UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON

ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

April 5, 2011

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, April 5, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)
Professor Douglas McDougall
  (Vice-Chair)
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost,
  Academic Programs
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost,
  Graduate Education and Dean, School of
  Graduate Studies
Mr. Hanif Bayat-Movahed
Professor Alister Cumming
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio
Professor Christopher Damaren

Professor Karen D. Davis
Professor Charles Deber
Ms Emily Holland
Mr. Rashi Maharaj
Professor Emeritus Michael R. Marrus
Mr. Liam Mitchell
Ms Judith Poë

Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-
  President, Research

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Robert L. Baker
Professor Katherine Berg
Ms Annie Claire Bergeron-Oliver
Professor Robert Gibbs
Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk

Professor Michelle Murphy
Mr. James Yong Kyun Park
Professor Ito Peng
Mr. Shakir Rahim
Professor Njoki Wane

In Attendance:

Ms Melissa Berger, Program and Planning Officer, Office of the Dean, University of
  Toronto Mississauga
Professor Tom Bessai, Director, B.A. Program in Architectural Studies
Professor Tom Chau, Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of
  Applied Science and Engineering
Ms Maria Pilar Galvez, member-elect, the Governing Council
Ms Pamela Gravestock, Associate Director, Centre for Teaching Support and
  Innovation
Ms Emily Greenleaf, Research Officer and Faculty Liaison, Centre for Teaching
  Support and Innovation
Dr. Jane E. Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the
  Vice-President and Provost
Professor Bryan Karney, Associate Dean, Cross-Disciplinary Programs, Faculty of
  Applied Science and Engineering

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

In Attendance (Cont'd)

    Professor Amy Mullin, Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean, University of Toronto, Mississauga
    Professor Seamus Ross, Dean, Faculty of Information
    Professor Richard Sommer, Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design
    Mr. Fred Thwainy, President, B.A. Architecture Studies Society
    Professor Sandy Welsh, Acting Vice-Dean, Teaching and Learning, Faculty of Arts and Science
    Professor Anthony Wensley, Director, Institute of Communication, Culture and Information, University of Toronto Mississauga
    Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council
    Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
    Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

ITEMS 4, 5, 7 AND 8 CONTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD.
ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1.   **Report of the Previous Meeting**

    Report 149 (March 1, 2011) was approved.

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

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

    The Chair recalled that at the March 1 meeting, the Committee had completed the second part of its semi-annual examination of the reviews of academic programs and units. The compendium of reviews, and the Report of this Committee's consideration of them, would be forwarded to the Agenda Committee for its meeting of April 15th and the Academic Board for its meeting of April 26th.

    A member observed that a number of the reviews received by the Committee had indicated that the reviewers were operating within time constraints that prevented their looking fully into particular issues or that prevented their understanding fully certain aspects of the unit being reviewed. The member asked whether the University was in fact receiving the feedback it required from the reviews or whether there was need to look further into the matter.

    Professor Regehr replied that the question was a very important one. 2010-11 had been a year of transition from the old quality-assurance process to the new one. The University of Toronto had used the year to implement many aspects of the new process before it was required, providing the opportunity to learn from the experience. The

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

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

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

University had, for example, initiated a workshop for academic units on the conduct of self-studies. All units would be receiving a full, standardized data set to assist them in their self-studies and reviews. In the process, the Provost's Office had learned that some units had scheduled review visits that did not permit reviewers sufficient time to learn about the programs fully. The units would henceforward receive advice on the time required for external reviewers' visits. That would be a part of an on-going process of evaluation of the implementation of the new quality-assurance process.

3.   **Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2010**

     The Chair stated that section 4.9 of the Committee's terms of reference made it responsible for monitoring academic matters, including reviewing annual reports on research activities.

     Professor Young presented the Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research for 2010. The report was entitled "Sustaining Research Excellence: Challenges and Opportunities." His objective in presenting the Report was to focus on three major challenges to be turned around and made into opportunities. Professor Young noted that the University of Toronto, according to one source, ranked 17th in the world for university research and innovation. The University of Toronto was one of the few institutions that could reasonably aspire to rank in the top ten universities in the world. It had a significant base of fundamental research, with capacity across the entire spectrum of research from knowledge translation through applied research. To achieve that top-ten ranking, it was important that the University recognize its strengths and also the challenges it faced. It could then improve how the Office of the Vice-President, Research could work with the divisions to assist researchers in achieving their goals. Highlights of Professor Young's report included the following.

- **Research funding landscape**. The landscape for research funding in Canada had changed dramatically in the past ten or so years. In the year 2000, the Government of Canada had established the Canada Research Chairs program. In 1997, the Canada Foundation for Innovation had been established to fund research infrastructure projects. The objective had been to build infrastructure and to attract top researchers. Professor Young noted that while the programs had succeeded in achieving those objectives, they had also been marked by the introduction of very complex requirements for oversight compared to those previously in effect. The Government of Ontario had established a Ministry of Research and Innovation to enhance Ontario's capacity in this area. Funding from the major federal research granting councils (the "tri-Councils" – the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, the Canadian

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

   3.   **Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2010** (Cont'd)

   Institutes of Health Research, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council) had begun to direct a significant proportion of their funding into areas other than basic discovery programs, often focusing on strategic areas of applied research. One outcome had been a major increase in programs conducted in partnership with other academic institutions, industry, government and not-for-profit organizations. The outcome had been three major challenges for the University of Toronto.

-   **Challenge #1 – Increase market share in tri-Council competitions**. The University's proportionate share of funding from the tri-Councils had been slowly but steadily declining over the past decade. That outcome was a serious one because the share of tri-Council funding was used in the formulae to determine each university's share of Canada Research Chairs, federal funding for the indirect costs of research, and eligibility for funding for infrastructure projects from the Canada Foundation for Innovation. The University of Toronto had earned more funding than any other university in Canada for discovery grants to fund basic research. It had not, however, fared as well in competition for grants from programs in areas of government-determined strategic areas, including those from the new Networks of Centres of Excellence. Tri-Council funding, and the funding that depended on it, were important to the University. It paid for graduate students and for other operating costs of many research groups, and it provided important research infrastructure. The funding for the indirect cost, or overhead cost, of research was also clearly important although it was also inadequate, with the University making up the difference. Research at the University and at its affiliated teaching hospitals represented a major enterprise, with spending of about $3-million per day or almost $1-billion per year.

-   **Challenge #2 – Strengthen research impact and partnerships**. Professor Young displayed graphs showing industry funding to Canada's thirteen research-intensive universities (the University of Toronto ranked second) and this University's share of industry funding as a percentage of total external funding (the University of Toronto ranked 11th). This indicated that there were clearly opportunities in this area to be pursued. Those opportunities did not take only the form of contract research. They included working in partnership with industry on solving problems of real importance to Canada and to the world. There was also the need and the opportunity to increase activity in partnership with various other institutions in working on problems in strategic areas where research was funded by the tri-Councils. The University was currently behind the University of British Columbia in its share of funding for Strategic Partnership Grants from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and it was behind three other universities in its share of funding for Strategic Network Grants. That was the case in spite of the University's clear leadership in discovery grants. A great deal of effort was being put into improvements in the competitions for those grants, and improvements were beginning to take place. The

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND
PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

3.   **Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2010** (Cont'd)

University's share of Canada Research Chairs was an important indicator, reflecting
total funding from all of the tri-Council programs, including the strategic grant
programs. When the program had been established, the University had received
funding for 270 Chairs. The number had since that time declined to 250, and the
University had recently learned that it would lose a further eleven Chairs – leading to
the loss of $1.7-million from the University's budget. Ten of those Chairs had been
won by the University of British Columbia because of its share of tri-Council Strategic
Partnership Grants. The University of Toronto had to be diligent to put this situation
right, and it was making progress. But, the formula for allocation of Canada Research
Chairs depended on the share of tri-Council funding over a number of years.
Therefore, it would take some years for the University of Toronto to increase its share
of the Chairs to the previous 250, requiring an increase of ¼ of 1% per year in its
share of total tri-Council funding over perhaps three or four years. Such an increase
would, of course, also be reflected in an increase in its funding envelopes for
infrastructure and for indirect costs.

- **Challenge #3 – Establish an organization to meet the new obligations for
  oversight and compliance**. Over the past decade, the amount of reporting and
  auditing of grant-funded research had increased exponentially. The increased
  requirements had been instituted for very good reasons: new accounting requirements
  arising from various scandals in the U.S. and Canada and increasing demands for
  greater transparency and accountability. The amount of reporting and auditing for tri-
  Council funded projects had increased, and a study of the matter had shown that the
  amount of reporting and auditing arising from grants from other sources was 2.4 – 3
  times as great as that for tri-Council standard/discovery grants. Professor Young cited
  one example. In 2000, the University had applied to the Canada Foundation for
  Innovation for a grant to construct a research building on one of the University's
  campuses. That grant had been audited regularly over the period, and the University
  was still required to submit reports. Similar requirements were in effect for other
  C.F.I. funded projects. The increase in the number of research grants, as well as the
  vastly increased complexity of their administration, had required additional staffing
  and reorganization in the Office of the Vice-President, Research. Professor Young
  noted that several years ago, following a tri-Council audit, the University had come
  close to missing a "satisfactory" rating. As a result of the restructuring and expansion
  of the office, the University's rating on the most recent audit had been "very
  satisfactory." The major instrument for the University's assurance of compliance was
  the Research Oversight and Compliance Office (ROCO). It was responsible not only
  for assurance of compliance with respect to the spending of research grants but also
  for adherence to ethical protocols – for example on the use of human subjects. The
  objective was to remove from researchers as much of the burden of grant
  administration as possible, leaving them the opportunity to focus on their teaching and

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

 3.   **Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2010** (Cont'd)

research. The Office of the Vice-President, Research was working with the academic divisions and departments to provide the best service possible. Partnership with the divisions and departments was particularly important under the new budget model because most funding now was within their budgets.

- **Tri-Pillar Model**. The support provided to researchers by the Office of the Vice-President, Research was organized through three groups.

  The Research Services Office was responsible for the administration of all research grants to University faculty made by the tri-Councils, the Canada Foundation for Innovation, etc. That Office assisted faculty members with applications that followed one of a number of standard procedures. The group was headed by Ms Judith Chadwick, the Assistant Vice-President, Research Services.

  The Innovations and Partnerships Office assisted with respect to technology transfer and the commercialization of University discoveries. The University had in recent years won grants for Centres of Excellence for Commercialization of Research, and their function had proceeded separately from the Office of the Vice-President. The Vice-President's Office was, however, still required to manage the intellectual property generated in the University and to manage and encourage knowledge translation. Staff within the Office were working with faculty members with appropriate interests to encourage them to build partnerships with the private sector. The group was currently being led by Associate Vice-President, Research, Professor Peter Lewis, but a Chief Innovations and Partnerships Officer was being recruited to head up this unit.

  The Research Oversight and Compliance Office sought to mitigate most of the various risks involved in the University's research efforts: that arising from the management and use of research funds, animal care, human subjects and research ethics. That group was led by Ms Elizabeth DiDonato.

- **Taking action**: **Research Services Office**. A new suite of Connaught Fund programs had been introduced in 2010, which was proving to be very transformative. The fund had very poor investment returns during 2009 as the result of the economic recession, and there had been no payout from the endowment funds. The year had been used as an opportunity, however, to work with researchers to develop the new programs for 2010. The Research Services Office had established a team of proposal development officers to assist faculty members in writing grant proposals for large-scale initiatives. The Office had established a group of divisional research facilitators to work with the divisions and departments to assist in the coordination of efforts to achieve synergies and efficiency in the work of the divisional and central research-services offices. The Research website had been transformed, and an e-mail-based

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

   3.   **Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2010** (Cont'd)

service was being developed to provide researchers with appropriate information, including alerts about funding opportunities. Finally, the office had been deeply involved in developing an information-technology system – the Research Administration Improvement and Systems Enhancement Project (Project RAISE) to strengthen and streamline the business processes required for research administration.

- **Taking action: the Innovations and Partnerships Office**. The University was in the process of recruiting a new Chief Innovations and Partnerships Officer. The Office (the I.P.O.) provided technology-transfer and commercialization services. It had put in place an improved process for the administration of research contracts, each of which required a unique process of due diligence for its administration. The I.P.O had eliminated much of the backlog in contract administration and was submitting monthly reports to Deans on the contracts in their divisions. MaRS Innovation had been operating very successfully as the commercialization engine for the greater Toronto area. Its first spin-off company, based on a technology developed at the University of Toronto, had been launched. Such companies would eventually generate a stream of revenue for the University, which would be used to support the full spectrum of research activities and not only applied research. The Office had contributed to the development of a new Centre of Excellence for Commercialization of Research in Regenerative Medicine, and it had assisted the University in winning funding from a federal/provincial program to foster research collaboration between post-secondary institutions and small / medium size private-sector enterprises.

- **Taking action: Research Oversight and Compliance Office (ROCO)**. ROCO had developed processes to resolve deficit positions that were in place in research accounts other than those funded by the tri-Councils. There were accounts in deficit positions in various divisions across the University that went back as far as a decade and had not been closed. In many cases, the amounts involved were relatively small, but in total the overdrawn accounts amounted to about $2½-million. Those accounts clearly had to be closed / written off, with the amounts found either in the divisions or centrally. The improved systems developed under Project RAISE would prevent such problems in the future or would ensure that they were dealt with expeditiously. All such accounts over two years old would be reviewed with reports made to the relevant Deans. Project RAISE would also make a major contribution to implementing solutions arising from the two most recent tri-Council monitoring reports. Finally, ROCO would respond to a new tri-Council Policy Statement on human-subject research ethics by delegating responsibility for such reviews to the divisions and by implementing communications and administrative strategies to address the renewal of expired protocols.

- **Measuring the University's success**. Professor Young said that the success of the University's future efforts in the research area could be measured against three benchmarks. First, the University would seek an increased market share of tri-Council

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

  3.   Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2010 (Cont'd)

funding to sustain a steady state of 250 Canada Research Chairs and other funding that depended on Tri-Campus market share. The return to 250 Canada Research Chairs would be a good macro-indicator of the University's success and would show that the University had done a great deal to improve its competitive position and to achieve the other funding required to enable the University's faculty members to do the research they needed to do. Second, The University would seek to increase private-sector funding for its research by at least 50% over the next five – ten years. It would be important to be able to lever that funding to increase the University's market share of tri-Council funding. Third, the University would seek to maintain its "satisfactory" rating from the tri-Councils at their next monitoring visit in 2015 and beyond.

In the course of discussion, two members congratulated Professor Young on his exciting report. One commented that it was very helpful and exuded a spirit of accountability. Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following.

(a) Canada Research Chair applications. A member asked whether the recent decline in the number of Canada Research Chairs might be related to situations where some current Chairs did not have an incentive to apply for renewal of their Chairs and therefore focused on applying for other research funding. Professor Young replied that he did not attribute the decline in the number of Chairs to that reason. The number of Chairs for each university depended wholly on its market share of tri-Council funding. He observed that the situation of current Canada Research Chairs differed among the divisions. In some cases, the Chair positions were used as a vehicle for recruitment. In some cases, current Chairs could use a part of the funding for the Chair to fund their research groups. In other cases, the funding was simply absorbed by the Chair's department or division to pay the salary of the Chair, and no amount was made available to the Chair for allocation. Those differences reflected the nature of the large and diverse University. While that differing treatment of Chair income affected current Chair holders, it did not affect the number of Chairs assigned to the University as a whole.

(b) Report data controlled for size. A member observed that because of its size, and because of the number and size of the affiliated teaching hospitals, the University's overall research achievement and the achievement of its medical-science divisions were bound to appear stellar. It would, however, be very useful for purposes of governance, to have information on the performance of the University as a whole and of its divisions controlled for size. Professor Young replied that the report was intended primarily to demonstrate the impact of the research completed by the University as a whole. In demonstrating that impact, the University's size was an important factor. Data was analyzed in a manner that did control for size, and some of that information appeared in the report on performance indicators. Professor Young acknowledged the importance of the information that took size into account and he undertook to consider the inclusion of more of that data in future annual reports.

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

 3.   **Vice-President, Research: Annual Report, 2010** (Cont'd)

(c) Research funding for the humanities and social sciences. A member observed that the amount of research funding for the humanities and social sciences was much less than that available to researchers in such other fields as science, medicine and engineering, but those smaller amounts were vital to completing research in the former areas. It was, therefore, particularly important to protect that funding in difficult economic times. Moreover, while the amounts provided for research in the humanities and social sciences tended to be small, investigators were subject to the same extensive stewardship reporting requirements.

Professor Young replied that tri-Council funding for research in the Humanities and Social Sciences together, and other related funding, would, by formula, amount to 20% of the funding provided to the University's researchers. The University did recognize that a dollar of funding had a differing impact depending on the academic area. It therefore sought to meliorate the problem for the Humanities and Social Science disciplines using University sources of funding. For example, the Connaught Fund was no longer used to provide start-up funding automatically to all new faculty. Rather, faculty had to compete for Connaught Fund grants. Part of the reason for that change was the recognition that a $10,000 grant could be of great significance to a researcher in the Humanities or Social Sciences, but it would not be of great significance for research projects in, for example, the medical sciences. Therefore, such grants, often along with matching funding from the Provost's Office, were more often directed more toward areas that did not require major research infrastructure.

(d) Burden of research administration. A member was struck by the statement in the report that it had become as much as three times more burdensome to administer some research grants. Was the University making efforts to respond to this situation in an effort to have the burden reduced? Professor Young replied that the problem was less with the ordinary discovery / operating grants and more with other grants, such as those from the Canada Foundation for Innovation, which had much more complicated requirements, including reporting on a number of occasions during the term of the grant rather than only at its end. The University did make considerable effort in its advocacy role. Professor Young, as Chair of the Ontario Council on Research (made up of the Vice-Presidents, Research of all the Ontario universities), enjoyed good access to the Chairs of the tri-Councils, the Chair of the Canada Foundation for Innovation and others. While the University was able to deliver its message, it was not always successful in achieving the outcome sought.

(e) Funding for research projects after the expiry of grants. A member noted that its was sometimes the case that research grants ended, leaving stranded a good research team and sometimes valuable equipment, both able to conduct valuable continuing research. Professor Young agreed that the outcome was often problematic.

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

4.   **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference: Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval**

Mr. Charpentier commented on the context of the proposal to amend the Committee's terms of reference. It came forward in parallel with proposals to make related changes to the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. Under usual circumstances, proposals to amend the terms of reference were presented by the Committee Chair or Vice-Chair, often acting with the Secretary of the Governing Council. The proposals at this time were somewhat different in that they had emerged from two parallel processes. First, the Task Force on Governance had over the past two years been engaged in a comprehensive review of the University's governance system. Its Report had been approved by the Governing Council in October 2010. At the same time as that review, there had been a Province-wide examination of the quality assurance process for both graduate and undergraduate programs.

Mr. Charpentier reported that the Task Force on Governance had heard, consistently and repeatedly, concerns about excessive duplication in governance, the substantial burden involved in securing approval of transactional matters, and the consequent need to streamline the consideration of items. In that context, the Task Force on Governance Implementation Committee had considered approval processes with a view to improving their efficiency while continuing to ensure appropriate governance oversight and accountability. As the Task Force developed its recommendations, it had met and consulted with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs; the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education; and the Chair of the Committee on Academic Programs. The Task Force's objective had been to ensure it was fully informed about the changes being made to the quality assurance processes and to provide advice in relation to its own deliberations and expectations with respect to governance and oversight. The timely communications had ensured that the recommended changes were consistent with the intent of the Task Force in responding to concerns expressed throughout its work. Critically, the recommendations would result in academic decisions being made by the academic bodies within governance, including the divisional councils and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. In particular, they would ensure that the highest level of academic oversight resided with the senior representative academic decision-making body: the Academic Board. It was necessary, because of provisions in the University of Toronto Act, that many of the Academic Board's decisions be confirmed by the Executive Committee of the Governing Council. However, that Committee's role was not to re-debate what the Academic Board had decided, but rather to assure itself that due process had been followed. If there was any serious concern, the Executive Committee would be able to refer the matter back to the Academic Board; it would not be able to reject an Academic Board decision. The Academic Board, and where appropriate the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, would be the decision-makers.

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

 4.   **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference: Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval** (Cont'd)

       Mr. Charpentier said that the Secretariat had been intimately involved in drafting the proposed revisions to the terms of reference, and it was satisfied that they addressed the necessary responsibilities. As well, the Implementation Committee had reviewed and endorsed the proposals.

       Professor Regehr recalled that the Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs, approved by the Governing Council in June, 2010, had been before the Committee in May, and the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (the U.T.QAP) had been presented to the Committee for information at the same time. A slightly revised draft of the U.T.QAP was currently before the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) for approval, which Professor Regehr anticipated would be granted shortly. The objective of the current proposals was to bring the University's processes into line with the U.T.QAP. Professor Regehr recalled that as proposals had come forward in 2009-10, she had commented on how they would be handled under the proposed new process. For example, modifications to existing programs would be approved by the divisional councils, with major modifications being reported annually to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for information. The major change being proposed at this time dealt with the procedures for the approval of new programs. Such proposals currently required the most levels of approval, and the sponsors of new programs had expressed concern that they were required to present their proposals again and again to various governance bodies. The problem would become more severe for proposals for new undergraduate major and specialist programs, which would now require additional steps for approval at the Provincial level.

       Professor Regehr outlined the current process for approval of proposals for new programs and she described the changes being proposed. The procedures would be the same for undergraduate and graduate programs, and certain steps would be removed to expedite the process. While it was anticipated that the primary locus of governance discussion of proposals for new programs would be the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, proposals would proceed to the Academic Board for approval. Upon University approval, the proposal would proceed to the Ontario Quality Council, to the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities for funding approval, and, where required, to the appropriate professional accrediting body. The outcome would reduce the number of steps required for approval from seven to five for undergraduate programs and from nine to five for graduate programs.

       Professor Regehr said that the proposed new process sought to distinguish between consultation and governance approval. Under the new U.T.QAP, there would be two separate parts to the consultative process. First, while a division was working up a

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

4.   **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference: Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval** (Cont'd)

new-program proposal, it would consult with the Provost's Office. Second, while the division was working up the proposal, it would ensure appropriate consultation with students, faculty, cognate programs and the cognate units that would be affected. That consultation would be described in the program proposal. Also expected, when appropriate, was consultation with interested parties external to the University such as the officers of accrediting bodies for professional programs and potential employers for vocationally directed programs when advice would help to ensure the employability of graduates.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

(a) Student participation in proposals for new graduate programs. A member asked whether removal of the Graduate Education Council's participation in approving new academic programs would means that graduate students would have an opportunity to make their views known only through the consultative process. Professor Regehr replied that graduate students were represented on divisional councils and on other governance bodies including the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Academic Board, and they would have the opportunity to state their views at meetings of those bodies as well as during the consultative process. Professor Corman stressed that divisional councils recognized the importance of the views of current graduate students about proposals for new programs. Among other things, those views were very important in gauging the level of demand for new programs. Statements verifying appropriate consultation with students were required in the documentation supporting new program proposals. Many divisional councils were strengthening their due-diligence procedures with respect to student consultation, among other things, in recognition of the fact that there would be no review of their decisions by the Graduate Education Council. Therefore, Professor Corman concluded that student involvement in the development of new programs would be as much a part of the process under the proposed new procedure as it had been under the old, if not more so.

(b) Divisional approval of program modifications. A member expressed concern about the delegation of authority to divisional councils to approve changes to academic programs, in the event that there were situations where those councils were not operating effectively or transparently. There would be no oversight of such approval at the level of University governance. Professor Regehr replied that it was recognized that there was need to make changes to the constitutions of the divisional councils to enable them to discharge effectively the new responsibilities proposed to be assigned to them. If, when the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs received reports for information about major modifications to programs, the Committee had reason for concern about approvals in a particular division, it would be important to review the situation at that time.

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

   4.   Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference: Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval (Cont'd)

A member stressed the importance of the need to observe the operation of the process and to review it if necessary. It was not possible to know definitively how the new process would work out in practice. More important than the number of steps involved was that there be value added at each step. The member thought that a major reason for the proposal was the very fact that value was not being added at each step of the current process. On the contrary, the action being taken at some steps appeared to be something very akin to rubber stamping, with the result that the process had become too time-consuming and expensive. It would be very important to ensure that value was being added by each step in the proposed new process.

Mr. Charpentier stressed that the Task Force on Governance Implementation Committee expected the systematic review of divisional constitutions to ensure that Faculty councils would be able to execute their responsibilities and to add value. The Governing Council Secretariat, under the aegis of the Implementation Committee, was working to refine the template that the divisions could use to assess their councils' constitutions and by-laws. One of the key concerns was to ensure that those bodies would be able to add value to the review of proposals for new programs and program modifications.

(c) Role of University civil service. A member stressed the importance of the role of University staff members in dealing with proposals for programs and program modifications. Very often, University staff members had long experience, which included experience with programs that had not succeeded. Very often faculty who held administrative positions for limited periods as well as other faculty and students did not have the same broad range of experience. The member hoped that the role of staff would be supported and appreciated. Professor Corman replied that staff were a key part of the process of administrative review. Staff members were often uniquely qualified and would have a role in ensuring that all procedures were followed properly.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed amendments to sections 3, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 to the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the proposed amendments to the sections of the "Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval" dealing with Admission policies and Academic program proposals, be approved.

**REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND
PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

  5.   **Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines**

        Professor Regehr presented the proposed new framework for student evaluation of
teaching. She stressed that student evaluation was only one element in the overall
evaluation of teaching and of academic units, which was a much broader process including
such things as peer review, instructor self-assessment, cyclical program review, and other
tools. However, the opportunity for students to have input into the process was absolutely
vital. In September 2009, a Course Evaluation Working Group had been established,
co-chaired by Professor Edith Hillan (Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life) and
Professor Jill Matus (Vice-Provost, Students) and including representation from many of
the University's academic divisions. Its mandate had been to review current course-
evaluation practices both across the University of Toronto and at peer institutions, to
review current research on course-evaluation practices, and to make any necessary
recommendations to improve this University's policies and practices. The review of
current research had been funded by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario
(HEQCO) and had been peer reviewed.[*]

        Professor Regehr noted that the interest in a new course-evaluation framework had
arisen from a number of factors including approaches from individual faculty members to
the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation, often as they were preparing their
portfolios for tenure and promotion. It had become clear from those approaches that
individual departments and divisions had very different practices for student evaluation of
teaching.

        The Working Group had made a number of recommendations. First, it had advised
that there was need to develop institutional guidelines for student evaluations of teaching.
It had become apparent that the University of Toronto was one of the few universities in
North America without a policy dealing with the matter. Second, it was recommended that
the University adopt a centrally supported, on-line system for course evaluations. Third it
was proposed that the system develop a flexible format that would be customizable to meet
the particular needs of individual academic units. The recommendations were presented to
the group of Principals and Deans, and the outcome was the establishment of a Course
Evaluation Framework Implementation Group, co-chaired by Professor Carol Rolheiser
(Director of the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation) and Professor Regehr, again
with broad representation from the University's academic divisions. The Implementation
Group had developed the proposed Policy, now before the Committee for approval, and it
was working on Guidelines for implementation of that Policy.

        Professor Regehr outlined the key aspects of the proposed Policy. First, it specified
that student evaluations would be completed for each course each time it was offered.

---

[*] A summary of the report of the Course Evaluation Working Group can be found at
http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/essentialinformation/evaluation-framework.htm

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

 5.   **Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines** (Cont'd)

Second, it set out the criteria governing access to the data provided by the course evaluations. Finally, the policy set out the responsibilities of academic administrators, instructors and students in ensuring that there was good data to evaluate courses.

Professor Regehr stressed that the Guidelines to implement the proposed Policy were very much in draft form, but they had been provided to give the Committee some knowledge of what the Implementation Group was working towards. Professor Regehr would bring the Guidelines back to the Committee for its information when they had been fully worked out.

Professor Regehr reported that the Implementation Group had issued a Request for Proposals to suppliers of a number of on-line course-evaluation systems and had received presentations on them. It was now in the final stages of the process of establishing an agreement with a supplier. It was also in the process of selecting and testing questions for the evaluations, with the staff of the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovations (C.T.S.I.) and the divisions conducting studies with student focus groups. The Implementation Group would also form a sub-group to work on ensuring an appropriate response rate. The University planned to make available a smart-phone application and other means to provide students with convenient access to the system. To promote a good response rate, it would be necessary to ensure that students know that the evaluations are meaningful and that other students would have access to the outcome. The Implementation Group was currently identifying divisions that wished to participate in a pilot project to use the new system in the summer of 2011 and to implement the system in the 2011-12 academic year. Professor Regehr and the C.T.S.I. staff were therefore making presentations about the system to the various divisions for their consideration and possible adoption.

Finally, Professor Regehr described the broad consultations that had taken place with Deans, Chairs, Faculty Councils, student leaders and student focus groups. On the suggestion of student leaders, information and an invitation for comment had been broadly distributed in student e-newsletters. A memorandum had been distributed to Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs. Consultations had been undertaken with the executives of the Faculty Association and the Canadian Union of Public Employees, and with the Teaching Academy, with very broad input having been received.

The Chair reiterated that only the Policy was included in the motion for recommendation to the Academic Board. Members would, however, be very welcome to make any comments and tender any advice with respect to the Guidelines.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following

(a) Instructors' option not to release course-evaluation data. A member asked why instructors were permitted, under the policy, to opt not to release course-evaluation data

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

 5.   **Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines** (Cont'd)

to students. Another member noted the experience in his Faculty. Instructors whose courses garnered poor ratings were the ones who opted out of release of their data, in fact skewing the distribution of aggregate ratings for the Faculty to the high side. The member also referred to the chart on page 4 of the Guidelines, which gave students access only to the data from "institutionally selected quantitative questions," and not to institutionally-selected open-ended questions, divisionally or departmentally-selected questions, or instructor-selected questions. Even access to the institutionally selected quantitative questions was qualified by a note, which gave instructors the ability to opt out of sharing that data. The member was not at all sure that the Policy addressed the issue of students' needing to know about the outcome of course evaluations.

Professor Regehr replied that it had been a general practice in the University to give instructors the option not to share the data from course evaluations with students. In practice, relatively few instructors chose to keep their data private. She would look again at the chart cited with a view to ensuring that students had access to all appropriate data generated by the course evaluations. She noted that there was a great deal of variance in the current practices among divisions, some of which denied students access to all course evaluation data. For those divisions, the new policy would represent a very radical change. Other divisions had a long tradition of providing student access to the data. While each division would have to develop its own arrangements under the new Policy, approving the new Policy would represent a major step forward.

Another member favoured careful reconsideration of the opt-out provision. He noted that students would be able to make use of other methods of providing their evaluations of teaching in those courses that did not permit release of data, such as use of electronic social media, and the information they released would be much less carefully derived.

(b) Doing course evaluations online. A member expressed concern that moving to on-line evaluations would reduce the participation rate by students. Professor Regehr acknowledged that some research had shown that moving to on-line evaluations had reduced response rates, but other research had shown increased rates of participation She noted that in some circumstances, those rates were already very low. In large classes, for example, the response rate for in-class surveys was sometimes less than 20%. Moreover, a great deal of work was being completed at other universities that had adopted the same on-line system that the University of Toronto proposed to use. The outcome of their strategies had been much improved response rates. The University planned to link the course-evaluation system to the Blackboard system now used by students. Students would have various means to complete the surveys including, as noted, smart phones. Faculty members could still use class time, urging students to use their laptops or other devices to complete the evaluation. While there was some risk, Professor Regehr hoped that there would be no decline. Another member commended the move to on-line administration

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

 5. **Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines** (Cont'd)

of the evaluation surveys. It represented the most efficient way to conduct the surveys, and especially in those cases where students completed their course work partially or fully off-campus, it represented the most effective way. The member's experience with on-line evaluations had been that the participation rate had increased.

(c) Analysis and reporting of data. In response to a question, Professor Regehr said that the planned on-line system had excellent reporting capabilities. The users would be able to choose the data required, and the system would be able to generate reports in a very time-efficient manner. The system would also be able to provide benchmarking data, comparing responses to University-wide data or data generated in the department or division. It would also be able to benchmark data in certain types of courses against that from comparable courses, for example required first-year courses or courses of a given size. After a number of years, it would also be possible to obtain analyses of changes in the data over time. The system was very flexible in the analyses it could provide.

(d) Limitations of course evaluations and their importance in promotion and tenure decisions. Two members expressed concern about the limitations of course evaluations, which served as a very important basis for reviews of faculty members' performance for purposes of promotion and tenure. One member observed that the evaluations could not measure the effect of teaching on the improvement of student learning. Another member expressed a number of other concerns. Response rates were sometimes quite low and provided inadequate data to inform key decisions about faculty members – a matter that was of particular concern to faculty members who were not yet tenured and those who were in the teaching stream. Questions on evaluations were not always appropriate for particular groups of students. For example, first-year science students would find it difficult to answer many of the usual questions. The member suggested testing potential questions on focus groups consisting of such students. Finally, the likelihood of a substantial change to the course-evaluation questionnaires under the new policy would make it difficult to place the new data in context as measurement of the quality of an individual's teaching. The member suggested that, before using data arising from the new evaluation questionnaires, the University test both new and previously used questionnaires in large, multi-section courses where the same instructor taught more than one section. That would provide at least some basis for comparison between the assessments provided by the earlier and the current questionnaires.

Professor Regehr, Ms Gravestock and Ms Greenleaf replied that the questionnaires were not seeking to measure student learning but rather students' perception of the quality of their learning experience. Questions were being developed that would provide a more accurate view of that perception. The process for developing course-evaluation questions was described on the website of the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation, and

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

5.   Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines (Cont'd)

members of the University were invited to provide advice.[*] The Centre was in fact testing new and older questionnaires in multi-section courses and analyzing the data.

(e) Student-conducted course evaluations. A member noted that the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU) had for many years been producing an *Anti-Calendar*, which was a major source of information about the results of course evaluations. The member noted that there had even been situations were there had been competition between ASSU and the Department about which body would undertake the course evaluations. Invited to respond, Professor Welsh said that she and Ms Greenleaf had been working closely with ASSU on the matter. ASSU was very interested in the University-wide process and had expressed certain concerns about response rate and about the opt-out provision for individual instructors. It had, however, been the experience that most faculty members did agree to publication of course evaluation outcomes in the Anti-Calendar. ASSU was pleased with the University initiative, and it was pleased to cease its activity in the area and to concentrate on other matters. Consequently, the initiative in the Faculty of Arts and Science was moving forward with the support of ASSU.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses, a copy of which is attached to Professor Regehr's memorandum of March 16, 2011, be approved.

6.   Academic Transcript Notations: Guidelines

Professor Regehr said that the discussion of guidelines for notations on academic transcripts formed a part of a larger process that had arisen from the Ombudsperson's report to the Governing Council in June, 2010. That report pointed out the existence of certain conflicts between the provisions contained in the Grading Practices Policy and those in the Graduate Grading Practices Policy. In reviewing the two policies, it had become clear that they dealt with three different matters: grading practices, academic transcripts, and academic continuity in the face of disruptions or crises. All of those matters were dealt with in the same policies, which were now many years old. Professor Regehr was therefore establishing a group to review the policies, which would engage in broad consultations. She expected that the outcome would be proposals for three new policies with accompanying guidelines dealing with: grading practices, transcripts, and academic continuity in the face of potential disruption.

---

[*] Go to: http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/about_ctsi/news/suggestions.htm

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

 6.   **Academic Transcript Notations: Guidelines**

In the meantime, a number of divisions had indicated their wish to record certain special academic enhancements on the transcripts of their students, including students who would graduate in the current year. Professor Regehr had therefore brought forward the incomplete draft guidelines now before the Committee for some initial discussion. The enhancements that the divisions wished to record were not the completion of regular programs. Rather, they included (a) achievements that would enhance students professional careers, or (b) the completion of small sets of courses such as the already established language notation. Professor Regehr hoped that the Committee's discussion would focus on certain key questions: what kinds of achievements should be recorded on academic transcripts? And what criteria should be applied? The concern of Registrars across Canada was that recording too many things on academic transcripts would cause the notations to lose value. Professor Regehr stressed that the discussion at this time focused on the recording of academic enhancements on academic transcripts. The Student Affairs group, under the direction of Professor Jill Matus, was looking at the possibility of a co-curricular transcript to record other kinds of achievements.

The following matters arose in questions and discussion.

(a) Steps to be taken going forward. In response to a question, Professor Regehr said that Provostial approval would permit appropriate transcript notations proposed for students about to graduate in 2011. This was being brought forward as an interim measure. In the longer term, the working group would consult widely and seek to clarify the appropriateness of various transcript notations, including notations recording academic awards on student transcripts.

(b) Appropriate subjects for transcript notations. A member urged that the University exercise care in determining what matters could be recorded by a notation on students' transcripts. There was a risk that transcripts could become too cluttered with notations. In that case, readers considering applications for admission to advanced degrees or applications for employment could well miss the most important matters. It was important to record such achievements as the completion of the Graduate Professional Skills Program offered by the School of Graduate Studies. On the other hand, recording of co-curricular activities would not be appropriate. Professor Regehr assured the member that such questions would be examined carefully. She agreed that a minimum standard should be set so as not to devalue the notations.

Another member expressed disappointment about the apparently limited scope for transcript notations and, in particular, the absence of opportunity to recognize co-curricular achievements on transcripts. While he understood that it would be challenging to define the scope of such achievements to be recognized on the transcript, there was extensive research that demonstrated the great value of learning outside of the classroom. It would therefore be important to define some such achievements as being worthy of

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

 6.   **Academic Transcript Notations: Guidelines** (Cont'd)

recognition on the transcript and to develop means to verify such achievements and to report them. While it was important that the transcript not be available as a "passport" in which students collected stamps, certain achievements were worthy of recording, and it was disappointing that the University was considering recording them only on a separate document.

Professor Regehr said that the matter would no doubt form part of the discussion of the forthcoming Policy, and the outcome could not be determined at this time. It would be important, meanwhile, to ensure that University of Toronto transcripts were comparable to those from other institutions. The University was in possession of a highly detailed document from the U.S. association of university registrars that defined what things should appropriately be recorded on transcripts, and that document would be studied carefully.

A member agreed that co-curricular activities were very important elements of a university education, but she thought it was more appropriate that such elements be recorded on students' resumés rather than on their academic transcripts. That would enable students to craft their resumés in such a way as to highlight the achievements that were of particular importance to the potential program or the potential employer. It was not the role of the University to present such information.

(c) Comparison of students. A member expressed concern about how students who came from institutions or divisions without transcript notations would be compared to those who had an opportunity to earn them at the University of Toronto. Readers of transcripts from outside the University, in particular, might not understand that some students had the opportunity to earn such notations whereas others did not. Professor Regehr agreed that it was important to maintain a balance in order to ensure a degree of consistency. On the other hand, she would be very pleased to provide the opportunity for University of Toronto students to have the opportunity to earn a competitive advantage.

(d) Decisions about recognition of programs for transcript notations. A member referred to the third category of programs that could be recognized by means of a transcript notation: "a defined series of non-credit courses, workshops, and activities that support student academic success or professional development goals directly associated with an academic program of study." He thought it important to define how decisions would be made on requirements for transcript notations according to that criterion.

       The Chair remarked that the discussion had been a good one. A great deal of work would no doubt follow before a Policy was brought forward for approval.

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND
PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

**7.   John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design: Degree
Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Architectural Studies**

            Professor Regehr said that the proposal now before the Committee was one of a
number of exciting new developments concerning the John H. Daniels Faculty of
Architecture, Landscape, and Design (FALD). The Academic Board had, at its previous
meeting, considered an Interim Project Planning Report for the Faculty's move to a new
location – the historic original Knox College building at 1 Spadina Crescent. The current
proposal was to move the Honours Bachelor of Arts Program, taught by faculty members in
the Daniels Faculty or Architecture, Landscape and Design, from the Faculty of Arts and
Science to FALD. While the students would register in the FALD, the faculty members
teaching the courses, and the program itself, would remain unchanged. The Faculty did not
currently offer an undergraduate program. For it to do so, it was necessary that its degree
requirements, based on stated degree-level expectations, be formally approved. The
degree-level expectations, like the program requirements, would remain unchanged.

            Invited to comment, Dean Sommer said that the Faculty of Architecture,
Landscape, and Design had for many years until late in the 1990s offered undergraduate
programs leading to qualification as professional architects or landscape architects. When
the decision had been taken to elevate the professional program to the graduate level, the
Faculty had wished to maintain its participation in undergraduate teaching, but it did not
have the faculty complement to offer a full undergraduate program. It had therefore
participated by offering the liberal arts major program in architectural studies. Since that
time, the Faculty had built up its complement of full-time tenure-stream faculty, and it
was moving both to expand its graduate program, including doctoral-level studies, and its
undergraduate program, assuming full responsibility for the undergraduate major program
in Architectural Studies.

            Three matters arose in discussion.

(a) Outlook for graduates. A member noted that the Faculty's training of professional
architects and landscape architects would continue to be provided at the graduate level.
What would graduates of the undergraduate program do? Professor Sommer replied that
the graduate programs were unique in Canada in that they were self-contained, requiring
no particular undergraduate preparation. However, he anticipated that many of the
students who completed the undergraduate liberal-arts program would then enter the
graduate program to train for professional qualification. They might also enter such other
fields as geography, planning, real estate, and public administration.

(b) Student support. Mr. Thwainy, President of the Bachelor of Arts Architectural
Studies Student Society, said that an important benefit of the proposal was that students
would be able to identify themselves as students in the John H. Daniels Faculty of
Architecture, Landscape and Design, where most of their professors taught. At the same

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

7.   **John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design: Degree Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Architectural Studies** (Cont'd)

time, they would be able to continue to take courses, outside of their Major, in the Faculty of Arts and Science. It would also be useful to have a single point of contact for their administrative needs. Currently, students had to deal with both their College Registrars and their advisor in FALD.

(d) Tuition fee. In response to a question, it was noted that there would be no change in students' tuition fees arising from the proposed change.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Faculty-level Honours Bachelor of Arts degree requirements for the Major Program in Architectural Studies, as outlined in the proposal to transfer that program from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, be approved, effective September 1, 2012.

8.   **University of Toronto Mississauga and Faculty of Information: Interactive Digital Media Specialist Program**

Professor Regehr said that the proposal represented a unique collaboration between the University of Toronto Mississauga and the Faculty of Information to develop an exciting new undergraduate program for students. She noted that the proposal was the first to be brought forward under the new provisions of the University's Quality Assurance Process, which called for an external appraisal of the proposed curriculum before the proposal was forwarded for approval. The appraiser's suggestions had been incorporated into the proposal now before the Committee. The proposal was therefore a landmark one in a number of ways. Professor Mullen expressed her gratitude for the very creative external appraisal of the proposal.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Specialist Program in Interactive Digital Media, as described in the proposal dated February 1, 2011, be approved, effective July 1, 2011.

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

9.   **Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: PhD Program in Biomedical Engineering – Establishment of a Concentration in Clinical Engineering**

        Professor Regehr said that the proposed new concentration in clinical engineering in the doctoral program in Biomedical Engineering represented an exciting proposal that responded to a high level of demand among students in, and alumni of, the masters program in the field offered by the Institute for Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering. The concentration would meet an emerging need for research clinical engineers within hospital research institutes, universities and the medical device industry.

        On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

                YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

                The proposed concentration in Clinical Engineering within the Ph.D. Program in Biomedical Engineering, as described in the Major Modification Proposal dated March 13, 2011, effective July 1, 2011.

10.   **Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Minor Program in Robotics and Mechatronics**

        Professor Regehr said that the proposed new Minor Program in Robotics and Mechatronics, like the Minor Program in Engineering Business approved earlier in the year, would provide a valuable additional option for students within the undergraduate program in Applied Science and Engineering.

        A member referred to the statement in the cover memorandum that "there are no new/additional financial resources at the University level required to implement the proposed minor." He observed, however, that the recent introduction of other minors in Applied Science and Engineering, including the Sustainable Energy Minor and the Minor in Bioengineering, had caused a very large increase in enrolment in the courses required by the new Minor. In some cases, courses with an enrolment of 15 – 20 students had grown to an enrolment of hundreds. The outcome had been a reduction in the quality of learning for each student. That appeared to the member to be a very significant planning and resource implication.

        Professor Corman said that the enrolment increase in a particular course(s) would be accompanied by a shift of enrolment from other courses. The overall financial cost, therefore, would not be affected, especially beyond the level that could be handled internally by the Faculty. That did not, of course, mean that there would not be implications for individual courses and students.

REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011

10. **Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Minor Program in Robotics and Mechatronics** (Cont'd)

Professor Damaren said that the Faculty did not anticipate enrolment shifts of the extent noted by the member on some previous occasions. Professor Regehr urged that Professor Damaren draw the member's comment to the attention of the officers in the Faculty. It would be very useful for the Faculty to consider the matter.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed Minor Program in Robotics and Mechatronics, as described in Report 3283 from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, effective July 1, 2011.

11. **Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded member that the final regular meeting of the academic year was scheduled for **Monday, May 16, 2011**. She would be out of Toronto and unable to attend, and Professor McDougall would be in the Chair.

The meeting adjourned at 6:29 p.m.

_____   _____
Secretary   Chair

May 9, 2011

59288