

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**

**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 164 OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**October 29, 2013**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, October 29, 2013 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Douglas McDougall (Chair)  
Professor Elizabeth Peter (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Sioban Nelson, Vice-Provost,  
Academic Programs  
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost,  
Graduate Education and Dean,  
School of Graduate Studies  
Professor Paul Kingston  
Mr. Yingxiang Li  
Ms Jessica Ng  
Dr. Graeme Norval  
Professor Russell Pysklywec  
Ms Jennifer Raso

Ms Catherine Riddell  
Professor Michael Ratcliffe  
Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth  
Professor Markus Stock  
Professor Scott Thomas  
Professor Vincent Tropepe  
Professor Cameron Walter  
Professor Sandy Welsh

Secretariat:  
Mr. David Walders, Acting Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Jan Barnsley  
Ms Sara Dolcetti  
Professor Zhong-Ping Feng  
Mr. Andrew Girgis  
Dr. Gary P. Mooney  
Ms Daisy Qin  
Professor Steven J. Thorpe  
Ms Aditi Ratho

In Attendance:

Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Ms. Justine Garrett, Coordinator, Academic Programs and Planning, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs  
Dr. Jane E. Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Alan Hayes, Director, Toronto School of Theology

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

### **1. Academic Presentation: Professor Sioban Nelson, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs**

Professor Sioban Nelson delivered a presentation on the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP). The presentation, which covered the development of the process, current protocols and relationship between the UTQAP and Governance, highlighted the following points:

- The province had seen a transformation relative to Quality Assurance. Authority and responsibility for Quality Assurance was delegated to Universities. Each University had developed its own Institutional Quality Assurance Process [ICAP] in line with the Province's Quality Assurance Framework. The Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) audited universities to ensure ongoing compliance with their IQAPs.
- The University's Quality Assurance processes were governed by the "Policy for Approval of Academic Programs and Units", which was approved by the Governing Council in June, 2010.
- University responsibility and authority for quality assurance, including careful selection of highly qualified reviewers who are experts in their fields, ensured that it is highly meaningful.
- An important facet of the UTQAP was the delegation of a significant amount of authority and responsibility to the divisional level.
- The four main protocols in the UTQAP were outlined: New Degree Program Approval, Major Modification, Program Closure and Cyclical Program Review.
- The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, together with the Academic Board to which it reports, formed the critical bodies for the consideration of specific proposals /reports that came forward in line with these protocols.
- Reports regarding Major Modifications to existing programs and Program Closures, were submitted to the Quality Council annually. Reports on Cyclical Reviews were submitted twice per year.

The Chair thanked Professor Nelson for her presentation.

### **2. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, April – October 2013**

Before turning to the current reviews, the Chair provided members with an update on the follow-up report for the Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations and its programs. The Faculty had requested that this report be postponed until Cycle 5, as the follow-up centred on issues of space, which were in the midst of being addressed. After consulting with the Faculty of Arts & Science Professor Sioban Nelson, the Chair reported that he had agreed to receive the Department's follow-up report in Cycle 5.

Professor Sioban Nelson then presented informal information on the progress that three units— the Department of Anthropology (FAS), the Department of Sociology (FAS), and the Department of Applied Psychology and Human Development (OISE) — had made in the past year since their reviews were considered at AP&P Cycle 2, 2012-13.

#### **i. Follow-up Report from Previous Review (Toronto School of Theology)**

The Chair explained that the conjoint degree programs delivered by the Toronto School of Theology (TST) were reviewed in January, 2012, and that the report of the external reviewers had been presented to the Committee on October 29, 2012. At that time, the Committee had requested a one year follow-up report regarding the content of the recommended conjoint Ph.D. program. In line with the UTQAP, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs had asked the Director of TST to provide a follow-up report. The

report addressed: recommendations relative to quality assurance in the proposed conjoint Ph.D. program; planning and integration with TST member institutions; faculty and student research; and doctoral student supervision. The report also described TST's consultation process as it developed the conjoint Ph.D. program.

Professor Alan Hayes, Director of the TST, was invited to comment on the Report. Professor Hayes noted that the new conjoint Ph.D program benefitted greatly from the input of external reviews.

**ii. Reviews April – October 2013 - Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering:  
Department of Materials Science and Engineering and its Programs**

The Chair reminded members of the Committee's role with respect to reviews and of the three questions they were asked to consider when considering the review:

- 1) Did the summary accurately tell the story of the full review?
- 2) Did the administrative response address all issues identified?
- 3) Were there any questions, comments or substantive issues that the Committee should consider? Was there need to ask that the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs bring forward a follow-up report?

The Chair invited Professor Paul Kingston, who had agreed to act as the leader of the reading group, to present a report of the group.

Professor Kingston reported that two issues were raised with respect to the second question.

- A more thorough explanation of international opportunities was requested.
- Clarity was requested with respect to Departmental commitment to diversity of the faculty complement.

Dean Cristina Amon replied to the issues raised. She noted that, while the requirements of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) presented some challenges for finding room in the curriculum for international opportunities, there were several pathways for students to go abroad. Students could also gain industry experience through the Professional Experience Year (PEY).

With respect to diversity, Dean Amon noted that the faculty in the unit were already culturally diverse and progress was being made in gender diversity. More than half of the tenure cases brought forward for this past years were for female faculty.

After thanking Professor Kingston for his report, the Chair invited additional questions from members regarding the review. Several members questioned timing with respect to program restructuring. Dean Amon reported that a great deal of progress had been made on restructuring since the last review of the Department in 2008, including securing CEAB accreditation.

The Chair thanked Dean Amon for her work and thanked the entire membership for their comments and their contribution to the review process.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and items approved.

**3. Report of the Previous Meeting: Report 163 – September 17, 2013**

Report Number 163 of the meeting of September 17, 2013 was approved.

**4. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the Report of the previous meeting.

**5. Date of Next Meeting – January 14, 2014 at 4:10 p.m.**

**6. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

There were no reports from the Administrative Assessors.

**7. Other Business**

There was no other business

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

November 5, 2013