

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**April 3, 2012**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, April 3, 2012 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (In the Chair)	Mr. Nykolaj Kuryluk
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs	Ms Cecilia Livingston
Professor Robert L. Baker	Professor Michael R. Marrus
Professor Katherine Berg	Professor Michelle Murphy
Professor Joseph Desloges	Ms Yuchao Niu
Mr. Cary Ferguson	Dr. Graeme Norval
Professor Robert Gibbs	Professor Elizabeth Peter
Professor Rick Halpern	Ms Judith C. Poë
Mr. Adnan Hussain	Mr. Kevin Siu
Professor Paul Kingston	Ms Helen Slade
	Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Brian Corman	Professor Suzanne Stevenson
Professor Karen D. Davis	Professor Joseph Wong
Professor Douglas McDougall	Mr. Tony Han Yin
Professor Heather MacNeil	

In Attendance:

Ms Anita Comella, Assistant Dean, Co-curricular Physical Activity & Sport, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education  
Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Acting Vice-Dean, Graduate Affairs, Faculty of Medicine  
Professor Kelly Hannah-Moffatt, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Programs, Teaching and Learning, University of Toronto Mississauga  
Dr. Jane E. Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Professor Ira Jacobs, Dean, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education  
Prof. Gretchen Kerr, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education  
Professor Anna Korteweg, Centre for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies  
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Assistant Dean and Director of the Office of the Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Prof. Marius Locke, Associate Dean, Graduate Education & Research, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Chief Administrative Officer, Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education  
Dr. Daniella Mallinck Coordinator, Academic Programs and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost  
Professor David Mock, Dean, Faculty of Dentistry  
Professor Ito Peng, Associate Dean, Interdisciplinary and International Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science  
Professor John Scherk, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate, University of Toronto Scarborough  
Professor Robert Schwartz, Dalla Lana School of Public Health  
Professor Rachel Silvey, Asian Institute  
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report 154 (February 28, 2012) was approved.

**2. Faculty of Medicine: Collaborative Masters and Doctoral Program in Public Health Policy**

Professor Regehr said that there was increasing movement from hospital-based to community-based care, leading to the need for more people with specialized knowledge in the area of public health. The proposed collaborative master's and doctoral programs would focus on research and policy-making. Collaborating units included the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education; the Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation; the Department of Nutritional Sciences; the Dalla Lana School of Public Health; and the School of Public Policy and Governance. As the organizational parent of the Dalla Lana School of Public Health, the lead academic division for the program was the Faculty of Medicine.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed Collaborative Masters and Doctoral Programs in Public Health Policy, as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine dated February 29, 2012, effective September 1, 2012.

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**3. Faculty of Medicine, Dalla Lana School of Public Health: The Public Health Nutrition Graduate Field within the Master of Science in Community Health (MScCH) Degree Program – Closure**

Professor Regehr said that the proposal was the second step of a two-step process. The first step had been the approval, in May 2010, of an Advanced-Standing Option in the Community Nutrition field within the Master of Public Health degree in Public Health Sciences. All students in the old Public Health Nutrition Graduate Field within the Master of Science in Community Health (MScCH) Degree Program had either graduated or were transferred to the newly approved Advanced-Standing Option in the MPH. The course requirements were identical. It was, therefore, now proposed to close the previous Graduate Field in the MScCH.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed closure of the graduate field in Public Health Nutrition within the Master of Science in Community Health (MScCH) Degree Program, offered by the Dalla Lana School of Public Health, as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine dated February 24, 2012, effective immediately.

**4. Faculty of Medicine: Collaborative Doctoral Program in Biomolecular Structure – Closure**

Professor Regehr said that the Collaborative Doctoral Program in Biomolecular Structure, established fifteen years ago, currently had only two students, with other students interested in the area now able to achieve the same learning outcomes in programs within their own departments. As a result, it was proposed to close the Collaborative Program.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed closure of the Collaborative Doctoral Program in Biomolecular Structure, as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Medicine dated February 21, 2012, effective December 31, 2012 or as soon as the current students have graduated.

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012****5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012**

The Chair reminded members of the procedures for the consideration of reviews of Academic Programs and Units. (See Report 152 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, page 5.\* ) The compendium of reviews, and a record of the Committee's consideration of them, would be forwarded to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board. If this Committee took the view that there were unresolved issues that should be considered by the Agenda Committee, the Chair would draw the matter to the attention of the Agenda Committee. The Agenda Committee would (on the basis of this Committee's recommendation) determine whether there were issues of academic importance that should be drawn to the attention of the full Academic Board.

**(a) Faculty of Dentistry**

The spokesperson for the reading team said, in response to the three questions the team was asked to deal with, (i) that the summary in the compendium accurately reflected the review report; (ii) that the administrative response dealt adequately with all of the issues identified; and (iii) that there were no matters requiring action that should be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee and that there was no need to request a follow-up report. While the reviewers had expressed concern about certain long-term issues – especially the Faculty's needs with respect to its space – there was clearly no answer to those concerns in the near term. The members of the reading team did, however, request updates with respect to two matters raised in the Review.

In response, Professor Mock said that the Faculty had reworked its Constitution and By-Laws, which would be submitted to the Academic Board for approval. Among other things, it had made provision for the representation of students in the first two years of the Doctor of Dental Surgery program on the Curriculum Committee. Students in that program were in classes during almost all working hours and therefore did not have the opportunity to use many of the University's student services. Professor Mock and the Faculty Registrar had met with the Vice-Provost, Student Life, who was about to survey students in the Faculty to determine which services they were most in need of. Every effort would then be made to provide them at the Faculty's Edward Street site.

Professor Regehr observed that Professor Mock had been a long-time leader in the University's academic governance, and this would likely be his final appearance at a meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. She therefore thought it particularly important to stress the observations of the reviewers about the many strengths of the Faculty under Professor Mock's leadership: the high overall quality of the

---

\* See: <http://assets.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/BoardsCommittees/app/r0920.pdf>

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)**

**(a) Faculty of Dentistry (Cont'd)**

professional program and the outstanding students it attracted; the internationally recognized and outstanding research completed by the faculty; and the exceptional quality of the research environment they provided for their graduate students. The spokesperson for the reading team referred to the specific statement of the reviewers that the Dean had done an outstanding job maintaining a first-rate educational and research environment despite funding challenges. The Committee, by its applause, congratulated Professor Mock on his extraordinary achievements.

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(b) Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary accurately represented the full review and that the administrative response had dealt with all issues. Two members of the reading team raised a number of questions, to which Professor Jacobs and his colleagues responded.

- **Enrolment growth.** The Faculty's plan was to increase its first-year undergraduate student intake from 175 to 250 students per year, to be achieved over two years. Students were not required to elect in their applications their wish to complete their degree in Physical Education and Health or in Kinesiology. The first two years of study were common to both programs, and students were then free to choose either program. There was no limitation on the number of positions in each program.

A member observed that there had been a constant recourse to growth to solve problems in the University. In the case of the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, the reviewers had observed that growth was rewarded by the institutional budget model. Growth was, however, a very serious matter, and the member was not at all certain that the recourse to growth had served the University well in the past.

Dean Jacobs replied that there was a growing recognition by society of the value of physical activity and of the research behind it. One result had been a large growth in demand from students for places in programs in the area. The plans for growth in the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education were modest by University of Toronto standards, and the Faculty had no wish to grow beyond the planned level. That level of growth would give the Faculty the opportunity to address a number of issues raised in the review. It would enable hiring that could improve the faculty/student ratio in the

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)**

**(b) Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education (Cont'd)**

University. That hiring would also enable the Faculty to provide a necessary enhancement of its course offerings and its research programs.

- **Practica courses.** The reviewers had expressed concern about the number of class hours in the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education being significantly greater than those at most other universities. However the additional number of hours arose from the practica associated with several courses. Those practica were comparable to laboratory sections in science courses. Students in those “physical literacy” courses had the opportunity to engage in physical activities associated with the concepts taught in the related lecture course.
- **Accessibility for students with a disability.** The Faculty’s practica were heavily oriented to physical activity. Nonetheless, the Faculty, like all divisions, had a clear mandate to make appropriate accommodations for students with physical disabilities.
- **Financial support for interuniversity and high-performance sport.** A member observed that the level of financial support for interuniversity and high-performance sport was low at the University of Toronto relative to comparable institutions in Canada. The University was not as able as others to attract elite athletes. Another member questioned whether the University should be concerned with attracting elite athletes and should instead stress extensive participation.

Professor Jacobs replied that the University had one of the most highly comprehensive athletic-activity programs of any university in North America. It should, however, offer opportunities to its students to pursue excellence in all areas in which they had exceptional talent – both in the purely academic areas, in athletics and in other areas, such as (for example) creative writing. With respect to financial support, Professor Jacobs said that the largest part of the athletics budget derived from student fees – a clear manifestation of the support of students for the athletic program. Other support came from the creative efforts of the Faculty from such sources as facilities rentals and philanthropy – most often gifts from alumni of all programs who had enjoyed wonderful athletic experiences while they were students.

Professor Regehr observed that it was unusual for a division to have a review in the first year or two of a Dean’s term. In the case of the Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education, Dean Jacobs - because the Faculty’s graduate programs were scheduled for review - had arranged a full review to aid the Faculty’s academic planning process. The Faculty’s Self-Study had been a model, and Professor Regehr was using it as an example for other divisions to follow.

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)**

**(b) Faculty of Kinesiology and Physical Education (Cont'd)**

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(c) Faculty of Arts and Science: Asian Institute**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary and the administrative response were very good. She raised the topic of language instruction and a language requirement in the Major Program in Contemporary Asian Studies. Professor Peng said that the Institute had given considerable attention to the question of a language requirement and, in the end, had decided against it due to an absence of language offerings in all areas. However, over time the program would undoubtedly revisit the matter and consider whether a language requirement for the program was advisable.

Professor Halpern suggested that, with improvements in online education, the University might find in the future that it could pool tri-campus resources and offer upper-year courses in certain languages which were not currently available to students.

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(d) Faculty of Arts and Science: Centre for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies**

The spokesperson for the reading team reported that the summary provided an accurate reflection of the review, that the administrative response adequately addressed all issues identified, and that there were no matters to bring to the attention of the Committee. The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, concluded that there were no matters to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(e) Faculty of Medicine: Department of Immunology**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the team was satisfied that the summary accurately reflected the review and that the administrative response had adequately addressed all issues raised. He noted that the reviewers had made a strong recommendation for an “older and more ambitious approach to translational research” that could be promoted by the further development of the Toronto Human Immunology Network. Professor Whiteside said that the Department of Immunology was recognized to be one of the finest departments in that discipline anywhere. It was strongly focused on

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012****5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)****(e) Faculty of Medicine: Department of Immunology (Cont'd)**

research in very basic science. The intention of the reviewers in making their recommendation was to encourage the Department to become more fully engaged in the translation of the outcome of their research into practical clinical applications. That objective would be encouraged by the strengthening of the academic network across the University and the hospital research institutes.

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(f) Faculty of Medicine: Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary of the review was accurate and that the administrative response adequately addressed all outstanding issues. He asked the Dean to elaborate on comments in respect to the possible dissolution of the Department and the creation in its place of a trans-Faculty EDU:A. Professor Whiteside replied that in the year prior to the review, the Chair of the Department had held substantial discussions with the leaders of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, the Department of Psychiatry, the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, the Vice-Dean, Research of the Faculty of Medicine and herself. The objective of those discussions was to arrive at a structure that would best foster cross-disciplinary research. It was clear that some members of the Department supported, but that others did not support, the creation of a cross-disciplinary EDU:A. Therefore, Professor Whiteside had concluded that it would be preferable to retain the current departmental structure but to supplement it by the creation of a cross-disciplinary EDU:C to foster collaborative research and educational partnerships.

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(g) University of Toronto Mississauga: Department of Philosophy**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary of the review captured all of the key issues, and the administrative response was complete. The review spoke very highly of the program, which leveraged the University's tri-campus model very well and which was "as strong academically as any department of its size in the Anglo-Saxon world." The spokesperson raised two issues coming from the review report for further discussion. The first was the quality of the space available to the department. The second was the comparatively modest level of enrolment in its programs, which they suggested could be addressed through limiting the number of required courses and prerequisites.

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)**

**(g) University of Toronto Mississauga: Department of Philosophy (Cont'd)**

Professor Hannah-Moffatt said that U.T.M. was very pleased with the review. The current renovations to the U.T.M. North Building would not in the short term increase space for the Department but, as the Dean's response indicated, UTM was addressing space concerns through a variety of means. With respect to enrolment, the Chair of the Department had spoken of plans: to reconsider program requirements; to investigate linkages with other departments such as Sociology and Political Science with a view to offering joint programs; and to initiate outreach activities to the high schools with a view to attracting students.

With the agreement of the Committee, The Chair concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(h) University of Toronto Mississauga: Department of Psychology**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the summary accurately reflected the review, the administrative response had adequately addressed all issues raised, and there were no matters to be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee. He noted that the review was an exceptionally impressive one. The Department offered its undergraduate program to a very large number of students, but it nonetheless delivered on its mandate to provide a research-intensive learning experience to its students, with laboratory work included in courses beginning with the introductory level. Professor Regehr quoted directly from the review, which described the Department as a stellar research department, which integrated research into its teaching at every level. The reviewers admired the grace and collegiality with which the Department accommodated its enrolment growth without compromising the integration of its research and teaching. Professor Hannah-Moffatt said that U.T.M. was very pleased with the work of the Department and with the review. With the agreement of the Committee, the Chair concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(i) University of Toronto Scarborough: Humanities Programs**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that for the reviews of all seven program areas formerly or presently located in the Department of Humanities, the summaries accurately reflected the reviews and the administrative responses adequately addressed all issues identified. There were no matters to forward to the Agenda Committee or the Academic Board for consideration. There were some general themes that emerged from the reviews of the programs that were suggested for discussion. All of the reviewers recognized that the establishment of individual departments for a number of groups formerly within the Department of Humanities was a work in progress. Increases in faculty

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)**

**(i) University of Toronto Scarborough: Humanities Programs (Cont'd)**

complement had been helpful in accommodating increases in enrolment. In cases as this where there was no site visit, it was suggested that reviewers be provided with the opportunity for a conference call or a teleconference with key current members of the programs. The reviewers did not understand the balance between part-time and full-time students in the programs or the possibility in some cases of using credits earned by students on another campus to meet their program requirements at U.T.S.C. Both issues might have been addressed through the opportunity to speak directly with U.T.S.C. faculty and staff.

Professor Regehr clarified that an external review of the Department of Humanities and its programs had been conducted in 2009-10, which had included an on-site visit by the review team. The review team had at the time focused their attention entirely on organizational and administrative issues, with the result that they had not provided a substantive review of individual programs. The current reviews were meant as a supplement to the original 2009-10 review and should be considered as an extension of that original process.

Professor Halpern said that the situation had been a very unusual one. He noted that since the original, structural, report of 2009-10, two program areas had created distinct Departments (English and Philosophy) and further structural change was anticipated.

With the agreement of the Committee, the Chair concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(j) University of Toronto Scarborough: Department of Biological Sciences**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that overall the review was a very positive one, with the reviewers praising the teaching and research in the Department. The summary of the review covered all of the major points contained in the original document, but it might have included more directly the review statement concerning teaching loads. A member of the Committee felt that the administrative response did not focus sufficiently on the recommendation that the Department expand the lecturer stream.

Professor Halpern said that the Department of Biological Sciences viewed lecturer-stream faculty as integral to the achievement of its mission. He noted that Departments made varying use of lecturer-stream appointments, but virtually all at U.T.S.C. were now seeing the wisdom of some strategic lecturer appointments.

With the agreement of the Committee, the Chair concluded that there were no issues to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)**

**(k) University of Toronto Scarborough: Department of Computer and Mathematical Sciences**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the review was generally a very positive one. It praised the teaching and research of a harmonious department consisting of three disciplines (Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science) with strong leadership and very good co-operative programs for students. The spokesperson did request Professor Halpern to comment on a statement in the review concerning undergraduate teaching loads in the Department.

Professor Halpern said that the Department was addressing teaching loads in its new Workload Policy.

A member commented that the Committee was clearly not an appropriate place to discuss the matter of establishing teaching loads. It was, however, important to note that the Committee's area of interest – the quality of academic programs – was intimately related to the issue. He was pleased that Professor Halpern was dealing with the matter at U.T.S.C.

The Chair agreed that the general matter of undergraduate teaching loads was an important one with respect to the quality of programs, but one that had to be resolved within each unit. With the agreement of the Committee, she concluded that there were no matters specifically related to this Department that should be drawn to the attention of the Agenda Committee.

**(l) University of Toronto Scarborough: Department of Psychology**

The spokesperson for the reading team said that the review made it clear that the U.T.S.C. Department of Psychology had many very considerable strengths. It was however, dealing with two important challenges.

- **Faculty / student ratio.** Professor Halpern recognized the issue and identified a number of strategies that the Department was undertaking including the use of instructional technology, limiting enrolment in its Specialist and Major programs, and making a number of additional faculty appointments in the discipline.

U.T.S.C. had chosen to focus its resources in providing experiential learning to the most talented students in their upper years through the “Budding Scholars” program. Appropriate students were identified in the early years of the program and were enabled to pursue laboratory-based, individual work with members of the faculty – often in paid positions.

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)**

**(l) University of Toronto Scarborough: Department of Psychology (Cont'd)**

- **Graduate expansion** A particular area of possible graduate expansion was Clinical Psychology. Professor Halpern replied that Professor Regehr had, early in 2012, convened a meeting of the Principals of U.T.S.C. and OISE/U.T. The outcome had been a plan to work together to provide graduate training in Counselling and Clinical Psychology that would draw on the resources and strengths of both divisions. Professor Halpern said that making new appointments in the areas of Clinical Psychology and Brain Imaging (another potential graduate growth area) would serve graduate needs and would also be helpful in improving the faculty / student ratio in undergraduate programs.

A member pointed out that the review of another U.T.S.C. program observed that in the case of the “bench sciences,” graduate teaching staff tended more often to have a physical presence on the U.T.M. and U.T.S.C. campuses. In other disciplines that was not always the case. He thought it important for U.T.S.C. to bear this in mind when determining how its faculty would best contribute to graduate teaching. Professor Halpern said that U.T.S.C. proposals for campus-based programs had emerged from the grass roots - from the faculty teaching in those areas. Such proposals were consistent with the *Towards 2030* document which envisioned 1,000 graduate students at U.T.S.C. by 2030.

The Chair, with the agreement of the Committee, said that there were no issues arising specifically from the review of the U.T.S.C. Department of Psychology to draw to the attention of the Agenda Committee. On the urging of a member, Professor Regehr undertook to provide updates to the Committee on the work being done to involve U.T.S.C. in graduate teaching in Clinical Psychology. This was likely to be done as a major modification to add a concentration to an existing program and as such required consultation with the Provost's office and Faculty level approval. She observed that this approach might provide a model for future graduate units.

**(m) General Matters**

In the course of discussion of the reviews, a number of general matters arose.

- **Naming individual faculty members in a review.** A lead reader expressed some surprise that individual members of an academic unit had been named in a particular review. Professor Regehr said that there was currently no guideline on the matter but that she would work with the Deans' offices to consider establishing one.

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**5. Reviews of Academic Programs and Units: Report, September 2011 – March 2012 (Cont'd)**

**(m) General Matters (Cont'd)**

- **Undergraduate teaching in Arts and Science by staff in the Faculty of Medicine.** A lead reader asked why the reviews of programs in Medicine had focused largely on graduate programs. It was explained that the undergraduate teaching of these units was in programs offered by the Faculty of Arts and Science. Professor Gotlieb reported that he was meeting with colleagues in the Faculty of Arts and Science to develop a schedule for the appropriate review of those undergraduate programs.
- **Data on the research performance of status-only faculty members and post-doctoral fellows.** In response to an observation, Professor Regehr and Professor Whiteside said that work was underway to seek a solution to the problem arising from the absence of information on research funding earned by faculty members and post-doctoral fellows when that funding was provided through the affiliated teaching hospitals and their research institutes. At the present time, the relevant data was located in the institution through which research funds flowed.

The Committee received, for information, the Appendix to the Report, listing the externally commissioned reviews of academic programs that had been completed between September 2011 and March 2012.

A member observed that it would be important for the Agenda Committee to be aware of two matters that had arisen from the discussion of the reviews. The first concerned tri-campus issues, in particular with respect to graduate programs based at the U.T.M. and U.T.S.C. campuses. The second was the question of balance between tenure-stream and teaching-stream faculty. Professor Regehr assured the member that specific reference would be made to those matters in the Report of the Committee, which went forward to the Agenda Committee, the Academic Board and the Governing Council.

The Chair stated that the discussion had been an interesting and valuable one. It was very important for the Committee to monitor reviews carefully, and she thanked all members of doing the job exceptionally well.

**REPORT NUMBER 155 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – April 3, 2012**

**6. Report of the Administrative Assessors**

**Provincial Audit of University Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

Professor Regehr reported that a team of auditors from the Office of the Provincial Auditor had been on campus for about three weeks to review the University's process for evaluating teaching effectiveness. They had expressed interest in: the process for student evaluation of teaching in courses; the extent to which information arising from that process was available to students; and other ways the University evaluated the effectiveness of the teaching of its faculty. One previous audit on the subject had been completed at the University of the Ontario Institute of Technology, and it was anticipated that a third audit would be completed before the issuance of a report.

**7. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair reminded members that the final regular meeting of the Committee of the 2011-12 academic year was scheduled for Tuesday, May 15, 2012 at 4:10 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

May 7, 2012