

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE
ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - April 5, 2011**

**4. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference:
Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding
Levels of Approval**

Mr. Charpentier commented on the context of the proposal to amend the Committee's terms of reference. It came forward in parallel with proposals to make related changes to the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee and the Academic Board. Under usual circumstances, proposals to amend the terms of reference were presented by the Committee Chair or Vice-Chair, often acting with the Secretary of the Governing Council. The proposals at this time were somewhat different in that they had emerged from two parallel processes. First, the Task Force on Governance had over the past two years been engaged in a comprehensive review of the University's governance system. Its Report had been approved by the Governing Council in October 2010. At the same time as that review, there had been a Province-wide examination of the quality assurance process for both graduate and undergraduate programs.

Mr. Charpentier reported that the Task Force on Governance had heard, consistently and repeatedly, concerns about excessive duplication in governance, the substantial burden involved in securing approval of transactional matters, and the consequent need to streamline the consideration of items. In that context, the Task Force on Governance Implementation Committee had considered approval processes with a view to improving their efficiency while continuing to ensure appropriate governance oversight and accountability. As the Task Force developed its recommendations, it had met and consulted with the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs; the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education; and the Chair of the Committee on Academic Programs. The Task Force's objective had been to ensure it was fully informed about the changes being made to the quality assurance processes and to provide advice in relation to its own deliberations and expectations with respect to governance and oversight. The timely communications had ensured that the recommended changes were consistent with the intent of the Task Force in responding to concerns expressed throughout its work. Critically, the recommendations would result in academic decisions being made by the academic bodies within governance, including the divisional councils and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. In particular, they would ensure that the highest level of academic oversight resided with the senior representative academic decision-making body: the Academic Board. It was necessary, because of provisions in the University of Toronto Act, that many of the Academic Board's decisions be confirmed by the Executive Committee of the Governing Council. However, that Committee's role was not to re-debate what the Academic Board had decided, but rather to assure itself that due process had been followed. If there was any serious concern, the Executive Committee would be able to refer the matter back to the Academic Board; it would not be able to reject an Academic Board decision. The Academic Board, and where appropriate the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, would be the decision-makers.

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

**4. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference:
Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding
Levels of Approval (Cont'd)**

Mr. Charpentier said that the Secretariat had been intimately involved in drafting the proposed revisions to the terms of reference, and it was satisfied that they addressed the necessary responsibilities. As well, the Implementation Committee had reviewed and endorsed the proposals.

Professor Regehr recalled that the Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs, approved by the Governing Council in June, 2010, had been before the Committee in May and a draft of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (the U.T.QAP) had been presented to the Committee for information at the same time. The U.T.QAP, slightly revised, was currently before the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council) for approval, which Professor Regehr anticipated would be granted shortly. The objective of the current proposals was to bring the University's processes into line with the U.T.QAP. Professor Regehr recalled that as proposals had come forward in 2009-10, she had commented on how they would be handled under the proposed new process. For example, modifications to existing programs would be approved by the divisional councils, with major modifications being reported annually to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for information. The major change being proposed at this time dealt with the procedures for the approval of new programs. Such proposals currently required the most levels of approval, and the sponsors of new programs had expressed concern that they were required to present their proposals again and again to various governance bodies. The problem would become more severe for proposals for new undergraduate major and specialist programs, which would now require additional steps for approval at the Provincial level. Previously, such proposals were approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, often as part of the division's annual calendar-change proposal. Under the Province's Quality Assurance Process, however, such proposals would now require the endorsement of the Quality Council and the approval of the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.

Professor Regehr outlined the current process for approval on proposals for new programs. For all programs, proposals were developed by the divisions in consultation with the Provost's Office. For undergraduate programs, that was followed by six steps towards approval: the division's council; the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs; the Planning and Budget Committee (for consideration of planning and resource implications), the Academic Board, and the Governing Council, then proceeding to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for funding approval and (if appropriate) to any relevant professional body for purposes of accreditation. For graduate programs, nine steps had been required after the division's development of the proposal in consultation with the Provost's Office: posting of the proposal for fourteen days on the School of Graduate Studies (S.G.S.) website for comment; approval by the divisional

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

**4. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference:
Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding
Levels of Approval (Cont'd)**

council; approval by the School of Graduate Studies' Graduate Education Council; the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs; the Planning and Budget Committee (for consideration of planning and resource implications); the Academic Board; and the Governing Council; then proceeding to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies; the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities for funding approval; and (if appropriate) to any relevant professional body for purposes of accreditation.

Professor Regehr described the changes being proposed. The procedures would be the same for undergraduate and graduate programs, and certain steps would be removed to expedite the process. First, changes already approved by the School of Graduate Studies removed the step of posting proposals for new graduate programs on the S.G.S. website. That process had yielded few comments (perhaps on average only one or two over two weeks), not justifying the continuation of the process. Second, constitutional changes in S.G.S. had also removed the step of approval by the Graduate Education Council. Rather, proposals proceeded directly from the divisional council to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Third, it was proposed that proposals not be examined by the Planning and Budget Committee unless the program required a new budget allocation from outside the division. Under the new budget model, it was normally the responsibility of the division to find any funding required for new programs. While it was anticipated that the primary locus of governance discussion of proposals for new programs would be the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, proposals would proceed to the Academic Board for approval. Upon University approval, the proposal would proceed to the Ontario Quality Council, to the Ministry of Training Colleges and Universities for funding approval, and, where required, to the appropriate professional accrediting body. The outcome would reduce the number of steps required for approval from seven to five for undergraduate programs and from nine to five for graduate programs.

Professor Regehr said that the proposed new process sought to separate the process of consultation from the process of governance approval. One of the reasons for the numerous steps required for governance approval was to use the approval process to assure consultation. Under the new U.T.QAP, there would be two separate parts to the consultative process. First, while a division was working up a new-program proposal, it would consult with the Provost's Office. A key step in the administrative review would be a consultation meeting involving staff from: the Planning and Budget group in the Provost's Office; the Government Relations group in the Office of the Vice-President, University Relations; the Office of the Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life (to deal with any staffing issues); and the Vice-Provost, Graduate Studies (for graduate program proposals). That group would consider potential issues to be dealt with and steps to be

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

**4. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference:
Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding
Levels of Approval (Cont'd)**

taken by the division to smooth the path towards approval. Second, while the division was working up the proposal, it would ensure appropriate consultation with students, faculty, cognate programs and cognate units that would be affected. The holding of such consultations was to be verified in the program proposal. In addition, when it was appropriate, the division was expected to consult with such existing bodies as the Tri-Campus Deans, the Council of Graduate Deans and the Council of Health Science Deans. Also expected, when appropriate, was consultation with interested parties external to the University such as the officers of accrediting bodies for professional programs and potential employers for vocationally directed programs when advice would help to ensure the employability of graduates.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

(a) Student participation in proposals for new graduate programs. A member asked whether removal of the Graduate Education Council's participation in approving new academic programs would mean that graduate students would have an opportunity to make their views known only through the consultative process. Professor Regehr replied that graduate students were represented on divisional councils and on other governance bodies including the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Academic Board, and they would have the opportunity to state their views at meetings of those bodies as well as during the consultative process. Professor Corman stressed that divisional councils recognized the importance of the views of current graduate students about proposals for new programs. Among other things, those views were very important in gauging the level of demand for new programs. Statements verifying appropriate consultation with students were required in the documentation supporting new program proposals. Many divisional councils were strengthening their due-diligence procedures with respect to student consultation, among other things, in recognition of the fact that there would be no review of their decisions by the Graduate Education Council. Therefore, Professor Corman concluded that student involvement in the development of new programs would be as much a part of the process under the proposed new procedure as it had been under the old, if not more so.

(b) Divisional approval of program modifications. A member expressed concern about the delegation of authority to divisional councils to approve changes to academic programs, in the event that there were situations where those councils were not operating effectively or transparently. There would be no oversight of such approval at the level of University governance. Professor Regehr replied that it was recognized that there was need to make changes to the constitutions of the divisional councils to enable them to discharge effectively the new responsibilities proposed to be assigned to them. If, when the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs received reports for information about major

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

**4. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs Terms of Reference:
Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 and to the Guidelines Regarding
Levels of Approval (Cont'd)**

modifications to programs, the Committee had reason for concern about approvals in a particular division, it would be important to review the situation at that time.

A member stressed the importance of the need to observe the operation of the process and to review it if necessary. It was not possible to know definitively how the new process would work out in practice. No matter how many steps were involved, it was important to ensure that there be value added by each step. The member thought that a major reason for the proposal was the very fact that value was not being added at each step of the current process. On the contrary, the action being taken at some steps appeared to be something very akin to rubber stamping, with the result that the process had become too time-consuming and expensive. It would be very important to ensure that value was being added by each step in the proposed new process.

Mr. Charpentier stressed that the Task Force on Governance Implementation Committee expected the systematic review of divisional constitutions to ensure that they would be able to execute their responsibilities and to add value. The Governing Council Secretariat, under the aegis of the Implementation Committee, was working to refine the template that the divisions could use to assess their councils' constitutions and by-laws. One of the key concerns was to ensure that those bodies would be able to add value to the review of proposals for new programs and program modifications.

(c) Role of University civil service. A member stressed the importance of the role of University staff members in dealing with proposals for programs and program modifications. Very often, University staff members had long experience, which included experience with programs that had not succeeded. Very often faculty who held administrative positions for limited periods as well as other faculty and students did not have the same broad range of experience. The member hoped that the role of staff would be supported and appreciated. Professor Corman replied that staff were a key part of the process of administrative review. Staff members were often uniquely qualified and would have a role in ensuring that all procedures were followed properly.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed amendments to sections 3, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 to the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the proposed amendments to the sections of the "Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval" dealing with Admission policies and Academic program proposals, be approved.

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011****5. Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines**

Professor Regehr presented the proposed new framework for student evaluation of teaching. She stressed that student evaluation was only one element in the overall evaluation of teaching and of academic units, which was a much broader process including such things as peer review, instructor self-assessment, cyclical program review, and other tools. However, the opportunity for students to have input into the process was absolutely vital. In September 2009, a Course Evaluation Working Group had been established, co-chaired by Professor- Edith Hillan (Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life) and Professor Jill Matus (Vice-Provost, Students) and including representation from many of the University's academic divisions. Its mandate had been to review current course evaluation practices both across the University of Toronto and at peer institutions, to review current research on course-evaluation practices, and to make any necessary recommendations to improve this University's policies and practices. The review of current research had been funded by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) and had been peer reviewed.

Professor Regehr noted that the interest in a new course-evaluation framework had arisen from a number of factors including approaches from individual faculty members to the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation, often as they were preparing their portfolios for tenure and promotion. It had become clear from those approaches that individual departments and divisions had very different practices for student evaluation of teaching. Indeed, a number of individual departments and divisions had requested assistance with reviews of their own practices. As a result of those approaches and as a result of the survey of the current research and literature, it had emerged that the University of Toronto was not always following best practices. There were more than thirty different course evaluation forms currently in use across the University, which made it difficult to assess and compare data at the institutional level for purposes of tenure, promotion and awards decisions. Questions were sometimes vague or confusing, which made the resulting data less meaningful or actually confusing. Focus groups sponsored by the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation demonstrated that students did not always understand questions in the way intended. Response scales differed from a five-point scale up to a thirteen-point scale. There was a lack of guidelines with respect to the administration of course evaluation surveys and inconsistency in practice, which could result in the introduction of inequities into the data. In some divisions, students administered the process; in others faculty did so. In some cases, the process was highly structured and in others less so. Finally, there were problems with the interpretation and use of the course-evaluation data, often including the over- or under-estimation of the importance of particular elements of the data or of particular questions. In some cases, there was over-reliance on the responses to a single question, with different questions being relied upon in different divisions.

Because of the limitations of the current practice, the Working Group had made a number of recommendations. First, it had advised that there was need to develop

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011****5. Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines (Cont'd)**

institutional guidelines for student evaluations of teaching. It had become apparent that the University of Toronto was one of the few universities in North America without a policy dealing with the matter. Second, it was recommended that the University adopt a centrally supported, on-line system for course evaluations. Third it was proposed that the system develop a flexible format that would be customizable to meet the particular needs of individual academic units. The recommendations were presented to the group of Principals and Deans, and the outcome was the establishment of a Course Evaluation Framework Implementation Group, co-chaired by Professor Carol Rolheiser (Director of the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation) and Professor Regehr, again with broad representation from the University's academic divisions. The Implementation Group had developed the policy, now before the Committee for approval, and it was working on Guidelines for implementation of the proposed Policy.

Professor Regehr outlined the key aspects of the proposed Policy. First, it specified that student evaluations would be completed for each course each time it was offered. Second, it set out the rules concerning access to the data provided by the course evaluations. It was the general practice in the University that students would have access to the data, although faculty could opt out of sharing that data. The practice was, however, not consistent across the University. Finally, the policy set out the responsibilities of academic administrators, instructors and students in ensuring that there was good data to evaluate courses.

Professor Regehr stressed that the Guidelines to implement the proposed Policy were very much in draft form, provided to give the Committee some knowledge of what the Implementation Group was working towards. Professor Regehr would bring the Guidelines back to the Committee for its information when they had been fully worked out.

Professor Regehr reported that the Implementation Group had issued a Request for Proposals to suppliers of a number of on-line course-evaluation systems and had received presentations on them. It was now in the final stages of the process of establishing an agreement with a supplier. It was also in the process of selecting and testing questions for the evaluations, with the staff of the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovations (C.T.S.I.) and the divisions conducting studies with student focus groups. The Implementation Group would also form a sub-group to work on ensuring an appropriate response rate. The University planned to make available a smart-phone application and other means to provide students with convenient access to the system. To promote a good response rate, it would be necessary to ensure that students know that the evaluations are meaningful and that other students would have access to the outcome. The Implementation Group was currently identifying divisions that wished to participate in a pilot project to use the new system in the summer of 2011 and to implement the system in the 2011-12 academic year. Professor Regehr and the C.T.S.I. staff were therefore making

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

5. Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines (Cont'd)

presentations about the system to the various divisions for their consideration and possible adoption.

Professor Regehr described the proposed central system. It would include approximately seven core questions to be included in all evaluations. It would also include a bank of questions that the divisions and departments could choose to add. Instructors would also be welcome to add questions. Only the instructors would be able to view the responses to their added questions. The maximum number of questions would be twenty in total.

Finally, Professor Regehr described the broad consultations that had taken place with Deans, Chairs, Faculty Councils, student leaders and student focus groups. On the suggestion of student leaders, information and an invitation for comment had been broadly distributed in student e-newsletters. A memorandum had been distributed to Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs. Consultations had been undertaken with the executives of the Faculty Association and the Canadian Union of Public Employees, and with the Teaching Academy, with very broad input having been received.

The Chair reiterated that only the Policy was included in the motion for recommendation to the Academic Board. Members would, however, be very welcome to make any comments and tender any advice with respect to the Guidelines.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following

(a) Instructors' option not to release course-evaluation data. A member asked why instructors were permitted, under the policy, to opt not to release data for the evaluation of their courses to students. Another member noted the experience in his Faculty, where instructors whose courses garnered poor ratings were the ones who opted out of release of their data, in fact skewing the distribution of aggregate ratings for the Faculty to the high side. The member referred to the chart on page 4 of the Guidelines, which gave students access only to the "institutionally selected quantitative questions," and not to institutionally-selected open-ended questions, divisionally or departmentally-selected questions, or instructor-selected questions. Even access to the institutionally selected quantitative questions was qualified by a note, which gave instructors the ability to opt out of sharing that data. The member was not at all sure that the Policy addressed the issue of students' needing to know about the outcome of course evaluations.

Professor Regehr replied that it had been a general practice in the University to give instructors the option not to share the data from course evaluations with students. In practice, relatively few instructors chose to keep their data private. While Professor Regehr thought it was appropriate for data to be made available to students, she also thought it important to respect the wishes of instructors who did not wish to do so,

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

5. Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines (Cont'd)

particularly those who held strong beliefs that the information should be regarded as private. She would look again at the chart cited with a view to ensuring that students had access to all appropriate data generated by the course evaluations. She noted that there was a great deal of variance in the current practices among divisions, some of which denied students access to all course evaluation data. For those divisions, the new policy would represent a very radical change. Other divisions had a long tradition of providing student access to the data. While each division would have to develop its own arrangements under the new Policy, approving the new Policy would represent a major step forward. Retention of the opt-out provision would be of considerable importance to secure widespread acceptance of the proposed Policy.

Another member favoured careful reconsideration of the opt-out provision. He noted that students would be able to make use of other methods of providing their evaluations of teaching in those courses that did not permit release of data, such as use of electronic social media, and the information they released would be much less carefully derived.

(b) Doing course evaluations online. A member expressed concern that moving to on-line evaluations would reduce the participation rate by students. Professor Regehr acknowledged that research had shown that moving to on-line evaluations had reduced response rates. However, she noted that in some circumstances, those rates were already very low. In large classes, for example, the response rate for in-class surveys was often less than 20%. Moreover, a great deal of work was being completed at other universities that had adopted the same on-line system that the University of Toronto proposed to use. The outcome of their strategies had been much improved response rates. The University planned to link the course-evaluation system to the Blackboard system now used by students. Students would have various means to complete the surveys including, as noted, smart phones. Faculty members could still use class time, urging students to use their laptops or other devices to complete the evaluation. While there was some risk, Professor Regehr hoped that there would be no decline. Another member commended the move to on-line administration of the evaluation surveys. It represented the most efficient way to conduct the surveys, and in those cases where students completed their course work partially or fully off-campus, it represented the most effective way. The member's experience with on-line evaluations had been that the participation rate had increased.

(c) Analysis and reporting of data. In response to a question, Professor Regehr said that the planned on-line system had excellent reporting capabilities. The users would be able to choose the data required, and the system would be able to send the data almost instantly to the instructors upon the date selected for release of that data – often the day after grades were submitted. The system would also be able to provide benchmarking data, comparing responses to University-wide data or data generated in the department or division. It would also be able to benchmark data in certain types of courses against that from comparable

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

5. Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines (Cont'd)

courses, for example required first-year courses or courses of a given size. After a number of years, it would also be possible to obtain analyses of changes in the data over time. The system was very flexible in the analyses it could provide.

(d) Limitations of course evaluations and their importance in promotion and tenure decisions. Two members expressed concern about the limitations of course evaluations, which served as a very important basis for reviews of faculty members' performance for purposes of promotion and tenure. One member observed that the evaluations could not measure the effect of teaching on the improvement of student learning. Another member expressed a number of other concerns. Response rates were sometimes quite low and provided inadequate data to inform key decisions about faculty members – a matter that was of particular concern to faculty members who were not yet tenured and those who were in the teaching stream. Questions on evaluations were not always appropriate for particular groups of students. For example, first-year science students would find it difficult to answer many of the usual questions. The member suggested testing potential questions on focus groups consisting of such students. Finally, the likelihood of a substantial change to the course-evaluation questionnaires under the new policy would make it difficult to place the new data in context as measurement of the quality of an individual's teaching. The member suggested that, before using data arising from the new evaluation questionnaires, the University test both new and previously used questionnaires in large, multi-section courses where the same instructor taught more than one section. That would provide at least some basis for comparison between the assessments provided by the earlier and the current questionnaires.

Professor Regehr, Ms Gravestock and Ms Greenleaf replied that the questionnaires were not seeking to measure student learning but rather students' perception of the quality of their learning experience. Questions were being developed that would provide a more accurate view of that perception. The process for developing course-evaluation questions was described on the website of the Centre for Teaching Support and Innovation, and members of the University were invited to provide advice. The Centre was in fact testing new and older questionnaires in multi-section classes and analyzing the data.

(e) Student-conducted course evaluations. A member noted that the Arts and Science Students' Union (ASSU) had for many years been producing an *Anti-Calendar*, which was a major source of information about the results of course evaluations. The member noted that there had even been situations where there had been competition between ASSU and the Department about which body would undertake the course evaluations. Invited to respond, Professor Welsh said that she and Ms Greenleaf had been working closely with ASSU on the matter. ASSU was very interested in the University-wide process and had expressed certain concerns about response rate and about the opt-out provision for individual instructors. It had, however, been the experience that most faculty members did agree to

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

5. Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses: Policy and Guidelines (Cont'd)

publication of course evaluation outcomes in the Anti-Calendar. ASSU was pleased with the University initiative, and it was pleased to cease its activity in the area and to concentrate on other matters. Consequently, the initiative in the Faculty of Arts and Science was moving forward with the support of ASSU.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses, a copy of which is attached to Professor Regehr's memorandum of March 16, 2011, be approved.

7. John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design: Degree Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Architectural Studies

Professor Regehr said that the proposal now before the Committee was one of a number of exciting new developments concerning the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design (FALD). The Academic Board had, at its previous meeting, considered an Interim Project Planning Report for the Faculty's move to a new location – the historic original Knox College building at 1 Spadina Crescent. The current proposal was to move the Honours Bachelor of Arts Program, taught by faculty members in the Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design, from the Faculty of Arts and Science to FALD. While the students would register in the FALD, the faculty members teaching the courses, and the program itself, would remain unchanged. The Faculty did not currently offer an undergraduate program. For it to do so, it was necessary that its degree requirements, based on stated degree-level expectations be formally approved. The degree-level expectations, like the program requirements, would remain unchanged.

Invited to comment, Dean Sommer said that the Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design had for many years until late in the 1990s offered undergraduate programs leading to graduates' qualification as professional architects or landscape architects. When the decision had been taken to elevate the professional program to the graduate level, the Faculty had wished to maintain its participation in undergraduate teaching, but it did not have the faculty complement to offer a full undergraduate program. It had therefore participated by offering the liberal arts major program in architectural studies. Since that time, the Faculty had built up its complement of full-time tenure-stream faculty, and it was moving both to expand its graduate program, including doctoral-level studies, and its undergraduate program, assuming full responsibility for the undergraduate major program in Architectural Studies.

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

7. John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design: Degree Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in Architectural Studies (Cont'd)

Three matters arose in discussion.

(a) Outlook for graduates. A member noted that the Faculty's training of professional architects and landscape architects would continue to be provided at the graduate level. What would graduates of the undergraduate program do? Professor Sommer replied that the graduate programs were unique in Canada in that they were self-contained, requiring no particular undergraduate preparation. However, he anticipated that many of the students who completed the undergraduate liberal-arts program would then enter the graduate program to train for professional qualification. They might also enter such other fields as geography, planning, real estate, and public administration.

(b) Student support. Mr. Thwainy, President of the Bachelor of Arts Architectural Studies Student Society, said that an important benefit of the proposal was that students would be able to identify themselves as students in the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design, where most of their professors taught. At the same time, they would be able to continue to take courses outside of their Major in the Faculty of Arts and Science. It would also be useful to have a single point of contact for their administrative needs. Currently, students had to deal with both their College Registrars and their advisor in FALD.

(d) Tuition fee. In response to a question, it was noted that there would be no change in students' tuition fees arising from the proposed change.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Faculty-level Honours Bachelor of Arts degree requirements for the Major Program in Architectural Studies, as outlined in the proposal to transfer that program from the Faculty of Arts and Science to the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design, be approved, effective September 1, 2012.

8. University of Toronto Mississauga and Faculty of Information: Interactive Digital Media Specialist Program

Professor Regehr said that the proposal represented a unique collaboration between the University of Toronto Mississauga and the Faculty of Information to develop an exciting new undergraduate program for students. She noted that the proposal was the

**EXCERPT FROM REPORT NUMBER 150 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 5, 2011**

**8. University of Toronto Mississauga and Faculty of Information: Interactive
Digital Media Specialist Program (Cont'd)**

first to be brought forward under the new provisions of the University's Quality Assurance Process, which called for an external appraisal of the proposed curriculum before the proposal was forwarded for approval. The reviewer's suggestions had been incorporated into the proposal now before the Committee. The proposal was therefore a landmark one in a number of ways. Professor Mullen expressed her gratitude for the very creative external appraisal of the proposal.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Specialist Program in Interactive Digital Media, as described in the proposal dated February 1, 2011, be approved, effective July 1, 2011.

Secretary

Chair

April 15, 2011