

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 109 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**June 4, 2004**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, May 12, 2004 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor J.J. Berry Smith(In the Chair)  
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and  
Provost  
Professor David Farrar, Vice-Provost,  
Students  
Professor Rona Abramovitch  
Professor Derek Allen  
Dr. Inez N. Elliston  
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh  
Mr. Martin Hyrcza  
Ms Maritza Jackman  
Professor David Jenkins

Professor James Lepock  
Ms Vera Melnyk  
Professor Robert Reisz  
Miss Maureen Somerville  
Professor Dennis Thiessen  
Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos

**Non-Voting Assessor:**  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President,  
Government and Institutional Relations

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary  
Ms. Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Mr. Syed W. Ahmed  
Mr. Frank Belluardo  
Mr. Bruce G. Cameron  
Ms Rochelle Fernandes  
Professor Faith Fich

Ms Ranjini Ghosh  
Professor Anthony Haasz  
Professor Alexandra Johnston  
Professor Ronald Kluger  
Professor Brian Cantwell Smith

In Attendance:

Professor Lesley Bush, Office of the Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Professor Jane Gaskell, Dean, OISE/UT  
Professor Anne Lancashire, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Professor Michael Marrus, Dean, School of Graduate Studies  
Professor David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine, and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health  
Care Institutions

ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**Report Number 109 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
June 4, 2004**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report**

The Chair welcomed the following to the meeting room to assist the Committee in its deliberations:

Professor Lesley Bush,  
Professor Jane Gaskell, Dean, OISE/UT  
Professor Anne Lancashire, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Professor Michael Marrus, Dean, School of Graduate Studies  
Professor David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine, and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions

The Chair further noted that Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, was a member of the Committee and would assist in the presentation of reviews from that Faculty.

The Chair then invited Professor Tuohy to present the reviews in conjunction with representatives of each of the Faculties in which the reviews were conducted.

Professor Tuohy noted that the introduction to the document was meant to highlight common themes among reviews, and that there were circumstances under which reviews could be waived, described at the end of the documentation before members. She noted that all programs were required to be reviewed at least every ten years (according to the provincial guidelines set out by the Undergraduate Programs Review Audit Committee (UPRAC)), and that the University of Toronto aimed to conduct a review every seven years.

Following the review process arising out of the *Raising Our Sights* process, which had initiated a significant change in the way reviews were done institution-wide (though, she noted, that the Faculty of Medicine had chosen to continue the pattern of reviews that had been established prior to *Raising Our Sights*). Professor Tuohy then noted that the Provost would lead the process for revising the guidelines on campus reviews during the *Stepping UP* process. Lastly, she noted that *Stepping UP* would require that each multi-divisional unit would have to have an approved plan in place for reviews.

**Faculty of Arts and Science**

The Chair invited Professor Tuohy and Professor Anne Lancashire, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science, to present the reviews from the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Tuohy noted that the Committee would be considering for the first time ‘augmented’ reviews, in which a review of graduate programs by the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies (OCGS) would be conducted simultaneously with an undergraduate program review.

Professor Lancashire noted that a principal theme in the reviews in Arts and Science that recurred throughout the reviews were on departmental governance and on the suitability of structures within them. In particular, the lack of clarity of procedures was confusing to newer faculty members and on occasion caused strong disagreements among colleagues. Professor Lancashire noted that the Faculty had struck a task force on governance practices in response to the reviews and had made many improvements since the reviews had been completed.

**Report Number 109 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
June 4, 2004**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)**

A second theme that arose out of the review process was the linkage among faculty members and among the units in which they worked. In particular, linkage issues revolved around space allocation, which in such a large Faculty spread its faculty members among different buildings. Professor Lancashire noted that, in particular, the space issues in the Department of Religion would be addressed within two years.

*Anthropology*

Professor Tuohy noted that the experience of the augmented review process for Anthropology was uneven, in that the focus of the review was on the size of enrolment at the undergraduate level compared to faculty complement, as opposed to the undergraduate program as a whole. She flagged for the committee that future augmented reviews should avoid. No further questions were raised.

*Drama*

Professor Tuohy noted that because the undergraduate and graduate programs in Drama were operated in separate units, some discussion occurred as to whether the two units should be brought together. Reviewers concluded that because the system seemed to work well, there was no cause to adjust it.

*History and Philosophy of Science*

A member remarked on the difference in tone between the review for the School of History and Philosophy of Science and the review for Anthropology, in that the augmented review focused much more on the undergraduate components than the graduate components. A member asked about the connections between the School and the Department of Philosophy. Professor Lancashire noted that close academic connections had developed between the School and the Department, but that even closer links could be contemplated as the Department moved closer to other Faculty divisions.

The Chair remarked that the Committee's oversight of only undergraduate reviews left an incomplete picture of the status of program reviews. Professor Goel noted that the issue would be addressed in an upcoming review of the University's Guidelines for Program Reviews.

During a brief segue into the role of the Committee in overseeing the reviews before members, a member noted that all the reviews highlighted the tightness of resources available to the University and to its various divisions, and although budgetary constraint was not the province of the Committee, it should nonetheless be highlighted. Another member noted that previous reviews of the same units should be included to view progress over time.

*Department for the Study of Religion*

A member noted that the review document before members was welcome and noted that the study of religion was increasingly important.

*Department of Sociology*

Professor Lancashire noted the significant lag in time between the review and its perusal by the Committee. She noted that a new Chair and two new Associate Chairs had been appointed and that numerous changes had been made addressing the review.

**Report Number 109 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
June 4, 2004**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)**

**School of Graduate Studies**

The Chair welcomed Professor Michael Marrus, Dean, School of Graduate Studies, to the meeting and invited his comments on reviews in the School. Professor Marrus noted that the School of Graduate Studies was “in the review business” but that he did not believe that the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies (OCGS) review process was well-understood on campus. He noted that the augmented review process was potentially very valuable, and would be especially useful for reviewing programs offered at more than one of the University’s campuses. Professor Marrus further noted that OCGS reviews, in his opinion, should be brought before governance committees for scrutiny and comment, especially since OCGS had granted permission for the reviews to be used for planning purposes.

A member asked which office was responsible for the costs associated with reviews. Professor Marrus noted that the Provost’s Office was responsible for basic costs and honoraria, but that additional charges for augmentation were borne by the commissioning unit.

Professor Tuohy noted that reviews for Centres and Institutes were ‘sunset’ reviews in that one of the mandates of review committees were to determine whether the unit should be continued.

*Drama*

No comments were made with respect to the Graduate Drama review.

*Institute for Policy Analysis*

It was noted that no program was currently attached to the Institute. Professor Marrus noted that it was important for the Institute to obtain secure funding from both public and private sources to focus on macroeconomic forecasting.

**Faculty of Medicine**

Professor Tuohy noted that the Faculty of Medicine had a very stable and excellent tradition of reviews and served as a model for their organization and their prompt and considered responses to issues brought forward by reviewers. She noted that the themes brought out by many of the reviews dealt with the multi-site nature of programs, the adequacy of space for academic programming, budgetary and other resources, and inter-Faculty cooperation with relevant Arts and Science units.

The Chair welcomed Dr. David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine, and Ms. Leslie Bush. Dean Naylor noted that Ms. Bush had developed a strong protocol to handle the continuing review process within the large Faculty and deserved appropriate congratulations for handling the “unending” review processes both for academic quality and various accreditation reviews that were ongoing constantly. He noted his desire to find some method of capitalizing on opportunities that might present themselves to rationalize the review process.

He noted his thanks to all the reviewers of his Faculty, noting that they provided an enormous amount of time and value for minimal honoraria.

**Report Number 109 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
June 4, 2004**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)**

*Department of Anaesthesia*

Dean Naylor noted that concerns brought forward regarding the Alternate Funding Plan (AFP) at the University Health Network (UHN) had been ameliorated significantly.

*Department of Biochemistry*

Dean Naylor noted that the review before members had occurred before two significant developments, namely, the appointment of a new Chair, and the availability of new space in the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR).

A member questioned comments made regarding time to completion within the Department, requesting information on what would happen in the event that the Department disagrees with a reviewer. Dean Naylor noted that resolution of a disagreement would begin with an internal debate within the Department. Professor Goel noted that reviewers, while they perform excellent work, sometimes allow anecdotal evidence to alter perceptions of a Department's strength.

*Department of Family and Community Medicine*

It was noted that the review before members had already proceeded to the Committee at an earlier date.

*Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology*

A member noted that the Department was young, and, because of a recent merger, widespread. He asked whether there was a plan to consolidate the Department. Dean Naylor noted that the Department was indeed "far-flung" but that some consolidation might be possible in the Medical Sciences Building, and a plan to move the Best Institute there could occur in the upcoming years.

*Department of Medical Genetics and Microbiology*

Members raised no issues with this review.

*Banting and Best Department of Medical Research*

A member noted that there seemed to be some confusion over the status of the Department and that communication regarding the Department's status vis-à-vis the Centre for Cellular and Biomolecular Research (CCBR) was lacking. Dean Naylor noted that appointments between the two units had been a protracted and anxious process, but that the appointments had been made and the relationship between the CCBR and the Banting and Best Department was clearer.

*Department of Medicine*

A member noted that grades seemed very high and that a significant number of students enrolled in undergraduate medical education received grades with honours status. She queried whether there was grade inflation. Dean Naylor noted that requirements to enter medical school continued to rise; even so, the Faculty continued to monitor grades and tried to drive evaluations according to clear criteria. He noted that the issue was one requiring constant management.

**Report Number 109 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
June 4, 2004**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)**

*Department of Nutritional Sciences*

A member noted his high level of satisfaction with the Dean for the conduct of the review and his management of the Faculty as a whole.

*Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology  
Department of Otolaryngology*

No comments were received regarding these reviews.

*Department of Public Health Sciences*

Professor Goel, noting that his academic appointment was in the Department of Public Health Sciences, noted further that the consolidated degree was the Master of Public Health (M.P.H.), not the Master of Public Health Sciences (M.P.H.Sc.).

*Department of Surgery*

Dean Naylor noted that the Department of Surgery at the University of Toronto was one of the ten best in the world, and noted his satisfaction with the Chair for attracting and retaining top quality staff.

The Chair thanked Dean Naylor for his excellent presentation to the Committee.

**OISE/UT**

The Chair welcomed Professor Jane Gaskell, Dean, OISE/UT, to the meeting.

*Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning*

Dean Gaskell noted that the Department was the largest in the Faculty, and that the review before members had been completed for the previous Dean. She noted that reviews did require a significant investment of time and work but were very worthwhile. She noted that a new Chair of the Department was excellent and that various options were being pursued.

**Waived Reviews**

*Faculty of Arts and Science*

Professor Tuohy noted that several waived reviews were in the Faculty of Arts and Science, which would not be conducting 'cluster reviews' during the next cycle of reviews. She then noted that six reviews were planned for the 2004-05 year and eight to ten for the 2005-06 year. Professor Lancashire noted that the Faculty was trying to schedule reviews in conjunction with appointments of Chairs.

A member queried who had responsibility for appointing reviewers. Professor Lancashire noted that the Dean's Office, in conjunction with related Departments, Institutes and Centres, following which reviewers must be scheduled. The priorities for the Dean's Office are to appoint reviewers who are logical, logistically sound, practical, and who have academic credibility.

**Report Number 109 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -  
June 4, 2004**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)**

*Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering*

The Chair invited Professor Tas Venetsanopoulos, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, to comment on the waived reviews. Dean Venetsanopoulos noted that six reviews were scheduled for the 2004-05 year and six more for 2005-06, which would ensure that all Departments would be reviewed within the seven-year window..

*Other Faculties*

Professor Tuohy noted that UTSC and UTM reviews were waived pending significant internal restructuring following the adoption of the tri-campus planning model, while OISE/UT was undergoing two OCGS reviews.

**Provostial Reviews**

Professor Tuohy noted that at OISE/UT and at the Faculty of Information Studies, both reviews highlighted the clarity of mission and vision.

Professor Tuohy noted that the UTSC review was conducted in the context of a search for Vice-President and Principal.

**2. Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) – Report of the Auditors on the 2001 U of T Undergraduate Program Review**

Following a brief discussion, members agreed that this item should be deferred to the first meeting of fall, 2004.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

June 25, 2004

31304