UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 75 OF THE COMMITTEE ON

ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

September 15, 1999

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, September 15, 1999, at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Wendy Rolph (In the
   Chair)
Professor Ruth Gallop
   (Vice-Chair)
Professor Carolyn Tuohy,
   Deputy Provost
Professor David Cook, Vice-Provost
Mr. Jason Baker
Professor Clare Beghtol
Ms Rakhi Bhavnani
Professor Philip Byer
Professor Francois Casas
Professor Carl Corter
Professor Raisa Deber
Mr. Michael Derzko
Ms Joy Fitzgibbon
Professor Gerald Goldenberg
Professor Hugh Gunz
Mr. David Kaplan
Professor Gretchen Kerr

Professor Angela Lange
Professor Emmet Robbins

Non-Voting Assessors
Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost,
   Students
Ms Karel Swift, Registrar

Secretariat:
Ms Patti Seaman, Secretary
Ms Susan Girard

Regrets:
Professor Derek Allen
Dr. Claire Alleyne
Mr. Eric Brock
Professor Rorke Bryan
Professor Ian McDonald
Professor J.J. Berry Smith

In Attendance:

Professor Marilyn Ballantyne, Faculty of Nursing
Ms Judith Chadwick, Program Director, Connaught Fund
Professor Don Cormack, Associate Dean, Division III, School of Graduate Studies
Professor Susan Howson, Associate Dean, Division II, School of Graduate Studies
Professor Ulli Krull, University of Toronto at Mississauga
Professor Douglas McDougall, Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning,
   OISE/UT
Professor Peter Pauly, Associate Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Rotman
   School of Management
Professor Jeanne Watson, Department of Adult Education, Community Development
   and Counselling Psychology, OISE/UT

**Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
September 15, 1999**

**ITEMS 7 (a) AND 7 (c) ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL. ALL
OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.**

1.   Introductory Remarks

The Chair welcomed the Committee for the academic year 1999-2000. She noted that the
Deputy Provost, Professor Carolyn Tuohy, was the Senior Assessor and a voting member
of the Committee. Vice-Provost, Professor David Cook was also a presidential assessor
and a voting member of the Committee. The role of the assessors was to bring forward or
sponsor items from the administration for the Committee's consideration. Other assessors,
who were non-voting members of the Committee, were Professor Adel Sedra, Vice-
President and Provost, Professor Heather Munroe-Blum, Vice-President, Research and
International Relations, Professor Ian Orchard, Vice-Provost, Students and
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar. She noted that these members might or might not be
attending each meeting, depending on the business to come forward.

She noted that the agenda package also contained general information about the Committee
that included: the meeting schedule; a general introduction to the Committee's work and
proceedings; Terms of Reference of the Committee; the *University Grading Practices
Policy*; and the Committee membership list.

The Chair invited Professor Tuohy to comment on the review process. Professor Tuohy
noted that a key part of academic planning was the review process. There were a number of
reviews that had been recently conducted, or were on-going, including the Provost's
reviews. She explained that the Committee's second annual program review meeting would
take place in July 2000 and consider the reviews undertaken in 1998-99 and 1999-2000.
Professor Tuohy stated that the recommendations and concerns voiced in the previous
review meeting would be taken into account in the next cycle of reviews. The *Guidelines for
Reviews of Academic Programs and Units* addressed many of the points raised by the
Committee, and with their implementation, the Committee was likely to see an improvement
in the review process.

2.   Time of Adjournment

It was duly moved and seconded,

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

The vote was taken on the motion.
The motion was carried.

3.   Report of the Previous Meeting of July 26, 1999

The Chair noted that two corrections to the report of the July 26 meeting had been brought
to her attention. On page 9, paragraph 3, the sentence read, "… the member stated that he
did not view it to be a substandard review." This should read "substantive review." On

**Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
September 15, 1999**

3.   Report of the Previous Meeting of July 26, 1999 (cont'd.)

page 11, paragraph 3, the sentence read, "…in his division it was common practice for review committees to consult the committee members who had previously conducted reviews." This should read, "it was common practice for committee members to consult reports of previously conducted reviews."

Report Number 74 of the meeting of July 26, 1999, as amended, was approved.

4.   Business Arising

At the July 26, 1999 meeting Professor Tuohy had undertaken to check the cognate departments with which the reviewers had met for the review of the Department of Immunology in the Faculty of Medicine. She noted that the question raised at the previous meeting was, given that the basic medical sciences were involved in undergraduate teaching, had reviewers consulted the Faculty of Arts and Science? Professor Tuohy reported that the reviewers for the department met for one hour with a group of representatives from the Faculty Arts and Science and the Faculty of Medicine to discuss topics related to undergraduate issues. Included in this group was Professor Ian Orchard, then Associate Dean, Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Science; Professor Rick Frecker, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Medical Education; Professor Brian Barber, Immunology Undergraduate Secretary and Immunology Specialist Program Coordinator; Dr. David Isenman, Dr. Chris Paige, Dr. Neil Berinstein, Dr. Tania Watts, Dr. Florence Tsui, and Dr. John Hay. The reviewers also met separately with students in the Immunology Specialist Program and with undergraduate medical students. These groups also provided reviewers with a written report on their programs. It was Professor Tuohy's view that the appropriate consultations had taken place.

5.   Guidelines for Divisional Submissions: Proposed Amendments

Professor Tuohy reported that this was the policy that guided the divisions in drafting their submission to this Committee. A number of changes were being suggested for the Committee's approval. Professor Tuohy noted that there were several reasons for these changes. In some cases it was a matter of updating the names of units and including new units. In other cases the changes were being made for clarification of the *Guidelines*. Past experience had indicated that it was of benefit to divisions to be more specific on some points. Finally, some minor editorial changes were being suggested. Professor Tuohy gave the following examples:

- updating the reference to UTCS to "information and computing services,"
- changing "curriculum" to read " academic program" proposals,
- notice that the proposals were to be submitted to the Provost's office, and a recommendation to the Committee would be made through the Deputy Provost,
- appropriate and rational naming and designations for program proposals.

Professor Tuohy drew members' attention to the paragraph detailing executive summaries coming forward from divisions. She noted that proposals should include resource implications, for the purpose of review by the Planning and Budget Committee, essentially to save the division from providing two submissions.

5. Guidelines for Divisional Submissions: Proposed Amendments (cont'd.)

A member drew attention to page 2 of the *Guidelines* and noted that for matters of consistency, the use of "curriculum" under the heading *Procedures*, should be amended to read "academic programs." Another member stated his appreciation for the updated *Guidelines* noting that many improvements had been made. However, he said that divisions were often confused in regard to which proposals to bring forward to the Committee for approval, and the process by which proposals passed through the various levels of governance. This could be resolved by personal discussions between divisions and the Provost's office, but was there a more effective way to disseminate this information? He noted that there was ambiguity as to why the Committee received some proposals for information and others for approval. As well, he said that it was never clear as to the process for deciding name changes. He said that new programs were not mentioned in the *Guidelines*. He further noted that there was uncertainty in the determination of what would be considered major and what was minor. It would be of benefit to clarify this in the *Guidelines*.

Professor Tuohy agreed that a reference to new programs should be added. With respect to major and minor proposals, it would be very difficult to insert more explicit wording into the policy. She emphasized that defining these items was a matter of judgment for the Deputy Provost and the agenda-planning group for this Committee. The Chair noted that the original intent had been to distinguish between major and minor academic program proposals in terms of governance and/or administrative approval levels, but not to catalogue the specifics on which such a determination was to be made. The member responded that he recognized that there would always be some ambiguity but that some specification of what constituted a major proposal should be included. The member continued by noting the importance of the executive summary as key to the Committee's decision-making process. He recommended that the summary include a program description and the program requirements. He further stated that course descriptions were not as important to have, although course titles and numbers were vital.

A member commended the *Guidelines for Divisional Submissions*. She asked how the *Guidelines* could be adapted to address cross-divisional programs. She noted that under current practice, it was possible for a division to make program changes such as dropping courses without the approval, or in some cases, the knowledge, of the other participating units. She requested that there be included in the *Guidelines* a provision that would ensure discussion between cross-divisional units. Professor Tuohy noted that the units were required to adhere to the program requirements as approved by the Committee. The member continued that in the case of many units the relationships were informal and information was often not disseminated. No official mechanism existed to ensure that units involved in cross-divisional programs were made aware of changes made to the programs by other units. Professor Tuohy noted that this was more a matter of administrative arrangements than a matter of governance.

A member noted that on page 2 of the document, under *Other Proposals*, only some faculties were specified. The Chair explained that most departments contained undergraduate and graduate components, and that the units specified in this section were those that had a graduate presence only. Professor Tuohy undertook to make this an exhaustive list of graduate-only faculties. A member noted that the *Guidelines* called for

**Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
September 15, 1999**

5.   Guidelines for Divisional Submissions: Proposed Amendments (cont'd.)

the program proposals to be presented to the Committee by the divisional representatives.
In fact, they were presented by the Senior Assessor. Professor Tuohy agreed and noted
that divisional representatives were invited to the Committee's meeting to answer any
questions.

The Chair asked the Committee if the changes that had been recommended at the meeting
were acceptable. Was there a consensus that the *Guidelines* could be approved at this time
with the amendments recommended by the members or did the members wish to see an
amended version of the document before they voted? The Committee agreed to the vote.

>   On motion duly moved and seconded,
>
>   YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED
>
>   The *Guidelines for Divisional Submissions*, dated September 15, 1999, as
>   amended, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A."

**6.   Faculty of Nursing: Proposal for Post-Master's Nurse Practitioner (NP)
         Diploma Program**

The Chair welcomed Professor Marilyn Ballantyne from the Faculty of Nursing.

The Chair noted that this item would also be considered by the Planning and Budget
Committee with respect to resource implications.

Professor Tuohy stated that the proposed Post-Master's Nurse Practitioner (NP) Diploma
program was designed to afford nursing professionals who had completed graduate
education the opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills required to perform the nurse
practitioner role in an acute care clinical setting. The program was a proposed revision to
the certificate program, Cert.ACNP., which had been offered from 1994-1998.

Professor Tuohy noted that, in response to the recommendations of a formal evaluation of
the certificate program, the proposed program would incorporate greater theory content and
a longer clinical practicum than did the existing certificate program. The proposed program
was renamed as a diploma program to be consistent with the University's Policy on
Diploma and Certificate Programs.

A member asked if this was the only post-master's diploma program at the University of
Toronto. Professor Tuohy noted that currently this was the only post-master's program but
that other faculties were considering such programs. A member offered his strong support
for the proposal citing an anticipated shortage of nurses as a growing concern provincially.
A member asked if there would be a periodic review of this proposal, perhaps at five-year
intervals. Professor Tuohy noted that under the new Policy on Diploma and Certificate
Programs all diploma programs were to be subject to regular periodic review, but no specific
time was identified.

6.   **Faculty of Nursing: Proposal for Post-Master's Nurse Practitioner (NP)
        Diploma Program** (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal for the revision and renaming of the Post Master's Acute Care
Nurse Practitioner Certificate Program as a Post-Master's Nurse
Practitioner Diploma Program in the Faculty of Nursing, effective January 1,
2000, as described in the submission from the Faculty dated August 19,
1999, subject to a review of resource implications.

7.   **School of Graduate Studies**

(a)   University of Toronto at Mississauga: Proposal for a Master of Biotechnology
         (M.Biotech.) Program

The Chair welcomed Professor Ulli Krull, University of Toronto at Mississauga, and
Professor Don Cormack, Associate Dean, Division III, SGS.

The Chair noted that this item would also be considered by the Planning and Budget
Committee with respect to resource implications.

Professor Tuohy introduced the proposed program noting that it would provide students
with a firm grounding in the science of biotechnology and an introduction to the
management of biotechnological organizations. The proposal was the product of a broad
consultation among the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM), the School of
Graduate Studies (SGS), the Faculty of Arts and Science, and the Rotman School of
Management, as well as the Faculties of Medicine, and Applied Science and Engineering. It
was to be based at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and administered through the
graduate departments of Botany, Chemistry, and Zoology, by SGS. A program committee
was to be established for that purpose. Faculty would be drawn largely from Mississauga-
based members of the relevant graduate departments, including Botany, Chemistry, Zoology,
Management, and various physical and social science departments.

The Master of Biotechnology program was a professional master's program which was
designed to equip talented science and applied science graduates for a career in the
biotechnology or pharmaceutical industries. The program would provide individuals with
the following:

   • a solid scientific exposure reflecting the diversity of modern biotechnology,
   • practical laboratory skills in areas selected by the individual with guidance from an
     advisory committee, and
   • an introduction to business management and the management of biotechnology.

A member asked if the courses proposed were limited to the students enrolled in this
program, and if so, did the University have a policy regarding limitations to enrolment. She
suggested that it would be beneficial to students to be able to take advantage of courses in
all departments, including those in this new program. This was a professional master's

7. School of Graduate Studies (cont'd.)

(a)   University of Toronto at Mississauga: Proposal for a Master of Biotechnology
(M.Biotech.) Program (cont'd.)

program; had consideration been given to whether this might subsequently inhibit students
from moving on to a Ph.D. program? Professor Krull noted that there was a rationale for
the closed course enrolments. Because of capacity and costs, the laboratory courses would
be closed to students outside the program. Some other courses, those associated with
placements and particularly the guarantee of placements, were accessible only to students in
the program. For pedagogical reasons, the program had courses for smaller groups in
which students worked in teams, as part of their training. He noted that some standard
lecture courses could be open. He noted that until experience prepared the participating
units to be able to anticipate student enrolment demands, they chose to limit course
accessibility at this time.

Professor Tuohy said that she was not aware of any university-wide policy on access to
courses. There were practices in a number of divisions that limited access to courses. For
example, in Ph.D. programs, specialist, and major programs, there were a wide range of
practices that either formally or effectively limited access to courses for students outside of
the program. However, throughout the University, units were encouraged to allow students
flexibility in the selection of courses. Several members spoke from personal knowledge of
a number of limited enrolment courses. There were legitimate reasons such as limited
resources and prerequisites for courses to have limited enrolments and that this was a
common practice at the University of Toronto. Professor Tuohy added that a number of
professional programs had courses that were restricted to students in the program.

The Chair reiterated the member's question about the possibility of these students moving
on to doctoral studies. Professor Cormack noted that the program was developed for
students not intending further study beyond the professional qualifications provided by the
master's degree. However, he said that students graduating from this program could be
excellent Ph.D. candidates. A member said that given that the program was designated as a
professional master's program, how would other institutions view the proposed program
particularly in regard to the students' preparation for Ph.D. level research? American
institutions accepted students from the bachelor's degree into doctoral programs. Professor
Tuohy noted that students who had graduated from the master's program were better
situated to begin Ph.D. work than were students with a bachelor's degree. Professor
Cormack suggested that students from this program would be viewed as strong, desirable
candidates. A member commented that other students who had graduated from professional
master's programs had been required in some cases to complete a second master's program
before continuing on to the Ph.D. Professor Krull noted that the professional master's
program would not guarantee direct admission to potential doctoral students, although the
students would be better prepared than those without a master's degree.

A member asked if it was necessary to include hands-on laboratory courses for students in
the program. Referring to the proposal, he noted that as a result of a survey of a dozen
biotechnological companies, business professionals were likely to see the graduates
pursuing sales or project management rather than applied research. If industry did not
anticipate the need for applied research, could the laboratory component be reduced?

7.   **School of Graduate Studies** (cont'd.)

(a)   University of Toronto at Mississauga: Proposal for a Master of Biotechnology
(M.Biotech.) Program (cont'd.)

Professor Krull noted that students entering the program would have already been exposed
to some laboratory work in their undergraduate programs. They would be comfortable
entering into more advanced laboratory work. In the case of students hoping to move on to
a Ph.D. program, a background in laboratory work would be an asset. For students who
would be pursuing careers in the biotechnology industry, it was to their advantage to have
first-hand knowledge of the scientific basis of the industry. This scientific background
could be used to gain a greater understanding of product and quality control.
Professor Krull noted that according to his reading of biotechnology industry periodicals,
business had identified an interest in both co-op experience and hands-on laboratory
experience. Laboratory experience gave students practical tools and techniques. The
compact laboratory modules would provide students with a compressed, but valuable,
experience.

A member asked about the quality of life for students in the program. Were the facilities at
UTM sufficient to offer all the courses there and to provide office space for the students?
Would students register at the Mississauga campus? Would administrative functions take
place there or on the St. George campus? Were the library resources at UTM sufficient to
support the program? Would the students have teaching assistantships at UTM or on the
St. George campus? Were there plans for other graduate programs at the Mississauga
campus? Professor Cormack stated that being on the Mississauga campus would not
disadvantage the students. In regard to TAships, the students would be attending the
program full time and would find it difficult to carry the load of a TAship as well. However,
there were TA positions available at UTM and all students were eligible to apply for them.
Professor Krull added that the faculty and students at UTM were fully integrated into
campus life. Library resources from a variety of locations were available to students
electronically. He said that there were a number of students pursuing graduate work in the
life sciences at UTM. Professor Tuohy reminded members that in its plan for 1994-2000,
UTM had contemplated the development of three new master's programs. This proposal
was the second to be put in place. The third remained in the planning stages.

The Chair asked about the issue of release time for faculty from undergraduate teaching to
enable their participation in the master's program. In the interest of the undergraduate
academic experience, would the replacement teaching staff continue to provide the same
level of teaching excellence? Professor Krull noted that although the faculty to replace
faculty released under stipend had not all been chosen, the College was satisfied that the
replacements would be equally qualified. He noted that three new faculty had been hired in
the life sciences, and that faculty to replace those released to participate in the program,
would be from UTM. This would ensure a high quality of education for students.
Professor Tuohy noted that the concern for maintaining a high standard of undergraduate
experience was paramount in the Provost's discussions with the Principal of UTM.

<u>**Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
September 15, 1999**</u>

7.   School of Graduate Studies (cont'd.)

(a)   University of Toronto at Mississauga: Proposal for a Master of Biotechnology
(M.Biotech.) Program (cont'd.)

> On motion duly moved and seconded,
>
> YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS
>
> **THAT** the proposal for a new Master of Biotechnology (M.Biotech.)
> program, based at the University of Toronto at Mississauga and
> administered through the graduate departments of Botany, Chemistry and
> Zoology by the School of Graduate Studies, effective May 1, 2000, as
> described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated
> May 28, 1999, the executive summary of which is attached hereto as
> Appendix "B," be approved.

(b)   Rotman School of Management: Proposal for a new field in Strategic Management
in the Ph.D. Program in Management

The Chair welcomed Professor Susan Howson, Associate Dean, Division II, SGS, and
Professor Peter Pauly, Associate Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Rotman School
of Management.

The Chair noted that this item would also be considered by the Planning and Budget
Committee with respect to resource implications.

Professor Tuohy explained that the Rotman School of Management currently offered a
Ph.D. in Management with specializations in Finance, Marketing, Operations Management,
and Organizational Behaviour. The proposal would add a fifth stream, in Strategic
Management, to the existing Ph.D program. The field of Strategic Management, a growing
area of strength at the Faculty, had grown out of the traditional disciplines of economics,
political science, sociology and psychology, and required a broad knowledge of theory and
methodology. The objective of the specialization was to prepare candidates for research
oriented careers, primarily in universities. The field was also suitable for research careers in
business or government. Professor Tuohy said that this proposal was consistent with the
Faculty's plan.

Professor Howson noted that there had been extensive discussion at the Executive
Committee on this proposal at the School of Graduate Studies.

> On motion duly moved and seconded,
>
> YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED
>
> The proposal for a new field in Strategic Management in the Ph.D. program
> in Management, in the Rotman School of Management, as described in the
> submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated May 28, 1999,
> subject to a review of resource implications.

Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
September 15, 1999

7.   School of Graduate Studies (cont'd.)

(c)   OISE/UT: Proposal for an M.A. and Ph.D. Program in Counselling Psychology

The Chair welcomed Professor Jeanne Watson, Department of Adult Education, Community Development and Counselling Psychology, and Professor Susan Howson, Associate Dean, Division II, SGS.

Professor Tuohy noted that the proposed M.A. and Ph.D. programs were designed to replace the existing M.Ed. and Ed.D. programs in the specialization of Counselling Psychology for Psychology Specialists. The latter were practice-oriented degrees. The new programs would provide an opportunity for more theoretical study and for developing and conducting advanced research, in order to prepare students for university research and teaching careers. Students enrolled in the M.Ed. and Ed.D. Psychology Specialist program, effective the start date of the new programs, would have the option to complete the programs they were in currently or to transfer to the new programs, if they were eligible to do so. Eligibility criteria would be based on the percentage of the program completed and on the scope of the student's research training and dissertation work.

A member asked about the academic rigour of the Ed.D. program and whether it required comprehensive, original thesis work, as did the Ph.D. program. What percentage of people in the Ed.D. program went on to do research work? She understood that most students in the program went into clinical practice, and were seeking certification in psychology, in order to register as clinical psychologists. Professor Watson noted that students graduating from the new programs would become both scientists and practitioners. She said that the Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs were distinct. The Ed.D. program focused on applied psychology and the Ph.D. combined applied psychology with research. Professor Howson noted that the Ed.D. and Ph.D. had been designed for students with different career objectives. A member explained that at OISE/UT, the Ed.D. degree was not regarded as a less rigorous degree. It was offered primarily for people going into practice. The new Ph.D. would also serve those who wanted to enter practice as clinician-scientists. Professor Watson noted that the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees met some of the accreditation requirements of the College of Psychologists of Ontario and would allow students to prepare for registration as Psychological Associates at the master's level or as Psychologists at the doctoral level.

A member noted that the program was being proposed by OISE/UT and not by the Department of Psychology. A member responded that there was no clinical program in the Department of Psychology. There were related areas in Medicine but those programs did not lead to certification. Professor Howson reported that the question of overlap was discussed at SGS Council and it was noted that OISE/UT and the Department of Psychology offered discrete programs that did not overlap, and were not in competition.

7.   **School of Graduate Studies** (cont'd.)

(c)   OISE/UT: Proposal for an M.A. and Ph.D. Program in Counselling Psychology
(cont'd.)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for new M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Counselling
Psychology in the Department of Adult Education, Community
Development and Counselling Psychology, OISE/UT, effective July 1, 2000,
as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated
May 28, 1999, the executive summary of which is attached hereto as
Appendix "C," and, the phasing out of the M.Ed. and Ed.D. degrees in the
specialization of Counselling Psychology for Psychology Specialists, be
approved.

8.   **Items for Information**

(a)   OISE/UT: Revised Divisional Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching

The Chair welcomed Professor Douglas McDougall from the Department of Curriculum,
Teaching and Learning, OISE/UT.

Professor Cook noted that divisional guidelines were required under the *Policy and
Procedures on Academic Appointments* and under the *Policy and Procedures Governing
Promotion*. In drafting such guidelines, divisions could utilize the University *Guidelines
for Developing Written Assessments of Effectiveness in Promotion and Tenure Decisions.*
The OISE/UT *Divisional Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching* were in accordance
with the general University guidelines and policies and hence had been approved by the
Provost. The role for divisional guidelines was to reflect the divisional structure and
practice but the divisional guidelines must be consistent with the above policies.

A member noted that there were a wide variety of ways to evaluate teaching. She said the
this proposal might be doing the unit a disservice in that the teaching staff was not being
evaluated in comparison with that from other units. Were these standards too
individualized? Professor Cook noted that the evaluation of teaching in promotion and
tenure decisions was based on the standards in the policies. A list of courses in a teaching
portfolio was not an effective evaluation of teaching. Professor McDougall noted that the
expectation in the policies was that units would develop handbooks on putting together an
effective teaching dossier. A member drew attention to some of the potential difficulties
arising out of the informality of student evaluations and faculty committee evaluations of
teaching. Professor McDougall noted that the OISE/UT *Divisional Guidelines for the
Assessment of Teaching* identified a number of activities to be part of the evaluation process,
including identifying the methods used to gather data, the requirement of informed consent,
the content of the forms, the collection and storing of information, and the ways in which it
could be used. A member asked to what degree faculty members could decide on the
material by which they chose to be evaluated? In the proposal, choice for faculty members
existed; was this a good method by which to determine promotion? What was the

**Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
September 15, 1999**

8.   Items for Information (cont'd.)

(a)   OISE/UT: Revised Divisional Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching (cont'd.)

rationale behind this decision? Professor Cook noted that there was a certain amount of
choice allowed in the University policies in order to reflect the different circumstances in the
divisions. The policies were not specific. There was the requirement that evaluation take
place. Complete files contained input from undergraduate and graduate students and an
assessment by a peer committee. These were the minimum requirements. The
methodology was the divisional responsibility.

(b)   Connaught Fund: 1997-98 Annual Report

The Chair welcomed Ms Judith Chadwick, Program Director, Connaught Fund.

Ms Chadwick noted that the Connaught Fund Annual Report followed a standard format
and that the categories were the same as those the Committee had seen in previous years.
The Report identified some programs and initiatives that had been undertaken. She noted
that the administration of the Connaught Fund continued to be effective. There continued to
be a great deal of enthusiasm regarding the Fund.

A member noted that in regard to the new staff support matching grants, were Faculties
required to match grants from funds from their operating budgets? Had there been any
change in the sources from which Faculties could seek matching funds? Ms Chadwick
explained that matching funds came from a variety of sources and that the divisional
identification of matching funds was undertaken prior to the application for Connaught
funds. She noted that the Faculty of Medicine could not use matching funds from the
affiliated hospitals. She stated that units in the Humanities and Social Sciences faced
unique challenges in finding matching funds, and that there were frequent consultations with
her office about sources of funding. There had not been any reduction in the number of
applications to the Connaught Fund.

9.   Reports of the Administrative Assessors

The Chair noted that at each meeting there was an opportunity for the administrative
assessors to report on items not raised on the agenda. One of the items Professor Tuohy
would report on was the Committee's Calendar of Business.

Professor Tuohy said that the report and background information on the program reviews
from the July 26, 1999 Committee meeting would be presented to the Principals and Deans
at an upcoming retreat. The Committee's comments would be useful to the divisional heads
in planning and evaluating their upcoming program reviews. Professor Tuohy drew
attention to the Calendar of Business that listed the annual items that came to the Academic
Board and its Committees as well as a number of new items coming forward. In particular,
she drew attention to the Report of the Vice-Provost, Students, on student financial support,
which would be presented to the Committee for information. Professor Orchard's first
report, presented in the spring 1999, had focused on issues of accessibility. It was expected
that the second report would focus more broadly on support and provide further analysis of
survey data. Finally, the Committee could expect to see various program

**Report Number 75 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
September 15, 1999**

9.   Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd.)

proposals coming forward in 1999-2000, possibly including a joint B.A.Sc./M.B.A.
program.

10.   Date of the Next Meeting: October 27, 1999

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

Secretary   Chair
September 15, 1999