike as "teaching staff" positions and the appointment of teaching-stream staff to administrative positions

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, July 2008 – December 2009: Annual Report (Cont'd)

University of Toronto at Scarborough: Department of Humanities (Cont'd)

was not at all contrary to that policy. The review's recommendation showed that the reviewers, two of whom were from outside of the country, might well not understand the University's policy, and the recommendation had required and shown the importance of a rapid administrative response to defuse the concerns of teaching-stream faculty.

Dean Halpern stated that the teaching-stream faculty members were valued by all at UTSC. Those faculty members were concerned about the reviewers' recommendation that academic administrative positions be limited to tenure-stream faculty, and Dean Halpern had moved promptly to meet with them as a group and with individual sub-groups. While the recommendation had been a cause for concern, it had also provided an occasion for the UTSC administration to reassure such faculty of their full integration with the faculty as a whole.

A member asked about student input into the decision to establish separate Departments of English and Philosophy. Dean Halpern replied that he had met with the relevant student organizations. Students in Philosophy were in full support of Departmental status. Students in English, while concerned about the issue, had not expressed a clear view in favour or, or opposed to, Departmental status.

The Chair said that the response to the review was clearly a work in progress, and the Committee would look forward to receiving further information, in particular the reports of the planned reviews of the programs offered by the Department.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair thanked the lead readers and all members for their diligent work in consideration of the reviews.

6. Student Financial Support: Annual Report of the Vice-Provost, Students, 2008-2009

Ms Swift said that the Annual Report on Student Financial Support was prepared and presented pursuant to the University's Policy on Student Financial Support. The Report demonstrated clearly that the University provided need-based financial assistance to its students that fully complied with its own Policy and more than met the guidelines under the Province of Ontario's Student Access Guarantee.

A member noted the increase in the average debt load of 2009 graduates from first-entry programs who had borrowed from the Ontario Student Assistance Program.

REPORT NUMBER 144 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 2, 2010

6. Student Financial Support: Annual Report of the Vice-Provost, Students, 2008-2009 (Cont'd)

Ms Swift replied that the average debt load had increased from about \$16,000 in 1999 (the first year in which data was tracked) to about \$19,400 in 2009. The increase was unsurprising given inflation over a decade and given the fact that most Arts and Science students now graduated with a four-year degree, following the termination of the three-year degree program.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, April 7, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. A major item on the agenda would be the process for governance consideration of reviews of academic divisions and programs.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

March 19, 2010

55304