

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 179 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**March 30, 2016**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto

Your Committee reports that it met on Wednesday, March 30, 2016 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Elizabeth Smyth (Chair)  
Professor Maydianne Andrade  
(Vice- Chair)  
Professor Locke Rowe, Vice-Provost,  
Graduate Research and Education,  
Dean of the School of Graduate  
Studies

Professor Robert B. Gibbs  
Professor Richard Hegele  
Professor Susan Jaglal  
Dr. Allan Kaplan, Vice-Dean, Graduate  
and Academic Affairs, Faculty of  
Medicine  
Professor Jim Yuan Lai  
Ms. Jennifer J. Lau

Professor Michael J.H. Ratcliffe, Dean of Arts,  
Trinity College  
Ms. Melinda Scott  
Professor Markus Stock  
Ms Alena Zelinka  
Ms Nana Mohan Zhou

Mr. Richard Levin, Executive Director,  
Enrolment Services and University  
Registrar

**Secretariat:**  
Mr. Patrick McNeill, Secretary

**Regrets:**

Mr. Ken Chan  
Professor Tara Goldstein  
Mr. Magno M. Guidote  
Ms. Mariam Hanna  
Mr. Ray Khan  
Professor Reid B. Locklin

Professor Alice Maurice  
Professor Sioban Nelson  
Professor Lacra Pavel  
Professor Nicholas Terpstra  
Ms. Emily Tsui  
Professor Ning Yan

**In Attendance:**

Professor Joshua Barker, Vice Dean, Graduate Education & Program Reviews, Faculty of  
Arts and Science (FAS)  
Mr. Horatio Bot, Director of Financial Services, FAS  
Professor Markus Bussmann, Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and  
Engineering (FASE)  
Professor Angela Colantonio, Director, Rehabilitation Sciences Institute (RSI)  
Professor Susan Christoffersen, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate & Pre-Experience  
Programs, Joesph L. Rotman School of Management (Rotman)

**In Attendance continued:**

Ms Michelle Deeton, Director, Office of the Dean, FASE  
Dr. Angela Esterhammer, Principal, Victoria College  
Ms Jessica Eylon, Program and Curriculum Officer, UTM  
Ms Jennifer Francisco, Coordinator, Academic Change, Office of the Vice-Provost,  
Academic Programs  
Ms Justine Garrett, Coordinator, Academic Planning and Reviews, Office of the Vice-  
Provost, Academic Programs  
Professor Bill Gough, Interim Vice-Principal (Academic) and Dean, UTSC  
Professor Daniel Haas, Dean, Faculty of Dentistry  
Professor Kelly Hannah-Moffat, Interim Vice Principal (Academic) and Dean, UTM  
Professor Alan Hayes, Director, Toronto School of Theology  
Professor Ann Komaromi, Centre for Comparative Literature  
Professor Mark Kortschot, Chair, Division of Engineering Science, FASE  
Professor Elizabeth Legge, Chair, Department of Art, FAS  
Professor Mairi MacDonald, Director, International Studies Program, FAS  
Professor Tiff Macklem, Dean, Rotman School  
Dr. Daniella Mallinick, Director, Academic Programs, Planning and Quality Assurance,  
Office of the Vice- Provost, Academic Programs  
Professor Ryan McClelland, Associate Dean Academic and Student Affairs, Faculty of  
Music  
Professor Don McLean, Dean, Faculty of Music  
Professor Domenico Pietropaolo, Principal, St. Michael's College  
Professor Roger Riendeau, Acting Program Director, Urban Studies Program and Vice  
Principal, Innis College  
Professor Jill Ross, Director, Centre for Comparative Literature, FAS  
Dr. Mohini Sain, Dean, Faculty of Forestry  
Professor Mark Schmuckler, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate, UTSC  
Professor William Seager, Department of Philosophy, UTSC  
Ms Archana Sridhar, Assistant Provost  
Professor Trevor Young, Dean, Faculty of Medicine  
Ms Caroline Ziegler, Faculty Governance and Programs Office, FASE  
Professor David Zingg, Director, Institute for Aerospace Studies (UTIAS)

ITEM 1 IS RECOMMENDED TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR APPROVAL. ALL  
OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. New Graduate Program: Conjoint MA in Theological Studies**

The Chair welcomed Professor Alan Hayes, Director, Toronto School of Theology (TST) and advised that the Committee had the authority to recommend to the Academic Board for approval new graduate programs and degrees.

In the absence of Professor Nelson, Professor Rowe served as the Provostial Assessor for the meeting and spoke to all items in that capacity.

Professor Rowe informed members that the origin of the program proposal for a new conjoint Master of Arts in Theological Studies with the Toronto School of Theology was closely aligned with the existing conjoint Ph.D. in Theological Studies which had commenced in September 2015. The proposal built on the earlier consultation that had taken place through the joint Faculty of Arts and Science/TST Working Group as the conjoint PhD proposal was developed. The program would be a full-time, three-session program with an anticipated start date for the academic year 2017-18.

Professor Hayes stated that TST represented a consortium of seven theological colleges associated with University. There was a strong relationship between the University and TST over the years and the cross-disciplinary activity that had taken place served as one of the many strengths of its programs. In developing the conjoint program, TST had consulted many U of T cognate units such as the Department for the Study of Religion, Centre for Medieval Studies, and others. Professor Hayes added TST represented a diverse cross-section of Christian denominations; it also had some engagement with other faith communities.

On motion, duly moved, seconded and carried

#### YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposed conjoint M.A. in Theological Studies, as described in the proposal from the Toronto School of Theology dated March , 2016, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.

## 2. Follow-up Report on Review: Christianity and Culture Programs, Faculty of Arts and Science

### General Comments Regarding Reviews

The Chair reminded members that the Committee had general responsibility for monitoring the quality of education and research activities within the University. Part of this responsibility, outlined in the *Accountability Framework for Cyclical review of Academic Programs and Units*, was to undertake a comprehensive overview of reviews of academic programs and units, monitoring the results of the reviews and administrative responses.

The Chair stated that the Committee's role with respect to Reviews was:

- to ensure that the reviews were conducted in line with the University's policy and guidelines, and to ensure that the Provost's Office had managed the review process appropriately;
- to ensure that all issues relative to the quality of academic programs had been addressed or that there was a plan to address them;
- to make recommendations concerning the need for a Follow-up Report, as necessary.

This was the second part of two parts when the Committee considered both Follow-up Reports and Reviews in 2015-16.

Professor Rowe stated that under the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP), the Committee could request a one-year follow-up report when concerns had been raised in an external review that required a longer period of response.

On March 31, 2015, the Committee considered the October 2014 review of the Christianity and Culture undergraduate programs (Specialist, Major, Minor in Christianity and Culture and Minor in Christianity and Education) together with the accompanying decanal response. A one-year follow-up report had been requested on the curriculum renewal, faculty complement, student recruitment, and the outcome of the program retreat(s).

Professor Rowe reported that since the 2013-14 review, the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Program Director of the Christianity and Culture programs had undertaken a number of changes to the programs' curriculum, including the suspension of admission to the Specialist program and a review of the major program. They had discussed faculty resource requirements, increased recruitment efforts, and held four faculty retreats in 2015, as described in the Dean's letter to the Vice-Provost dated March 2, 2016.

The Chair thanked Professor Rowe and asked for comments from the Committee. No further reports were requested.

### **3. Semi-Annual Report on the Reviews of Academic Units and Programs**

All reviews were brought forward to the Committee for information and discussion.

The Chair explained that twelve (12) reviews would be considered. Of these, two (2) had been commissioned by the Vice-President and Provost and ten (10) were commissioned by Deans (decanal reviews). The submissions to the Committee included a summary of the reviews and the signed administrative response from each Dean, which highlighted implementation plans guided by reviewer recommendations.

The Chair noted that the Reviews had been distributed among four Reading Groups, and each group had been asked to address three questions:

- 1. Did the summary accurately tell the story of the full review?*
- 2. Did the administrative response address all issues identified?*
- 3. Were there any questions, comments or substantive issues that the Committee should consider? Was there need to ask that the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs bring forward a follow-up report?*

The Chair said that for each review, the leader (spokesperson) of the reading group would be invited to comment on the review, other members would be invited to comment, and Committee members would be invited to ask questions. The Chair would then indicate whether the Committee had identified any matters that should be brought to the attention of the Agenda Committee or whether a follow-up report to the Committee would be necessary.

Professor Rowe provided some general comments noting that over the years, the Vice-Provost and the Committee had carefully examined the review reports to identify both recurring and new themes. The themes raised in the group of reviews reflected previous reviews considered by the Committee. In particular, the themes included the excellence of the University's research reputation and the impressive body of scholarship produced by its faculty, the quality of its programs, and the talent and high calibre of its students. In addition, Cycle 5's set of reviews had highlighted programs' innovative, interdisciplinary curricular approaches and valuable links to professions and industry.

Professor Rowe added that the reviews had noted areas for development. These included strengthening relationships between units to support academic program collaborations; making strategic investments in the faculty complement; and refining curricula to meet student needs or changing disciplinary landscapes.

The Committee had a thorough discussion of each of the reviews. In some cases, members of the Reading Group asked for clarification of points raised in the reviews. Representatives of the units and programs that had been reviewed were available to answer questions.

### **Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (2 Decanal Reviews):**

#### Institute for Aerospace Studies and its programs (UTIAS)

The spokesperson for the reading group stated that the summary was accurate and the issues raised were well represented. Overall this was a very positive and straightforward review with clear responses from the Dean with specific plans for addressing the issues. Members of the reading group asked two questions for clarification regarding the qualifying exam and recruitment of graduate students.

Professor Zingg described the current two-step process and stated that he would further explore the approach raised by the reviewers to determine if any changes were required. He responded that UTIAS had focused its graduate student recruitment efforts on the use of social media and website to increase visibility. A larger applicant pool was expected in 2016.

No follow-up report was requested.

#### Division of Engineering Science and its programs

The spokesperson for the reading group said that overall the review was very positive. The summary of the review was accurate and captured all of the key issues and the administrative response was complete. Members of the reading group asked questions about plans for engagement with the Department of Mathematics and the steps that would be taken to foster a culture of entrepreneurship among students in Engineering Science.

Professor Kortschot responded that the Department of Math had supported the program by providing a large number of courses, although it had some challenges with the continuity of second year courses. He stated that he was optimistic that the challenges would be addressed in consultation with the department.

Professor Kortschot stated that the program would continue to foster entrepreneurship through a design “experience” in years three and four, as opposed to offering dedicated design or capstone design courses given the already intensive curriculum. The “Entrepreneurship Hatchery”, as a student business incubator, was one example of how students were engaged and entrepreneurship was fostered and promoted..

No follow-up report was requested.

### **University of Toronto Mississauga (Provostial Review – non UTQAP)**

The spokesperson for the reading group stated that although it was a difficult and complex review, the summary was accurate and Professor Hannah-Moffat should be commended for her response as it was very thorough and acknowledged all of the issues identified by the reviewers. The reading group noted the reviewers’ overall positive impression of UTM.

The reading group asked the interim Dean to identify one or two issues of highest priority and what she would suggest as first steps in beginning to address them.

Professor Hannah-Moffat stated that the first priority would be to develop a vision for UTM, working with the Principal’s office. Other high priority action items included a review of the reporting structure between the Office of the Dean and the Registrar’s office; the creation of a working group to address workload issues, particularly staff support for faculty; and a review to restructure the Office of the Dean.

Professor Hannah-Moffat agreed that it was a complicated review and that Professor Amrita Danieri, who would be transitioning into the role of UTM’s next Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean, was well-positioned to start addressing some of the issues and to develop a shared vision and distinctive mission for UTM.

The Committee requested a follow-up report in one year from the incoming Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean that would outline steps taken to respond to the issues and concerns raised by the reviewers. The Committee also noted that, subject to the reception of the report one year hence, an additional report two years hence might be requested.

### **Faculty of Medicine (Decanal Review): Rehabilitation Sciences Institute (RSI) and its programs**

The spokesperson for the reading group said that the summary of the review captured all of the key issues, and the administrative response was complete. Members of the reading group asked questions about revenue generation and funding, as well as about student research networks.

Professor Young noted that it was helpful for the Faculty to consider recommendations made by the reviewers. The funding model of RSI was similar to the Institute of Medical Science (IMS). Both are Extra Departmental Units (EDUs). The need to provide graduate student funding affects the RSI budget; however, philanthropic efforts were underway to expand the resources available to RSI. This model had been successful and the budget was positive, with a surplus each year. The Dean also said that the overall rehabilitation sciences sector at the Faculty of Medicine was in a positive financial position.

Professor Young added that Professor Angela Colantonio had recently assumed the role as Director, and she was keen on developing new partnerships and would grow the program.

Professor Colantonio spoke about new student-led initiatives including the publishing of the Student Rehabilitation Magazine. The Director stated that RSI had been invited to a World Health Organization Partners meeting in May, which would provide an additional platform for discussions on recruitment and scholarly exchange. Formal discussions on international collaborations had also occurred with international visitors/scholars from a number of other countries.

No follow-up report was requested.

### **Faculty of Music and its programs (Provostial Review)**

The spokesperson for the reading group said that the summary of the review captured all of the key issues and that the Dean should be commended for providing a strong administrative response to address all of the issues identified by the reviewers. The nature and scope of the reviewers' recommendations would warrant a follow-up report. The reading group asked the Dean to address the faculty strategic academic plan, budget model and space issues.

Professor McLean thanked the reading group and commented that it was a complex review. The review had informed the strategic planning process that was underway. He had appreciated the reviewers' understanding of the fiscal and physical constraints under which the Faculty operated. The reviewers had also observed that the University budget model did not easily support the unique nature of music study because instructional and space costs generally intensify as enrolment increases. Professor McLean stated that faculty facilities were below national and international standards affecting student experience and faculty work.

Professor McLean reported that several of the recommendations of the review report had already been implemented or were well underway to realization, in the context of the development of the Faculty's Strategic Academic Plan 2016-2021, which was expected to be completed in June 2016. He appreciated the opportunity to report back to the Committee.

The Committee requested a follow-up report in one year regarding the completion of the strategic academic plan and its implementation, including the prioritized implementation of the issues raised in the External Review.

### **Faculty of Arts and Science (6 Decanal Reviews):**

#### Centre for Comparative Literature and its programs, with Literature and Critical Theory programs (CCL)

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that, in their opinion, the summary had accurately reflected the full review. He added that the Dean's administrative response was thoughtful and fulfilled the spirit of the recommendations received. The reading group asked the Dean to comment on the Centre's renewal plan, the structure of the MA program, Teaching Assistant (TA) workloads and strategies to recruit and support students with non-academic career plans.

Professor Barker responded that the renewal plan was a priority for both the Faculty and the Centre and that together they were planning to review the current arrangements to have a better understanding of the current financial and organizational implications. They would also consider the appeal of the program to those students who are not contemplating academic careers, and look at ways to improve the heavy TA workloads (e.g., through fundraising).

Professor Barker stated that graduate student funding had continued to be a challenge across the Faculty. The Dean would continue to work with graduate-only FAS units, such as CCL, to allocate TAs in fields of interest and academic preparation.

Professor Ross stated that course work for both the MA and PhD in year one had included the need to satisfy the program's language requirements. CCL would continue to develop strategies to support student interests and goals. One such strategy was the development of courses with a digital humanities focus; others included new internships in partnership with FAS and the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) and professionalization seminars.

No follow-up report was requested.

#### Diaspora and Transnational Studies (DTS) undergraduate program

The spokesperson reported that the reading group agreed that the summary had accurately told the story of the full review. He added that the administrative response addressed, in general, most of the issues identified. The reading group asked for additional comment about approaches to injecting greater human and financial resources, setting aside seats for DTS students who had difficulty in enrolling in DTS-related courses, enhancing research opportunities for students and promotion of increased student/faculty interaction.

Professor Barker stated that UTQAP review process was a "feeder" into the annual budget review process within FAS; and that the Dean and DTS Director would continue to discuss issues raised in the review, including access to courses – the strategy to offer cross-courses had been successful. FAS would also continue to offer financial support for students to enrol in study-abroad courses, attend conferences and compete in international competitions. Advancing Teaching and Learning in Arts and Science (ATLAS) was the primary mechanism for supporting a wide range of teaching and learning initiatives within the Faculty including support for new experiential learning opportunities.

No follow-up report was requested.

#### Department of the History of Art and its programs

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that, in their opinion, the summary had accurately told the story of the full review. He added that the administrative response addressed most of the issues identified; however, recommendations regarding further developing the relationship with the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design (FALD); faculty morale; and the transfer of study abroad courses had not been adequately addressed.

Professor Legge commented on the relationship with FALD. In some cases, there was an excellent relationship – there had always been cross-listed courses, and FALD had been part of the search committee that had hired an architectural historian. She noted that every effort would be made to consolidate the relationships with the Faculty and others, including UTM and UTSC, to benefit the student experience and broaden courses available.

Professor Barker acknowledged that challenges regarding faculty morale could arise for various reasons, including space allocations. He emphasized that the leadership of the Chair of the department had been outstanding – more work would be done to improve communications and address the issues in a tri-campus context.

Professor Legge stated that the department had worked with FAS advisors and the Centre for International Experience (CIE), and would continue to undertake improvements to facilitate approval of transfer credits from study abroad programs. Professor Barker said that increasing the international outbound student experience was a priority for FAS and that they wanted it to grow substantially. This would require a better streamlined process of credit transfer.

Mr. Levin stated that the Office of the Registrar was committed to enhancing the credit transfer process to support internationalization initiatives and would welcome comments and ideas.

No follow-up report was requested.

#### International Relations undergraduate program

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that, in their opinion, the administrative response had not sufficiently addressed key issues raised in the review. The reading group commented that there were serious concerns noted by the reviewers which required immediate attention, rather than medium to long-term actions outlined in the administrative response. Many of the concerns echoed an internal review of the program in 2011-12.

Professor Barker noted that the reviewers had commented on the tremendous reputation of the IR program, and on students' high regard for it. He acknowledged the challenges raised by the reviewers and stated most relate to complex resourcing arrangements – over time and because of the program's success and scale of its growth, the challenges had increased.

Professor Barker stated that there would be on-going consultation with faculty, including the Chairs of the three Departments associated with the program – Economics, History and Political Science. This consultation would be informed by ongoing discussions with the Federated Universities regarding academic program matters. These discussions had been convened by the Vice-Provost. The FAS Dean's Office, in consultation with Trinity College, would review the leadership structure with the aim of establishing a sustainable directorship.

The Committee requested a one-year follow-up Report regarding the steps taken to address the concerns identified in the review including issues around resourcing arrangements and curriculum design and delivery.

Urban Studies undergraduate program

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that the summary was comprehensive and covered the full review which was overall very positive – there were no major concerns.

A member asked about the potential expansion of partnerships beyond North American cities and the unit’s relationship with other programs such as Geography.

Professor Barker stated that historically there had been a close relationship with the Department of Geography and each had enjoyed continued growth and student demand. Urban studies was expected to grow and engage further with other divisions given its connection to one of the President’s three priorities to “leverage our urban location(s) more fully, for the mutual benefit of University and City”.

No follow-up report was requested.

**University of Toronto Scarborough (Decanal Review): Department of Philosophy and its programs**

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that the summary was comprehensive and covered the full review which was overall very positive. The reading group was impressed with the Dean’s administrative response. The spokesperson stated that as a new department, they were to be commended on the program’s success.

One member asked about space needs.

Professor Gough responded that the Highland Hall project would help alleviate space challenges.

No follow-up report was requested.

**Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) joint with Joseph L. Rotman School of Management (RSM) (Decanal Review): Commerce Program**

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that the summary accurately told the story of the full review; however the group felt that the Deans’ joint administrative response needed further elaboration with respect to several issues including the admissions process, student morale, faculty teaching assignments and organizational structure.

Professor Christoffersen stated that FAS and RSM had worked collaboratively to discuss the issues raised in the review through an *ad hoc* working group. This had included an ongoing discussion of improvements to the undergraduate program’s organizational structure, admissions process and governance practices. Professor Christoffersen said that she and the Rotman Commerce Academic Director had worked with RSM area coordinators to discuss faculty teaching assignments with the aim of strengthening teaching at the undergraduate level, reflecting the RSM Dean’s vision statement.

With regards to low student morale as reported in the review, Professor Christoffersen stated that a number of changes had been instituted as a result of the ad hoc working group discussions to improve the undergraduate student experience; these had included increased staff complement and funding for career services, increased student space and access to classrooms with up-to-date and consistent technology, and increased base budget funding to support other improvements.

Professor Barker commented that the student experience was important to both divisions and would be made a priority. The Deans had worked together closely to respond to the reviews' recommendations, and had established the advisory group that would continue to meet to determine the best way forward for the program.

Professor Macklem agreed and added that their shared objective was to enhance academic quality with the goal of making it a leading commerce program in Canada – the program was strong. He commented that the external review helped to focus on the highest priority issues.

The Committee requested a follow-up report in one year that outlined steps taken to address the issues raised by the reviewers regarding the admission process, organizational structure, student morale and faculty teaching assignments.

## **SUMMARY**

***University of Toronto Mississauga (Provostial Review - non-UTQAP)*** in one year (with the option to request a second one-year report) from the incoming Vice-Principal, Academic and Dean that would outline steps taken to respond to the issues and concerns raised by the reviewers.

***Faculty of Music and its programs (Provostial Review)*** in one year regarding the completion of the strategic academic plan and its implementation, including the prioritized implementation of the issues raised in the External Review.

***International Relations undergraduate Program, Faculty of Arts and Science*** in one-year regarding the steps taken to address the concerns identified in the review including issues around resourcing arrangements and curriculum design and delivery.

***Commerce Program - Faculty of Arts and Science (FAS) joint with Joseph L. Rotman School of Management (RSM)*** in one year that outlined steps taken to address the issues raised by the reviewers regarding the admission process, organizational structure, student morale and faculty teaching assignments.

The Chair expressed her appreciation to the Deans and other faculty representatives in attendance for their thorough work and active engagement.

The Chair thanked the members of the Reading Groups for their work. She also thanked Dr. Daniella Mallinick and Ms Justine Garrett of the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs for assembling the Review Compendium.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

On motion duly moved, seconded and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted and items approved.

**4. Report of the Previous Meeting: Report 178 – March 1, 2016**

Report Number 178 (March 1, 2016) was approved.

**5. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

There was no business arising from the Report of the previous meeting.

**6. Date of Next Meeting:**

Members were reminded that the next meeting was scheduled for May 10, 2016 at 4:10 p.m.

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**7. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

There were no reports from the Administrative Assessors.

**8. Other Business**

The Chair informed members that with the material for the final meeting on May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016, members would receive an evaluation survey to provide feedback on their experiences of having served on the Committee. She encouraged members to complete the survey.

The meeting adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

April 5, 2016