

Revised

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO  
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL  
REPORT NUMBER 86 OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

January 31, 2001

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, January 31, 2001 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Ruth Gallop (In the Chair)  
Professor Derek Allen (Vice-Chair)  
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Deputy Provost  
Professor Paul Gooch, Vice-Provost  
Professor François Casas  
Professor James Donaldson  
Ms Joy Fitzgibbon  
Professor Lynne C. Howarth  
Professor Angela Lange  
Professor Michael R. Marrus  
Professor Ian McDonald  
Ms Vera Melnyk  
Professor Keren Rice  
Ms Catherine Seymour

Professor J.J. Berry Smith  
Ms Adelene Tan  
Professor Donna Wells  
Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,  
Students

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard  
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Raisa Deber  
Mr. Rob Foote  
Mr. Arvin Hariri  
Mr. David Kaplan

Professor Alexander R. Jones  
Professor V. Kumar Murty  
Professor Emmet Robbins

In Attendance:

Mr. Ken Burke, Chief Administrative Officer, OISE/UT  
Professor Gail Donner, Dean, Faculty of Nursing  
Professor Michael Fullan, Dean, OISE/UT  
Professor David Naylor, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Ms Carol Robb, Assistant Vice-Provost  
Professor Barry Sessle, Dean, Faculty of Dentistry  
Ms Lynn Snowden, Assistant Vice-Provost  
Professor Jake Thiessen, Associate Dean Professional Affairs, Faculty of Pharmacy

THE ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**Report Number 86 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 31, 2001**

---

Time of Adjournment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was agreed

THAT the meeting adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m.

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs - Annual Reports, Volume 2**

The Chair noted that the document, *Reviews of Academic Programs and Units, 1998-99 - 1999-2000, Volume 2*, (referred to as the Report) was presented for information and discussion.

Professor Tuohy said that although the academic reviews were presented for information, the Committee had an important role to play. This Committee was the point of entry into governance for the reviews and it was here that the reviews would be under the closest scrutiny. It was not the Committee's mandate to redo the reviews but rather to ensure that they had been done, that they had been conducted using an appropriate process and full documentation, and that issues that were identified by the reviewers were addressed by the administration. This was the second set of reviews considered by the Committee. The record of the discussion of both volumes would be forwarded to the Agenda Committee of Academic Board and considered for inclusion on the agenda of Academic Board. If the reviews were not placed on the agenda of Academic Board, they would be forwarded to the Executive Committee.

**(a) Faculty of Medicine**

Professor Tuohy gave a brief introduction to the reviews undertaken in the Faculty of Medicine, and noted that it is one of the most reviewed Faculties in the University. She described the three categories of reviews that appeared in the Report. In the first category were regular cyclical reviews of Departments within the Faculty, of which there were seven in this Volume. The Review of the Faculty commissioned by the Provost at the end of Professor Aberman's term as Dean formed a second category. In the third category was the 'Review of Reviews' that was commissioned by Dean David Naylor as part of the *Raising Our Sights* process.

Professor Tuohy highlighted a number of common themes that appeared in the reviews of the Health Science faculties of the University. Among the themes were 'post-genomic' medicine; inter-faculty initiatives; curriculum change; enrolment expansion; student financial support and counseling; and space.

**(i) Dean's Reviews**

The Committee considered the reviews of seven departments.

**Report Number 86 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 31, 2001**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs - Annual Reports, Volume 2** (cont'd)

**(a) Faculty of Medicine** (cont'd)

**(i) Dean's Reviews** (cont'd)

Department of Medical Imaging

Members noted the concerns expressed by the reviewers with respect to a shortfall of residents and insufficient exposure to medical imaging in the undergraduate curriculum. Dean Naylor explained that the number of students training in medical imaging was constrained by the number of residency slots which had been reduced. He also stated that a limited number of hours of curriculum were available, and a review of curriculum was being undertaken by the Associate Dean.

A member asked the Dean to describe the contribution from practice earnings made by members of the Department. The Dean replied that there had been a decline in the Teaching and Research resources available for clinical educators over the past 25 years, and that currently 20% of OHIP billings were being given up to support teaching.

Department of Occupational Therapy

The Committee had no questions on this review. The Dean indicated that space had been an issue, but recent developments had resulted in a feeling of cautious optimism.

Department of Physical Therapy – no comments

Department of Rehabilitation Science

A member noted the comment by the reviewers that faculty morale was at risk due to heavy workloads. Dean Naylor replied that concerns about workload issues in the Faculty generally stemmed from the fact that a large proportion of clinical faculty were status-only, and some might prefer to emphasize graduate over undergraduate teaching. Nonetheless, it was important that all faculty contribute to undergraduate, professional and graduate programs as relevant in each department. In the case of the graduate department of Rehabilitation Sciences, curriculum change in the professional programs in Physical Therapy and in Occupational Therapy had exacerbated this tension, but when the curriculum was fully established the Chair expected the situation to stabilize. He also indicated that the undergraduate departments of Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, as well as the Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Science, had been under-resourced compared to those in sister institutions.

Dean Naylor mentioned the successful partnership of the Department with the Toronto Rehabilitation Institute.

Department of Pharmacology

A member remarked that the administrative response to the review had not addressed the reviewers' concern about administrative staff support. Dean Naylor replied that staffing needs would be addressed in the proposed Institute for Drug Research whose establishment had been approved by the Faculty Councils of Medicine and Pharmacy.

**Report Number 86 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 31, 2001**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs - Annual Reports, Volume 2** (cont'd)

**(a) Faculty of Medicine** (cont'd)

**(i) Dean's Reviews** (cont'd)

Department of Pharmacology (cont'd)

A member noted the drop in complement and asked whether there would be enough faculty for critical mass. Dean Naylor replied that the partnership between the Department and the Faculty of Pharmacy would strengthen the program by providing additional faculty complement.

Department of Physiology

A member asked for clarification of the term PBL. Dean Naylor replied that PBL was Problem Based Learning, a way of delivering program material that focused on clinical problems as opposed to discrete disciplines. Assessments of PBL had not demonstrated gains over traditional modes with regard to student knowledge and skill level, but did indicate increases in student satisfaction – an important consideration. The effect of the introduction of the PBL curriculum had been to decrease the role of basic science faculty in undergraduate medical education while increasing the role of clinical faculty. The Faculty was currently reviewing the PBL curriculum with an eye to preserving a small-group format while enhancing the role of the basic sciences.

Dean Naylor also reported that Faculty was undertaking a review of the undergraduate curriculum this year.

A member expressed concern about the implication that the Department of Physiology had raised its standards with the effect of restricting enrolment. Dean Naylor explained that more attention was being paid to entry standards, such as courses and grades. Professor Tuohy undertook to look at the original text in the review.

Department of Psychiatry

A member asked for clarification of the reference to 'breadth versus depth' in the reviewers' comments on research. Dean Naylor explained that the department had undergone major growth in its research funding and was highly successful in the peer-reviewed competitions in both Canada and abroad. He suggested that the reviewers were perhaps alluding to the international profile of psychiatry research in Toronto. Dean Naylor expressed his confidence that the department was going to continue to develop areas of excellence and achieve even greater international distinction in the future.

A member asked why the Continuing Education programs had not been mentioned in the Review. Dean Naylor indicated his surprise at the omission, as the continuum of undergraduate/graduate teaching and continuing education was usual.

**Report Number 86 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 31, 2001**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs - Annual Reports, Volume 2** (cont'd)

**(a) Faculty of Medicine** (cont'd)

**(ii) Provost's Review**

Professor Tuohy explained that this review was done at the time of the search for a Dean of the Faculty, and was done at the level of the Dean.

A member commented on the disconnect between the statement in this review that the Faculty 'was poised to take the next steps to rank as an international centre of excellence' and the statement in the Review of Reviews that the Faculty 'is Canada's pre-eminent school of Medicine and one of the leading Faculties in the world'. Professor Tuohy noted that the Strategic Planning Committee conducting the 'Review of Reviews' had based its comment on a wide range of reviews, whereas the assessment in the Provost's Review reflected the judgment of the two external reviewers selected to assess the Faculty overall.

A member noted that Continuing Education was not addressed in the Provost's Review. Professor Tuohy replied that continuing education was addressed in the review, but omitted from the summary. The reviewers had stated that the Faculty's continuing education programs were among the top 15% in North America in its level of activity. Professor Tuohy undertook to revise the summary.

A member asked about the transfer of the Institute of Medical Science (IMS) from the School of Graduate Studies to the Faculty of Medicine. Dean Naylor responded that this was a budgetary transfer that brought the Institute into alignment with the Faculty and made it easier to deal with budgetary issues.

**(iii) Dean's 'Review of Reviews'**

Dean Naylor explained that this 'Review of Reviews' was a synthesis of the ongoing cycle of external reviews carried out to identify common themes to assist in strategic planning for the Faculty.

A member asked what formal mechanisms were available to judge the student experience within the Faculty. Dean Naylor replied that additional thought was required to develop such mechanisms. Professor Tuohy added that this issue was not unique to the Faculty of Medicine, and that a President's Council on Undergraduate Education would be established in the near future.

The Chair thanked Dean Naylor for attending and participating in the discussion.

**(b) Faculty of Dentistry**

The Chair welcomed Dean Barry Sessle.

Professor Tuohy commented that this Review had been commissioned as part of the *Raising our Sights* planning process.

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs - Annual Reports, Volume 2** (cont'd)

**(b) Faculty of Dentistry** (cont'd)

A member asked for clarification of the term 'intra mural practice'. Dean Sessle replied that an intra-mural practice would be a dental practice set up within the Faculty, which would allow faculty members to maintain their clinical skills and would be a recruitment tool for new faculty.

A member asked for clarification of the term 'evidence based dental practice'. Dean Sessle replied that evidence based practice was based on clear-cut and well documented scientific observation, as opposed to prevailing practice.

A member inquired about the intent of the reviewers' recommendation concerning writing competency. Dean Sessle explained that, currently, several health science faculties had writing labs which students could choose to use, but the Faculty was planning to formalize writing skills and make them an integral part of the program.

A member noted the harsh description of clinical facilities that was included in the review summary. Dean Sessle indicated that the description applied only to one clinic that had not been upgraded in forty years. Professor Tuohy undertook to revise the summary to reflect that the comment was not a generalized observation.

In response to a question about the proposed mentorship program involving students and alumni, Dean Sessle responded that the Faculty was planning to implement the program.

The Chair thanked Dean Barry Sessle for attending and being involved in the discussion.

**(c) Faculty of Nursing**

The Chair welcomed Dean Gail Donner.

Professor Tuohy explained that the Provost had commissioned two reviews of the Faculty, one at the time of the search for the Dean, and a second in the context of the development of the Faculty's *Raising our Sights* plan.

A member suggested that there was a disconnect between the Faculty's plan and the nursing shortage. Dean Donner explained that the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities had recently issued a call for proposals to increase graduate enrolment in nursing, to provide faculty for undergraduate nursing programs. The Faculty welcomed this initiative as a way of building its graduate programs. Professor Tuohy added that the Faculty of Nursing was in a unique position in having the only second-entry undergraduate nursing program in Ontario, and was also seeking government funding to increase enrolment in that program.

**Report Number 86 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 31, 2001**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs - Annual Reports, Volume 2 (cont'd)**

**(c) Faculty of Nursing (cont'd)**

Dean Donner emphasized the Faculty's need for additional space. A member noted that the Faculty was developing graduate programs that would be delivered via distance education. Dean Donner indicated that the Acute-Care Nurse Practitioner program offered by the Faculty was unique in Canada. The Faculty would be taking the existing program and transferring it to a distance education mode of delivery with a target date of January 2002. Professor Tuohy added that the province was very interested in distance education in nursing.

The Chair thanked Dean Donner for attending the meeting and participating in the discussion.

**(d) Faculty of Pharmacy**

The Chair welcomed Professor Jake Thiessen, Associate Dean Professional Affairs, from the Faculty of Pharmacy.

Professor Tuohy explained that this review had been commissioned by the Provost as part of the *Raising our Sights* planning process, and noted how beneficial the reviews had been to the Provost's Office in discovering what Faculties were doing.

Professor Thiessen commented on the excitement within the Faculty at the new opportunities that were available.

A member asked about the tuition fees for the program. Professor Thiessen responded that, while the tuition fees were three times that of other Canadian faculties, they were still substantially less than the tuition at schools in the United States. Professor Tuohy noted that a portion of the increased tuition fees was returned to the Faculty to support program enhancements through the Academic Priorities Fund planning process.

A member referred to the statement that 'the Faculty of Pharmacy interacted less with other health sciences than might be expected'. Professor Thiessen responded that the reviewers had not asked him about the interactions with other Faculties, and noted that the Faculty of Pharmacy's interactions were not limited to other health sciences, but included hospitals and the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering.

A member inquired about the difference between the B.Sc. in Pharmacy and the proposed B.Sc. in Pharmaceutical Sciences. Professor Thiessen replied that graduates with a B.Sc. in Pharmacy were professional accredited pharmacists, while the B.Sc. in Pharmaceutical Sciences program was intended to draw students into graduate studies and research, and did not include a clinical component. Professor Tuohy added that the program was currently under development, and would most likely be a Faculty of Arts and Science major or specialist program.

A member asked for an explanation of the difference between pharmaceutical sciences and pharmacology. Professor Thiessen replied that pharmaceutical sciences included the study of physical chemistry, instrumental analysis and dosage design, while pharmacology included the study of drug toxicology and mechanisms of action.

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs - Annual Reports, Volume 2** (cont'd)

**(d) Faculty of Pharmacy** (cont'd)

The Chair thanked Professor Thiessen for attending the meeting and participating in the discussion.

**(e) Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)**

The Chair welcomed Dean Michael Fullan to the meeting.

Professor Tuohy informed members that this had been the first review of OISE/UT since the merger on July 1, 1996. One of the reviewers had participated in the review of the Faculty of Education in 1994. Professor Tuohy noted that the merger was progressing well, although some issues remained unresolved. She also noted that the allocation from the Academic Priorities Fund in response to the Faculty's plan, was completely directed towards graduate student support.

Professor Fullan indicated that the integration of preservice and graduate education had been a challenge throughout North America. He reported on the increased enrolment in the preservice program requested by the provincial government, and on the large number of retirements since the merger. He also described the increase in graduate student financial support from \$2.9 million at the time of the merger, to \$5.3 million in the current operating budget.

In response to a member's question concerning the implication of the increase in non-tenure faculty, Dean Fullan replied that 40% of the faculty in the preservice program would be non-tenure stream faculty who had been seconded from schools. Professor Tuohy commented that the Provost was working with the Dean to address this concern.

In response to a member's question concerning workload, Dean Fullan explained that a report on workload had been completed eighteen months ago, and that he was working with Department Chairs and faculty on a person by person basis to address the problem. He indicated that the two main issues were the larger class size and field supervision requirements in the preservice program, and the graduate student supervision requirements in other programs.

A member congratulated Dean Fullan on the success of the merger. The Chair thanked Dean Fullan for attending and being involved in the discussion.

**Extension of Time of Adjournment**

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was agreed

To extend the time of adjournment to no later than 6:30 p.m.

**Report Number 86 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –  
January 31, 2001**

---

**1. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs - Annual Reports, Volume 2** (cont'd)

**(f) School of Graduate Studies (SGS)**

Professor Tuohy informed members that these reviews had been commissioned by the Dean of SGS as part of a five-year cyclical review of Centres and Institutes. They were distinctive among reviews conducted at the University in that the first term of reference of each review was always to determine whether or not the Centre or Institute should be continued.

Institute of Medical Science (IMS)

Dean Marrus indicated that the structure of IMS had put graduate medical education on the map, and that, after thirty years, the Institute had reached a level of maturity and stability at which the transfer of IMS from SGS to the Faculty of Medicine was warranted.

Institute for Environmental Studies

A member asked whether the recommendation of the reviewers concerning increased collaboration with other units had been implemented. Dean Marrus responded that new units were constantly being drawn in to collaborative programs.

Centre for International Studies

Dean Marrus noted that the Centre for International Studies and the Centre for Russian and East European Studies had been transformed by the opening of the Munk Centre.

A member expressed concern at the impression conveyed by the five-year renewal for each centre. Professor Tuohy undertook to revise the introduction to this section to clarify the standard process of the five-year reviews of Centres and Institutes.

Centre for Russian and East European Studies – no questions

Professor Tuohy thanked the members for their thoughtful consideration and discussion of these reviews. She also thanked staff in the Divisions as well as the three Assistant Vice-Provosts for their work in preparing the review summaries.

A member expressed his appreciation of the presentation of the review summaries.

**2. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting was Wednesday, March 7, 2001.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

February 27, 2001