

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 121 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

March 1, 2006

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, March 1, 2006 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Derek Allen
(In the Chair)
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Rona Abramovitch
Mr. Navine K. Aggarwal
Professor Gage Averill
Dr. Inez N. Elliston
Ms Linda B. Gardner
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Douglas McDougall
Ms Vera Melnyk
Mr. Matto Mildenerger
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor John Scherk
Miss Maureen Somerville

Non-Voting Assessors:

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of
the Governing Council
Professor John R. G. Challis, Vice-
President, Research and Associate
Provost
Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Vice-Provost,
Graduate Education and Dean,
School of Graduate Studies
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall
Ms Cristina Oke, Acting Secretary

Regrets:

Mr. Blake Chapman
Professor Luc De Nil
Dr. Raisa B. Deber
Mr. Christopher Goode
Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh

Professor Ian R. McDonald
Professor Linda McGillis Hall
Mr. Andrew Pinto
Professor Anthony Sinclair
Professor J. J. Berry Smith

In Attendance:

Professor Charles Dyer, Vice-Principal Academic Resources, University of Toronto at
Scarborough
Professor Antoinette Gagné, Coordinator, Concurrent Teacher Education Program,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
Ms Mira Gambhir, Assistant Coordinator, Concurrent Teacher Education Program,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Professor Jane Gaskell, Dean, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
 Professor Gretchen Kerr, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
 Professor Charles Jones, Acting Dean, University of Toronto at Mississauga
 Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
 Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director, Special Projects, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

ITEMS 3, 7 and 8 CONTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council. He conveyed the regrets of the Chair, who was unable to attend the meeting due to illness. In the absence of a Vice-Chair, the Committee invited Professor Allen to act as Chair.

1. Reports of the Previous Meetings

Report Number 119 (January 19, 2006) and Report Number 120 (February 1, 2006) were approved.

2. Business Arising from the Previous Meetings

There was no business arising from the previous meetings.

3. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto: Concurrent Teacher Education Program

Professor Hillan advised members that the Concurrent Teacher Education Program (CTEP) had developed from a partnership established to enhance the undergraduate student experience by expanding teacher education across the campuses of the University. The partnership included the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT); the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM); the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC); the Faculty of Music; the Faculty of Physical Education and Health; and two Federated Universities – the University of St. Michael's College and Victoria University.

CTEP would be one of the strongest undergraduate teacher preparation programs in the province and was an important initiative in the ongoing improvement of teacher education in Ontario. CTEP drew upon the expertise of all the partner groups, and integrated the study of education across a five-year period. At the end of their course of study, graduates from CTEP would earn a Bachelor's degree in Arts, Science, Music, or Physical and Health Education as well as a Bachelor of Education degree.

Each of the partners had brought a wealth of knowledge and experience in preparing their graduates for entrance into teaching education while OISE/UT was a recognized provider of excellent initial, continuing and graduate level teacher education programs as well as being a source of high quality scholarship and research in education. Until this initiative,

3. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto: Concurrent Teacher Education Program (cont'd)

the partners had operated their programs in isolation and had been unable to benefit from university-wide collaboration.

A Concurrent Teacher Education Program had been signaled in OISE/UT's *Stepping Up* academic plan and the involvement of CTEP partners in this initiative was also included in their *Stepping Up* plans.

At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Gagné explained that, in the summer of 2004, the Provost had provided funding for a Task Force to develop a proposal for the Concurrent Teacher Education Program. The Task Force had become the CTEP Planning Council, and had included representation from the seven CTEP partners. As a result of extensive consultation and planning within each unit and across CTEP partners, the Council had designed an innovative and unique program that met the needs of all of the partners.

Subject to approval of Governing Council and pending OISE/UT initial accreditation of CTEP by the Ontario College of Teachers, the Faculty of Music, the Faculty of Physical Education and Health, UTM and UTSC would offer the program with OISE/UT in the academic year 2007-2008. Both the University of St. Michael's College and Victoria University were founding members of the CTEP Planning Council and had been active participants in the planning process. They would take the CTEP proposal to their governing bodies and to the Faculty of Arts and Science during 2006-2007, and, subject to approval of Governing Council and pending OISE/UT initial accreditation of CTEP by the Ontario College of Teachers, would offer the program with OISE/UT in the 2008-09 academic year.

A member commented that the proposed program was complicated and challenging, and asked if the program would be available to Arts and Science students who were not registered in the partner colleges. At the invitation of the Chair, Professor Gagné replied that, in the first few years, the program would be considered as a 'pilot' program, and would be monitored to ensure that its graduates had been fully prepared to become teachers. She also noted that OISE/UT had to maintain a balance among its Bachelor of Education programs, and not let any one particular program, because of its size, overcome the other initial teacher education programs.

A member suggested rephrasing the statements that 'students registered on the St. George campus would benefit from all of their courses being offered downtown', while students at UTM and UTSC would be expected to travel downtown if there were not a sufficient number of candidates to form a section on those campuses.

A member commented that, in her experience as a classroom teacher, student teachers enrolled in a concurrent teacher education program had been better prepared than student teachers enrolled in a one-year program. She also expressed her concern that general arts students who were interested in the concurrent teacher education program could only apply to the program if they registered at UTM or UTSC.

A member expressed her support for the program. She noted that while Intermediate/Senior certification was being offered by the Faculties of Music and Physical Education and Health, UTM and UTSC, only UTSC was offering Primary/Junior certification. She asked when the full range of programs would be offered. Professor Gagné replied that eventually the other partners would offer Primary/Junior certification.

**3. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto:
Concurrent Teacher Education Program (cont'd)**

Professor Dyer added that UTSC had been involved in the Early Teacher Project since 1992, with a focus on Science and Mathematics at the Primary/Junior level.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Subject to approval of the University Faculties involved, and subject to initial accreditation of the program by the Ontario College of Teachers,

THAT the Concurrent Teacher Education Program, as described in the documentation dated February 3, 2006 which is attached hereto as Appendix 'A', be approved, effective for the 2007-08 academic year.

4. School of Graduate Studies: Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology: Proposal for Direct Entry into the Ph.D. Program

Professor Hillan reported that the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (IHPST) was proposing changes to the admission requirements of the doctoral degree in order to allow direct entry into the program. The Institute aimed to admit undergraduate applicants of exceptional potential directly into the doctoral stream program, viewing this as an opportunity to renew their commitment to excellence and to continue to attract the very best applicants nationally and internationally.

In most cases, doctoral applicants would already have an M.A. or M.Sc. Direct entry to the doctoral program for students with an appropriate Bachelor's degree was proposed in certain circumstances, although students would be required to complete additional course work. The University of Toronto expected that Direct Entry would be available only to exceptionally well-qualified students.

Direct-entry students would be required to maintain an average of at least A- with no mark lower than a B+ at the end of the first year, with a cumulative average of at least A- at the end of the second year with no individual grade less than B+.

A member asked whether a student would be asked to leave the program if they received a grade of B. Professor Pfeiffer replied that point four of the requirements stated 'Direct-entry students should maintain an average of at least A' which allowed some flexibility. The student's standing would be determined by their supervisory committee.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed direct-entry admission option for the Ph.D. program in the Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology, effective September 2006.

5. School of Graduate Studies: Faculty of Music – Proposal for Direct Entry into the Ph.D. Program

Professor Hillan explained that the Faculty of Music proposed changes to the admission requirements of the doctoral degree in order to allow direct entry into the doctoral stream program for undergraduate applicants of exceptional potential. Students would be required to complete additional course work. The University of Toronto expected that Direct Entry would be available only to exceptionally well-qualified students.

In the case of direct entry to the Ph.D. (Musicology, Ethnomusicology and Theory), students would be required to maintain an average grade of at least A- in order to continue in the doctoral program; otherwise the student would be required to transfer into the Master's program.

A member noted the inconsistency in the minimal grade requirement between the two proposals for direct entry into the Ph.D. program. Professor Pfeiffer replied that thirty-four of the seventy-five doctoral programs had direct entry options, each of which had to include a specific reference to exceptionality in the admission requirements. Departments had some latitude in dealing with students in the program once they had been admitted.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed direct entry admission option for the Ph.D. in Music, effective September 2006.

6. Faculty of Music: Bachelor of Music Program – Comprehensive Option

Professor Hillan informed members that a centerpiece of the Faculty of Music's *Stepping Up* plan had been a Comprehensive option within the Bachelor of Music degree, intended to offer increased curricular flexibility and choice for a specific subset of the Faculty's students. The Comprehensive Option would provide students with depth in musical training while preserving considerable opportunities to pursue breadth through electives in Music and in other Faculties. Professor Averill added that the option had been driven by student interest, and would enhance the student experience.

A member asked whether students in the Faculty of Music who were enrolled in the Concurrent Teacher Education Program would be able to follow any option within the Faculty. Professor Averill replied that students in the Concurrent Teacher Education Program would be enrolled in the Music Education program in the Faculty.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed Comprehensive Option, within the existing Bachelor of Music degree program, effective September 2006.

7. Policy on Official Correspondence with Students

Professor Farrar advised members that, as the University moved toward implementing student portals, it was important to have a policy that would specify students' responsibilities with respect to both postal mail and electronic communications. It was essential that the University and its divisions had reliable means of communicating with students. The proposed policy would not impact on or change any of the methods of communication already covered by other existing University policies, for example, the *Grading Practices Policy* and the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*.

A member expressed his concern about the implementation of the policy. It had been his experience that students were hard to reach. He asked how students would be held responsible for maintaining their contact information on the Repository of Student Information (ROSI). Professor Farrar replied that the University provided centrally-supported technical services and the infrastructure to make electronic mail and/or on-line communications systems available to students, and students were expected to monitor and retrieve their mail on a frequent and consistent basis.

A member expressed her concern that the policy had a built-in assumption that every student had a computer, a modem, and access to email. Professor Farrar replied that there were a number of places on the University's campuses where students had access to computers. The member asked what the roll-out plan for the policy would be, how often students would be required to check their email, and how information concerning the policy would be communicated to students.

A member said that, while he appreciated the idea behind the policy, he did not see any sign of a plan to inform students about the policy. He noted that, on occasion, there were technical problems with utoronto e-mail accounts. He was not convinced that all students would know about the policy when it came into effect on September 1.

Professor Farrar replied that the University had several ways of communicating with students, including Faculty and divisional Calendars, the student portal, *Getting There* (a publication of Student Affairs), Canada Post, and email. Receiving electronic correspondence was a reality of the modern world. He also noted that the policy was a statement of principles, and did not include implementation details.

Professor Pfeiffer commented that the School of Graduate Studies would inform graduate administrators about the policy. In their regular review of ROSI files, they would monitor the maintenance of email and postal addresses.

A member suggested that important correspondence be flagged in some way. He also suggested that official messages be treated like a registered letter, and that an acknowledgement of receipt be required.

Ms Swift advised members that many of the University's peer institutions had similar policies in place. Students could be reminded about the policy when they logged on to ROSI.

A member spoke in support of the policy. The majority of students had email accounts. He received mail at both his parents' address and at his downtown address. In his view, it made the University responsible for using the correct address.

A member urged that a robust implementation plan be developed. He was concerned that students in third and fourth years might not read *Getting There*.

7. Policy on Official Correspondence with Students (cont'd)

Professor Farrar assured members that an appropriate communication plan would be developed. At the moment, only 10% to 15% of email addresses bounced back. He also noted that the University would continue to use registered mail.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Policy on Official Correspondence with Students, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'B', be approved, effective September 1, 2006.

8. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference

Mr. Charpentier reminded members that the Coordinating Committee of the Graduate Education Task Force had recommended that the complexity of the governance of graduate programs should be streamlined, wherever possible. It had therefore been proposed that the Governing Council delegate to the Graduate Education Council of the School of Graduate Studies authority to approve changes to admission requirements to graduate programs and to approve the establishment of direct admission options for existing PhD programs.

All changes approved under this new authority would be included in an annual report, for information, to the Committee, which would, with the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, monitor the report to discern any trends in the changes approved and to satisfy itself with respect to the consistency of decisions and adequacy of standards.

Mr. Charpentier also noted that a minor change had been made to item 3 of the Committee's terms of reference to eliminate a redundancy, where the Committee's response to proposals from divisional councils had been dealt with twice.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Subject to approval of amendments to the Statute of the School of Graduate Studies (i) to devolve certain responsibilities for graduate education to the Faculties and other divisions offering graduate degree programs, and (ii) to identify the School of Graduate Studies Council as the Graduate Education Council,

- (a) THAT, effective July 1, 2006, section 4.1 of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs be amended to add the following second paragraph:

Proposals from divisional councils to approve changes to admission requirements to graduate programs, and to approve the establishment of direct admission options for existing PhD programs, may be approved by the Graduate Education Council.

8. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference (cont'd)

- (b) THAT, effective July 1, 2006, the “Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Guidelines Regarding levels of Approval” be amended to add the following statement in the row entitled “Admission policies” in the column headed “Received by AP&P for information”

Changes to admission requirements for graduate programs and approval of direct entry options to existing PhD programs, as approved by the Graduate Education Council, are included in an annual report of changes to graduate programs submitted to the Committee for information.

9. Annual Report of the Vice-Provost, Students on Student Financial Support, 2004-2005

Professor Farrar reminded members that this was an annual accountability report. As specified in the *Policy on Student Financial Support*, the report provided a summary, by academic division, of the levels of student financial need assessed through the University’s common needs assessment program; the student financial assistance provided; the value of funding provided to graduate students; the debt levels of students graduating from first-entry programs; and, the results of the 2005 survey of students with respect to accessibility. The Report also included, as Appendix 3, updated data for 2004-05 from the Faculty of Law. At the direction of the Governing Council, the first study on accessibility to Law was provided in the spring of 2003.

Professor Farrar noted that need-based financial support to students had increased from about \$1.5 million in 1992-93 to about \$45.8 million in 2004-05. The survey results had provided evidence that accessibility with respect to the ethno-cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds of students in first-entry undergraduate, professional deregulated-fee and doctoral-stream graduate programs had remained relatively stable. The data on the student aid provided by the University, and the survey results, provided reassurance that the University continued to be accessible to students from minority and less-advantaged socioeconomic backgrounds, as measured by parents’ level of education and income, and that the University continued to meet its obligations under the *Policy on Student Financial Support*.¹

A member observed that parental income had been reported in constant dollars, and had not been adjusted for inflation. Professor Farrar replied that the use of constant dollars was a deliberate choice. Parental income was an imperfect measure because many students did not know the amount of their parents’ income.

Ms Swift commented that the methodology had changed for this year’s survey. The survey had been administered through a combination of a web-based questionnaire and telephone follow-up.

Members of the Committee were encouraged to make known any concerns they had about the student financial support programs and their success in meeting the goal of the *Policy on Student Financial Support* – that no student offered admission to a program should be unable to enter or complete that program due to a lack of financial means.

¹ <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl/pap/policies/stufinan.html>

10. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

(a) Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost

Professor Challis reported that, within his portfolio, four Committees had been established and were carrying out their work. He also reported that, as a result of the discussion at the Academic Board meeting on February 16, student members had been invited to participate on the Committee that was reviewing the Collections' Policies, and the Committee reviewing research policies and procedures.

(i) **Advisory Committee on the Appointment of an Executive Director of Innovations and Assistant Vice-President of Research, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost, University of Toronto**

This Committee was co-ordinating the search for the newly created position of Executive Director of Innovations at the University of Toronto and Assistant Vice-President, Research.

(ii) **Senior Awards and Honours Committee**

This Committee was intended to enhance the quality and number of nominations from the University for major international and national research awards.

(iii) **Review of Collections Policies**

A Committee was reviewing the Collections Policies of the University of Toronto as they existed within separate Faculties and Departments, with the aim of developing a Collections Policy for the entire University.

(iv) **Review of Research Policies**

A Committee was reviewing, updating, revising, and amending as appropriate, the policies and procedures relating to research matters.

(b) Vice-Provost, Graduate Education

Professor Pfeiffer reported that the Council of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) had approved changes to the SGS Constitution to implement the recommendations of the Task Force on Graduate Education. The revised SGS Constitution would be considered by the Academic Board at its March 30 meeting. Revised constitutions from other divisions would also be proceeding to the Academic Board before the end of this academic year.

11. Date of Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, April 5, 2006.

12. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Acting Secretary

Chair

March 23, 2006