



FOR INFORMATION

PUBLIC

OPEN SESSION

TO: Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

SPONSOR: Mark Schmuckler, Acting Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

CONTACT INFO: (416) 978-0490, vp.academicprograms@utoronto.ca

PRESENTER: See Sponsor

CONTACT INFO:

DATE: December 15, 2020 for January 12, 2021

AGENDA ITEM: 7

ITEM IDENTIFICATION:

Report on the Review of Clinical Departments, 2018 and 2019

JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:

“The Committee...has general responsibility...for monitoring the quality of education and the research activities of the University....The Committee receives annual reports or such more frequent regular reports as it may determine, on matters within its purview, including reports on the ...[r]eviews of academic units and programs.”

GOVERNANCE PATH:

1. **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs** [For Information] (January 12, 2021)

PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:

The Governing Council approved the [Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units](#) in 2010. The *Policy* outlines University-wide principles for the approval of proposed new academic programs and review of existing programs and units. Its goal is to align the University’s quality assurance processes with the Province’s Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) through establishing the authority of the *University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process* (UTQAP), which outlines the process for reviewing academic programs and the units that offer them.

The Dean of the Faculty of Medicine commissions reviews of the Faculty’s clinical departments, modeled on but outside of the scope of the UTQAP review process, and prepares an annual report on their outcomes and implementation plans. Because of the unique contribution clinical departments make to the Faculty’s education programs, this report is brought forward for information to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P). These reviews are intended to help assess and improve quality. The *Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units* states that “...the quality of the scholarship of the faculty, and the degree to which that scholarship is brought to bear in teaching are the foundations of academic excellence. More generally, all of the factors that contribute to collegial and scholarly life —academic and administrative complement, research and scholarly activity, infrastructure, governance, etc.— bear on the quality of academic programs and the broad educational experience of students.”

The annual Report on the Review of Clinical Departments was previously submitted to the AP&P on May 10, 2018.

HIGHLIGHTS:

Three external reviews of clinical departments were completed in 2018 and 2019: the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology; the Department of Medicine; and the Department of Psychiatry. Additionally, the submission to AP&P includes a report on the review of the Terrence Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research, a unique Extra-Departmental Unit:A (EDU:A) that does not offer degree programs. A table that summarizes the review outcomes and decanal responses/implementation plans is provided.

The overall assessment of the quality of the three clinical departments is very high. Reviewers identified the clinical departments as being among the highest ranked in Canada and internationally, and commended their collaborative environments and strong commitment to the University’s research mission. Clinical departmental Chairs and senior leadership were also praised for their efficiency, competency, commitment and vision. The decanal administrative responses/implementation plans addressed the reviewers’ recommendations.

The reviewers praised the outstanding, collaborative research conducted within the Donnelly Centre, its significant contribution to graduate, post-doctoral and undergraduate training of students in affiliated departments, and the leadership of the Director. The decanal administrative response addressed the reviewers’ recommendations.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There are no financial implications.

RECOMMENDATION:

For Information.

DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:

- Summary Table of 2018 and 2019 Clinical Department Reviews



Systematic reviews of academic units are a critical process of quality assurance accountability at the Temerty Faculty of Medicine. Academic reviews of Clinical Departments are commissioned by the Dean to coincide, normally, with the end of the term of the Chair; as such, they can inform both strategic priority-setting and Chair (re)appointments. These reviews are distinct from professional accreditation and are not governed by the University of Toronto’s “University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process” (UTQAP). Like UTQAP reviews, the protocols for Clinical Department reviews include (i) terms of reference (ii) self-study report, (iii) visit by external reviewers, (iv) reviewers’ report of findings, and (v) Chair’s and (vi) Dean’s responses. Summarized outcomes of a review are brought forward, for information, to the Committee on Academic Policy & Programs of Academic Board; the full report and responses are submitted to the Executive Committee of the Temerty Faculty Council and circulated broadly in the Clinical Department.

CLINICAL DEPARTMENT	Dept. of Obstetrics & Gynaecology
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dr. Geoffrey Cundiff – Dept. of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, University of British Columbia 2. Dr. Nanette Santoro – Dept. of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, University of Colorado
DATES OF REVIEW	February 26-27, 2018
STRENGTHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ <i>“On track to exceed its stature as a top Canadian program and achieve recognition in the top tier of academic Ob/Gyn departments worldwide”</i> ▫ Excellent international reputation for broad range of postgraduate medical education, with strong sub-specialty training programs ▫ Robust administration and support programs for residents in Obstetrics & Gynaecology ▫ <i>“Numerous innovative programs and a desire to pursue excellence in all areas”</i> ▫ Strong commitment to research mission via fostering of University-Hospital Clinician Investigator Program ▫ Cultivation of interpersonal relationships between the University Chair and Hospital Chiefs/Division Heads ▫ Chair <i>“bringing resources to support research-intensive junior faculty to the Chiefs was a brilliant move”</i>
RECOMMENDATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Consolidate and improve the 3rd- and 4th-year medical student experience in ObGyn ▫ Strengthen communications between the Chair and MD Program / ObGyn Residency Program Education leaders ▫ Provide additional support to the UME Director for curriculum delivery in the community-based teaching hospitals ▫ Focus on mid-career development to anticipate succession for senior research and administration roles ▫ Increase administrative staffing to ensure sustainable workloads
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN Decanal Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ The Chair has quickly addressed all stated concerns in MD program and ObGyn Residency education ▫ An Education Council has been established to increase communications between Chair and education program leaders ▫ The Department has committed to an annual stipend for a community hospital-based faculty member to support the UME Director in curriculum delivery ▫ New faculty members have been recruited to leadership positions within the Department addressing succession concerns ▫ Significant enhancements to the size and structure of the administrative team have been made

Systematic reviews of academic units are a critical process of quality assurance accountability at the Temerty Faculty of Medicine. Academic reviews of Clinical Departments are commissioned by the Dean to coincide, normally, with the end of the term of the Chair; as such, they can inform both strategic priority-setting and Chair (re)appointments. These reviews are distinct from professional accreditation and are not governed by the University of Toronto's "University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process" (UTQAP). Like UTQAP reviews, the protocols for Clinical Department reviews include (i) terms of reference (ii) self-study report, (iii) visit by external reviewers, (iv) reviewers' report of findings, and (v) Chair's and (vi) Dean's responses. Summarized outcomes of a review are brought forward, for information, to the Committee on Academic Policy & Programs of Academic Board; the full report and responses are submitted to the Executive Committee of the Temerty Faculty Council and circulated broadly in the Clinical Department.

CLINICAL DEPARTMENT	Dept. of Medicine
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dr. Katrina Armstrong – Dept. of Medicine, Harvard Medical School 2. Dr. Graydon Meneilly – Dept. of Medicine, University of British Columbia
DATES OF REVIEW	December 3-4, 2018
STRENGTHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ <i>“Highly regarded by the most qualified candidates for academic positions in the country and continues to recruit talented leaders from peer institutions...best in Canada by an order of magnitude, and in the top ten departments in North America”</i> ▫ Impressively detailed strategic plan with many goals achieved ▫ Recognized leader in medical education at all levels; the person-centred care curriculum it <i>“pioneered”</i> should be <i>“singled out”</i> ▫ Excellent research programs; collaborations at all levels; outstanding scholarly production in the last 5 years ▫ <i>“Stunning”</i> progress in the area of Quality Improvement (QI) ▫ <i>“Substantial inroads into breaking down barriers and improving integration,”</i> especially in research programs ▫ Under the Chair's direction, <i>“has made remarkable strides in educating all stakeholders about the importance of equity”</i>
RECOMMENDATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Develop alternative staffing models with hospital partners to ensure balance between workload and education; increase IT support, particularly with implementation of the new Competency-By-Design curriculum ▫ Enhance efforts to ensure pipeline of basic clinician scientists and gender diversity in Clinician Scientist Training Program (CSTP); with stakeholders ensure that Clinician Investigators (50% research-50% clinical) receive appropriate support at all sites; address the harmonization of ethics and contracts between sites; continue bolstering city-wide research collaborations ▫ Consider a special track for QI research ethics as part of the ethics harmonization process; continue to invest in mentorship and advancement of junior faculty with a QI focus in partnership with hospital leadership ▫ Continue current efforts towards equity, diversity, and inclusion and track results ▫ Encourage broader mentorship of junior scientific faculty; recognize contributions to mentorship as part of faculty promotions ▫ Further fundraising training for faculty; consider applying for alternative funding plan; continue plans to involve patient advisors in all aspects; consolidate staff in new space
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN Decanal Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Redesign of the clinical teaching units with hospital leadership to address clinical workload and learner experiences ▫ Expanded CSTP selection committee and enhanced support for CSTP trainees and early career scientists ▫ Appointment of MD/PhD program graduate to mentor residents on basic science careers in academic medicine ▫ Continue working closely with hospital leaders to identify new and existing opportunities for MDs with QI expertise ▫ With TAHSN leaders, initiating work on physician performance monitoring, late career transitions, and alternate funding models for academic medicine; Temerty Medicine and TASHN research are addressing ethics and contract harmonization ▫ Faculty development and trainee curriculum on topics related to equity and diversity, e.g., allyship; surveys to track impact ▫ Advocate for mentorship contributions to be recognized in senior promotions



- Fundraising focused on the career lifespan of the Physician Scientist and funding through creation of CME divisional activities, alumni events, and diversification of funded fellowships
- Staff have moved into a new space in the Naylor Building



TEMERTY FACULTY OF MEDICINE
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Systematic reviews of academic units are a critical process of quality assurance accountability at the Temerty Faculty of Medicine. Academic reviews of Clinical Departments are commissioned by the Dean to coincide, normally, with the end of the term of the Chair; as such, they can inform both strategic priority-setting and Chair (re)appointments. These reviews are distinct from professional accreditation and are not governed by the University of Toronto’s “University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process” (UTQAP). Like UTQAP reviews, the protocols for Clinical Department reviews include (i) terms of reference (ii) self-study report, (iii) visit by external reviewers, (iv) reviewers’ report of findings, and (v) Chair’s and (vi) Dean’s responses. Summarized outcomes of a review are brought forward, for information, to the Committee on Academic Policy & Programs of Academic Board; the full report and responses are submitted to the Executive Committee of the Temerty Faculty Council and circulated broadly in the Clinical Department.

CLINICAL DEPARTMENT	Dept. of Psychiatry
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS	1. Dr. John Geddes – Dept. of Psychiatry, University of Oxford 2. Dr. Gustavo Turecki – Dept. of Psychiatry, McGill University
DATES OF REVIEW	September 16-17, 2019
STRENGTHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ “[The] Department is ranked among the world’s top institutions based on the volume of papers published.” ▫ Well-functioning Department with many achievements since the last review ▫ Academic Scholar Awards has been “transformational;” “outstanding” fundraising ▫ Clear and transparent processes across the Department for academic progression ▫ Fellowship Program “has become enormously successful and is a real strength of the Department” ▫ Review of the residency curriculum to ensure future clinicians and researchers can meet the needs of the mentally ill ▫ Integration of services and research in partnership with the hospitals ▫ Chair congratulated on his “strong leadership and vision;” has taken “bold steps” to increase Department’s research impact
RECOMMENDATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Develop a clear strategy with specific priorities to meet its multiple education and research objectives ▫ Influence the development of more integrated clinical services to reduce redundancy and gaps across hospital partners ▫ Engage with hospital partners to conduct research consistent with the Department’s strategy; utilize overlapping research activity to capitalize on the resulting critical mass of expertise required for world leading research ▫ For more objective evaluation of the process, consider independent oversight of the new Competency-By-Design curriculum ▫ Strengthen the Child & Adolescent subspecialty residency program; repurpose posts from other specialties to increase positions ▫ Continue efforts to address a sense that Status Only faculty are relatively undervalued and to recognize their contributions more consistently across all sites; consider changing the name, Status Only
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN Decanal Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ The Department will identify and support a smaller set of clear priorities in education and research to increase its impact ▫ The Department will continue working with hospital partners to address redundancy and gaps in service provision ▫ To increase its impact, the Department is committed to fostering better integration of different research groups; e.g., the Department’s internal grant competitions will require a team of applicants from diverse hospitals across domains of expertise ▫ To ensure objectivity, an independent Competency-By-Design expert has been invited to join the departmental evaluation committee ▫ The Department will continue to work (with Temerty Faculty of Medicine) to increase positions in Child & Adolescent Psychiatry ▫ The Department is committed to continuing to include and engage Status Only faculty in all aspects and to better support their academic activities and career trajectories; may propose a name change (e.g., “Affiliate”) to align with other institutions

Systematic reviews of academic units are a critical process of quality assurance accountability at the Temerty Faculty of Medicine. Academic reviews of Clinical Departments are commissioned by the Dean to coincide, normally, with the end of the term of the Chair; as such, they can inform both strategic priority-setting and Chair (re)appointments. These reviews are distinct from professional accreditation and are not governed by the University of Toronto's "University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process" (UTQAP). Like UTQAP reviews, the protocols for Clinical Department reviews include (i) terms of reference (ii) self-study report, (iii) visit by external reviewers, (iv) reviewers' report of findings, and (v) Chair's and (vi) Dean's responses. Summarized outcomes of a review are brought forward, for information, to the Committee on Academic Policy & Programs of Academic Board; the full report and responses are submitted to the Executive Committee of the Temerty Faculty Council and circulated broadly in the Clinical Department.

EDU:A <i>[non-UTQAP; no degree programs]</i>	Donnelly Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research
EXTERNAL REVIEWERS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Christopher McMaster – Dept. of Pharmacology, Dalhousie University 2. Prof. Robert Waterston – Dept. of Genome Sciences, University of Washington
DATES OF REVIEW	October 28-29, 2019
STRENGTHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ <i>"The Donnelly Centre has performed outstanding research. This ranges from peer reviewed publications (both number and quality), to trainee supervision, to research dollars...It is easily the best research group in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Toronto, and ranks as one of, if not the, best in Canada."</i> ▫ <i>"Excellent" at generating IP and contracts; highly collaborative research</i> ▫ <i>"Exemplary" graduate, post-doctoral, and undergraduate training; "all trainees loved the collaborative environment and sharing of equipment and expertise"; trainee morale is high</i> ▫ <i>"Outstanding leadership from the current Director"</i>
RECOMMENDATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Recruitment of a new Donnelly Centre Director position is a clear top priority ▫ Increase diversity and junior faculty complement when pursuing new hires ▫ Consider co-recruiting with the Dept. of Molecular Genetics to address the need for computational biology supervision in the Molecular Genetics program, and with the Institute of Biomaterials & Biomedical Engineering and Dept. of Computer Science to strengthen collaborations ▫ Increase administrative staff to include 1) a facilities coordinator, 2) an extra position in the finance office, 3) an additional IT staff, and 4) possibly a dedicated individual for IP/business development ▫ Refresh the financial sustainability model to cover faculty and current administrative staffing (presently understaffed) that is not covered by the current base budget allocation
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN Decanal Response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ With the appointment of a new Director, there is an opportunity to recruit outstanding and more diverse junior faculty ▫ A recommendation for the new Director will be a joint recruitment plan for the Donnelly Centre and the Dept. of Molecular Genetics to recruit faculty in computational biology ▫ The joint recruitment of computational biologists with the Dept. of Computer Science should be a priority going forward; look for recruitment opportunities with engineering ▫ A close examination of the current staffing level and budget requirements to increase the number of staff will be undertaken by the new Director