

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 159 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

January 15, 2013

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, January 15, 2013 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Douglas McDougall (Chair)	Professor Emmanuel Nikiema
Professor Elizabeth Peter (Vice-Chair)	Ms Michelle Mitrovich
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs	Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean, School of Graduate Studies	Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Karen D. Davis	Ms Ioana Sendroiu
Professor Joseph Desloges	Ms Maureen Somerville
Mr. Aidan Fishman	Professor Steven Thorpe
Mr. Omar Gamel	Dr. Sarita Verma
Mr. David Kleinman	Professor Sandy Welsh
Mr. Richard Levin	
	Secretariat:
	Mr. David Walders

Regrets:

Mr. Michael Dick
Professor Rick Halpern
Professor Paul Kingston
Professor Russell Pysklywec
Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Ms Tisha Tan
Ms Judith C. Poë

In Attendance:

Mr. David Curtin, Office of the President
Ms Catherine Drea, Office of Student Learning
Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life
Ms Kim Elias, Office of Student Learning

In Attendance (cont'd):

Dr. Jane E. Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
 Mr. Ulli Krull, Vice Principal, Special Initiatives, UTM
 Dr. Daniella Mallinck, Coordinator, Academic Programs and Planning, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR INFORMATION

The Chair welcomed the new Secretary of the Committee, Mr. David Walders.

The Chair reminded members that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs has general responsibility for monitoring the quality of education and research activities of the University. He added that in 2010, the Governing Council approved the *Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units*, which established the *University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process* (UTQAP). The UTQAP, he continued, outlines the process for reviewing academic programs and the units that offer them.

Because Dr. Sarita Verma, the member presenting the Report of the Review of Clinical Departments (agenda item 2) was not yet present, the Chair altered the agenda and moved the Report of the Review of Graduate Collaborative Programs to the first item, and the Report of the Review of Clinical Departments to the second item.

1. Report of the Review of Graduate Collaborative Programs, 2011-2012

Professor Brian Corman provided an introduction to the Report. Professor Corman noted that since graduate collaborative programs are not degree programs, but rather are value-added programs, the review process was expedited. A member asked how the value-added benefit was assessed in the Report. Professor Corman answered that the Director of each program under review conducts a self-study to ascertain whether the program is still adhering to the agreed-upon learning outcomes. He added that, collectively, these self-studies assess whether graduate collaborative programs are adhering to, or deviating from, the memorandum of agreement for graduate collaborative programs.

2. Report of the Review of Clinical Departments, 2011-2012

Professor Regehr explained that since the goal of the UTQAP is to review programs and not departments, the Review of Clinical Departments is not covered under the UTQAP. In deciding how to structure reviews of clinical departments, the Faculty of Medicine, in consultation with the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic Programs, agreed to model its clinical department reviews on the UTQAP, and present summaries to the Committee, rather than full reports.

2. Report of the Review of Clinical Departments, 2011-2012 (cont'd)

Professor Regehr introduced Dr. Sarita Verma to provide an overview of the Report. Dr. Verma emphasized the importance of clinical departments to the Faculty of Medicine, noting that there are 17 such departments. With respect to the mechanism for review, Dr. Verma noted that the Faculty of Medicine decided to model their reviews on the UTQAP to ensure consistency and to strengthen the connection between clinical departments, which are off-site and house the hospital-affiliated faculty, and the University. Dr. Verma advised that reviews of clinical departments are tied to the terms of the Department Chairs of the Faculty of Medicine (normally five years) and as such do not follow the UTQAP review timelines, which follow an eight year cycle.

3. Co-Curricular Student Record (*Presentation*)

The Chair invited Ms Lucy Fromowitz, Assistant Vice-President, Student Life to make her presentation.¹

Ms Fromowitz highlighted several key elements of the Co-Curricular Student Record (CRR):

- The focus of CRR is intended to be active, not passive student learning. Activities that could be included on the CRR are those that are attached to the University, meet the established validation criteria and involve intentional, active learning. Students who successfully complete an activity would be those students who had been highly engaged in that activity, and successful completion would be indicated on the CCR.
- Underpinning the CRR would be a database whereby students could match their interests and competencies with available activities, describe what skills and competencies they learned during the activity, and allow the directors/supervisors of the programs to assess engagement of individual students.
- The overall goals of the CRR are to accurately reflect the student learning experience (much of which might occur beyond the classroom), to encourage student engagement in co-curricular activity, and to foster relationships between students, the University, and the wider community.
- The program is set to launch in September, 2013.

Several members asked questions on the topic of tracking and validating student engagement in activities. Ms Fromowitz responded that student engagement would be tracked at many stages of involvement and that attendance would be recorded. She added that a user-friendly CRR computer system would allow for ease of tracking.

Several members also questioned whether there were adequate mechanisms for fairly and accurately validating engagement, including how to assess the quality of the involvement. Ms Fromowitz responded that evaluation would be done locally by the directors or program supervisors, who would have direct knowledge of student engagement. The issue of how to assess the quality of involvement was under consideration.

The Chair thanked Ms Fromowitz for her presentation.

¹ For presentation, please see: <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=9326>

CONSENT AGENDA

On Motion duly moved, seconded and carried.

YOUR BOARD APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and the items approved.

4. Report of the Previous Meeting: Report 158 - October 29, 2012

Report Number 158 of the meeting held on October 29, 2012 was approved.

5. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising.

6. Date of Next Meeting – Tuesday, February 26, 2013 at 4:10 p.m.

7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

There were no reports from the administrative assessors.

8. Other Business

No items of other business were raised.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

January 24, 2013