

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**September 21, 2010**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, September 21, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)	Professor Robert Gibbs
Professor Douglas McDougall (Vice-Chair)	Ms Emily Holland
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs	Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean, School of Graduate Studies	Mr. Rashi Maharaj
Professor Maydianne Andrade	Professor Emeritus Michael R. Marrus
Professor Robert L. Baker	Mr. Liam Mitchell
Mr. Hanif Bayat-Movahed	Professor Michelle Murphy
Professor Katherine Berg	Mr. James Yong Kyun Park
Ms Annie Claire Bergeron-Oliver	Professor Ito Peng
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio	Ms Judith Poë
Professor Christopher Damaren	Mr. Shakir Rahim
Professor Karen D. Davis	
Professor Charles Deber	

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan

Regrets:

Professor Alister Cumming	Professor Njoki Wane
---------------------------	----------------------

In Attendance:

Professor William Gough, member, the Governing Council; Chair, Department of Physical and Environmental Science, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Professor Kate Brand, Acting Assistant to the Dean, Policy and Planning, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
Professor Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Ms Leslie Lewis, Assistant Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough  
Mr. Scott Moore, Quality Assessment Officer, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Amy Mullin, Interim Vice-Principal Academic and Dean, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Professor Julia O'Sullivan, Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Professor Jeanne Watson, Chair, Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council  
Mr. Anwar Kazimi, Committee Secretary, Office of the Governing Council

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report 146 (May 11, 2010) was approved.

**2. Calendar of Business, 2010-11**

The Chair said that the Calendar of Business showed the annual items planned to come before the Committee over the course of the year. It was subject to change. The timing might not be precise. Changes might arise for a variety of reasons, including the emergence of new priorities and issues. Additional items – in particular proposals from the academic divisions – were likely to come forward as the year progresses. Professor Regehr added that she anticipated that a number of items would be added to the Calendar of Business as the academic year progressed.

**3. Approvals under Summer Executive Authority, 2010**

The Chair said that each year, the Governing Council delegated authority to the President of the University, with the concurrence of the Chair of the Governing Council, to approve certain urgent matters that arose in the summer when the Council and its Committees did not meet. Any approval under summer executive authority was to be reported to the appropriate Board or Committee for information. The Chair reported that there had been no matters within the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs approved under summer authority.

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I**

**Chair's Remarks**

The Chair said that the Committee would, beginning in 2010-11, deal with reviews of academic programs and units in two meetings. In addition to the reviews now before the Committee, further reviews would be considered in the spring term.

The Chair recalled that each reading team had been asked to deal with three questions. The first question was intended to reassure members that the summary they had received accurately reflected the full review: were there any issues raised in the review report that were either (i) not presented in the summary, or (ii) not presented with

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

sufficient stress? Second, did the administrative response address all of the issues identified in the review? Or, for very recently completed reviews, did the response present a plan for moving forward to address those issues? Finally, was there need for the Committee to consider action? Were there any matters that the Committee should consider? Was there need to ask that the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs bring forward a follow-up report– either a formal report in a year’s time or an informal oral report containing additional information, perhaps as part of the “Reports of the Administrative Assessors” made to the Committee at each meeting? Was there need to draw the review to the attention of the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board? If the lead readers were satisfied that the summary was complete and that all issues had been addressed, they were asked simply to report those facts. There would be no need to summarize the review report or to comment further. The Deans responsible for the various units and programs were in attendance to respond to any questions or concerns.

The Chair said that the compendium of reviews, and a record of the Committee’s discussion of them, was forwarded to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board. If the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs took the view that there were unresolved issues that should be considered by the Agenda Committee, the Chair would ensure they were reflected in the Committee’s minutes or report. The Agenda Committee would (on the basis of this Committee’s recommendation) 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 job of the Governing Council, led by this Committee, was not to manage the review process, but rather to ensure that the Provost’s Office was managing it well and ensuring the necessary steps were being taken to address any problems and to achieve improvements. The reviews dealt with many factors including academic and administrative complement, research and scholarly activity, infrastructure, and governance. However, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and its reading teams, were asked to focus their attention on the discussion of the quality of academic programs rather than on any administrative issues noted in the units.

A member observed that issues addressed in a unit’s self-study might not be addressed in the review of the unit. How would such issues be considered? Professor Regehr replied that such issues might be addressed in one or more of several ways. First, most issues arising from self-studies would indeed be picked up by reviewers. The reviewers met with the relevant Dean or other commissioning officer and with the Vice-Provost, who identified issues within the unit. Second, the Dean was able in her or his administrative response to address issues not raised in the review but deemed to be important. Third, each Dean met annually with the Vice-President and Provost and

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

others from her Office to review academic and budget issues, and any issues arising from self-studies could be identified. Fourth, divisions prepared five-year strategic plans, identifying their goals. The plans were prepared by the Deans and others in the unit, and again would normally deal with any substantial issues raised in self-studies. Indeed, issues could arise not only in self-studies but in the course of events between years in which self-studies and reviews were conducted, and Deans would normally address such issues when they did arise.

**Vice-Provost's Remarks**

Professor Regehr said that the quality assurance process in Ontario was in a state of transition, and she briefed the Committee on where the process stood at this time. The revised *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units* had been approved by the Governing Council in June 2010. The University's Quality Assurance Process (the UTQAP) had at the same time been submitted to the Governing Council for information. It had also been submitted to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) for approval. The University was currently awaiting a response from the Quality Council. A number of the changes proposed in the Quality Assurance Process would require changes to the University's governance process and, subject to the approval of the Quality Council, those changes would be submitted to the Governing Council for approval later in the fall.

Professor Regehr reported that a substantial number of changes would be implemented in the new process. First, reviews, which had previously been submitted to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs annually, would be submitted twice each year. Doing so would allow more time for Committee discussion and would enable more timely receipt of reviews. Second, reviews had previously been submitted on a slip-year basis to enable Deans to complete their responses and to begin implementation of changes. Henceforward, reviews would generally be presented to the Committee within six months of their completion. Third, the self-study process had been changed from that previously required by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. The objective of the changes was to encourage candid, critical analyses and reviews, not simply asking whether particular programs merited approval but rather pointing out areas of strength and areas where improvements were required. Fourth, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs would be able henceforward to request follow-up reports on areas of concern, which reports would be provided in one year's time. Professor Regehr hoped that there would not be need for such reports in many cases because a large number would cause a substantial backup in the Committee's work, but the option would be an important one in a few cases. Already one Dean had requested the opportunity to make a follow-up report on a review, which report would be considered by AP&P at a future meeting.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

Professor Regehr noted that a number of changes would require attention in the coming year. First, there would be need to revise the governance process for the approval of new programs. That would require amendment of the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. It would also require corresponding amendments to the constitutions of the academic divisions. Second, the documentation concerning reviews would change to conform with the more structured approach of the UTQAP. (The documentation before the Committee for this meeting followed the guidelines used for the documentation submitted to the Committee in previous years.) The new documentation would include data sets and benchmarks that will be common to all units. Manuals containing clear guidelines would be prepared to assist units in developing proposals for new programs and in conducting reviews.

**Provostial Review****Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering**

The spokesperson for the Committee's lead readers reported that the reading team had been most impressed with the review of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. They had found the summary of the review to be accurate and the administrative response to be thorough and satisfactory. Their questions dealt with a number of specific matters. Had the Faculty's governance been strengthened since the previous review, which had included negative comments on the operations of the Faculty Council? Was the new hybrid budget model which the Faculty had recently implemented proving to be successful? Professor Amon responded to those and other questions.

**(a) Faculty governance.** Professor Amon confirmed that the Faculty had been working to strengthen its system of governance over the past four years, and she reported that during that time there had been no difficulty in achieving quorum for Faculty Council meetings. Following the completion of the Faculty's self-study, it had been decided that the existing governance model continued to be appropriate. While a few changes had been made to the structure of the Faculty Council's standing committees, and while efforts had been made to encourage strengthened leadership, significant alteration had been deemed unnecessary.

**(b) Space.** A member referred to concerns about limited space within the Faculty, an issue that the reviewers had not had sufficient time to study. Professor Amon said that a thorough space audit had been completed, and a thoughtful evaluation of the Faculty's space needs had been included in the Faculty's self-study.

**(c) Faculty budget model.** Professor Amon said that the Faculty's new budget model, which had been put into place in July 2010, was a hybrid model. It followed the University's budget model to the extent that was reasonable, delegating to the departments

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

and institutes autonomy to manage their budgets and therefore providing incentives to increase revenues and contain costs. However, the model also recognized historical commitments to departments given that certain on-going expenses such as salaries for tenured faculty members did not change as quickly as student enrolments. Every effort was being made to incorporate incentives for entrepreneurship and cost constraint, promoting both accountability and transparency, in line with the University budget model. There would be ongoing assessment of the model, particularly at the end of the second year of its implementation, in 2012.

**(d) Copies of final examinations to students.** Professor Amon had been surprised to learn that students were required to pay administrative fees in order to receive a copy of their final examinations and also to have them reread. Professor Amon stated that her office had been working on determining the origin of the fees, which appeared to reflect University-wide requirements. The Faculty would explore more fully solutions that would meet both student and administrative needs. In the interim, copies of all final exams would be made and returned to students. Given the University-wide origin of this requirement, Professor Amon urged that the Committee, or some other appropriate University body, consider the matter.

**(e) Research opportunities for undergraduate students.** A member noted that the reviewers had suggested that efforts should be made to encourage more undergraduate students to become involved in the Summer Internship Program and in research opportunities. The member noted that the administrative response had suggested that the reviewers might not have fully appreciated the extent of the experience opportunities fostered by the Faculty, but he also noted that the administrative response did speak of the desirability of “increasing opportunities for students to engage in research work over the summer.” Professor Amon replied that extensive progress had been made in both areas over the past three years. The Faculty had collected and provided information about summer research activities, had provided funding for some opportunities to add to the funding already in place, and had arranged a Research Day at which students would make presentations on the outcome of their summer research. A substantial proportion of students had been participating in the Professional Experience Year (which included placements over two summers), in the Engineering Summer Internship Program, and in summer research programs. The Faculty was therefore working to determine the extent of demand for further opportunities. She noted, as an example, that about 24 students from the Indian Institutes of Technology had visited the University during the past summer, and the Faculty had experienced no difficulty in finding summer research placements for all of them.

Professor Regehr urged that the substantial discussion that had taken place concerning discreet individual matters not obscure the fact that the review, by three very

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010**

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

high-level individuals, had been an exceptionally positive one, stressing the excellent, leading-edge work of the faculty and the excellent programs offered to exceptionally well-qualified students. While there were steps that should be taken, overall the Faculty had received a stellar review. Professor Regehr congratulated Professor Amon and the Faculty on its very positive review. The Chair stated the Committee's view that there were no unresolved matters with respect to the review of the Faculty that required follow-up.

**Divisional Reviews**

**Faculty of Arts and Science: Aboriginal Studies Program**

The spokesperson for the lead readers commented that the review had been most insightful and had been a pleasure to read. She noted that there had been only one reviewer – something that could always lead to a perspective based on the particular interests of that reviewer. All of the matters raised in the review had been addressed in the administrative response with one exception; the response had not identified specific sources of the funding necessary for the further development of the Aboriginal Studies Program recommended by the reviewer. The reviewer had recommended a “thorough review of the curriculum.” The reading team endorsed that recommendation, suggesting that the review be completed when two members of the core faculty return from leave and would be able to participate. The reading team encouraged the unit to preserve the quality of its Program as it expanded.

Discussion focused on the following matters.

**(a) Number of reviewers.** Professor Peng noted that it was sometimes difficult to identify experts in specialized fields to serve as external reviewers for the University's smaller programs, making the appointment of more than one reviewer a challenge. Professor Regehr stated that, under the new University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP), all undergraduate programs would be reviewed by two individuals and graduate programs would be reviewed by three people.

**(b) Funding for the program.** Professor Peng reported that the Faculty of Arts and Science as a whole was engaged in a strategic planning process, and the review had been submitted before the completion of that process. She did understand, however, that the Faculty's Strategic Planning Committee (S.P.C.), had made a favourable recommendation with respect to the needs of this program.

**(c) Curriculum review.** Professor Peng agreed that it would be important that all core faculty within the Aboriginal Studies Program be engaged in any curriculum review process, including in particular the two faculty members who were currently on leave.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010**

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

A member noted the reference in the review to the perceptions of some students that courses grounded in aboriginal perspectives were “at odds with courses they encounter in other areas of their curriculum.” He hoped that the observation did not mean that courses in the program did not adopt scientific standards of objectivity. Another member urged that aboriginal perspectives pursued in the curriculum not exclude other perspectives, including critical perspectives, of the subject matter. Professor Peng and Professor Regehr said that the program was committed both to examining issues of importance to aboriginal Canadians and to maintaining high standards of scholarship. Two members stressed that the review had spoken of “perspectives” in the plural, and that there should be no conclusion that the program’s courses took some single approach. The Chair and Professor Regehr said that any major changes arising from the Program’s curriculum review would come before the Committee.

**Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics**

The spokesperson for the reading team commended the summary, which had captured the essence of the very thorough review of the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, and she congratulated the Department on its achievements. (The reviewers had concluded that the Department “continues to flourish in a culture of academic excellence that leads to world-class status in the field . . . . The remarkably collegial environment contributes to a high morale among faculty, staff and students.”) She said that the administrative response had by and large addressed the concerns identified by the external reviewers. However, certain matters might have been addressed in greater depth. For example, there was need for a fuller response to the issue of graduate student recruitment. Perhaps the response had been limited because the matter was a University-wide issue rather than one contained within the Department or the Faculty of Arts and Science. The reviewers had stressed the importance of providing adequate support to this small Department, where the addition of even one lecturer would constitute a 10% increase in its faculty complement. The reading team was disappointed that the reviewers, while noting the highly positive results of student course evaluations, had not met with undergraduate students.

Professor Peng observed that the review was a very strong and a very positive one. She believed that the administrative response had addressed all of the reviewers’ recommendations. With respect to graduate-student recruitment, the issue was indeed one that had to be addressed on a University-wide basis. With respect to faculty complement in the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, the Faculty of Arts and Science Strategic Planning Committee had, in harmony with the reviewers’ recommendations, proposed the allocation of two new faculty positions to the Department. Using those new positions to make appointments jointly with the new Dunlap Institute and with the Canadian Centre for Theoretical Astrophysics could result in a significantly larger number of faculty in the combined groups.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010**

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

Committee discussion focused on two matters.

**(a) Graduate student recruitment.** A member said that graduate-student recruitment was a University-wide challenge that had been cited in a number of reviews. He asked where the matter should be addressed and what could be done to address it. Another member suggested that, while the root of the problem might be financial, it would still be appropriate for the Committee to raise the issue, which should be addressed at a higher level, given the impact of student recruitment on the quality of academic programs.

Professor Corman acknowledged that graduate-student recruitment was problematic across the University, and the basis of the problem was the University's difficulty in offering competitive levels of financial support to all graduate students. In the previous year, Professor Corman had met with each graduate unit and had learned that they all shared a concern about their inability to be competitive in attracting outstanding international students because of inadequate funding. There were similar concerns with respect to the recruitment and support of domestic students, although they were not as severe.

Another member suggested that the issue was broader than a University of Toronto one. The basis of the problem was the inadequacy of government funding for graduate students. It was essential that there be ongoing institutional lobbying as well as individual pressure on government to draw attention to the University's concern. In particular, federal research granting agencies should be encouraged to provide competitive levels of support to the graduate students working on grant-funded research projects.

**(b) Tri-campus aspects.** A member urged that summaries of reviews make clear whether the reviewers had consulted with the chairs of the departments on all three campuses with respect to graduate programs. Professor Regehr replied that the need for such consultations would be included in the material provided to the reviewers.

The Chair said that while the review had included recommendations for the Faculty and the Department to consider, the review overall was a very good one, and a follow-up report was not required.

**Faculty of Arts and Science: Woodsworth College Employment Relations Program**

The representative of the Committee's reading team said that the review had been very thorough and positive. (According to the summary, the reviewer had commended the program for its "high quality, breadth and depth, student satisfaction, engagement of faculty members, facilities and its contribution to the integration of human resources and labour relations.") The

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

summary was a good reflection of the review report, and the administrative response had addressed all issues thoroughly. There were no issues that required the attention of the Committee.

**Faculty of Arts and Science: Centre for Environment**

The spokesperson for the Committee's lead readers said that while the summary of the review of the Centre for Environment had touched on all of the main points, the tone of the review had been more urgent than that of the summary. The administrative response had addressed all identified issues. However, the reading team felt that greater clarity could have been provided when commenting on some matters, particularly the four options for the Centre's future that the reviewers had outlined. The reviewers had indicated a preference for two of the proposed options: the establishment of a School of Environment, or the establishment of a School of Environment along with a University-wide commitment to the study of environment. In contrast, the Centre and the Faculty of Arts and Science believed that strengthening the Centre in accordance with its original plans was a better option. The administrative response indicated that decisions could not be taken because of the need to await the conclusion of discussions with the Faculty of Forestry. However, the administrative response did not make clear the nature of those discussions and the effect they could have on the future of the Centre for Environment. As well, there had been some question as to whether the suggestion of a School for Environment would be a University-wide matter that was beyond the scope of the review.

The reading team recommended that a follow-up report on the Centre be provided to the Committee in one year, following the conclusion of discussions with the Faculty of Forestry. An issue that should be included in the follow-up report concerned the reviewers' recommendation that the University establish a graduate program associated with the Centre, with direct entry at the PhD level. The administrative response had stated that it would make more sense for a stand-alone graduate program to start at the Master's level. The spokesperson for the reading team expressed some concern that the reviewers had not given sufficient recognition to the growing role of studies of environment across the University. For example, the review had made no mention of the minor program in environmental engineering now offered by the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

Professor Peng concurred with the reading team's recommendation for a follow-up report. Because the discussions with the Faculty of Forestry had been continuing at the time, it had been difficult to provide a definitive response concerning the future direction of the Centre for Environment. Professor Regehr recalled that, in March, the Committee had received the review of the Faculty of Forestry, and it had been informed of the establishment of a Faculty Working Group charged with considering future organizational arrangements for the Faculty. The Working Group had not yet reached its conclusions.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

The Chair stated the Committee's view that a follow-up report on the Centre for Environment should be provided.

**Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Spanish and Portuguese**

The spokesperson for the Committee's lead readers said that the summary had accurately reflected the review of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, and the administrative response had addressed the questions raised in the review. The reviewers had identified one problem that caused them concern. The current review, like the 2004 review, had referred to the pressures pointed out by students in the one-year M.A. program, who were required to complete eight half courses over one academic year and who were also expected to serve as teaching assistants. The reviewers had recommended that the program be expanded to two years and that a thesis requirement be added. The Department and the Dean had declined to accept the recommendation, pointing to (a) the lack of financial means to provide guaranteed funding packages for the M.A. students for a two-year program, and (b) the additional workload that would be required of an already stretched faculty complement in the Department. The Department had proposed to extend the program to include course work in the summer, but the program would still be more compressed than the reviewers had recommended.

Professor Peng replied that she did not accept that extending an M.A. program atypically to two years was necessarily the appropriate response in this case. She would, however, report the members' concern to the Chair of the Department. Professor Corman said that there were many excellent external scholars engaged in the process of reviewing the University's programs, and they made many recommendations that were greatly valued by the University. In some cases, however, there were suggestions that were not found to be appropriate or to be possible in the circumstances. It was, therefore, the responsibility of the Department, the Faculty and the University as a whole to determine whether to implement recommendations.

The Chair in summarized the Committee's view that there were issues that had been clearly articulated, but that a follow-up report was not required.

**Faculty of Medicine: Department of Molecular Genetics**

The representative of the Committee's lead readers said that all of the issues raised in the review had been reported accurately in the summary, and all of those issues had been dealt with in the administrative response, with plans in place to deal with each matter. The lead readers took the view that there was no need for a follow-up report.

A member referred to problems arising from the fact that the faculty members in the Department of Molecular Genetics were dispersed geographically among five nodes.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010**

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

Professor Whiteside replied that the dispersion of faculty was a significant factor in many departments in the Faculty of Medicine. In this case, faculty were located on campus in the Medical Sciences Building as well as off campus at the Hospital for Sick Children and the Lunenfeld Institute in the Mount Sinai Hospital. In addition, new recruits had been located in the Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research. The geographical dispersion could be an issue, because it was a very important challenge to engage faculty and students together in scholarly exchanges. An on-going seminar series, including presentations by graduate students, had been put into place, and the rotation of graduate students among nodes was being instituted, with students increasingly becoming the best ambassadors to bring the nodes together. That rotation was also proving to be very valuable in helping students to feel a part of a more unified Department. Nonetheless, the matter did represent an on-going issue that would require continuing attention.

Professor Whiteside noted that the two external reviewers had been among the most effective reviewers she had worked with. One very important issue they had raised – one that should be of concern to the University as a whole – was the need to increase the stipends for graduate students to a level commensurate with the cost of living in Toronto.

The Chair concluded that the Committee saw no need for a follow-up with respect to the review.

**Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE): Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology**

One of the Committee's lead readers reported that that the summary of the review of the Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology had been well done, and the administrative response had adequately addressed the issues identified. The members of the reading team and one other Committee member drew attention to certain questions raised in the review.

**(a) Combination of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology within one department.** The reviewers had observed that the combination of adult education and counselling psychology in one department at OISE was unique in North America. The reviewers had concluded that, because of the Department's focus on adults in the community (rather than children in schools), the combination of the two programs made sense. The member questioned whether such a pairing was the most appropriate one. In particular, he questioned whether, given the other psychology programs in the University, this combined Department was the best place for a program in counselling psychology. Professor O'Sullivan replied that the current Department was a very strong one, but the question was one that would be considered in OISE's major academic planning process that would begin in the near future.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

**(b) Budget model and cross-departmental collaboration.** A member of the reading team pointed out the reviewers' concern that the devolved budget model was "thought by some to work against cross-departmental/interdisciplinary collaboration." Professor O'Sullivan replied that the reviewers' concern would also be addressed in the academic planning process.

**(c) Mentoring of new faculty.** A member of the reading team referred to the reviewers' recommendation for a formal mentoring program for new faculty to assist them with the tenure process. The program would replace a less formal one that was apparently not operating as well as might be desired. Professor O'Sullivan replied that the proposal was under discussion in OISE. The recommendation was one that would be best considered not only by the Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology but by the OISE community as a whole.

**(d) Research-stream and professional graduate programs.** A member referred to the reviewers' observation of the discrepant treatment of OISE students in graduate programs designated as research-stream and others in sometimes-similar graduate programs intended to prepare students for professional practice. The former received guaranteed funding packages and the latter did not. Given the cost of funding packages, there was a tendency to admit fewer students to the research-stream programs and more to the professional programs. While the problem was not unique to OISE, the reviewers' report had been very helpful in drawing attention to the issue.

**(e) Counselling psychology program.** A member observed that certain other academic departments offered programs very similar to that in counselling psychology, including the Department of Psychiatry in the Faculty of Medicine and the Department of Psychology in the Faculty of Arts and Science, where the program included courses in clinical psychology. There was indeed a Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology in OISE. Given the University's general wish to achieve economies and consolidation, the member wondered whether the reviewers had considered the best place for the teaching of counselling psychology.

Professor Watson said that the question of the appropriate placement for the counselling psychology program was a philosophical one that could be debated at length. However, if one adopted a view of psychotherapy within a learning model rather than a disease model, then the program's placement within a faculty of education could be seen as entirely suitable. She stressed that graduates of the doctoral program in counselling psychology were accredited to practice by the Canadian Psychological Association.

In the course of discussion, Professor Regehr stressed that program planning began with individual academic divisions; programs were not imposed centrally by the Committee.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

The issue could be seen as a significant one that merited discussion, but that discussion would appropriately begin at the divisional level.

The Chair summarized the Committee's view that a follow-up report to the Committee was not required. The issues that had been raised would be explored further as part of OISE's academic planning process.

**University of Toronto Mississauga: Department of Anthropology**

The spokesperson for the Committee's lead readers said that the very strong review made it clear that the Department of Anthropology at the University of Toronto Mississauga was a very distinguished unit. The summary accurately reflected the review, and the administrative response dealt with all of the issues raised. There was, however, need for the Committee to consider a very fundamental question raised by the review, albeit one outside of the control of the Department: the issue of tri-campus relations within the University. The issue raised by the reviewers echoed one the member had observed frequently over the past twenty years. It was difficult for the University of Toronto Mississauga to secure the loyalty of graduate students to that campus, and it was difficult to satisfy properly the career aspirations of the excellent faculty in the Department of Anthropology solely on that campus. The root of the problem was the pull of the St. George Campus felt by faculty and graduate students. The specific problems cited were the long distance between the campuses, difficulties of commuting, and the attraction of guest lectures and other events taking place on the St. George Campus. Remedies suggested included improved inter-campus bus service, fare subsidies, and a richer program of events at UTM. The member had, however, heard such suggestions made over many years, but the University's most basic and difficult problem remained. The *Towards 2030* exercise had deferred offering proposals to solve the problem, as had the planning of many administrations in the past. The issue was a very difficult one in the light of the University's unique structure in North America: a unitary graduate school crossing the three campuses, combined with relatively autonomous undergraduate divisions on two major campuses apart from the central campus with student populations now amounting to more than 10,000 students at each. The issue, as cited in the review, was clearly an impediment to the quality of the work of an excellent Department at UTM, and the member had no solution to propose. He did, however, think it very important that the issue be placed on the table for discussion.

Another member of the reading team said that the member's point was a very good one, but the problem was not one that the Department of Anthropology at UTM could solve on its own. The broader problem should not distract attention from the fact that the review demonstrated the strength of an excellent department, and the administrative response to the reviewers' suggestions was a very good one. The member referred to the

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

reviewers' suggestion that the Department develop a long-term vision, suggesting that it begin with a retreat or two to develop ideas. Had that suggestion been taken into account? Would it be implemented by the Department's Curriculum Renewal Initiative?

Professor Mullin replied that the suggestion was very much on the table. The new Chair of the Department was providing means to foster full consultation within the Department, using the Department's Executive Committee and developing a well-articulated committee structure that would offer new faculty the opportunity for full involvement. The long-range planning effort would include, but not be limited to, the Curriculum Renewal Initiative.

With respect to tri-campus relations, Professor Mullin said that different Departments at UTM were approaching the matter in different ways, with some enjoying more success than others. The availability of Graduate Expansion Funds would be of great assistance. The funding would allow UTM Departments to bring more graduate students onto the Campus, which would enrich the experience of undergraduate students and would enable faculty to mentor more graduate students at UTM. The Department of Anthropology had applied for that funding and was manifesting considerable enthusiasm to take advantage of the opportunity. The outcome should be at least some measure of improvement.

A member reported that UTM graduate students were funded for transportation costs. In addition, teaching assistants who were not principally at UTM were reimbursed for their travel costs. The problem of transportation had, therefore, been dealt with. The Anthropology Graduate Students' Union at UTM was creating opportunities for graduate student participation in activities at UTM, and the undergraduate students union was in discussion about shared activities.

The Chair concluded that there was no need for a follow-up report with respect to this review. While the matter of tri-campus relations was a very important one, it was a broader matter and not one that could be solved within the context of the response to this review.

**University of Toronto Mississauga Forensic Science Program**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary of the report was a good one, accurately reflecting the "troubling" nature of the full report, in particular its serious concerns about the curriculum, faculty complement, space and facilities, and structure of the unit offering the program. The administrative response made clear that "the lack of a strong and broad research profile for the discipline within UTM, coupled with the quality of current teaching, highlight the need to rebuild the program entirely or

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

consider its termination.” The Interim Dean had therefore halted admission to the program and would in the forthcoming year explore the serious questions raised by the review. It was therefore clear that there was need for a follow-up report in one year’s time to deal with the outcome of the Dean’s exploration of those questions.

The reading team observed that there were major mismatches between the recommendations of the review and the administrative response. First, the review had recommended that forensic science be “established as a separate department” or have a “department-like structure.” The administrative response envisioned the program continuing to be housed within the Department of Anthropology. Second, the review recommended the elimination of the forensic psychology and forensic anthropology tracks within the program; the Departments of Psychology and Anthropology could consider establishment of separate degree tracks within their own programs. The administrative response foresaw the continuation of those tracks within the forensic science program.

The spokesperson said that the review raised a number of other questions. How should specialized programs be managed in the context of larger Departments? How should the University deal with specialized programs delivered largely by sessional lecturers who were practitioners, again in the context of a larger Department? How should the University make use of expert practitioners in the context of an institution that was research-intensive? What would be the broader implications if the University were to cease to offer a program in forensic science – a program that was presumably valuable for law-enforcement agencies.

Professor Mullin agreed that a follow-up report would be appropriate, particularly in view of the fact that UTM was considering whether to continue the program or to end it. She was concerned that there had been only a single reviewer in this case – a particular problem when the outcome of the review was so troubling. UTM did take the view that it would be appropriate for the program to be located within the Department of Anthropology. There was only one full-time faculty member with a strong commitment to the program, and she was a member of the Department of Anthropology. Professor Mullin was engaged in conversations with other Departments to determine whether they remained committed to the area of forensic science. They had previously been offered positions in the area, but they had not succeeded in hiring faculty in the area. It was now important to know if those Departments would retain a commitment to the area without new faculty appointments in it. Professor Mullin was engaging in consultations with the new Director of the program. The previous Director had resigned from the University, and the time was clearly appropriate for fundamental rethinking. When the program had been initiated at UTM, it was the only program in forensic science in Ontario. The societal consequences of discontinuing the program would now be much less, with a significant number of other programs in place at other universities and at colleges of

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

applied arts and technology. Professor Mullin had also been in discussion with the Centre for Forensic Science and Medicine in the Faculty of Medicine, which agreed that the program should either be substantially strengthened or closed. The program, in its present situation, would not advance the cause of forensic science in Ontario or in general.

A member observed that there were situations in the University where it might be appropriate to question the balance between (a) the teaching of practitioners and (b) research. In this case, there appeared to be no question of balance; there was very little contribution to research arising from the program. Professor Mullin agreed. The original vision had been a research-oriented program. That vision had not been fulfilled. Only one faculty member involved in the program, the Director, was engaged in research in the area. Others offering courses in the program were practitioners. While most had doctoral degrees, they were not pursuing research agendas.

A member stressed that there was more than one stream within the program, each of which had enjoyed different levels of success. The program in forensic chemistry was accredited by the Chemical Society of Canada, and two of the winners of that Society's undergraduate awards had been students in the forensic chemistry program. That program stream had clearly enjoyed a great deal of success.

A member asked whether it had been intended that the program would be a research-based one from the point of view of the faculty or of students. Professor Mullin replied that it had been planned that the faculty would be active researchers, and that fact would inform the nature of the program they offered to students.

The Chair stated that the review was one that would require a follow-up report in one year's time.

**University of Toronto Mississauga Department of Historical Studies**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary accurately reported on all of the key issues raised in the review. While the administrative response did deal with most of the issues raised by the reviewers, there were two important matters that were not addressed. First, the review had raised the matter of the direction of future academic appointments. The reviewers had recommended that forthcoming appointments be research-stream faculty. The Department already had a substantial number of teaching-stream faculty. Second, the reviewers had observed that the Department had not identified peer programs against which to benchmark the UTM programs. The spokesperson also noted the recommendation that UTM faculty offer more graduate courses on the UTM campus rather than on the St. George campus.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

Professor Mullin said that the Department was currently discussing future academic appointments. The likely outcome for a forthcoming appointment was to seek an individual in the teaching stream. Budgetary constraints might well require a sessional appointment. The Department's long-term objective was, however, to make further appointments into the research stream. With respect to benchmarking, the Department had some difficulty in identifying appropriate peers because of its interdisciplinary nature. While it was not neat, the Department could select partial peers – individual programs in such areas as classics, religion, gender studies and history. With respect to graduate courses, individual instructors and graduate departments were always welcome to offer courses on the UTM campus when they believed that they could attract sufficient enrolment. Graduate students could be deterred from taking courses at UTM because of the travel required and therefore the difficulty of fitting a UTM course into their schedules. Offering courses at UTM was, however, encouraged particularly in areas of distinctive strength where graduate students would be inclined to spend much of their time at UTM.

While a member thought that it would be useful to have a brief, oral follow-up report on those matters, the Chair concluded that the review was a good one and that recommendations were being dealt with. With the agreement of the Committee, she therefore did not request a follow-up report.

**University of Toronto at Scarborough – Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary was an accurate reflection of the review report. The review raised many substantive issues. While the administrative response did not deal with every aspect of the review, many of the issues were related and intertwined, and it was clear that the UTSC administration had taken action with respect to a number of those issues, and that it was in the process of dealing with others. Because there were several matters to be dealt with, the reading team had concluded that it would be appropriate for the Committee to receive a follow-up report in a year's time.

Dean Halpern said that he hoped and anticipated that UTSC would in time be on track in dealing with the issues that had emerged from the review. He wished to comment on three areas that had emerged as particularly important ones in the review. First, the undergraduate programs in chemistry and physics required immediate attention. In both cases, he had met with colleagues and with Professor Gough, the new Chair of the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences. While the challenges were somewhat different in the two disciplines, they shared one problem: the need for up-to-date equipment for teaching and research. UTSC had moved quickly and had devoted \$2.3-million to the purchase of new laboratory equipment and a further \$1.5-million to

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010****4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

laboratory renovation. That work was underway, and Professor Halpern expected it to be completed in the next few months. In March or April of 2011, it was expected that further space would become available in the original Science Wing, with the completion of the new Instructional Centre. The faculty in Physics had been working with the Chair on revision of the curriculum in that discipline. The outcome of that revision would be to enable Scarborough students to complete their entire programs on their own campus. Searches for new faculty were underway in both Chemistry and Physics. The Chemistry group had succeeded in appointing a senior colleague and searches would continue to provide an appropriate expansion of the faculty complement in the two disciplines.

Second, the review had been critical of governance in the Department. Professor Gough and his Office were working to establish a new constitution that would function effectively and that would play a key role in improving communications within the Department.

Third, the review had noted problems in the area of compliance with health and safety standards. A health and safety audit had been undertaken as quickly as possible. It had turned out that the problems were all of a minor nature, and all had been addressed.

Dean Halpern said that the Department was a leading one, and it had made University of Toronto history by being the first Department off the St. George Campus to host a graduate program – the highly successful Master of Environmental Studies program. Professor Gough had in a few short months succeeded in taking the Department to a new and higher level, and there was general enthusiasm for his work as Chair.

Discussion focused on the following topics.

**(a) Formation of new departments.** A member referred to a statement in another review referring to the likely formation of a new department of Astronomy and Physics at UTSC. Dean Halpern said that the faculty in Physics did favour forming a separate department. The formation of a separate department had been suggested by the fact that two new Departments were, at the time of the review, being formed by groups of faculty in the Department of Humanities. Dean Halpern had met with colleagues in Physics to discuss the issue. He took the general view that faculty members in individual disciplines should be permitted to form separate departments if there were sound academic and pedagogical reasons to do so. The UTSC administration had set out certain clear criteria for the formation of a separate department, which were described in the administrative response. Those criteria would include a commitment to protecting the programs offered to students jointly with the Department of Physical and Environmental Science. Professor Halpern was confident that the necessary steps were being taken in this case. It remained

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010**

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

an open question whether other groups within the Department would move to form separate departments. He anticipated that the question would continue to be considered in the course of future reviews of multi-disciplinary departments at UTSC.

**(b) Teaching resources.** A member observed that a major source of the problems appeared to be an absence of growth of resources to deal with the growth of enrolment in Department's courses. For example, in early-year Physics courses, most teaching assistants were upper-year undergraduates. Many of the courses in Physics were offered by sessional faculty. The problems in the Physics programs were in all probability the outcome of the absence of teaching by research-stream faculty assisted by graduate students.

Professor Halpern replied that it would be appropriate to keep separate the questions of the Department's resources and the staffing of its courses. UTSC was now, as the result of enrolment growth, in a strong position to augment the resources of all of its departments. That favourable situation had occurred after a long period of steady-state funding while UTSC struggled to adjust to the expansion of its enrolment. For the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, there was, however, still a problem of constrained space, which would be remedied over time. It was, as noted earlier, anticipated that further space would become available in March 2011 when the new Instructional Centre would open and space would become available in the original Science wing. In another three to five years, UTSC planned to have a new science research centre. In the absence of adequate space, UTSC could not attract first-rate research-stream faculty in the laboratory sciences; it was not at this time able to provide them with research-laboratory space. Therefore, UTSC had made a strategic decision to hire teaching-stream staff with contractually-limited term appointments. They would provide the basis for eventual hiring of research-stream faculty when research space would be available for them.

Professor Halpern said that UTSC was making every effort to move away from using senior undergraduate students as teaching assistants. It was seeking to attract graduate students from the tri-campus graduate departments.

**(c) Availability of a full curriculum in Physics at UTSC.** A member asked if a full program in Physics at UTSC would require the addition of a substantial number of courses with additional Physics faculty to teach them? Professor Halpern replied that the Physics curriculum would move from its current high degree of focus on Astrophysics to a broader range of areas. The additional faculty, to be engaged over a two-or three-year period when research space becomes available, would enable the offering of a full curriculum. Professor Gough added that the need would be coverage of third and fourth year courses, and the planned hiring in Physics would permit that need to be met.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010**

**4. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part I (Cont'd)**

The Chair concluded that it was the view of the Committee that a follow-up report would be appropriate in the case of this review.

**Review Process**

In the course of discussion, a member observed that the Committee's reading teams had found that the summaries, which were public documents, were sometimes less candid than the original review reports. The problem was that the summaries did not then flag the urgency of problems perceived by the reviewers. In the current year, and even more so in the new quality assurance process, the University was asking external reviewers to be candid and, where appropriate, critical. The member was not at all sure of how to balance the need to flag issues seriously requiring action and the wish to avoid the publication of statements that might be considered too critical and even actionable. Professor Regehr responded that under the new University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP), full review reports (apart from sections dealing with personnel matters) were to be considered public documents and would be submitted to the Committee. It would, however, be important to distinguish between the reports required by the Committee to understand the issues fully and the information published on the web. With the implementation of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process, an appropriate governance model would be developed.

**Chair's Concluding Remarks**

The Chair recalled that it was the consensus view of the Committee that it should receive follow-up reports to the reviews of three units where substantial structural changes were anticipated: the Faculty of Arts and Science Centre for Environment, the University of Toronto Mississauga Forensic Science Program, and the University of Toronto at Scarborough Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences. The Committee would also presumably see, in the usual course of events, plans for curriculum change in the Faculty of Arts and Science Aboriginal Studies Program.

The Chair thanked members for the very good job they had done in consideration of the reviews. The reports from the reading teams had been very good, and the discussion had been spirited and very useful.

**REPORT NUMBER 147 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – September 21, 2010**

**5. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for **Tuesday, November 9, 2010.**

The Secretary reported on plans for a new system for distribution of materials for future meetings. Members would cease to receive packages of printed materials. Rather materials would be made available to members electronically using the “Board Books” system, which was in increasingly wide use. Members could expect to hear from a representative of the company providing the system, who would offer a brief on-line training session on its use.

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

November 15, 2010