

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 116 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

June 14, 2005

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, June 14, 2005 at 11:00 a.m. in the Dean's Conference Room, Medical Sciences Building, at which the following were present:

Professor J.J. Berry Smith (In the Chair)
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic
Professor David Farrar, Vice-Provost,
Students
Professor Rona Abramovitch
Professor Stuart Aitchison
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Mary Chipman
Ms. Maple Chong

Dr. Inez N. Elliston
Professor Wayne Hindmarsh
Professor Jenny Jenkins
Mr. Stefan Neata
Professor John Scherk

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary
Mr. Neil Dobbs

Regrets:

Ms. Janice Bayani
Professor Pamela Catton
Professor Sujit Choudhry
Professor David Clandfield
Ms. Leigh Honeywell
Mr. Senai Iman

Professor Ronald Kluger
Ms. Vera Melnyk
Mr. Raza Mirza
Professor Robert Reisz
Professor Barbara Sherwood Lollar
Miss Maureen Somerville

In Attendance:

Professor George Baird, Dean, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz, Vice-Principal and Dean, University of Toronto at Scarborough
Professor Donald Cormack, Vice-Dean, School of Graduate Studies
Professor Russell Hartenberger, Associate Dean, Faculty of Music
Professor Susan Howson, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health
Ms. Helen Lasthiotakis, Director of Policy and Planning, Office of the Provost
Professor Roger Martin, Dean, Rotman School of Management
Professor Catharine Whiteside, Interim Dean, Faculty of Medicine

ITEM IS REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Report Number 116 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs - June 14, 2005

1. Report of the Previous Meeting (May 11, 2005)

The report of the previous meeting (May 11, 2005) was approved.

2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report

Prior to the Committee's consideration of the reviews, the Chair reminded members of past methods of assessing program reviews. The Committee's mandate was not to assess the content of reviews, but rather, their processes and whether their recommendations were followed up. In the past, the Committee had considered reviews as they were received, but over time it was felt that members would have a broader and more consistent understanding if they were considered together. Committee members later welcomed the introduction of review summaries prepared by the Office of the Provost, which rendered consideration of the reviews much more manageable. Unfortunately, consideration of the review summaries dramatically diminished the attention paid to the reviews themselves. Although the summaries were accurate, the accountability and audit function performed by the Committee was correspondingly diminished.

The Chair had therefore determined that each review should be read by several members of the Committee, and that each member should be expected to read approximately three reviews in detail. Each member should also be prepared to report on their review and to discuss whether the summary accurately reflected the review, whether the administrative response adequately addressed the issues raised in the review, and whether there were any other issues that required consideration by the Committee.

Following consideration by the Committee, a record of discussion would be forwarded to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board, and ultimately to the Governing Council for information and discussion.

The Vice-Chair, noting that accreditation reviews were not considered by the Committee, asked if it would be possible in future years' summaries to include the length of time that programs were accredited (if applicable). Ms. Lasthiotakis responded that future summaries would include the year of the last review along with the type of review that occurred. She then noted that the reviews before the Committee were those commissioned by the University, and not those for external accreditation.

Lastly, it was emphasized that the reviews before the Committee had been conducted during the 2003-04 academic year, and that many of the recommendations had begun to be addressed already.

Faculty of Arts and Science

The Chair welcomed Professor Susan Howson, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science.

Aboriginal Studies

Professor Chipman noted that the review contained fully nineteen recommendations in five paragraphs, but that the summary did not include them all; specifically, a recommendation to add a full-time administrator to the unit was not included in the summary. The review itself called for greater depth of courses (not just breadth) and for more full-time faculty, noting that without additional teaching capacity, the program was too frail. Recommendations from the 1999 review of the program did not seem to have been carried out.

**Report Number 116 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -
June 14, 2005**

2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)

Professor Howson replied that the responses were designed to be brief, and were written in mind of where progress was possible in the near future given budgetary and other constraints. She further noted that a proposal developed through the Academic Initiatives Fund (AIF) had become the focus of the Faculty of Arts and Science. In explaining next steps for Aboriginal Studies, Professor Howson explained that the limited ability to allocate resources meant that plans for all units constantly underwent minor adjustment as a result of attempting to meet the goals outlined by review recommendations and in response to individual circumstances.

Botany

Ms. Chong reported that the review summary was an accurate reflection of the review report, but noted her concern that the review had concluded that introductory courses had 'barely adequate resources' to meet need, especially in BIO 250. Professor Howson stated that the Faculty was working to increase the number of labs, and in particular was working with the east and west campuses to employ videoconferencing as a pedagogical tool to address deficiencies in the program. Professor Buchweitz pointed out that an AIF submission had been approved and additional resources would be online shortly. Professor Farrar noted that the Biotechnology program at the University of Toronto at Mississauga included the capacity for videoconferencing, and would enhance the academic experience when fully integrated.

East Asian Studies

Professor Allen reported that the review summary for East Asian Studies was an accurate reflection of the review. He noted with concern that the review remarked on three major issues for the program – that it was insufficiently rigorous, that it was overcrowded, and that staffing was inadequate. In his view, the review pointed out a vivid illustration of the suffering quality of undergraduate education that was pertinent to all sectors of the University, and deserved to be noted. The administrative response had addressed some of the concerns, and the *Stepping UP* planning processes were in line with the review recommendations. In Professor Allen's opinion, though, the pedagogical concerns raised by the review were insufficiently addressed by the administrative response. Lastly, Professor Allen noted a discrepancy between the review report's assumptions about course loads for minors and the Faculty of Arts and Science standard.

Professor Howson noted that the discrepancy was an error of the reviewers, and that the Department of East Asian Studies abided by the Faculty regulations. As for the problems identified, she noted that a new Chair had assumed responsibility for the Department. Furthermore, the Faculty agreed with the review's comments on language instruction and a task force on language was about to report.

Members expressed their concern that the review's conclusions had been so stark and encouraged the efforts of the Faculty to improve programming within the unit.

Fine Art

The Vice-Chair noted that the statement within the review, that interdisciplinary programs would be unsuccessful in the Department, seemed to be a dramatic departure from *Stepping UP's* emphasis on interdisciplinarity. Professor Howson reported that the Department was in the midst of reviewing its curriculum and redesigning its 100-level courses to be more interdisciplinary. Furthermore, some responsibility for pursuing interdisciplinary study lay with students. The Chair noted that opportunities existed among smaller specialist programs to pursue interdisciplinary work in unusual or innovative ways.

**Report Number 116 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -
June 14, 2005**

2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)

French

Professor Jenkins reported that the French Department's review's major issue was the issue of upcoming retirements and the plans for hiring replacements. She queried whether the replacement of 9.6 full-time equivalent faculty positions over five years was a rapid enough strategy to meet need. She noted that the summary was an accurate reflection of the review.

History

A member noted that the review cited that 25% of doctoral students in the Department of History received external funding, a proportion perceived to be too low. Professor Howson agreed, noting that additional effort was required to address funding concerns in the Department. The member noted that there seemed to be no standard available to assess the appropriate level of outside support.

Spanish and Portuguese

Ms. Chong reported that the summary accurately reflected the contents of the review, except for one issue: the review recommended the reduction of class sizes throughout the Department, especially in first-year courses. Professor Howson informed the Committee that the Faculty was well aware of the issue, in that it applied to all language departments. Another member noted that the lack of standard evaluation of Teaching Assistants (TAs), who were responsible for significant elements of undergraduate instruction, needed to be addressed. Professor Farrar noted that although the system of TA evaluation was departmentally based, the Faculty was examining methods of using best-practice systems throughout the numerous Departments. Professor Howson noted that some Arts and Science Departments had devised effective methods of evaluation and feedback and were actively sharing methods with other units.

School of Graduate Studies

Addiction Studies

Professor Hindmarsh stated that the summary accurately reflected the review, but he noted that the program had suffered a decline in enrolment and its existence might not be justifiable in the future. The Chair said that he was struck by the small number of students in the program. Professor Cormack noted that the School of Graduate Studies did monitor the health of all programs and if one were deemed unsustainable it would give serious consideration to discontinuation. A member noted that the lack of interest by PhD students was potentially problematic. Professor Cormack noted that Master's-level enrolment seemed healthy and stable, but that perhaps the Doctoral stream should be removed. In any case, such decisions were pending based on the review.

Biomedical Engineering

Mr. Neata informed the Committee that the Provostial summary was in order and that no other issues required the Committee's attention.

Environmental Health

No issues required the Committee's attention.

**Report Number 116 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -
June 14, 2005**

2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)

Ethnic and Pluralism Studies

Dr. Elliston informed the Committee that the summary captured the highlights of the review, especially with regards to program capacity issues and future opportunities for linkages with other units. The major practical current issue of which the Committee should be aware was the importance of the program in Ethnic and Pluralism Studies to the wider community.

Centre for Industrial Relations

Professor Abramovitch informed the Committee that the review of the Centre was routine and contained several positive recommendations. Of particular note for the Committee's consideration was the recommendation that Library holdings pertinent to the Centre be nurtured. Professor Cormack confirmed that the School of Graduate Studies felt this was an important recommendation and would work towards its fulfillment.

Integrative Manufacturing

Mr. Neata informed the Committee that the summary accurately reflected the review. He noted that he had been impressed by the employment success of graduates of the program. A member asked Professor Cormack to follow up with a question of how often summer projects for the students were not secured, given the centrality of work-related internships. Professor Cormack agreed to do so. Another member asked what the justification for maintaining the program was, given its extremely small enrolment. Professor Cormack responded that the program, though small, was aimed at top-ranked students to provide an excellent learning experience.

Faculty of Medicine

Department of Medicine

The Chair welcomed Professor Catharine Whiteside, Interim Dean, Faculty of Medicine.

Professor de Nil reported that the summary accurately reflected the review report, but noted that the review had taken place almost two years prior. Professor Whiteside confirmed that many of the recommendations had already been implemented. Members commented on the intricate and complex relationships requiring careful management in a Department of Medicine, including relationships with affiliated hospitals, chairs, clinical faculty, and many other groups. As a result, the Department had a unique administrative structure.

University of Toronto at Scarborough

Department of Social Sciences

It was noted that the review summary accurately reflected the intent of the review. The Chair, noting that five major recommendations had been made, asked Professor Buchweitz about their status. Professor Buchweitz responded that they were all in the process of being addressed. The Vice-Chair noted that the Report cited a historical perception of a 'culture of absenteeism' and asked for clarification of the Report's commentary on this topic. Professor Buchweitz responded that it was a challenge for both the east and west campuses to concentrate faculty members with graduate student commitments *in situ* as opposed to on the St. George Campus. It was a priority

**Report Number 116 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -
June 14, 2005**

2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)

for the Scarborough administration to address the issue as more graduate programs were situated there.

The Chair asked why Economics was not among the disciplines represented in the Social Sciences at the University of Toronto at Scarborough. Professor Buchweitz and Professor Howson explained that the absence of Economics at Scarborough was a long-standing issue that had arisen as a result of disagreements between the Scarborough administration and faculty members, and which had resulted in the issue addressed by the review. Professor Buchweitz indicated that discussions were underway to address the issue.

Provostial Reviews

Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design

The Chair welcomed Professor George Baird, Dean, Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design. Professor Baird reported that the recommendations related to hiring a development officer and performing searches for faculty members to enhance the Faculty's diversity had been addressed. He noted that the report's recommendation to enhance consultation with students was, in his opinion, a mystery, stating that student consultation processes seemed to be robust. He had allocated funds to improve the web presence of the Faculty because the web function was increasingly a primary tool in the disciplines. A member asked what the interaction between members of the Department of Geography and the Faculty was. Professor Baird responded that some courses were offered for students of both programs in a joint studio, and faculty members did maintain some interaction on common areas of scholarly interest.

Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Abramovitch reported that the review of the Faculty of Arts and Science was an impressive one, and that the response was an excellent one. The summary captured the review report accurately. Professor Howson discussed the 'short tenure clock' in the Faculty, noting that hiring practices reflected the expectations of the Faculty.

School of Graduate Studies

Professor Jenkins and Professor Aitchison reported that the review, of which the summary was an accurate reflection, recommended a comprehensive review of the School and its operations. Professor Hillan reported that the final report of the Task Force recommended by the review was nearing completion, and that the Principals and Deans had already met and addressed a discussion paper arising from the Task Force.

Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

The Chair welcomed Professor Roger Martin, Dean, Rotman School of Management. Professor Scherk reported that the summary was accurate and applauded the School for its thorough response to the review report. Two issues were key, in his opinion: the role of the School in the tri-campus environment, and the financial arrangements for the School. Professor Martin reported that discussions on tri-campus issues were proceeding well, and the key issue was on the branding of the school. Issues arose from the use of the Rotman brand, and the School was required to control its use. At present, there was a clear direction that the brand was of the School at the St. George campus, and other uses required approval. On the issue of the finances

**Report Number 116 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -
June 14, 2005**

2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report (cont'd.)

of the School, Professor Martin noted that a long-term plan had been put in place to ensure a stable financial future for the School.

Professor Martin reported that the Commerce program had had an external review, and that he had been working with Dean Sinervo of the Faculty of Arts and Science to address issues raised by that review. Students in the Commerce program wanted to be graduates of the Rotman School, which was not currently the case.

Faculty of Music

The Chair welcomed Professor Russell Hartenberger, Associate Dean, Faculty of Music, to the meeting. Professor Hartenberger reported that the new Dean of the Faculty, Professor Gage Averill, had been very active in addressing the review's recommendations, with AIF approval for one-hour lessons in place for Fall 2005. In addition, the Faculty was in talks with the Royal Conservatory of Music, which was trying to create an identity as an academic entity. He noted that the library issues were serious but that plans were underway to address them. A member noted her gratification that the expansion of community outreach initiatives in the Faculty had been dramatic and effective. Professor Howson noted that discussions for interdisciplinary majors with Victoria University were underway and showed strong potential.

Faculty of Pharmacy

It was noted that the summary was an accurate reflection of the review report. There was no discussion.

Faculty of Physical Education and Health

The Chair welcomed Professor Bruce Kidd, Dean, Faculty of Physical Education and Health, to the meeting. Professor Aitchison reported that the summary was accurate. He noted that there had been a significant number of negative comments from students, especially graduate students. Professor Kidd had noted his concern with the negative student comments, and had met with the graduate student leadership to address their concerns. He stated that, after the resolution of the Varsity Stadium issue, the Faculty would be submitting its plan for *Stepping UP*, which was designed to address significant revenue challenges. He anticipated that the plan would be delivered to the Provost's Office by July 2005.

The Chair thanked all members for attending the meeting, and wished them a pleasant summer.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

August 29, 2005

34345