

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**March 1, 2011**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, March 1, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)	Professor Christopher Damaren
Professor Douglas McDougall (Vice-Chair)	Professor Karen D. Davis
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs	Professor Charles Deber
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean, School of Graduate Studies	Ms Emily Holland
Professor Robert L. Baker	Professor Emeritus Michael R. Marrus
Ms Annie Claire Bergeron-Oliver	Mr. Liam Mitchell
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio	Professor Ito Peng
	Ms Judith Poë
	Professor Njoki Wane
	Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Hanif Bayat-Movahed	Mr. Rashi Maharaj
Professor Katherine Berg	Professor Michelle Murphy
Professor Alister Cumming	Mr. James Yong Kyun Park
Professor Robert Gibbs	Mr. Shakir Rahim
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk	

In Attendance:

Ms Sally Garner, Executive Director, Planning and Budget, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Dr. Jane E. Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Angela Lange, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate, Teaching and Learning, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Ms Leslie Lewis, Assistant Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Professor Jill Matus, Vice-Provost, Students  
Professor Mayo Moran, Dean, Faculty of Law  
Mr. Scott Moore, Quality Assessment Officer, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Peter H. Pauly, Vice-Dean, Academic, Rotman School of Management  
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean (Undergraduate), University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Professor Sandy Welsh, Acting Vice-Dean, Teaching and Learning, Faculty of Arts and Science

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report 148 (January 11, 2011) was approved.

**2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010**

The Chair said that each member who had advised the Secretary that they would be in attendance at this meeting had been assigned to a reading team. Each team had been asked (a) to read the full review of the academic program or unit as well as the summary of that review, and (b) to deal with three questions. First, reading teams were asked to assure the Committee that the review summary accurately reflected the full review. Were there any issues raised in the review report that were either not presented in the summary, or not presented with sufficient stress? Second, did the administrative response address all of the issues identified? Or, for very recently completed reviews, did the response present a plan for moving forward to address those issues? If the answer to those questions was not in the affirmative, should the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs be asked to bring forward any missing information in a follow-up report? Third, was there need to consider action? Were there any questions, comments or substantive issues that the Committee should consider? Was there need to ask that the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs bring forward a follow-up report in one year's time? If the reading team was satisfied that the summary was complete and that all issues had been dealt with, they were asked simply to report those facts.

The Chair said that the Deans responsible for the various units and programs were in attendance to respond to any questions or concerns. The compendium of reviews, and a record of the Committee's discussion of them, would be forwarded to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board, and the Chair would report the consensus of today's discussion. The Agenda Committee would then 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 responsibility of the Governing Council, led by this Committee, was not to manage the review process, but rather to assure itself that the Provost's Office was managing the process well. The standards were high. The new policy required that the standards of University of Toronto programs be compared to "the best in their field among international peer institutions."

A compendium, containing the summary of the reviews and the administrative responses, is attached hereto as Appendix "A".

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011**

**2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

The Chair commented that the reviews were far-reaching, dealing with many factors including (according to the Policy) “academic and administrative complement, research and scholarly activity, infrastructure, governance, etc.” However, this Committee, and its reading teams, were asked to focus their attention on the quality of academic programs rather than on any administrative issues observed in the units.

**Faculty of Law**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the answer to all three questions was the desirable one. The reviewers observed that the Faculty of Law was a stellar one, “one of the best law schools in the world.” There was one negative factor in the review: the Faculty’s dire need for additional space. There was also a question concerning the absence of a thesis requirement in the planned new Global Professional Master of Laws degree program. Both matters were dealt with in the administrative response.

Professor Regehr concurred that the review was a stellar one, and she thanked Professor Moran and her colleagues for their outstanding performance.

In response to a member’s question, Professor Moran noted that the Master of Studies in Law program was a small one designed for students without undergraduate training in law. While small, the program had attracted remarkable students.

The Chair congratulated the Faculty on its excellent review and concluded that there was no need to propose further consideration of any matter.

**Rotman School of Management**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the review was overall a very strong endorsement of the Rotman School of Management, its direction and its leadership. The summary provided accurate and full information about the review. While the administrative response did not accept all of the reviewers’ recommendations, it provided a good rationale for choices not to do so in certain cases, based on the needs of the School at this time. The spokesperson observed three relatively minor issues from the review. First, the rate of offers to applicants for admission was very high for the Executive M.B.A. program. Second, survey data collected by the School of Graduate Studies showed that only about 25% of the students surveyed would repeat their educational experience or were unsure that they would do so. Third, there was some question concerning the relationship between the Rotman School and the Commerce / Management departments at the Mississauga and Scarborough Campuses. The member asked whether there was any indication of what the direction of the future relationship and partnership might be.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011****2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

Professor Regehr observed that the review was once again a very strong one. In all reviews, there were some areas of note, and the decanal response had identified actions to be taken in appropriate areas.

Discussion focused on three matters.

**(a) Program focus on integrative thinking.** A member asked for clarification of the School's focus on integrative thinking, which was apparently an important part of the Rotman brand. Professor Pauly replied that the term "integrative thinking" was a shorthand used to describe the School's wish to instill an ability to think about complex business matters and about issues that arose in an uncertain environment. The School had designed a number of courses with a specific focus on integrative thinking, including courses in decision-making and modeling complexity. The reviewers were correct that it was taking a period of time for the integrative thinking focus to enter into the overall program to add to the education of students. The School had, however, succeeded in establishing many educational elements to support its distinctive approach.

**(b) Business school rankings: the role of alumni salaries.** A member expressed surprise at having learned from the review that the salaries of graduates of the M.B.A. program played so large a role (40% weight) in a respected international ranking of business schools. He asked whether that fact would serve as a disincentive to training potential managers of not-for-profit organizations or third-world businesses.

Professor Pauly said that there were many rankings of business schools. The review focused on one of them: the *Financial Times* International Ranking. That was a multi-factor ranking of the type that President Naylor argued against so forcefully. Two of the multiple factors considered in the ranking concerned graduates' employment and their salaries. Only two of the factors were purely academic ones: research output and the quality of the Ph.D. program. The focus on the salaries of graduates was a particular disadvantage to the rankings of Canadian universities because salaries of new M.B.A. graduates were relatively low by international standards.

**(c) Tri-Campus issues.** A member noted that the review (later on the agenda) of the Department of Management at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) showed that tri-campus issues were important ones for the discipline of Management at the University. However, those issues were not dealt with in the summary of the review of the Rotman School or in the administrative response, apart from a brief reference to the Departments at the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) and UTSC demonstrating the breadth of the participation of the Rotman School across the University.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011****2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

Professor Pauly said that there were close ties among the faculty members on the three campuses. Most research-stream faculty members at UTM and UTSC participated in graduate teaching and supervision at the Rotman School and had access to its facilities. While there were strong linkages, there were also issues, in particular concerning the different treatment of faculty members on the three campuses. The review was of the Rotman School of Management; therefore the reviewers quite properly focused on the School's own work on the St. George Campus and not on tri-campus relations.

In response to questions, Professor Regehr said that the Rotman School was not home to a tri-campus graduate department of management. It offered the M.B.A. program, with other programs offered on the other campuses. The graduate programs on other campuses included the Master of Management in Professional Accounting program at UTM. Professor Corman added that in management, as in other programs, there was no duplication of programs or violation of the principle of a unitary graduate school.

The Chair concluded that the review report was a sterling one and that the Committee saw no need to recommend to the Agenda Committee consideration of any matter.

**Faculty of Medicine**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary reflected the full review very well. The administrative response described a series of plans and actions to deal with the reviewers' recommendations. Where there were no actions planned, the reasons were clearly explained. The reading team thought that there was no need for the Committee to address any further issue.

Professor Regehr observed that the reviewers had been extremely complimentary about the quality of the M.D. program and the Faculty's graduate programs – the primary focus of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Professor Regehr noted that the M.D. program was scheduled for an accreditation review in the near future, and that review would provide additional information regarding the quality of undergraduate medical education.

Two matters arose in discussion.

**(a) Budget matters.** A member of the reading team noted that the reviewers had made reference to two budgetary matters. They had suggested that (in the words of the summary) the Faculty create "a new, as earned budget model." The adoption of such a model could lead to internal organizational changes. The administrative response had dealt with the question of organizational change but had not directly commented on the proposal concerning a budget model. Second, the review had referred to the "almost total absence of research overheads,"

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011****2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

resulting in the lack of research income for Departments. The member commented that two of the three reviewers (from Oxford and Harvard) were probably unaware of the very low rate of overhead attached to research grants in Canada.

Professor Whiteside replied that she had not made reference in the administrative response to the proposal for an “as earned” or responsibility-centred budget model within the Faculty. The Faculty was, however, with its revenue/expense model, moving in that direction. The reviewers, while they had access to information about the Faculty’s budget model in the self-study, had not discussed the matter in any detail with Professor Whiteside or her senior staff. They had been advised that the level of funding for indirect costs was generally very low in Canada. Their concern might well have reflected that of the Chairs of the clinical departments, in which most research faculty were located in the hospitals, and there was room for legitimate concern from that perspective about overhead costs. Professor Whiteside said that the Faculty was seeking to deal with the problem.

**(b) Research co-ordination.** A member said that the reviewers had stated that the quality of the M.D. program “ranks amongst the highest in the world,” and they had also stated that “Toronto ranks among the top biomedical research institutions in the world, one of the three largest producers with Harvard and Beijing.” Yet, they had also stated that the Faculty’s “research activity does not match the performance of its educational programming.”

Professor Whiteside replied that the Faculty’s relationships with its affiliated teaching hospitals in education matters, including academies in each hospital, functioned exceptionally well. The Faculty’s relationships with the affiliated teaching hospitals in the areas of the governance, strategic planning and production of deliverables in the area of research had not reached the same, very high level of co-ordination. The review had provided the impetus for the Faculty to address the matter. The Faculty’s strategic planning exercise, to be completed by September, 2011, included research co-ordination as a major element of the plan. There were outstanding scientists in the Faculty, and an improved organizational relationship among them would allow them to be even more productive.

Professor Whiteside said that the Toronto Academic Health Sciences Network had extraordinary research assets. If the member institutions could combine those assets and plan more comprehensively and strategically, the outcome would be even more valuable.

Professor Regehr stressed that the faculty and its affiliated hospitals produced extraordinary, world-renowned research. The reviewers’ comment related to relationships that were very complex and very different from those in institutions in the United States and the United Kingdom, with which the reviewers would be familiar.

The Chair stated that there were no matters to be addressed by the Committee or the Academic Board on a go-forward basis.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011****2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)****University of Toronto at Scarborough: Department of Management**

One of the spokespersons for the reading team said that the summary of the review of the UTSC Department of Management was a complete and accurate representation - with one exception which might cause misunderstanding. The administrative response had appropriately addressed all issues raised by the reviewers. The exception to the accuracy of the summary concerned the reporting of a statement that the reviewers had recommended “that in line with a commitment to teaching improvement, faculty should use more in-class peer observation and assessment to better ensure teaching quality and incorporation of best practices.” That statement did not accurately reflect the reviewers’ view that the teaching culture in the Department was excellent. Professor Regehr thanked the member for the observation and agreed to amend the summary to make the reviewers’ view clear.

The member stated that the review had included one major recommendation: that the UTSC Department of Management be given greater autonomy and that it eventually become a separate Faculty of Management. The second member of the reading team urged that the University as a whole develop its view on the appropriate evolution of the three-campus structure (see below). He prefaced his remarks by stressing that the review, while dealing with needs for action, included many observations about the very real strengths of the Department. Teaching quality was very high, as was morale among faculty members. It was clear that the Department and its programs were a credit to UTSC and to the University as a whole.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following

**(a) Tri-Campus matters.** A member commented on the recommendation that the Department of Management eventually become a separate Faculty of Management. It was very clear from the review, and from the Dean’s response to it, that tri-campus issues were in need of high-level attention. There appeared to be a consensus among the reviewers, the UTSC Management faculty, and the UTSC Dean that the Department should have more autonomy and that it should plan to become a separate Faculty. That would, however, be a breach of the principle of a unitary graduate school in that it would lead to the establishment to two Faculties of Management and likely eventually three. There might well be some overall body intended to avoid duplication and competition among the different Faculties of Management, but it appeared that there already was competition. The member concluded that the University badly needed a strategic, tri-campus plan. The development of such a plan was clearly beyond the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, but it would be very important for the Committee to make it clear that such a plan was needed.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011****2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

Dean Halpern agreed that the matter was a very substantial one. UTM and UTSC were Faculties of Arts and Science and had functioned as such for many years. The Tri-Campus Deans worked to equalize policies and guidelines and deal with issues. Professor Regehr was the Provostial representative on the group, providing a direct tie to the Provost's Office. The Rotman School was moving in a similar manner, under the leadership of Professor Pauly, to establish a Management Coordinating Council. Professor Pauly had drawn up terms of reference, and the Council was aiming to coordinate similar activities across the three campuses. In his administrative response, Professor Halpern had sought to make it clear that he endorsed the call for greater autonomy for the Department of Management in financial matters. He did not endorse moving at this time to the establishment of a separate Faculty. To undertake such a step, there was need for a compelling academic rationale and vision. At the moment, the desire for a separate Faculty primarily reflected the objective of greater control over the resources earned by the Department. A solution to that problem could be worked out by means well short of the establishment of a separate Faculty. UTSC was engaged in its academic planning process, and the Department of Management, like other Departments, was completing its plan. Professor Halpern took the view that the desire for greater autonomy could be articulated in the Department's plan, and UTSC could move forward to implementing appropriate arrangements.

The member thanked Professor Halpern for his clear and transparent explanation, including his acknowledgement that he did not know the shape and path towards the formation of any new Faculty or multi-Faculty campus. This uncertainty about the future of tri-campus arrangements, after so many years, was a real cause for concern. He urged that the Chair draw the need for clarity with respect to this matter to the attention of higher levels of governance.

Professor Halpern said that the issue of new Faculties at UTSC and UTM was not in the first instance a Decanal matter. Rather it was a matter for the Provost's Office and for the appropriate committees of the Governing Council.

Professor Regehr thanked the member for bringing the issue forward and for urging that it be considered at the appropriate places in the University's administration and the appropriate committees of the Governing Council. The primary concern of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs was assurance that the academic programs and teaching in the Department of Management were strong. UTSC planned new programs in Management, which would come forward to the Committee. The matter of academic structure was not within the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, but Professor Regehr was aware of the importance of the matter, and she had no doubt that it would be a central topic for the consideration of the Principals and Deans of UTSC and UTM, the Provost and the President.



**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011****2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

**(b) Access to graduate supervision.** Professor Halpern said that concerns about access to graduate-student supervision were common among the research-stream faculty in the Department of Management. The matter was under active discussion, and Professor Halpern was confident that a remedy would be found in the near future. He also anticipated that UTSC would move forward to establish graduate programs of its own, particularly professional Master's degree programs in particular areas. UTSC was also in discussion concerning the development of Ph.D. programs to be housed on its campus with specialization in Human Resources and Organizational Behaviour. Such programs would be developed in cooperation with the Rotman School. One reason such a development would be welcomed by UTSC faculty would be the opportunity for greater access to graduate teaching.

**(c) Absence of compensation to UTSC for providing graduate teaching.** Professor Halpern said that the absence of compensation to UTSC for the graduate teaching of its faculty was a fact of life for UTM and UTSC and was a much larger issue than that related to the Department of Management and the Rotman School. All graduate faculty at UTSC offered teaching in graduate programs, almost all of which were located on the St. George Campus. Another member noted that their salaries were fully borne by the UTSC but the income generated by all graduate students in Arts and Science was attributed to the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Halpern said that in recent years, efforts had been made using the University Fund to address this inequity. In addition, a part of the University's graduate enterprise was shifting to UTSC and UTM, as those campuses established programs of their own. Those programs were very small, niche programs, but their establishment did represent a small, slow way to address the problem. There was clear need for UTSC leaders to engage in dialogue with their counterparts on the other campuses and with the Provost's Office and, through that Office, with the appropriate committees of the Governing Council. The matter was a shared one, and Dean Halpern was confident that the University would find an appropriate way forward.

**(d) Co-operative Program in Management.** A member observed that there appeared to be two tiers of students in the program in Management: those in the Co-op Program and the other students. The other students appeared to feel that they did not have access to the same level of support as students in the Co-op Program. Professor Halpern said that the Co-op Program required the highest average grade for admission among all programs at UTSC, and the other Management Program required almost as high an average grade. The tuition fees for both programs were not regulated, but students in the Co-op Program paid an additional fee for that program to cover the costs of their placements and pre-placement training. It was that additional support that was the cause of concern among non-Co-op students in Management. Students in both programs, given their field of study, were highly conscious of value for money. UTSC had worked to improve the level of support to Management students who were not in the Co-op program in terms of academic

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011**

**2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

advising and career counselling. UTSC aimed to use the expertise gained in the Management and other Co-op programs to provide greater opportunities to other students in Management including shorter-term placements, service learning and traditional volunteer and intern placements.

The Chair, reading the consensus of the Committee, said that the review was a strong one, and the Committee's discussion an excellent one. The issues raised in the discussion, particularly the issue of the appropriate future tri-campus structure of the University, would be reflected fully in the Committee's report. Notwithstanding that larger issue, which should be considered elsewhere, the review itself raised no cause for concern about the programs offered by the Department of Management that would require the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**University of Toronto Mississauga: Department of Political Science**

A member of the reading team said that the summary closely reflected the candid review of the Department. While the administrative response did not accept all of the reviewers' recommendations, particularly the recommendation concerning sub-fields for new appointments, it provided cogent reasons for not doing so and provided alternatives. The reading team observed that the review had raised a number of matters.

**(a) Tri-Campus matters.** The reviewers noted that members of the Political Science faculty usually spent only about two days per week on the UTM campus and were on the St. George Campus for the remainder of the time. Their reason for so doing was recognition that the research component of their appointments, and the consequent need to interact with graduate students, was critical to their advancement. The outcome, however, was a shortfall in the opportunity for their undergraduate students to interact with their professors. That problem was a manifestation of the culture of the organization, and it would be difficult to effect change. One suggestion was a recommendation that graduate students in Political Science be employed to staff an office to assist undergraduate students at the UTM campus.

Professor Lange said that the issue of the availability of faculty to undergraduate students for only limited days per week was an on-going issue in many Departments at UTM and UTSC. Faculty members taught graduate students on the St. George Campus and found it important, in order to conduct their research, to be in regular contact with their graduate students. The reviewers had suggested the establishment of an office for undergraduate consultations, where a member of the faculty or, where necessary, a graduate student would be available on each business day during term. UTM did encourage faculty to be available on campus for more hours, and the proposal for a help office was one means of achieving that goal. The Chair of the Department of Political Science at UTM tried to make arrangements for faculty time at UTM to

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011**

**2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

be spread out through the week. A significant part of the problem was the small size of the Department, only twelve faculty members. The planned addition of 3½ new appointments would help to alleviate that problem.

Professor Corman said that the matter was not entirely a manifestation of a tri-campus problem. Faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences did not, in general, conduct their research from their offices and they were not therefore in their offices for all working days on any campus. The situation for faculty members in those disciplines was very different from that of faculty members in the Sciences, where research was most often conducted in on-campus laboratories.

A member observed that the matter of the availability of faculty on the UTM campus was not a particular problem for the Department of Political Science at UTM. It was a part of the much broader issue of tri-campus arrangements. That broader problem included many issues that had arisen in numerous reviews: UTM and UTSC student access to fourth-year courses on the St. George Campus (see below), faculty access to graduate student supervision, reward systems for faculty, inter-campus transportation, tri-campus seminars, etc. It would be the “beginning of wisdom” to recognize that all of those issues should be dealt with on a comprehensive basis as University-wide problems.

**(b) Faculty appointments.** The review was laudatory concerning the quality of the faculty in the small Political Science Department and recognized that its resources were well deployed. The reviewers noted, however, that there had been a number of faculty resignations and that enrolment in Political Science at UTM was growing rapidly. There was, therefore, urgent need for 3½ additional appointments. The reviewers had observed that there were too few women faculty in the Department, and they urged remedy of the gender imbalance through the new appointments. One member of the reading team noted that there appeared to be a substantial number of women in the discipline, and he agreed that every effort should be made to remedy the gender imbalance.

Professor Lange said that UTM had appointed a significant number of women in the Political Science Department. The gender imbalance had arisen from the recent departure of three women members of the faculty for various reasons. Every effort was being made to address gender balance in the forthcoming appointments. To deal with the matter in the short term, women faculty had been appointed to more than half of the sessional positions in Political Science at UTM.

A member pointed out that the reviewers had expressed concern that the Department lacked “sufficient faculty resources in the areas of Canadian politics, political theory, women and politics, comparative politics, and public policy.” Those areas appeared to the member to be very fundamental areas in the discipline of Political Science. The administrative response had taken issue with the reviewers’ observation, noting strength in such areas as political theory and Canadian politics. The member asked if the reviewers’ remarks had represented an unfair

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011**

**2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

assessment or if there was a real problem with respect to gaps in the Department's coverage of basic areas. Professor Lange replied that the observation had been made by a reviewer from a very large Department of Political Science at another university, which would have sufficient faculty members to cover all areas of the discipline very well. UTM, with its more limited faculty resources, had chosen to concentrate on four areas and to provide good coverage of those areas: Canadian government and politics, comparative government, international relations and political theory.

**(c) Access to fourth-year courses on the St. George Campus.** Professor Lange said that the question of access of UTM students in certain disciplines had arisen frequently in reviews. In some part, the problem might be attributable to a lack of clarity in information provided to students about the matter. UTM students had access to fourth year courses on the St. George campus that was equal to that of St. George campus students. The perception of poor access arose from the fact that many fourth-year courses, on the St. George Campus and on the UTM campus, were filled and had waiting lists.

The Chair said that she would ensure that the Agenda Committee received a summary of the discussion. It indicated, however, no need for Committee action or for a follow-up report.

**UTSC Department of Humanities: Follow-Up Report**

Professor Regehr recalled that under the new procedures for consideration of reviews of academic programs and units, the Committee could request a one-year follow-up report on further developments. The report on the UTSC Department of Humanities was the first such report.

Professor Halpern said that, in response to the review of the Department of Humanities provided to the Committee one year ago, UTSC had moved to establish two new Departments: the Department of English and the Department of Philosophy. That move had been the cause of some concern at UTSC at the time, but one year later, everyone involved had concluded that the step was the right one to have taken. First, faculty morale was very high, both in the two new Departments and in the Department of Humanities. The Departments were now focused on the future and were actively engaged in the academic planning process. Second, UTSC as a whole now had a better view of the process of establishing new Departments. UTSC had learned the transaction costs of setting up a Department. With the generous support of the Office of the Provost, the Departments had been set up with the modicum of administrative support required for their smooth functioning. As the Campus contemplated the establishment of further new Departments, it had learned not only the costs of so doing but also the process of moving proposals through local governance and the Governing Council.

Professor Halpern recalled that the original review had been so focused on structural issues that it had not even given attention to the review of the Department's programs.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011**

**2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: July – December, 2010 (Cont'd)**

Professor Scherk had therefore scheduled a series of external reviews of the programs offered by the Department of Humanities, and also by the two new departments, to take place over the next few months.

Professor Halpern commented on leadership in the three Departments. Many members of the faculty were either near or past the usual retirement age, with the others either new tenure-stream or recently tenured appointments. There were, therefore, very few faculty members in the middle of the rank structure or age range. As a result, it was necessary for younger faculty members to step up and assume leadership roles. Professor Halpern was very pleased with the outcome, with Chairs and Associate Chairs in the new Departments doing excellent work in a very brief period of time, providing leadership that had created very strong morale. The Chair of the Department of Humanities had agreed to a reappointment for a two-year term, and a search would soon be underway for a Chair who would assume office for a longer term. Meanwhile, the academic planning in the Department was being brought to a conclusion.

Professor Regehr thanked UTSC for breaking new ground with the first follow-up report. It had provided an excellent example of the Decanal team and a whole Department taking a troubling review and using it as an opportunity to make dramatic changes very quickly, resulting in new opportunities for students.

The Chair said that there clearly were no unresolved matters requiring the attention of the Agenda Committee or requiring a further follow-up report.

**Concluding Comments**

The Chair thanked members for their diligent work in considering the reviews, and she looked forward to the continuation of the process at the Committee's meeting in September.

**3. Student Financial Support: Annual Report of the Vice-Provost, Students, 2009-2010**

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

The Committee received the report. There were no questions.

**REPORT NUMBER 149 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 1, 2011**

**4. School of Graduate Studies: Graduate Education Council Approvals - Annual Report for 2009-10**

Professor Corman stated that this would be the final report from the Graduate Education Council on matters approved under delegated authority. Under the terms of the recently revised Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies, the Council would not be asked to approve the matters described in the annual report, which would instead be approved by the Councils of the individual Faculties.

**5. Report of the Administrative Assessors**

Professor Regehr recalled that she had advised the Committee of the intention to bring forward changes to the Committee's terms of reference. Because the Governing Council's Task Force on Governance wished to consider the matter one more time, Professor Regehr anticipated that the proposal would be brought to the Committee's next meeting.

**6. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, April 5, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. Among the items likely to be on the agenda were:

- the annual report of the Vice-President, Research,
- the proposal for revision of the Committee's terms of reference to accommodate the new Quality Assessment Process,
- a proposal to revise and consolidate the Grading Practices Policy and the and Graduate Grading and Evaluation Practices Policy, and
- a new Policy on Course Evaluations.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

March 14, 2011