

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

January 11, 2011

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, January 11, 2011 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)	Professor Christopher Damaren
Professor Douglas McDougall (Vice-Chair)	Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs	Mr. Rashi Maharaj
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean, School of Graduate Studies	Professor Emeritus Michael R. Marrus
Professor Robert L. Baker	Mr. Liam Mitchell
Mr. Hanif Bayat-Movahed	Ms Judith Poë
Professor Alister Cumming	Secretariat:
Professor Gabriele D'Eleuterio	Mr. Neil Dobbs
	Mr. Anwar Kazimi

Regrets:

Professor Maydianne Andrade	Ms Emily Holland
Professor Katherine Berg	Professor Michelle Murphy
Ms Annie Claire Bergeron-Oliver	Mr. James Yong Kyun Park
Professor Karen D. Davis	Professor Ito Peng
Professor Charles Deber	Mr. Shakir Rahim
Professor Robert Gibbs	Professor Njoki Wane

In Attendance:

Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Ms Melissa Berger, Program and Planning Officer, Office of the Dean, University of Toronto Mississauga
Professor Anne-Marie Brousseau, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Programs, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Rick Halpern, Dean and Vice-Principal (Academic), University of Toronto at Scarborough
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
Professor Bryan Karney, Associate Dean, Cross-Disciplinary Programs, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering
Professor Angela Lange, Vice-Dean Undergraduate, Teaching and Learning, University of Toronto Mississauga
Professor Peter MacDonald, Chair, Department of Chemical and Physical Sciences, University of Toronto Mississauga

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Professor Andrew Petersen, Department of Mathematical and Computational Sciences,
University of Toronto Mississauga
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean (Undergraduate), University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Professor Sandy Welsh, Acting Vice-Dean, Teaching and Learning, Faculty of Arts
and Science
Mr. Henry Mulhall, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Assistant Secretary of the Governing Council

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report 147 (September 21, 2010) was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Item 4, Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 2010-11, Part I

The Chair recalled that Report Number 147 dealt with the reviews of academic programs and units. The Committee's Report had been forwarded to the Academic Board, the Executive Committee of Governing Council, and the full Governing Council, and the Chairs of this Committee and the Academic Board had provided those bodies with information on the revised review process. The work of the staff in the Office of the Vice-President and Provost and the work of this Committee had received a very positive reception.

3. Major Calendar Changes, Approval Process

Professor Regehr noted that all major calendar-change proposals were coming before the Committee at this particular meeting because the academic divisions required approval of their proposals at this time in order to meet the schedules for the publication of their calendars. The process of consideration of curriculum changes had begun in the divisions at the end of the previous academic year and had taken place over the summer and early in the fall term, culminating in the consideration of changes by the curriculum committees and councils of the divisions in the fall.

Professor Regehr said that changes in the approval process and in the Committee's terms of reference would be proposed, probably at the Committee's next meeting, arising from the new University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP). The proposals currently before the Committee had been structured according to the categories established in the UTQAP: new programs, major changes to existing programs, deletions of programs, and new minors. Subject to the approval of changes to

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011**3. Major Calendar Changes, Approval Process (Cont'd)**

the terms of reference, it was anticipated that responsibility for dealing with some of those categories would change for 2011-12 proposals for curriculum changes to take effect in 2012-13. Under the UTQAP, major changes to existing programs would be approved at the divisional level and would be reported to the Committee only for information. In addition, the Provost's Office would report all major changes in an annual report to the Quality Council. Minor program changes would be approved at the divisional level.

4. Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus: Major Calendar Changes, 2011-12

Professor Regehr said that the Faculty of Arts and Science proposed four new undergraduate programs, as well as major modifications of existing programs, program deletions, and three new minor programs. The proposals had arisen from a curriculum-renewal process that had been on-going in the Faculty for a number of years. That process began in the academic departments, centres and institutes. Proposals were then reviewed by one of the Faculty's Undergraduate Curriculum Committees in the Humanities, Sciences, or Social Sciences. The review process included extensive consultation within and outside of the unit. Proposals endorsed by one of the Curriculum Committees were then forwarded to the Faculty of Arts and Science Council and were reviewed by the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. The Faculty proposed four new major programs: Biodiversity and Conservation Biology, Environmental Biology, Genome Biology, and Public Policy. The Faculty proposed major modifications with respect to two programs. It proposed a Specialist Program in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology – a proposal regarded as a major change because it was to be offered in an area in which there was an existing major program. In addition, it proposed to consolidate nine existing specialist programs into one Specialist and one Major program in Computer Science. The Faculty also proposed to delete a number of programs. It currently offered about 300 specialist and major programs. In its process of curriculum renewal, the Faculty had identified an issue that arose in some of its more specialized programs. When students reached the upper year of their programs, their selection of courses was frequently limited by program requirements. Therefore, the Faculty proposed to replace narrowly defined programs with broader programs offering a greater freedom of choice of courses in their upper years. The deletion of those programs did not imply a narrowing of course choice; students would still be able to select the previously required courses or to choose alternatives to match their interests. Finally, the Faculty proposed to establish three new minor programs. Initiation of those minors would, in the planned new arrangements, represent minor program changes because specialist or major programs were already offered in those areas: Asia-Pacific Studies, the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology, and Computer Science.

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011**4. Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus: Major Calendar Changes, 2011-12 (Cont'd)**

Invited to comment, Professor Welsh stressed that the proposed changes had in all cases been initiated by the appropriate departments, centres and institutes as part of their on-going review of the curriculum and of degree-level expectations.

Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following.

(a) Degree of course specification in new programs. A member, noting that the Faculty was proposing to delete programs that specified too large a number of courses and allowed too few options, asked how the Faculty would avoid the recurrence of the problem in proposals for new programs. He asked how the problem had been avoided in, for example, the proposed new Major Program in Biodiversity and Conservation Biology. Professor Regehr and Professor Welsh explained that all proposals for new programs were examined carefully at both the Faculty and University levels of administration and governance. That process would be even more rigorous under the new UTQAP. Programs proposed by departments, centres and institutes were examined by the Office of the Vice-Dean, Teaching and Learning in the Faculty of Arts and Science, where every effort was made to ensure the consistency with degree-level expectations, to avoid redundancy, to ensure (where appropriate) complementarity with other programs, and to avoid such issues as too high a level of specification of course selection. That examination often led to discussions and consultations, including those with the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs. Proposals were then examined in considerable detail by an advisory committee in the Faculty, and they were then forwarded to the appropriate Curriculum Committee. After the review of program proposals in the Faculty, they were forwarded to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs and to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. In the case of many new programs under the UTQAP, proposals would also be forwarded to the Academic Board and to the Executive Committee of the Governing Council and, with approval at the University level, to the Quality Council for approval and the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for approval for funding. Professor Brousseau described the process for the proposed new Major Program in Biodiversity and Conservation Biology, noting that the situation in that case was special because of the elimination of the former Departments of Botany and Zoology and the establishment of the new Departments of Cell and Systems Biology and of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology and the restructuring of programs undertaken in the light of the reorganization.

(b) Durability of proposed programs. A member asked how the Faculty could be confident that a proposed new program would last over the years. Professor Brousseau replied that there was no crystal ball that would provide certain knowledge about the endurance of a new program. The Faculty made its best efforts to review developments in the academic discipline and in the marketplace and to make good choices to meet the

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011**4. Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus: Major Calendar Changes, 2011-12 (Cont'd)**

needs that were apparent at the time. Professor Regehr added that it should not necessarily be regarded as a failure if a new program did not endure. There might be clear academic rationale and student demand for a program at one time, but as the field changed that might no longer be the case. Such a series of events did not demonstrate a failure on the part of the University. Rather it demonstrated that the University had to be nimble, moving quickly both to meet needs while they existed and to close programs when the needs disappeared.

(c) Minor Program in Asia-Pacific Studies. A member noted that the proposed new Minor Program in Asia-Pacific Studies was to be offered by the Dr. David Chu Program in Asia-Pacific Studies rather than by the Department of East Asian Studies. He recalled a debate some years previously in the Faculty of Arts and Science when it had been stressed that the Department was an interdisciplinary one. Given the cost of administering an additional program, he wondered why the program was not to be offered by the Department of East Asian Studies, the regular academic unit most directly able to do so. Professor Brousseau replied that the Dr. David Chu program currently offered the Major Program in Asia-Pacific Studies, and there was an indication of student demand for a Minor program, the requirements for which could be filled by some of the same courses required for the Major. She did not know the reason for the administrative location of both programs.

(d) Deletion of programs for reason of low or declining enrolment. A member noted that low or declining enrolment was cited as the reason for the closure of a number of programs. He asked if the Faculty had a definition of the number of students that would cause the closure of a program. Were there criteria for program closures arising from declining enrolments? He noted that the Major Program in Semiotics and Communication Theory was proposed for closure, notwithstanding a total enrolment of 63 students, although the number of students enrolled in the earlier years of the program was declining. Professor Brousseau replied that there was no firm numerical threshold. The criteria varied depending on circumstances in the particular Department and depending on the availability of the courses required for the program. For example, in the case of the Program in Semiotics and Communications Theory, the program currently relied very heavily on a single faculty member, who was likely to retire in the near future. In the case of that program, the requirements of the Literary Studies Program at Victoria College had been revised, and students with an interest in Semiotics would be able to take some coursework in the area in the Literary Studies program. Students currently registered in that Major Program would be able either to transfer to the Literary Studies program or to complete the current program in Semiotics.

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011

4. Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus: Major Calendar Changes, 2011-12 (Cont'd)

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed major calendar changes as described in the submission from Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus, effective for the academic year 2011-12.

5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Major Calendar Changes, 2011-12

The Chair noted that a slightly revised version of the calendar-change proposal was before the Committee, including a change of the effective date of implementation. The University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) proposed to close two co-operative programs – Anthropology and Sociology – effective for the 2011-12 academic year, rather than the 2012-13 year (as in the original proposal).

Professor Regehr said that UTSC proposed one new program: a Minor Program in Literature and Film Studies. (She noted that under the current terms of reference, the Committee had the authority to approve new specialist, major and minor programs within established degree programs that did not require additional resource allocations and that were not “major.” Under the UTQAP and the planned new terms of reference for 2011-12, the proposal would be considered a major modification because there was currently no major or specialist program in Literature and Film Studies. It would be approved at the divisional level and reported to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for information.) UTSC also proposed the addition of Major Programs in (i) Human Biology, and in (ii) Biodiversity, Ecology and Evolution – areas in which it currently offered Specialist Programs. It proposed major modifications to the requirements for the Major Program in Physical Sciences, the Major Program in Astrophysics and Physics, the Specialist Program in Physical and Mathematical Sciences and the Specialist Program in Physics and its Applications. Finally, UTSC proposed the deletion of three programs: the Specialist Program in Natural Sciences, the Co-operative Specialist Program in Anthropology and the Co-operative Specialist Program in Sociology. In the case of the two co-operative programs, there had been persistently low enrolments and considerable difficulty in finding suitable work-term placements for students.

A member referred to the proposed changes in the programs in Physics and Physical Sciences – areas that had not traditionally attracted high enrolments, and she asked about current enrolments in those programs. Professor Scherk replied that enrolments were currently small. A review of the Department and its programs,

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011

5. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Major Calendar Changes, 2011-12 (Cont'd)

completed in the spring of 2010, had recommended revitalization of the Physics programs at UTSC to make them sustainable. At the present time, there were too few courses offered to enable students to complete their programs without taking courses on another campus – something that probably contributed to the programs' low enrolments. UTSC was optimistic that with new appointments in Physics, with a thorough rethinking of the programs, and with the availability of more third and fourth-year courses, enrolment would grow to the level required to make the programs sustainable.

On motion duly made, seconded, and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed major calendar changes as described in the revised submission from the University of Toronto at Scarborough, effective for the academic year 2011-12.

6. University of Toronto Mississauga: Major Calendar Changes, 2011-12

Professor Regehr said the University of Toronto Mississauga proposed two calendar changes: the addition of a Minor Program in Computer Science and the closure of the Minor Program in Science Education. The closure of the Science Education program arose in significant part because of the advent of the new Concurrent Teacher Education Program at UTM.

On motion duly made and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed major calendar changes as described in the submission from the University of Toronto Mississauga, effective for the academic year 2011-12.

The Chair noted that the material provided to the Committee on the closure of the Science Education Minor at UTM used the format for program closures developed for the University's new Quality Assessment Process – the UTQAP. Professor Regehr would be pleased to receive any feedback on that format.

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011**7. Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Major Calendar Change, 2011-12**

Professor Regehr said that the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering proposed to establish three new programs. The first was a new Minor Program in Engineering Business – a unique program to be offered by the Faculty in partnership with the Rotman School of Management. The Faculty also proposed two new undergraduate Certificate Programs: Engineering Business and Global Engineering. Certificate Programs in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering were offered to students in the regular undergraduate degree programs who wished to take a set of courses in another particular area to gain specialized knowledge. In those cases, students could opt for a certificate program rather than a minor program, with the requirements of the former being about half those of a minor program.

Professor Karney said that the proposed Minor Program in Engineering Business was a very exciting one, which the Faculty anticipated would be a very popular one with students. He wished to acknowledge the high level of cooperation and support from the Rotman School of Management in the development of the proposed program, and he looked forward to the continuing relationship between the two divisions.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

(a) Engineering Business Minor: Use of the term “engineering” as a modifier. A member noted that over the past decade, the use of the term “engineering” had increasingly been used in connection with other fields, for example: tissue engineering, cellular engineering, systems engineering, data engineering, financial engineering, etc. The member noted that many professional associations in Engineering had expressed concern about the use of those terms. Was the proposed program in Engineering Business a matter of similar concern? Professor Amon replied that her personal view was that the term “engineering” was in fact over-used as a modifier. In this case the program was to be called “Engineering Business” rather than “Business Engineering.” Its intention was to assist students in applying business principles in their careers in engineering and technology companies. The member was heartened to hear the response, and he asked that the correct term “Engineering Business” be stated in the record of the meeting.

(b) Engineering Business Minor program requirements. A member observed that the proposed, very exciting program in Engineering Business would require six half courses or three full-course equivalents. Students in the program in Engineering Science were required to complete only three full-course-equivalent complementary-studies courses in their programs and would therefore be required to take all of their complementary-studies courses to complete the proposed Minor Program. The member asked whether that would make the Minor a feasible one for all undergraduate students in the Faculty. Professor Karney replied that the point was a very important one that had been given careful consideration by the Faculty. He

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011**7. Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering: Major Calendar Change, 2011-12 (Cont'd)**

anticipated that the proposal was nonetheless an appropriate one. It was anticipated that the level of student interest in the program would be very high, and some students would as a result be willing to complete at least one extra course to meet the requirements of the minor. Some of the courses for the Minor would be offered in the summer to enable students to take an extra course and deal with timetable conflicts. If students wished to obtain training in Engineering Business and were not willing to complete the requirements of the Minor, they could opt for the proposed Certificate Program in Engineering Business, which would require only about half the course work required for the Minor. Finally, the requirements for the Minor could be met after students had completed the requirements for their degree, provided that they did so within the maximum of twelve years from their first enrolment. Professor Karney replied that he anticipated that many students and alumni would do so.

(c) Transcript recognition of completion of certificate program. A member observed that students who completed a Certificate Program in the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering would not have that achievement recorded on their official transcript of academic record. The member asked about University policy determining what may or may not be recorded on a transcript. Professor Regehr replied that she was planning to bring forward revisions to, or regulations accompanying, the current Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs, which Policy had been approved by the Academic Board and confirmed by the Executive Committee of the Governing Council in 2003. Professor Regehr was working with the University Registrar and with some of the academic divisions on the revisions. One of the questions under consideration was minimum criteria for the transcript recording of student achievements.

(d) Global Engineering. A member referred to the proposal to establish a new Certificate in Global Engineering and asked whether, as in the case of Engineering Business, it was planned also to offer a Minor in the area. Dean Amon replied that the Faculty was not currently planning to offer a Minor program in Global Engineering, but she hoped that it would be possible to do so eventually as student interest grew with the offering of the Certificate Program and as the Faculty became able to offer more courses.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed major calendar changes, as described in the submission from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, effective for the academic year 2011-12.

REPORT NUMBER 148 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – January 11, 2011

8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Regehr reported on matters she planned to bring to the Committee at its next meetings. First, as noted previously, there would be need for the Committee to consider amendments to its terms of reference to implement changes to the quality-assurance process. Second, also as noted earlier, there would be need to consider criteria for recording the completion of certificates on academic transcripts. The outcome would be either a recommendation to amend the 2003 Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs or the adoption of a set of guidelines. Third, Professor Regehr and Professor Corman were reviewing the Grading Practices Policies. The annual report of the Ombudsperson had noted certain discrepancies between the University Grading Practices Policy and the Graduate Grading and Evaluation Practices Policy. Professor Regehr anticipated a proposal to amalgamate the two policies. Finally, Professor Regehr anticipated that she would bring forward a proposal for a Course Evaluation Policy. The University of Toronto was almost the only university not to have a policy providing that courses would be evaluated. A Working Group had been considering the matter over the past year and had reported to the Principals, Deans, Directors and Chairs. That had led to the establishment of a Course Evaluation Implementation Group, co-chaired by Professor Regehr and Professor Carol Rolheiser of the Centre for Teaching Innovation and Support. Professor Regehr would bring forward a policy proposal to the Committee in the near future.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting was scheduled for **Wednesday, March 1, 2011**. The agenda would include: (i) the second part of the series of reviews of academic programs and units for 2010-11, and (ii) the annual report of the Vice-Provost, Students on Student Financial Support. With respect to the reviews, the Chair noted that, because of the large number of reviews considered by the Committee in the fall, there would be relatively few reviews requiring the Committee's attention at its meeting of March 1. Professor Regehr noted that the Committee would in all likelihood receive a large number of reviews again in the fall term of 2011.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 31, 2011

58657