

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

March 31, 2009

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, March 31, 2009 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 Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic
Professor Jonathan Freedman, Deputy
Provost
Professor Gage Averill
Professor Katherine Berg
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Professor Elizabeth Cowper
Professor Robert Gibbs
Professor William Gough
Ms Jacqueline Greenblatt
Ms Emily Greenleaf

Professor Lesley Ann Lavack
Professor Rhonda Love
Professor Hy Van Luong
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth
Ms Lynn Snowden
Miss Maureen J. Somerville
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Mr. John David Stewart

Non-Voting Assessor:

Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-
President, Research

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Luc F. DeNil
Ms Anne Guo
Ms Jenna D. Hossack
Mr. Joseph Koo

Professor Ato Quayson
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Ms Charlene Saldanha

In Attendance:

Mr. Andrew Dale Brown, Senior Vice-President, Education, University of Toronto
Medical Society
Ms Melissa Berger, Planning and Program Officer, Office of the Dean, University of
Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Robin Elliott, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Music
Professor Glen Jones, Acting Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President
and Provost
Ms Daniella Mallinick, Assistant to the Dean, Policy and Planning, Ontario Institute
for Studies in Education
Professor Jay Rosenfield, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education, Faculty of Medicine
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Vic Timmer, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, Faculty of Forestry

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Ms Linda Vranic, Director, Operations, Office of the Vice-President, Research
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions
and Dean, Faculty of Medicine

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report 139 (March 3, 2009) was approved.

2. Faculty of Medicine, Undergraduate Program in Medicine: Grading Practices

Professor Hillan reported that the Faculty of Medicine proposed a change to its grading practice with respect to transcripts for students in its Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) program. The Faculty currently recorded grades using three intervals: honours, pass or fail. It proposed to move to a two interval system: credit or no credit. The two-interval system was used in almost all other medical programs in Canada. The proposed change was consistent with the University's Grading Practices Policy. Academic awards for excellence would continue to be given. The proposal followed extensive consultation within the Faculty, involving both faculty members and students.

The Chair reported that the University Registrar, Ms Karel Swift was unable to attend the meeting, but she had confirmed that the proposal was consistent with the Grading Practices Policy. While no other division currently used CR/NCR throughout its program, the Policy made it entirely permissible for the Faculty of Medicine to do so.

The following matters arose in discussion.

(a) Student consultation and the effect of the proposed change with respect to applications for further study. A member asked whether, in the process of consulting with students, there had been any expressions of concern about any negative effect of the proposed change on student applications for placements or subsequent degree programs. Professor Rosenfield replied that the Faculty would not have moved forward with the proposal in the absence of broad support emerging from full consultation. The process of consultation had been led by Mr. Brown, culminating in a very professionally managed referendum involving students in all four years of the program. Mr. Brown reported that a remarkable 84% of all students in all years, including those in the combined M.D./Ph.D. program had participated in the referendum. Of those students, a very strong majority of 77% supported the proposal. The referendum had followed full discussion using a lunch-time information session, on-line presentation of the information, podcasts, and information in the University of Toronto Medical Journal. As part of the ballot (conducted on-line), students were asked to indicate whether or not they felt they were well informed about the implications of the proposal, and only a small minority stated that they were not well informed.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

2. Faculty of Medicine, Undergraduate Program in Medicine: Grading Practices (Cont'd)

(b) Distinctions with respect to student performance. A member asked how those evaluating graduates from the program for employment or further study would distinguish among applicants with only a two-interval system and presumably all applicants presenting only “credit” scores on their transcripts. Professor Rosenfield replied that while the official transcript would report only credit or no credit scores, the detailed system of grading and feedback would remain in use in the Faculty’s clinical courses. Detailed transcripts were not in fact helpful. All medical students would likely receive the highest or second highest scores; students admitted to medical programs did not perform at a lower level. With the removal of the importance of distinctions between those high levels, instructors would feel free to give more detailed feedback without concern about the major consequence of marginal differences having exaggerated consequences, leading to a pass rather than an honours grade. When students applied for specialty training, a “Dean’s Letter” was sent to the Canadian Residents’ Matching Service.” That letter could and did report detailed information about student performance.

On the recommendation of the Faculty of Medicine,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed change in grading for all courses in the undergraduate program in Medicine (MD) to Credit/No Credit, effective September 2009.

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II

The Chair reminded members that the Committee’s function was to consider whether “the University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements.” The record of the Committee’s discussion would be forwarded to the Academic Board’s Agenda Committee, which would review it and determine whether the Board should discuss issues of academic importance. Each reading team had been asked to deal with the following questions:

- (a) Did the summary before the Committee accurately reflect the review report?
- (b) Did the administrative responses address the issues identified?
- (c) Were there any questions/comments/issues for the Committee?

The Deans or other officers responsible for the various units and programs were in attendance to respond to any questions or concerns. If the Committee’s lead readers were satisfied that the summary was complete and that all issues had been dealt with, they were

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

asked simply to report those facts. There would be no need to comment further. If, on the other hand, the Committee took the view that there were unresolved issues that should be considered by the Agenda Committee, the Chair would make that consensus clear and ensure that it was reflected in the Committee's Report.

A member commented that he had observed certain issues of a general nature that had arisen from the reviews. Those matters were not discreet problems within a particular division and would not emerge from the three questions that members were being asked to consider. He asked whether there would be an opportunity for the Committee to give attention to such general issues or to refer them to the Academic Board for consideration. Professor Hillan replied that the administration had, in its own work on the reviews, recognized that certain such issues would require further thought. In addition, about two months ago, the Executive Committee of the Governing Council had approved the establishment of the new position of Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. That officer would play a central role with respect to very important matter of quality assurance. An appointment was anticipated very shortly. Professor Hillan therefore took notice of the question of the appropriate mechanisms for discussion of the broader concerns. She would raise the matter with the new Vice-Provost. If it then appeared appropriate, she could propose mechanisms for broader Committee discussions.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified, and there were no outstanding questions that would require the Committee's attention. Three matters had arisen in the review. The first was the tension between obligations to the separately administered, pre-service Initial Teacher Education Program and the Department's obligations to its own graduate programs. Among the concerns was the absence of teaching-load credit for practicum supervision in the Initial Teacher Education Program and the perception of inadequate recognition of that service in promotion and tenure decisions. The second concern had to do with need for more administrative support and the third had to do with workload. Those issues had, however, been recognized and were being addressed.

Invited to comment, Professor Jones noted that at least one element of the review had gone beyond its mandate: its comments on the Initial Teacher Education Program. Nonetheless, the review had been a very helpful one, which had reached a highly positive response from the Department. A member requested amplification of the comment that the "status of the practicum [in the Initial Teacher Education Program] is under review." Professor Jones replied that the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education itself would be

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

subject of a Provostial review in 2010-11 and the practicum would be considered in that review. The Ontario College of Teachers would also be conducting an external review in the next few years. Some changes had been made to the practicum, but more would be considered.

In the course of discussion, it was noted by two members that the review's reliance on a large number of acronyms made it very difficult to understand. They urged either that such extensive use of acronyms be avoided or that a glossary be provided.

The Chair understood the consensus of the Committee to be that there were no issues arising from the review that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Chemistry

The lead reviewer commented that it was a great pleasure to comment on this highly positive review of a "uniformly excellent" department. He noted that the Department offered two programs not noted in the summary: the Minor Programs in Chemistry and in Environmental Chemistry. The summary had accurately reflected the review report. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified (including some that were outside of the scope of the review and of the responsibilities of the Department and the Faculty). There were, therefore, no issues requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of English

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the highly positive review report and the administrative response addressed all of the issues identified. The questions arising from the review that required attention were not specific to the Department of English but were more general questions for the University's consideration. Those questions included tri-campus coordination and dealing with rapid enrolment growth, particularly in the number of undergraduate and Master's degree students.

Professor Klausner replied that the Department and the Faculty were closely monitoring the rapid growth of enrolment in the Master's degree program. There was concern that the growth might well be disturbing the balance between the M.A. and Ph.D. programs.

Professor Klausner observed that the question of tri-campus relations was one that had arisen in a number of reviews, and it should be of very high priority for the Provost's Office. He noted that in some cases, such as the Department of Chemistry, the relationships were working very well.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

In the course of discussion, a member asked whether the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs should have a role in the consideration of these broader matters, given their important implications. Ms Lasthiotakis noted that one of the reasons for presenting the reviews to the Committee in groups was to enable it to discern any more general issues that might be emerging. In some cases, for example concerns about funding for the units, there was no action the Committee could take. In other cases, the issues were in fact being addressed, and the matter of tri-campus relationships was one of those. Professor Hillan's memorandum to the Committee covering the reviews made reference to "the complex nature of tri-campus relationships," the recognition of the issue in the *Towards 2030* planning process, and the actions that had been taken to deal with the matter, in particular the biweekly meetings of the Tri-Campus Deans Committee to ensure consultation and coordination. Professor Averill observed that there was an issue of time lag. The reviews reflected attitudes expressed to the reviewers in their discussions with department members that had taken place over a year ago.

The Chair observed that any general matters that remained and required the Committee's attention would no doubt be brought to it by its assessors. It was clear that there were no specific matters regarding the Department of English that required the attention of the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Equity Studies Program, New College

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review of the program (described as "unique and highly sought after"). The administrative response had addressed all of the issues raised, and there were no matters requiring the Committee's attention.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Forestry Conservation Program

The Committee's lead reader said the summary accurately reflected the review report. (The programs were described as well run and reflecting a very appropriate marriage between liberal arts and professional education.) The administrative response had addressed all of the issues raised, and there were no matters requiring the Committee's attention.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Music Program

The Committee's lead reader reported that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (It stated that programs were taught by an "extremely dedicated and qualified faculty" offering a very "well designed curriculum.") The administrative response had dealt with all issues identified, and there were no matters specific to the review that required the Committee's attention. The lead reader did note that a number of reviews, including this one, had identified concerns about inter-divisional teaching that would require University attention. Professor Hillan noted that the University's

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

Interdivisional Teaching Task Force had reported in October 2008 with recommendations for dealing with the matter.

Professor Elliott said that the Faculty was very pleased with the review. The external reviewer had succeeded in one day in developing a very good understanding of the program. The concerns he had noted, which included those concerning inter-divisional teaching, space and finances, were the subject of on-going discussions.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Department of Philosophy

The reading team found that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (It stated that the Department was unrivalled in North America for its “extensive array of philosophical expertise at such a level of eminence.”) The administrative response had addressed two major issues raised: concerns with respect to the position of faculty members in Philosophy at the University of Toronto at Scarborough and concerns about funding for graduate students, especially international graduate students. Given the administrative response, there were no issues requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

A member commented that the Committee should take note of the fact that Philosophy was one of the areas where tri-campus issues were most significant, manifesting themselves in morale and faculty retention problems.

The Chair concluded that the matter should be included in the broader issues that emerged from consideration of the reviews. There were, however, no specific concerns with respect to the Department of Philosophy that should be drawn to the attention of the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Sexual Diversity Studies Program

The Committee’s lead reader referred to the summary of the review. (It found the program to be “among the finest of undergraduate sexuality studies programs in existence.”) The lead reader was concerned that the summary did not adequately express the strength of the review’s concern that the Program was unable to hire faculty. The concern was not merely one of resources. Rather, in the absence of a permanent faculty member to teach in the Program, it was at real risk of collapse. The administrative response did deal with many of the specific issues raised, but it did not deal adequately with that fundamental question. The concern, both a broader one and one that was of specific importance to this program, was one of responsibility for funding core teaching in a relatively small program housed in a College. The Mark S. Bonham Centre for Sexuality Diversity Studies had recently been established as an EDU:B. Such units had the authority to make faculty cross-appointments. However, it remained unclear how it might be able, in practical terms, to do so.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

Professor Klausner said that the desirability of having a faculty complement for the Program was the very reason for the Centre's establishment as an EDU:B. While it was true that there was no opportunity for a budget allocation for such a cross-appointment, the Program had been very successful in its advancement activities in the past, and it was anticipated that it could succeed again in future efforts. In addition, there had been agreement to pursue a joint appointment for the Program with the Department of English. The lead reader noted that this information, which was not provided in the administrative response, appeared to take care of the major concern raised by the review.

The Chair concluded that, on the basis of the additional information provided by Professor Klausner, there was no need for the matter to be considered further by the Academic Board.

Faculty of Arts and Science: Women and Gender Studies Institute

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (It stated that the Institute was "rightly acclaimed as a top ranking women's and gender studies department in North America and internationally.") The administrative response did deal with the issues raised in the review. They included faculty workload, the Institute's need for additional space, and the desirability of some access to the Institute's courses for students registered in other academic units. This review, among others, stressed the general need for the University to strengthen its diversity and equity programs. With the administrative response having addressed those points and others, the lead reader did not think that there were outstanding issues that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

Professor Klausner observed that the need for additional space was an on-going one noted in virtually all reviews.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Economics

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (That report described the U.T.M. Department of Economics as one of the top few Economics research departments in Canada.) The administrative response dealt with the issues raised, which had also arisen in other reviews. However, some of the matters remained unresolved, in particular the search for three tenure-stream faculty members, the recommendation for an addition(s) to the administrative staff, and certain space issues. Therefore, the lead reader thought it would be helpful for Dean Averill to provide an update.

Professor Averill said that U.T.M. had authorized searches for three-tenure stream faculty members in Economics. Two searches had succeeded and the faculty members

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

would be joining the Department in 2009-10. The third search had not succeeded and had been reauthorized for 2009-10. A new member of the administrative staff had been appointed to be shared by two departments, and 60% - 65% of that person's time would be devoted to the Department of Economics. The Department had received some additional funding through graduate-expansion funds, and the improvement would benefit undergraduate as well as graduate students. No new space was currently available for the Department, which was currently located in a highly overcrowded building. Space in the previous Library would be used to accommodate new faculty and administrative staff until planned new buildings were available. Those buildings would alleviate general space problems on the Campus. In response to the lead reader's question, Professor Averill said that the problem in relation to providing "significant hands-on applications" of Economics to students arose from the shortages of both faculty and space.

The Chair concluded that there were no issues arising from the review that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of English and Drama

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (The report commented on the Department's "first-rate faculty, and its teaching and research profiles make it compare very favourably with departments much larger in size on both the national and international scene.") The review's concerns arose from the Department's being "gravely understaffed" with 78% of its courses being taught by sessional instructors. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified, and none needed to go forward to the Academic Board.

A member said that he found it shocking that 78% of the program's courses were being taught by people other than tenured / tenure-stream faculty. Professor Averill agreed that there was a very substantial shortfall in this Department as well as some others. Depending on how faculty:student ratios were calculated, the ratio at U.T.M. was as high as 39:1. U.T.M. had, however, launched searches for two new faculty members for the Department of English. It continued to look at various factors, including performance indicators and the length of waiting lists for filled courses, and it accorded a very high priority to finding means to deal with this problem.

The member asked whether there was any plan to change the way sessional instructors were used and to improve their position at U.T.M., or whether it was planned to reduce their numbers in favour of tenure-stream faculty. Professor Averill replied that U.T.M. would work to create an improved climate for sessional instructors, but it would be appropriate to update the complement plan and to reduce reliance on sessional instructors for so high a proportion of teaching. Ms Snowden added that the Chair of the

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

Department did not accept the review's conclusion that sessional and tenure-stream faculty operated in two solitudes. On the contrary, there were harmonious relations between the two groups. In addition the high proportion of courses taught by sessional instructors in 2007-08 was anomalous, with a large number of faculty members on leave and others seconded to the St. George Campus English Department to fill administrative positions. While the reliance on sessional instructors was still high, it was declining from the proportion cited in the review report.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Management

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (The review characterized the students as generally satisfied with the Department's programs, which were of high quality. The faculty was described as very high quality, enthusiastic and committed, although the programs were over-reliant on non-tenure-stream faculty. The review expressed concerns about the Department's relationships within U.T.M and with the Rotman School of Management.) The administrative response had dealt with all of the issues. Because some of the administrative process to address the review were still in progress, the lead reviewer suggested that it would be valuable for Dean Averill to provide a brief update report.

Professor Averill said that there had been dramatic change over the past year. U.T.M. had authorized searches for three tenure-stream faculty members in Management, leading to one appointment, with two offers outstanding. Aggressive action had been taken to promote retention of existing faculty members. Administrative staff for the program had been added, and facilities had been improved with the addition of the new Li Koon Chun Finance Learning Centre (a simulated securities trading laboratory), two state-of-the-art classrooms and a new lounge. With respect to relationships with the Rotman School of Management, the Deans on the three campuses were meeting regularly and working together closely on issues, including comparability of faculty compensation. The plans for the expansion of the Rotman School of Management's facilities included the provision of shared space for faculty from U.T.M. and U.T.S.C.

The Chair concluded that, on the basis of the updated information provided by Professor Averill, there were no items that would require the attention of the Academic Board.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Mathematics and Computational Sciences

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary provided to the Committee accurately reflected the review report. (The reviewers praised the variety of faculty research and the faculty's collegiality and dedication to teaching. They had a very positive view of U.T.M.-

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

specific initiatives, including programs in bioinformatics, mathematical finance and forensic computing. They expressed various concerns including apparent over-reliance on non-continuing instructors and inadequate space.) The administrative response addressed all of the issues raised. The lead reader asked for further information in response to the reviewer's comments about the Professional Experience Year and the possibility of a co-operative program structure at U.T.M.

Professor Averill replied that U.T.M. had an Experiential Learning Office, which was being brought into the Dean's Office. That Office, working with the Career Centre, coordinated placement efforts for about 350 students, matching them with potential employers in the community. Those opportunities were mixed in nature, with some providing remuneration for students and others not. U.T.M. had not adopted the co-operative education model, which was provided at the University by the University of Toronto Scarborough. While experiential learning had been made most broadly available to students in Mathematics and Computational Sciences, U.T.M. wished to accept the considerable challenge of making such opportunities broadly available across many programs.

University of Toronto at Mississauga: Department of Sociology

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary did accurately reflect the review report. (The review commented that senior and intermediate faculty were highly productive with national and international reputations, and junior faculty were publishing regularly in excellent venues. Students were satisfied with the quality of teaching and the structure of the program.) Various concerns were expressed including apparent low morale among faculty, arising from the tri-campus graduate framework and from Departmental governance. The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified. There were no residual questions requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

The lead reader asked whether the concerns with respect to Departmental governance had been addressed through the appointment of a new Chair. Professor Averill said that a new Chair had been appointed who had adopted a very pronounced collegial and democratic approach to Departmental governance.

A member observed that this review was one of a number that had referred to the perception of unrealistic expectations being placed on junior members of the faculty. Professor Hillan replied that the University had in the fall of 2007 participated in a collaborative study on pre-tenure faculty and had during the past year initiated a program for junior faculty and had increased communications in order to de-mystify the tenure process. Professor Hillan would continue to monitor the matter carefully.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)****University of Toronto at Scarborough: Department of Social Sciences**

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (The review report spoke highly of the wide array of innovative interdisciplinary programs, the diversity of the student body, the quality of the faculty and the availability of co-operative programs in a number of areas. However, it also expressed, concerns about various matters including: the structure of the Department, certain of its programs, certain aspects of the student experience including the rate of attrition in some programs, low faculty morale, and insufficient faculty input into Departmental decision-making.) The administrative response had dealt with all of the issues raised.

The member thought it would be worthwhile for Professor Buchweitz to comment further on one matter. The reviewers had suggested that some of the Department's challenges had originated from its introduction of a number of new programs while it was at the same time seeking to cope with a very substantial growth in enrolment and while it faced limitations on its faculty complement and resources. Did that indicate some general problem with respect to the process of approval of new programs? Professor Buchweitz replied that a number of interdisciplinary programs had been introduced eight or nine years previously in an effort to provide stronger links among the four traditional disciplines within the department. However, some of the assumptions underlying the new programs had proven to be too optimistic. U.T.S.C. had sought to put into place innovative programs that were responsive to student demand. In some cases, the programs were very successful, but in others they were not. In the latter cases, U.T.S.C. would acknowledge the outcome and either remedy the problems or discontinue the program.

A member observed that the U.T.S.C. administration was very clearly acting to deal with issues that had been drawn out by the review. He asked if the Committee might be given an update report. Professor Buchweitz replied that the administrative response was a very recent document and that there was not, therefore, a great deal of progress to report at this time. The Chair was continuing to work on the question of appropriate administrative structure for the disciplines in the Department of Social Sciences. The answer to that question would have to take into account, among other things, the extraordinary growth of the Department in the past decade. It was clear that the structure would have to change, and Professor Buchweitz hoped that there would be a proposal ready in the fall.

The Chair concluded that U.T.S.C. and the Department were actively working on appropriate changes and that proposals would come forward in the fall. There were, therefore, no matters that would require the attention of the Academic Board at this time.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)****U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Environmental Science and Technology**

The lead reader commented that there were common themes that appeared in the reviews of all four of the programs offered jointly with Centennial College. The underlying cause appeared to be the lack of a real understanding of the appropriate administrative interactions by the two institutions. (Professor Hillan's covering memorandum referred to the decision by the two institutions to revise their Memorandum of Understanding with respect to the programs, clarifying their "senior academic administrative leadership, setting up a Joint Programs Steering Committee and a Joint Programs coordinator, and coordinating a new marketing and recruitment campaign to raise program awareness.")

With respect to the joint program in Environmental Science and Technology, the lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. In spite of the general issues with respect to the joint programs, this particular program had real academic value and potential as a vehicle for "preparing graduates with a combination of key theoretical and practical skills to work in the environmental field." The administrative response discussed the general concerns pertaining to all of the jointly offered programs and it also addressed the specific recommendations relating to this particular program. There were, therefore, no matters requiring the attention of the Academic Board.

Professor Buchweitz commented that U.T.S.C. had learned a great deal through the review process, and it was committed to continue and improve the joint programs with Centennial College, which had been initially offered in 2003-04. For example, it would undertake marketing and communications efforts to promote those programs that were undersubscribed with strong students. It had been remarkable that demand for some of the joint programs had been very strong in spite of the complete absence of marketing efforts previously. The two institutions were putting joint committees into place. Professor Buchweitz would within a week be commencing discussions with his counterpart at Centennial College concerning other areas for collaboration.

A member observed that in this case and perhaps others, the review process itself appeared to have played a substantial role in bringing about improvement. It was not surprising that problems would be brought to the surface in an initial review of particular programs. That decisive action was being taken to deal with those problems represented a real triumph for the process of reviews. Professor Buchweitz agreed with the observation, and he noted that the success of the process was even more remarkable in the case of the joint programs. It had been difficult to identify appropriate reviewers, who would both evaluate the programs as university-level academic programs and who would also

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

understand and evaluate the elements of the programs providing training in the applied and technological aspects. Once appropriate reviewers had been identified, they had found it difficult to appreciate and evaluate both elements.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Industrial Microbiology

The lead reader commended the summary very highly, stating that it was exemplary and was very helpful in that the review report itself was difficult to understand. The administrative response had dealt with all of the review's recommendations. In particular, it had dealt with the pivotal issue of lack of commitment to the program on the part of U.T.S.C. faculty in biological science, who had not played a role in the genesis of the program. The U.T.S.C. administration planned decisive action and, if the program could not be appropriately redesigned with full faculty support from both institutions, it might well be closed. There were no remaining issues that would require the attention of the Academic Board. The member reinforced the importance of rigorous review of joint programs to ensure the commitment by the faculty of both institutions; in the absence of such commitment, the students in the program would not be well served.

Professor Scherk said that the review had found many aspects of the joint program to be very promising. He noted, for example, that graduates with good training in applied laboratory techniques would be better prepared for graduate study than those from typical science programs. Given that faculty members in Biological Science had not exhibited great interest in the program, it had been suggested that U.T.S.C. position the program more in the area of Environmental Microbiology, because there was a higher level of faculty interest in the Environmental Science Department. U.T.S.C. would work to reposition the program in that manner and would review the curriculum carefully. Professor Scherk anticipated that the program would be retained and would have a very worthwhile future.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Journalism and New Media Studies

The Committee's lead reader reported that the review outlined very real potential for the two recently established joint programs as well as areas of serious challenges. This was accurately reflected in the summary. The administrative response had demonstrated a substantial commitment to address the challenges, and several important improvements had already been made. The reviewers and the administrative response had dealt with a number of the general themes with respect to the joint programs with Centennial College, and the response had reiterated the steps being taken to improve the programs.

U.T.S.C. Joint Program with Centennial College: Paramedicine

The lead reader said that the summary of the review was an excellent one, which had organized the content of the review very well and had provided observations in a highly coherent

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)**

manner. The reading team was concerned that the administrative response did not completely address all of the issues raised in the review. First, the review stated certain concerns about the design of the curriculum for the joint program. While the administrative response indicated that the joint program curriculum committee would examine the concerns, the outcome was unclear. It was proposed that a new choice of major programs or streams might be available for the academic part of the revised curriculum to replace the current mix of courses in biology, chemistry, psychology, anthropology and health studies. It was, however, not specified in the response what the revised curriculum would be. It was also noted that students ran into problems progressing through the program because they completed their qualification for their paramedic certification following their third year of study, and they were required by the certifying body to begin work immediately following that certification. They could therefore complete their degree requirements only through part-time study, sometimes including summer study before completion of their third year. Second, the review raised questions concerning communications between faculty at the two institutions and communications with students. Improved communications would be important to break down the current barriers and to promote understanding between the faculty involved in offering the program. For example, the reviewers proposed the initiation of orientation activities for students and “meet and greet functions” involving faculty from U.T.S.C. and Centennial College. The administrative response did not deal with the specific suggestions. Third, the review spoke of a lack of understanding by the U.T.S.C. faculty of matters having to do with the levels of qualification within the profession of Paramedicine. Clearly, such understanding would be required to make the joint program work. The reading team was concerned that there be clarification of these specific matters and that there be a clarification of the overall goal of program.

Professor Scherk said that he regretted that the administrative response had not specifically addressed all of the questions raised. The U.T.S.C. administration did, however, take the matters raised in the review very seriously and was addressing them. In order to address all of the specific questions, however, it was important to deal with the major problem which was the overall goal and the appropriate structure of the program. U.T.S.C. and Centennial College had established joint curriculum committees for all of the joint programs and had asked that they report to the Steering Committee by the end of May. In this case, however, the people involved in the Paramedicine program said that it would take longer to resolve the issues. The key was to develop a structure that would deal with the current requirement of the certifying body that students must begin their work in Paramedicine immediately after qualifying for their certificate – now after their third year. They were still one year from the University degree at that stage. It was important, therefore, that the program be structured in such a way that students could both complete their professional requirements and their academic requirements in a suitable progression. While it was clear that restructuring must take place, it was not yet clear how it would be achieved. Professor Buchweitz added that, in spite of the problems in program design, Paramedicine had attracted many very good and very enthusiastic students, who had greatly enriched life at U.T.S.C. He was confident that the problems of program design would be solved.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)****Faculty of Medicine: Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology**

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (It described the Department as "a preeminent department on the Canadian national and broader international scenes.") The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified, and there were no questions requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board. The member was pleased to note the addendum to the summary, reporting on the successful recruitment and appointment of a new Chair as of January 1, 2009. Professor Whiteside said that the appointment had been the outcome of an international search.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Nutritional Sciences

The Committee's lead reader commented on the review (which described the Department as "dynamic with a high quality faculty and students.") The summary had omitted one key recommendation of the review team: to expand the space of the Department and to provide the state-of-art research facilities needed to attract high-quality faculty and students. The administrative response dealt with all of the issues identified, including that concerning the Department's space. The member thought it would be useful for the Committee to receive an update report on the search for a new Chair and on any action being planned with respect to the question of space and facilities.

Professor Whiteside said that the Faculty had carried out a successful international search for a new Chair, and a highly qualified individual had been identified and would be recommended to the Agenda Committee for appointment. The matter of space for the Department was a very significant one. Researchers in Nutritional Sciences were located primarily in the FitzGerald Building, one of the oldest and most decrepit buildings on campus. The Faculty had very nearly completed a new master plan for the reorganization of the Medical Sciences Building, and Professor Whiteside anticipated that new laboratory space would become available to researchers in Nutritional Sciences. Professor Whiteside hoped that the renovation would be complete within the next eighteen months.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report (which said that the Department was considered to be one of the top ten Obstetrics and Gynaecology departments in the world). The administrative response had addressed all of the issues identified in the review and in fact had gone beyond the review report to deal with certain other issues that were important to the Department. There were therefore no matters requiring the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

Professor Whiteside said that the Department was an exceptionally successful one. Its work was fully integrated with the affiliated hospitals and their research institutes as well as with the Department of Physiology on campus, providing a very strong basis for its educational and research mission.

A member asked about problems noted by the reviewers concerning appointments of junior faculty to clinical departments who would work in one of the hospital-based research institutes. Professor Whiteside replied that the matter arose with respect to various clinical departments. Substantial work had been completed to address the matter since the completion of the review. The problem had primarily been one of communication. It had been agreed that the clinical departments would not make appointments into the research category until those appointments had been approved by the Vice-President, Research of the relevant hospital.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Occupational Sciences and Occupational Therapy

The Committee's lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review. (The reviewers had concluded that "in comparing with top U.S. schools, the School would be in the top three – based on the quality of the faculty and the volume of their research, the curriculum model and the quality of their students; it certainly stands as a top ranked school in Canada.") The administrative response had dealt with all of the major issues. Discussion arose concerning two matters.

(a) **Prerequisite requirements.** The lead reader noted that one detailed matter had not been addressed in the administrative response. Students in the Master of Science in Occupational Therapy program had reported that the absence of specific course prerequisite requirements for the program had caused some difficulties. Some students lacked sufficient preparation in the life sciences to handle material in the program while others found that the same material was not sufficiently challenging. The students had suggested reinstatement of the prerequisite requirements in the life sciences. Professor Whiteside undertook to raise the matter with the Chair of the Department. She noted that the Department's reputation was stellar, and the matter had not arisen in two other recent reviews: the accreditation review and the review by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

(b) **Inter-professional education.** The lead reader said that in this review and a number of others, the reviewers had noted that students had expressed the desire for more inter-disciplinary learning and had suggested the development of an interdisciplinary rehabilitation clinic in cooperation with the programs in Physical Therapy and Speech / Language Pathology. Professor Whiteside said that the matter of interdisciplinary learning had been receiving very close attention in all of the health professions. The University was planning to launch a core

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

curriculum for all ten health professions. The faculty in Rehabilitation Medicine had been real leaders in that development, which clearly represented the future direction of education in the medical sciences.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery

The lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report (which spoke of “enthusiastic and productive faculty and a satisfied and proud cohort of trainees.”) The administrative response had addressed all issues raised in the review, and there were no questions that would require the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board. Professor Whiteside commented that the Department was regarded as one of the top departments of otolaryngology globally.

Faculty of Medicine: Department of Surgery

The Committee’s lead reader said that the summary accurately reflected the review report. (That report concluded that the “stature of the department remains extraordinary as the leading Canadian University Department of Surgery and amongst the top ten internationally.”) The administrative response had dealt with all of the issues raised, and there were no matters that would require the attention of the Committee or the Academic Board. The lead reader noted that this review and others had stressed that it would be important to take steps to ensure that the new Academy, to be developed in cooperation with the community hospitals in Mississauga, provided opportunities for a comparably good student experience.

Externally Commissioned Reviews

The Chair noted that the compendium of summaries of the reviews included a list of externally commissioned reviews, which were not within the purview of the Committee. They included one professional accreditation review and a large number of appraisals by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. Those reviews were listed for information.

General Observations

In the course of discussion, a member observed that the summaries of the reviews had been very well prepared and very helpful. The compendium of summaries had helped a great deal to tie the process together. The Chair noted that the grouping of reviews had been of great value in helping the Committee to deal with the reviews and to discern particular themes. On behalf of the Committee, the Chair and Professor Hillan thanked Ms Lasthiotakis for her excellent work in preparing the review summaries.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

3. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, 2007-08 – Annual Report, Part II (Cont'd)

The Chair thanked all members for their diligent work in participating in the Committee's discharge of the very important responsibility for monitoring the process of internal review of the academic units and programs. She commented that the process, and the Committee's review of the process, was improving over time.

4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report

Professor Young presented the Annual Report of the Vice-President, Research, dated March 2009. The highlights of his report included the following.

- **Mission.** Research at the University was conducted by the University's outstanding faculty and graduate students. The mission of the Office of the Vice-President, Research was to enhance the University's impact in research and innovation through enabling new strategic initiatives that promoted fundamental scholarship, discovery and multidisciplinary cultural, social and technological innovation.
- **Office of the Vice-President, Research: Reorganization.** To achieve that mission most effectively, the Office had been restructured over the past year. Its work was now based on three administrative pillars. The new Research Services Office combined the Tri-Council funding group and the Government Research Infrastructure Programs group, adopting the best practices of each. The Innovations Group dealt with research contracts, commercialization of the products of University research, and all aspects of innovation. The new Research Oversight and Compliance Office combined into a single office the groups providing assistance with research-grant accounting, ethics compliance, and legal services. Each of the three new units was headed by an Executive Director, who reported to the Vice-President, Research. The outcome was a cleaner and more effective structure.
- **Support for research.** The role of the Vice-President's Office was to support the University's faculty. The University led all others in Canada in funding from the federal research-granting Councils - the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the Natural Sciences Research Council, and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research - typically receiving 16% of total funding. That share was very important, in part because it was the basis of other research support including the University's share of Canada Research Chairs (currently 256 Chairs) and of payments to cover a part of the indirect costs of research. It was very important for the University to maintain its share of federal grant funding because its proportion of Canada Research Chairs and indirect funding support had declined

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

over the past five years. That had been the case because of the establishment of new universities and allocation formulae that provided a larger share for smaller institutions.

The University's faculty had made applications primarily for discovery grants and focus scholarships. There were, however, a number of targeted areas for research funding, particularly those associated with the Federal Government's science and technology strategy, for which the University had not been as competitive. For example, while the University had received 16% of funding from the federal research-granting councils, it had won only five of 140 Industrial Research Chairs. Such awards were also included in the allocation mechanism for such other funding as that for the indirect costs of research. Therefore, improving the University's performance in those targeted areas was very important. The Vice-President's Office had prepared a market-share report, which had been presented to the group of Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs, with a view to developing a strategy to increase the University's funding share.

- **Canada Foundation for Innovation.** University of Toronto researchers had won 18.3% of funding for research facilities from the Canada Foundation for Innovation (C.F.I.) since the inception of the Foundation in 1998. However, competition had increased recently with more applications being submitted, and the University had not fared as well in the most recent competition held two years ago. The University had, therefore, established a process for external peer review to pre-screen applications before their submission to the C.F.I. The University had invited 100 individuals from outside of Canada to serve as referees. The outcome had been very positive, with the University and its affiliated hospitals having submitted strong applications for nearly \$170-million of support. By working with the affiliated hospitals and other institutions, the applications had avoided duplication. The results would be announced in June. Most principal investigators had supported the pre-screening process, although there had been some initial concern about the additional time required. The receipt of comments from the peer reviewers had, however, enabled applicants to strengthen their submissions substantially, leading to real recognition of the value of the process. The recent Government of Canada budget had added \$150-million to the funding for the C.F.I. competition; therefore, the timing of the University's strengthening its internal process had been ideal. Funding for the next year's C.F.I. competition would be increased by \$600-million, and the University's internal process would already be in place.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

- **Canada Excellence Research Chairs.** The University had also applied the pre-screening process in its submission of its applications for the new Canada Excellence Research Chairs. The program had been established to enable Canadian institutions to attract outstanding international researchers, and it focused on areas of strategic importance to Canada. Twenty Chairs, valued at \$10-million each over seven years, would be awarded nationally. Based on its share of funding from the federal research granting councils, the University of Toronto had been invited to apply for fourteen chairs in the first phase of the competition. Invitations to apply for the second phase of the competition would be issued in April, 2009, with final decisions announced in 2010. There would be very substantial prestige attached to the Chairs. The University was eager to perform well in this competition and was confident with respect to the outcome.
- **Research and innovation catalogues.** There was, at this time, virtually no growth in government funding to support basic discovery research. Almost all new funding was devoted to supporting the federal government's science and technology strategy. The priority areas included: environmental sciences and technologies; natural resources and energy; health and related life sciences and technologies; and information and communications technologies. Therefore, to assist the University's professoriate in achieving that new funding, the Office of the Vice-President, Research had initiated catalogues of the University's research strengths in those areas, where the University indeed had considerable strength across the three campuses. The University had also partnered in sponsoring fora in one of those areas – digital technology; those fora had involved other institutions and businesses in the community. A second catalogue had dealt with the area of space research. In the spring of 2009, catalogues would be developed in the areas of life sciences and technologies; health and related life sciences; and energy and the environment. Researchers at the University of Toronto ranked first in the world in the number of citations in the area of Environmental Engineering – a fact that was not widely known. The University would seek to build communities in that and other targeted areas to obtain funding and to conduct research.
- **Program to foster partnerships.** The University had initiated a new program to bring together researchers in the University with collaborators in the community: industry, government agencies, other universities, and other agencies in the not-for-profit sector. The University would, for example, bring in relevant civil-service officers to show them the research work that was being done. The University had a number of strong projects in the area of space research, but they were operating independently across the University. The Canadian Space Agency had noted the receipt of a number of different applications for support from the University and had suggested the idea of a coordinated approach. From time to

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

- time, companies in the private sector would initiate approaches, seeking the completion of research on interesting problems. The Office of the Vice-President, Research would seek to bring together the company with relevant researchers to enable them to determine if they would share an interest in working together on the matter. Industry Canada was often a participant in the discussions.
- **Recognizing faculty excellence.** Professor Young displayed a chart showing the share of various honours held by University of Toronto faculty members as a proportion of those honours held by university faculty nationally for the period 1980 to 2008. For example, University of Toronto faculty held 63% of the Canadian awards of membership in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The chart displayed both international and national awards. In general, the more competitive and prestigious the honour, the greater the University of Toronto share. The University clearly had many exceptionally talented researchers. The need was to complete the work required to identify areas of opportunity and to put forward nominations. The Vice-President's Office had therefore established an Office of University Awards and Honours. The officer worked with appropriate people in the various Faculties and across the three campuses to assist with the preparation of nominations. The awards not only brought recognition to the researcher and the University, they also frequently provided a contribution to the individual's research funding. Professor Young identified a number of faculty members who had won major awards over the past year.
 - **Impact of University of Toronto innovation.** University of Toronto research had a major impact on the Canadian economy. That research had generated patents and licenses for the use of University-developed technology. It had led to the formation of 120 spin-off companies employing between 4,000 and 5,000 people and generating economic impact of about \$1-billion per year. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology had gone further to determine its economic impact by also calculating the impact of its alumni on the economy, which it had found to be the equivalent of the Gross Domestic Product of a small European country. The economic and social impact overall of the University of Toronto had been very substantial, but the University had not sought to quantify that impact. The Office of the Vice-President, Research would seek to do so over the next year.
 - **MaRS Innovation.** The MaRS Innovation Group had won \$15-million of support from the federal government's Centres of Excellence for Commercialization. With partial matching funding, that would amount to \$25-million. MaRS Innovation was a commercialization collaboration involving the MaRS centre, the University, its affiliated hospitals, Ryerson, the Ontario College of Art and Design, BioDiscovery Toronto, and the Ontario Institute for Cancer Research. Those

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009**4. Vice-President, Research: Annual Report (Cont'd)**

institutions would be working together to transfer the technologies they had discovered to the private sector for commercial development. Professor Young would report in the next year or the year thereafter on the progress and benefits of that major commercialization development.

- **Celebration and promotion of University of Toronto research.** The previous year's annual report was focused on an external audience and had been widely distributed. (In view of the current economic circumstances, the annual report now before the Committee, was a much smaller and less expensive document.) The previous report had contained extensive statistical information as well as twenty profiles of faculty researchers. It had dealt with certain questions such as how the University's researchers were contributing to a solution for the AIDS problem. The report had received considerable acclaim, including two major prizes from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, District II – the largest of the CASE districts which included 600 institutions including Princeton and Carnegie Mellon University. The report had received the Gold Prize for its visual design and the Silver Prize for overall institutional reports. The other external medium produced by the Office was *Edge* magazine. That magazine targeted the areas to which the Office had been giving particular attention. The issue dealing with digital media was distributed to all relevant government ministers and other political officers. Another issue focused on the commercialization of University research. The Office was currently working on an issue on the social impact of University research. *Edge* magazine too had won major CASE awards: the Silver Prize for newsletters and the bronze prize for staff writing. The work on *Edge* would lead up to the next annual report, which would celebrate the special research work being carried out at the University.

In response to a member's question, Professor Young said that he had decided to include only basic information on the Connaught Fund in the report. The only element he wished to add to the report was that, in the light of the very poor state of the securities markets, there would unfortunately be no disbursements from the endowment funds, including the Connaught Fund, for the current year.

REPORT NUMBER 140 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – March 31, 2009

5. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the final regular meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, May 12, 2009 at 4:10 p.m..

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

April 21, 2009

50542