

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 131 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

September 10, 2007

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Monday, September 10, 2007 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)
Professor Douglas McDougall
(Vice-Chair)

Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic

Professor Cheryl Misak, Deputy Provost

Mr. Taufik Al-Sarraj

Professor Derek Allen

Professor Jan Angus

Professor Gage Averill

Professor Katherine Berg

Professor Ragnar Buchweitz

Ms Tiffany Chow

Professor Elizabeth Cowper

Professor Robert Gibbs

Ms Bonnie Goldberg

Professor Audrey Laporte

Dr. Stefan Mathias Larson

Professor Cheryl Regehr

Ms Lorenza Sisca

Miss Maureen Somerville

Professor Suzanne Stevenson

Non-Voting Assessors:

Dr. Tim McTiernan, Interim
Vice-President, Research

Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Vice-Provost,
Graduate Education and Dean, School
of Graduate Studies

Professor Pekka Sinervo, Vice-Provost,
First Entry Programs and Dean, Faculty
of Arts and Science

Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Secretariat:

Ms Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Ms Emily Gregor

Ms Milka Ignjatovic

Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard

Professor Yuki Mayumi Johnson

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles

In Attendance:

Professor Robert Baker, Chair, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology,
Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Malcolm Campbell, Associate Chair for Graduate Studies, Department of Cell
and Systems Biology, Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Amrita Daniere, Graduate Chair, Department of Geography and Chair,
Department of Geography, University of Toronto at Mississauga

In Attendance (cont'd)

Professor Meric Gertler, Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Research, Faculty of Arts and Science

Professor Normand Labrie, Vice-Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT)

Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

ITEMS 5, 6 and 7 CONTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Welcome and Orientation

Introductory Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the first meeting of the year. The Chair introduced herself, the Vice-Chair, Professor Doug McDougall, the voting assessors, Professor Edith Hillan, Vice- Provost, Academic, and Professor Cheryl Misak, Deputy Provost, and members of the Secretariat who were present.

The Chair then invited members to introduce themselves, and to note their role on the Committee (teaching staff member, administrative staff member, student member, alumni member, assessor).

Orientation

The Chair gave a brief overview of the work of the Committee, focusing on the mandate and scope of the Committee, especially as it related to the Planning and Budget Committee. She described the organization of the Governing Council and its Boards and Committees¹, and noted that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs was one of the four Standing Committees of the Academic Board.

The Chair reviewed the structure and function of the governance process. She explained that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – or AP&P - was the entry level of governance for a number of major items. As the entry-level body, the Committee was responsible for a detailed review of the matters brought before it, before either approving the matter, or making a recommendation for approval to the Academic Board. Among the items that the Committee approved were the following:

- minor changes to admission policies and amendments to divisional practices concerning examinations and grading policies;
- minor amendments to awards policies and practices;
- minor changes to curriculum within established degree programs or in academic regulations;
- diploma and post-secondary certificate programs.

¹ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Boards+and+Committees/Governing+Council/2.02.03.pdf.pdf>

1. Welcome and Orientation (cont'd)

The Committee was also responsible for:

- considering and recommending new degree programs;
- considering and recommending academic policies, including those on academic services, research, earned degrees, admissions and awards;
- monitoring other academic matters including:
 - reviews of academic programs and units;
 - activities of the Connaught Committee;
 - student financial support;
 - research and international activities;
 - student awards.

The Chair reminded members that, for new academic programs, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs made recommendations concerning the academic content and requirements, while the Planning and Budget Committee considered the planning and resource implications of the proposal.

The Chair concluded the brief orientation by encouraging members to become familiar with the Committee's Terms of Reference, so that the Committee's discussions could be focused appropriately.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair noted that the main business of the May meeting had been the review of the annual report of the Reviews of Academic Units and Programs, which was one of the most important responsibilities of the Committee. The Committee's Report would be considered by the Agenda Committee, to decide whether there were any items requiring the attention of the Academic Board. The Report plus the reviews would then go to the Executive Committee and to Governing Council for information.

Report Number 130 of the meeting of May 25, 2007 was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

The Chair invited Professor Hillan to comment on the development of degree expectation guidelines – an item that had been raised under Other Business on page 15 of the Report.

Professor Hillan informed members that the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV), a group affiliated with the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), had developed Guidelines for University Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations.² The Guidelines were intended to clarify the competencies expected of graduates from Baccalaureate/Bachelors programs of Ontario's publicly funded universities.

² <http://www.cou.on.ca/bin/publications/onlinePublications.cfm>

3. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting (cont'd)

Included among the competencies were:

- depth and breadth of knowledge;
- knowledge of methodologies;
- application of knowledge;
- communication skills;
- awareness of limits of knowledge;
- autonomy and professional capacity.

Each Ontario university was expected to develop a set of competencies for its programs by June 2008. The Council of First-Entry Deans was currently developing the set of competencies for the first entry undergraduate degrees.

4. Report on Approvals Under Summer Executive Authority

The Chair explained that each year, authority was granted to approve matters that could not wait until the next regular meeting of the appropriate Committee or Board.

In 2007, approval had been given under summer executive authority for a revision to the design of the diploma of the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), a matter that was within the terms of reference of the Committee. Approval had been necessary because Professor Ian Orchard was both Vice-President and Principal, and Acting Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean of UTM. The diploma had included the imprinted signatures of the Vice-President and Principal and of the Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean. The revised diploma would include the imprinted signatures of the Vice-President and Principal of UTM, the President of the University of Toronto, and the Secretary of the Governing Council, until a Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean, UTM, had been appointed and had taken office.

5. School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

The Chair welcomed Professor Baker and Professor Gertler to the meeting. She explained that this proposal would be considered by the Academic Board on October 2, 2007 and by the Governing Council on October 30, 2007.

Professor Hillan informed members that the proposed programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology had arisen from the reorganization of biological sciences in the Faculty of Arts and Science. The reorganization had resulted in the formation of the Department of Cell and Systems Biology (CSB) and the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB). At the time of the reorganization, it was indicated that the new graduate departments would work towards the development of new programs.

The proposed programs aimed to provide more focused graduate studies that were well-aligned with student interest and demand. The new EEB graduate program had been developed by the Department's Graduate Affairs Committee (GAC) and had included extensive consultation with the Department's graduate students and faculty members, as well as input from cognate units in the Faculty and with other divisions in the University. The proposal contained elements of the previous Botany and Zoology graduate programs as well as new elements.

5. School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (cont'd)

The Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) proposals had been accepted following unanimous department faculty approval and majority graduate student approval. The proposals had been approved by the Tri-Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Science (April 30, 2007) and by the Graduate Education Council (May 22, 2007).

Professor Hillan noted that the two existing graduate programs (Plant & Microbial Biology and Zoology) would continue to be jointly administered by the CSB and EEB departments; and the programs would continue until there were no more students registered in each program.

A member asked why the projected ratio of Master's to Doctoral students in the EEB programs was lower than that projected in the CSB programs. Professor Baker commented that, in general, young faculty members tended to take Master's students over PhD students. The difference in the ratio of PhD/MSc students in the two departments may reflect the demographics of the faculty in the two Departments.

A member noted that the proposed Master's program was a twelve-month program, and asked whether the Department had considered a two-year program. Professor Baker replied that the Master's program was intended to provide students with an opportunity to prove their research potential and to prepare them to enroll in advanced graduate degree programs, as well as allowing them to seek employment in organizations such as government or private labs requiring research experience.

A member noted that the Master's program that was proposed by the Department of Cell and Systems Biology was a two-year program, and asked what the implication of the length of the two programs would be on enrolment. Professor Baker replied that the areas of interest in the two departments were very different and would not overlap.

On motion duly made and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposal to establish the Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology within the Faculty of Arts and Science, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'A', be approved, effective September, 2008.

6. School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Cell and Systems Biology

The Chair welcomed Professor Campbell to the meeting. She explained that this proposal would be considered by the Academic Board on October 2, 2007 and by the Governing Council on October 30, 2007.

6. School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Cell and Systems Biology (cont'd)

Professor Hillan explained that these proposed programs had also arisen from the recent reorganization of biological sciences in the Faculty of Arts and Science. With the founding of the new graduate department of Cell and Systems Biology (CSB), faculty and students in the graduate department had initiated a process to develop a proposal for the new CSB graduate programs. The proposed graduate programs had been tailored to the research interests of CSB faculty members and current graduate students.

There had been extensive consultation within the Department as well as with cognate units in the faculty and with other divisions in the University. Consultation had included town hall meetings with CSB graduate students, an online survey of graduate students, and discussions with the CSB Graduate Studies Committee. A number of cognate units had been consulted. There had also been discussions with the Dean of Forestry, and the Chair of Chemical Engineering, as well as the program directors for the collaborative graduate programs in Proteomics and Bioinformatics, and Developmental Biology.

The Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) proposals had been accepted following unanimous department faculty approval and majority graduate student approval. The proposals had been approved by the Tri-Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Science (April 30, 2007) and by the Graduate Education Council (May 22, 2007).

Invited to comment, Professor Campbell explained that the driving force behind the development of the proposed programs had been to provide training and mentoring to students in the fields of Cell, Molecular and Systems Biology.

A member asked whether there had been discussions concerning potential overlaps with other Departments. Professor Campbell replied that he and the Chair of CSB had met with the Chairs and/or Associate Chairs of the Departments of Molecular and Medical Genetics, Medical Biophysics, Biochemistry, and Computer Science to discuss the impact of the proposed CSB program on the unit, and to identify potential opportunities for collaboration between the units.

A member noted the ratio between enrolment in the Master's and the Doctoral program. Professor Campbell explained that there was a high demand for scientists with an M.Sc. degree in many career paths, including education, business and policy development. The projected balance in enrolment between the two programs was considered to be appropriate by the Department.

Professor Pfeiffer added that the Master of Science degree was considered to be a universal degree that was particularly popular within Canada. She referred members to a recent publication by the Canadian Association of Graduate Studies (CAGS) entitled *A Profile of Master's Degree Education in Canada*.³

³ <http://www.cags.ca/Default.aspx?tabid=1775>

6. School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Proposal for Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy Degree Programs in Cell and Systems Biology (cont'd)

On motion duly made and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposal to establish the Master of Science (M.Sc.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs in Cell and Systems Biology within the Faculty of Arts and Science, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'B', be approved, effective September, 2008.

7. School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Joint Master's Degree Program in Spatial Analysis (University of Toronto Department of Geography and Ryerson University) – Proposed Closure

The Chair welcomed Professor Daniere to the meeting. She explained that this proposal would be considered by the Academic Board on October 2, 2007 and by the Governing Council on October 30, 2007.

Professor Hillan explained that the University of Toronto Department of Geography and the Ryerson University School of Applied Geography had established the Joint Master of Spatial Analysis Program (M.S.A.) in 1999. Since that time, the academic focus of the Department of Geography had changed. A number of core faculty involved with the program had left the University, and no University of Toronto students were currently enrolled in the program. The Department of Geography had therefore proposed to withdraw from the M.S.A. program and to close the program at the University of Toronto.

The proposed closure had been extensively discussed within the department. A series of meetings with Ryerson University administrators had been held to review the withdrawal of the University of Toronto from the program. In October 2006, the Dean of Graduate Studies, Ryerson, had agreed to the dissolution of the joint program. The Graduate Committee of the Department of Geography had approved the withdrawal on February 5, 2007, the Geography Council had approved of the withdrawal on March 20, 2007 and the Graduate Education Council of the School of Graduate Studies had approved the program closure on May 22, 2007. Following the program closure at the University of Toronto, Ryerson University would assume full responsibility for the program.

A member asked what savings would result from the program closure. The Chair reminded members that resource implications of proposals were considered by the Planning and Budget Committee. Professor Daniere indicated that, since there were no students currently enrolled in the program, there would likely be no savings resulting from the program closure. Invited to comment, Professor Gertler added that, since students in the M.S.A. program had not been included in the graduate funding guarantee, there would be no savings resulting from student financial support.

A member asked whether there had always been a low demand for the program. Professor Daniere replied that the maximum enrolment of University of Toronto students in any year had been five.

7. School of Graduate Studies / Faculty of Arts and Science: Joint Master's Degree Program in Spatial Analysis (University of Toronto Department of Geography and Ryerson University) – Proposed Closure (cont'd)

Professor Pfeiffer noted that, in 1999, graduate programs at Ryerson University were new. The University of Toronto had assisted and supported the development of graduate programs at a sister institution, and the program was now well-established at Ryerson.

On motion duly made and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED

THAT the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies and the Faculty of Arts and Science to close the Joint Master of Spatial Analysis (M.S.A.) Program at the University of Toronto, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix 'C', be approved, effective immediately

8. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT): Certificate Program in Leadership in Higher Education

The Chair welcomed Professor Labrie to the meeting. She explained that, under Section 4 of the *Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs*, the Committee had the authority to approve certificate programs, such as the one being considered, that required completion of secondary school as a condition of admission, comprised a coherent sequence of courses, provided a mechanism for assessment of student performance, registered students as University of Toronto students, and conferred diplomas on students at Convocation.

Professor Hillan explained that the Department of Theory and Policy Studies in Education (TPS) at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the University had identified a need, both within the University and in the post-secondary community, for professional development opportunities. The University currently offered the Leadership Advancement Program (LEAP) through Staff Development. TPS faculty had taught components of the LEAP program for several years. The success of this program and the feedback from the target community suggested that there was demand for a certificate program.

The program would be an undergraduate level certificate drawing from the M.Ed. in Higher Education (emphasis on Leadership) program. Students would be evaluated, consistent with the Grading Practices Policy, on the basis of the undergraduate grading scheme. Each of the four courses required for the Certificate would be taught by TPS professors and associated faculty who normally taught these courses. To meet the unique needs of working professionals, the program would be delivered in an innovative, cohort-based, compressed format. The students would begin the certificate in a full week summer workshop, followed by 4 or 5 weekends of study in 3 additional semesters (Fall, Winter and Spring).

The proposed *U of T Certificate in Leadership in Higher Education* was intended to serve the needs of professionals currently working in positions of administrative responsibility in higher education, and those aspiring to organizational leadership positions within colleges and universities. While application to the Certificate Program required completion of secondary school as a minimum basis for admission, applicants would normally be expected to present a university degree or equivalent and relevant professional experience. Special consideration would be given to applicants lacking the formal academic credentials but who had significant relevant professional experience. The certificate program would be reviewed regularly as part of the review of programs in the Department.

8. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT): Certificate Program in Leadership in Higher Education (cont'd)

Invited to comment, Professor Labrie observed that a number of University and College administrators were interested in a Certificate Program rather than in a Master of Education (M.Ed.) degree.

A member noted that no numbers had been included in the documentation, and asked how many students were expected to enroll in the program. Professor Labrie replied that there was a cohort of sixty students, of whom 48 were enrolled in the M.Ed. program and 12 were enrolled in the Certificate Program.

A member noted the reference in the documentation to the shift in resources from the LEAP program to the Certificate Program. Ms Swift stated that the LEAP program had been discontinued.

A member summarized his understanding of the three choices available to administrative staff - the one-time-only workshop format of the LEAP program, the Certificate Program, and the M.Ed. degree program – and asked why the Certificate Program would be chosen over the degree program. Professor Labrie replied that most applicants for the Certificate Program would not be eligible for admission to the M.Ed. program. Ms Swift added that historically, administrative staff members were not required to have a Baccalaureate degree.

A member noted that the Calendar Entry clearly stated that application to the Certificate Program required completion of secondary school as a minimum basis of admission. Another member noted the reference to special consideration being given to ‘applicants lacking the formal academic credential but who had significant relevant professional experience’, and asked if those who had not completed high school could be admitted to the program. Ms Swift replied that under very special circumstances only, such as those in which a student had completed an academic bridging program, could be admitted to the Certificate Program.

A member asked why the Certificate Program had been approved under OISE/UT Summer Executive Authority. Professor Labrie replied that the effective date of the Certificate Program was July 2007, and noted that students were enrolled in the Program.

A member asked what the relationship was between the M.Ed. Program and the Certificate Program. Professor Labrie replied that the courses in the Certificate Program existed as Master’s courses. The program was cohort-based with Master’s students and students in the Certificate Program.

8. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT): Certificate Program in Leadership in Higher Education (cont'd)

A member asked if students had enrolled in the Program believing that they would receive a Certificate even though the program had not been approved by governance. Ms Swift replied that the Program had been under discussion for several months. While the program was proceeding through the appropriate governance processes, it had been publicized by staff development and staff had been invited to apply for admission to the program. Students had been informed that the program was in the process of being brought forward to governance.

A member asked what would happen if the Committee did not approve the program. Ms Swift replied that a division could issue a diploma for the completion of a program approved by the division.

A member asked about the quality of the courses, since both Master's students and Certificate students were enrolled in the same courses. Professor Hillan reiterated that Certificate students would be evaluated on the basis of the undergraduate grading scheme, while the Master's students would be evaluated according to graduate grading requirements. Ms Swift added that admission to the Certificate Program was highly selective.

On motion duly made and seconded,

IT WAS RESOLVED

THAT the Certificate in Leadership in Higher Education, as described in the submission from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education that is attached hereto as Appendix "D", be approved, effective for the academic year 2007-2008.

9. School of Graduate Studies: Annual Report of Items Approved Via Graduate Governance Procedures 2006-2007

The Chair observed that this was the first annual summary of items approved by the new system of graduate governance. Professor Pfeiffer reminded members that two years ago, graduate governance had been restructured, and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had delegated authority for approval of some matters to the Graduate Education Council (GEC) of the School of Graduate Studies. The decisions made at the GEC had been made with appropriate consideration and relevant contextual information.

A member commented that the change in governance had been an excellent change. Another member asked how the Committee was expected to respond to the report. The Chair encouraged members to raise any questions they had on items presented for information.

10. Calendar of Business

The Chair drew the attention of members to the Calendar of Business that had been included in the agenda package. A member asked why there were no items of business in Cycle Two on the Calendar of Business. The Secretary replied that no items had yet been identified for consideration in Cycle Two. The Chair added that the Committee's Agenda Planning Group met before each Committee meeting to consider items coming forward and to review the flow of business.

11. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Hillan reported that the Undergraduate Program Review and Audit Committee (UPRAC) would be conducting an audit of the internal mechanisms for review at the University in 2008.⁴ This would be the second UPRAC audit; the first audit had been conducted in 2001, and the report of the audit had been received by the University in 2004. The site visit was expected to be at the beginning of February, 2008. Members of the Committee might be invited to meet with the auditors.

There were no other reports.

12. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Tuesday, October 23, 2007.

13. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 9, 2007

⁴ <http://www.cou.on.ca/bin/affiliates/associations/upracmain.cfm>