

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 173 OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**March 31, 2015**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, March 31, 2015 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth (Chair)  
Professor Maydianne Andrade (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Sioban Nelson, Vice-Provost,  
Academic Programs and Vice-  
Provost, Faculty and Academic Life  
Professor Locke Rowe, Vice-Provost,  
Graduate Research and Education,  
Dean of the School of Graduate  
Studies  
Ms Shakira Brathwaite  
Professor Markus Bussman  
Mr. Ken Chan  
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng  
Ms Stephanie Gaglione  
Professor Robert B. Gibbs

Professor Tara Goldstein  
Ms Jeannie Kim  
Professor Paul Kingston  
Ms Lorraine McLachlan  
Professor Emmanuel Nikiema  
Dr. Graeme W. Norval  
Professor Elizabeth Peter  
Professor Markus Stock  
Professor Vincent Tropepe  
Professor Sandy Welsh  
Ms Alena Zelinka

Mr. Richard Levin, Executive Director,  
Enrolment Services and University  
Registrar

**Regrets:**

Ms Halla Ahmed  
Professor Russell Pysklywec  
Professor Sonia Sedivy  
Professor Nhung Tuyet Tran

**Secretariat:**

Mr. Patrick F. McNeill

**In Attendance:**

Professor Heather Boon, Dean, Leslie N. Dan Faculty of Pharmacy  
Professor William Gough, Member of the Governing Council and Vice-Dean, Graduate  
Education and Program Development, University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC)  
Professor Allan Kaplan, Vice-Dean, Graduate and Life Sciences Education  
Professor Reid Locklin, Department for the Study of Religion, St. Michael's College  
Dr. Daniella Mallinck, Acting Director, Academic Programs, Planning and Quality  
Assurance  
Professor Don McLean, Dean, Faculty of Music  
Professor Faye Mishna, Dean, Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work  
Ms Teresa Nicoletti, Administrative Coordinator, Office of the Dean, FAS

Professor Justin Nodwell, Chair, Department of Biochemistry.  
Professor Donna Orwin, Chair, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures  
Professor Domenico Pietropaolo, Principal, University of St. Michael's College, and  
Director, Christianity and Culture Programs  
Professor Richard Sommer, Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape,  
and Design  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Acting Coordinator, Academic Planning and Reviews, Office of the  
Vice-Provost, Academic Programs  
Professor L. Trevor Young, Dean, Faculty of Medicine

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

The Chair welcomed members and guests to the meeting.

The Chair reminded members that the Committee had general responsibility for monitoring the quality of education and research activities within the University. Part of this responsibility, outlined in the *Accountability Framework for Cyclical review of Academic Programs and Units*, was to undertake a comprehensive overview of reviews of academic programs and units, monitoring the results of the reviews and administrative responses.

The Chair stated that the Committee's role with respect to Reviews was:

- to ensure that the reviews were conducted in line with the University's policy and guidelines, and to ensure that the Provost's Office had managed the review process appropriately;
- to ensure that all issues relative to the quality of academic programs had been addressed or that there was a plan to address them;
- to make recommendations concerning the need for a Follow-up Report, as necessary.

This was the second part of two parts when the Committee considered both Follow-up Reports and Reviews in 2014-15.

Professor Nelson reported that 56 Reviews had been completed since the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) had been implemented in 2011/12. Of those Reviews, the Committee had requested 17 Follow-up Reports, including the five being considered by the Committee at this meeting.

## **1. Follow-up Reports on Reviews**

### **a) Department of Biochemistry and its graduate programs (Faculty of Medicine)**

The Chair noted that this Follow-up Report was requested by the Committee at their meeting of on April 16, 2013. The Committee had asked for a two-year Follow-up Report regarding time-to-completion for the M.Sc. and Ph.D. programs, budget modelling, and strategic planning.

The Chair welcomed the Faculty representatives: Professor L. Trevor Young, Dean, Faculty of Medicine; Professor Allan Kaplan, Vice-Dean, Graduate and Life Sciences Education; and, Professor Justin Nodwell, Chair, Department of Biochemistry.

Professor Nelson reported that the Dean had outlined a strategic vision and identified several significant initiatives in order to generate new revenue and had plans to increase faculty complement. As well, the Dean had noted that the Associate Chair, Graduate Education would work to facilitate Departmental goals of reducing time-to-completion.

**b) Department of Psychology and its undergraduate programs (Faculty of Arts & Science)**

The Chair noted that the Committee, at its meeting of April 16, 2013, had requested the Dean to provide a two-year Follow-up Report about the Department's progress in managing over-enrolment in the programs through increased complement and decreased numbers of students enrolled in the major and specialist programs.

The Chair advised that Professor Sandy Welsh, Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Program Reviews, Faculty of Arts and Science, and member of AP&P, would represent the Dean.

Professor Nelson stated that the Department of Psychology had consulted with the Dean's Office to address the over-enrolment in its programs through the increase in faculty complement. Since the review, the Department's complement had been increased through six faculty appointments, which had contributed to reduced enrolment pressures.

**c) John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design (FALD) and its undergraduate and graduate programs**

The Chair noted that the Committee, at its meeting of April 1, 2014, requested a one-year Follow-up Report on the progress of the Faculty's reorganization and the cultivation of new faculty leadership. The Chair welcomed Professor Richard Sommer, Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design.

Professor Nelson stated that Dean Sommer had implemented a number of administrative and staff changes since its external review in order to ensure that the needs of the expanding FALD were well met, while cultivating a new generation of leadership among its faculty and staff. Organizational changes included new staffing in the Dean's Office and the Office of the Registrar and Student Services. As well, a new Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) had been appointed.

In addition, through growth within the FALD and promotions of several faculty with tenure, a new cohort of faculty had been brought into key leadership roles. New staff positions would be created to support them. Faculty had been appointed to chair key committees as a means of preparing them to assume further leadership roles in the future. A mentorship process for tenure-stream faculty had been developed.

**d) Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy and its undergraduate and graduate programs**

The Chair indicated that a Follow-up Report on the reorganization of the Faculty's administrative structure was requested by the Committee at its meeting of April 1, 2014.

The Chair welcomed Professor Heather Boon, Dean, Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy (LDFP).

Professor Nelson commented that the Faculty had undertaken a self-study and had begun to implement key administrative changes which were subsequently endorsed at a Faculty retreat in November, 2014. Dean Boon had appointed a new CAO and a Director for the Office of Experiential Education. A fully revised academic leadership structure would be undergoing an approval process and was expected to be in place shortly. It proposed the creation of three positions: Associate Dean for Research; Associate Dean for Education; and, Graduate Program Director. The administrative review and revitalization would continue over the next 12-18 months.

**e) University of Toronto Scarborough (UTSC) joint programs with Centennial College: Specialist in Journalism, Major in New Media Studies, and Specialist in Paramedicine**

The Chair reminded the Committee that at its meeting of April 1, 2014, three (3) Follow-up Reports were requested by the Committee regarding the programs' learning outcomes and an update on the integration of the UTSC and Centennial College teaching schedules for the New Media Studies program.

The Chair welcomed Professor Bill Gough, Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Program Development, UTSC.

Professor Nelson reported that UTSC and Centennial College had collaborated to develop a mission statement and program objectives for each program. This had included specific learning outcomes for the three programs (a description had been included in the agenda). Changes to the sequencing of program components had been made, in order to address the matter of better integration of the Major in New Media Studies teaching schedule. Beginning in 2015-16, students would spend much of year two at Centennial College to complete most of their New Media Studies program requirements.

A member commended the UTSC and Centennial College representatives for their work in clearly articulating the learning outcomes for each program.

**Follow-up Reports on Reviews – General Comments**

A member commented that though there were no specific questions by Committee members on any of the Follow-Up Reports (5) presented, this reflected that the Review process, including specifically the option to request a follow-up report, worked very well. He stated that he was impressed with how well each Dean's written response addressed

the questions raised previously by the Committee. The Chair noted the Committee's enthusiastic support of the member's remarks and stated she would inform the Deans in writing of the comments and thank them for their reports.

## **2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, Part II**

All reviews were brought forward to the Committee for information and discussion.

The Chair explained that three reviews would be considered. Of these, one was commissioned by the Vice-President and Provost and two were commissioned by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science. The submissions to the Committee included a summary of the reviews and the signed administrative response from the Dean, which highlighted implementation plans guided by reviewer recommendations.

The Chair noted that the Reviews had been distributed among three Reading Groups, and each group had been asked to address three questions:

1. *Did the summary accurately tell the story of the full review?*
2. *Did the administrative response address all issues identified?*
3. *Were there any questions, comments or substantive issues that the Committee should consider? Was there need to ask that the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs bring forward a follow-up report?*

The Chair said that for each Review, the leader of the Reading Group would be invited to comment on the Review, other members would be invited to comment, and Committee members would be invited to ask questions. The Chair would then indicate whether the Committee had identified any matters that should be brought to the attention of the Agenda Committee or whether a follow-up report to the Committee would be necessary.

Professor Nelson outlined the goals of the UTQAP, which were to:

- obtain expert advice of leaders in the field concerning academic and administrative issues;
- measure the University's performance against leading international programs; and,
- obtain guidance and input from peers on key strategic directions.

She added that the UTQAP Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plans (FAR/IPs) were prepared and submitted to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) each year. FAR/IPs captured the most prominent strengths and opportunities for development as noted by the external reviewers, the Dean's response and implementation plan, and the outcome of the Committee's discussion.

### **Review 1 - Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work (Provostial Review)**

The group leader reported that the summary accurately reflected the full review and the administrative response had addressed the main issues.

The group observed that this was a laudatory review and highlighted the reviewers' comments regarding the high-quality graduate programs, excellent faculty research and well-managed Faculty. The group raised several questions: (1.) What measures were in

place to correct any misconceptions regarding the availability of graduate student funding?; (2.) What percentage of PhD students received external funding?; (3.) Could the Dean address the issue of diversity?

Dean Mishna responded to each of these questions. She acknowledged that the funding process (financial support package) needed to be clarified. The composition of doctoral funding packages for the first two years of the minimum funding commitment had already been regularized. The funding commitment was in place for all five years and the Faculty would make it a priority to better communicate the composition of packages in subsequent years.

Dean Mishna commented that the PhD Program had been very successful in federal and province-wide SSHRC and OGS external award competitions. In the past 5 years (2009-2010 through 2013-2014), over 40% of PhD students received a SSHRC or an OGS for a yearly average of \$363,000.00 per year towards the PhD Guaranteed Funding commitment.

Dean Mishna stated that, as part of the admissions process, the Faculty undertook a great deal of outreach to ensure a diverse student make-up, particularly in the GTA. The Faculty currently offered five specializations within the Master of Social Work program, and it was working with the broader community to develop a sixth specialization in “Indigenous Trauma and Resiliency”.

The Chair thanked the group for its report and thanked Dean Mishna for her responses. The Committee did not request a Follow-up Report.

### **Review 2 - Faculty of Arts and Science: Christianity and Culture Programs (Decanal Review)**

The group leader noted the reviewers’ comments on the many important strengths of the program and stated that the summary and the administrative response had addressed many of the main issues. The group suggested that the summary include additional emphasis on the administrative and financial structural challenges, provide more detail about space and infrastructure needs and the establishment of a broad curriculum committee. With respect to the curriculum review process, the group commented that more than one retreat might be required.

The group asked the following questions: (1.) What options were being considered to address the recommendations around faculty? How could a post-doctoral fellow help?; (2.) What were the current and future student recruitment strategies?; (3.) Could there be further comment on state of communications about resource allocation between the Faculty of Arts & Science (FAS) and St. Michael’s College (SMC)?

Principal Pietropaolo responded to these questions. He stated that he found the review to be very constructive and, although it pointed out certain areas of weakness, it had also presented new opportunities and potential for growth. He stated that future retreats were planned.

Principal Pietropaolo explained that a post-doctoral fellow could play an important role by teaching and contributing to curriculum discussions and to the intellectual community. This was one preliminary way to address the reviewers' recommendations around faculty, which would be pursued further with the FAS. Principal Pietropaolo stated that given how recently the reviewers' report had been received, there were not yet any concrete plans regarding recruitment, but he would carefully consider the recommendations of the reviewers.

Principal Pietropaolo and Professor Welsh provided some additional background with respect to the relationship between the FAS and SMC noting the complexity of program planning and allocation of resources, including faculty recruitment/hiring and the flow of funds to ensure students received the support they needed. SMC was one of three federated universities that had an operating relationship with the University of Toronto.

Professor Nelson advised that she was chairing a committee to renew the operating agreement between U of T and the federated universities. The renewal of this agreement had provided an opportunity to achieve greater clarity on operating processes that affected the four entities.

The Chair thanked the group, Principal Pietropaolo and Vice Dean Welsh for their remarks. The Chair summarized the discussion for the Committee and the Committee requested a Follow-up Report in one year on curriculum renewal, faculty complement, student recruitment and the outcome of the Program Retreat(s).

### **Review 3 - Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and its programs (Decanal Review)**

The group leader reported that the summary and the administrative response had addressed all the main issues.

The group observed that this was a laudatory review and highlighted the reviewers' comments regarding the Department's research and successful initiatives. The group presented some collegial thoughts in two areas: graduate funding and department complement planning. The group asked the following questions: (1.) Could strategies for increasing graduate funding packages be identified?; (2.) Were there any general aspirations to build faculty in any specific areas or new areas?; (3.) How did the planning process tie into the Departments' academic plan; (4.) How would the Department address the lack of physical space?; and, (5.) Could the Department further articulate the graduate student recruitment strategy?

Professor Welsh responded on behalf of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. She stated that the issue of funding for graduate students continued to be part of an important conversation with all units. She noted that funded students in the Department received an average of \$36,000 per year, net of tuition, and that the Department was successful in competing for additional internal funding (i.e., Connaught Fund) for its graduate students and competed well in securing external funding through various international

competitions. Professor Orwin, Chair, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures added that the Department was well-positioned in the community (GTA) to raise funds.

Professor Orwin explained that, as the smallest department in the Faculty, there was a need to think creatively to build faculty and to be flexible to take advantage of any opportunities that might present themselves, while maintaining a complement of faculty to meet the needs of the Department's programs (e.g., linguistics), as part of the academic plan.

Professor Orwin advised that the current facilities would be renovated in the summer to improve public space.

Professor Welsh noted that major modifications to the Master's program had been undertaken to address the need for students to have a deep command and high proficiency in languages. Such changes helped in the recruitment process. Professor Orwin added that, as the only Slavic program in Canada, the Department recruited high quality candidates from across the country and internationally.

The Chair thanked the members of the group and Professors Orwin and Welsh. The Committee did not request a Follow-up Report.

The Chair thanked all the members of the Reading Groups and the entire Committee for their thoughtful commentary. She also thanked Dr. Mallinick and Ms Tan for assembling the Review Compendium.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and the items approved.

### **3. Minor Amendment: Standards of Professional Practice Behaviour for All Health Professional Students**

On a motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the amended *Standards of Professional Practice Behaviour for all Health Professional Students* be approved, effective immediately.

### **4. Report of the Previous Meeting:**

Report Number 172 of the meeting of February 19, 2015 was approved.

### **5. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the Report of the previous meeting.

**6. Date of Next Meeting** – Tuesday, May 12, 2015 at 4:10 p.m.

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting was scheduled for May 12, 2015 at 4:10 p.m.

**7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

Mr. Levin provided an update on admissions and noted that interest in the direct entry programs was strong and non-Ontario applications had increased. Like the previous year, the University Registrar's office was committed to sending out early admission offers.

**8. Other Business**

The Chair informed members that they would receive an evaluation survey as part of the agenda materials for the final meeting on May 12, 2015. Members would be asked to provide feedback on their experiences of having served on this Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

April 1, 2015