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Call to Order  
The meeting was called to order at 3:13 pm by the Chair, Derek Allen  

1. Approval of the minutes of the February 13, 2017 meeting of Council  
The Chair called for a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded and carried.  

2. Business Arising  
There was no business arising from these minutes.
3. Report from the Dean, David Cameron

Dean Cameron thanked everyone present for their attendance at the meeting, noting the need for quorum and the many motions presented for approval.

Dean Cameron gave a brief overview on current discussions of the Strategic Mandate Agreement with the province of Ontario. The SMA provides a definition of the missions of various educational institutions in the province. UofT has come to the end of its first three-year agreement and is now entering negotiations with Bonnie Patterson, the provincial negotiator, about the next three-year agreement. The overall direction that the province hopes to move in is to change the allocation of funding over time, with implementation in the third SMA. In the next SMA, the plan is to allocate a portion of money that comes to the university on the basis of the number of students admitted. There are some concerns about smaller universities in other parts of the province and declining student numbers, and therefore consideration will be given to moving away from a straight per-student allocation to a “corridor funding” model. Over time, this would move a portion of money for allocation on the basis of performance outcomes. These outcomes are not developed yet but will be related to undergraduate education, quality of undergraduate student experience, success rates, and research performance. These are among the categories for which indicators will be developed. Institutions will compete for a portion of resources that were previously allocated on a percapita student basis.

This could potentially be a significant shift in the way government relates to post-secondary institutions and expectations. It’s possible a new government could see things differently. One can look around the world at other systems where key performance indicator models have been put in place, and see a general context where the model fits. The indicators being discussed are aligned with what we are trying to do well already at UofT, so if there will be competition it will fit with our aspirations and values. This path will have a broader impact on faculties, faculty members, students, and the way we do business. The discussion between the University and province has just begun but it is hoped that an agreement will be reached by late spring or early summer. There will be more to come on this topic.

A member asked whether the changed focus means a shift against large class sizes and a focus on teaching excellence, and a shift in way we do business. Dean Cameron said there were discussions about that possibility for FAS in relation to declining domestic undergraduate enrolment. The government proposal is that FAS could reduce domestic intake by a certain amount but retain the grant portion of revenue, but would then lose the tuition part of revenue. That would be a noticeable income loss. To make up for the loss, FAS could decide to rebalance domestic and international student enrolment. Dean Cameron noted he has concerns about the impact this would have since the international student focus is in data sciences and not the humanities, where enrolment is already declining. A shift in the balance would accentuate high demand areas and further weaken other areas. Among the glories of FAS are its scope and balance and the fact that it is big enough to maintain a diversity of other activities. These factors would complicate moving in the direction of rebalancing domestic and international enrolment.
A member asked if there were any examples of how teaching-faculty members would be affected. Dean Cameron referred to his previous answer, and noted that more than 50% of the incoming class in statistical sciences are international students. If we follow demand this ratio would likely rise further. This would pose challenges for English Language learners in a department facing that situation. We would want a better distribution but that would be hard to achieve. Over the last decade rankings have become more significant. Presidents would formerly celebrate good and dismiss bad rankings, but we don’t hear this so much anymore and the rest of world does pay attention. We would hear more about key performance indicators. If they don’t fit who we are and our achievement goals this would distort the mechanism we want to fit into.

A member asked whether the university should be immune to government policy, and said that education should be immune to this kind of change. Dean Cameron noted it is important to remember that universities receive substantial funding from the government. In Canada and Ontario there is recognition of the autonomy of higher education institutions. Dean Cameron feels that other jurisdictions would face more interventionist policies than we have. This is a small step in improving accountability, and as we have been blessed with autonomy this should allow the departments autonomy to set their own course.

4. Major Modifications to Undergraduate Programs (for Approval) – Pamela Klassen, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate & International

Before turning to the motions on the agenda, the Chair noted the necessity of having a quorum since at the last meeting there was no quorum and the proposed motions could not be voted on. The Chair read a list of categories of non-voting members from the Constitution and called for voting members to stand for a count. A count of 34 was reached, confirming quorum. The Chair called on Vice-Dean Klassen to introduce the first motion.

Vice-Dean Klassen noted before introducing the motions that the length of the list of proposed curricular changes was proof of the diversity and depth in Arts & Science programs. She thanked the colleagues who had worked so hard on these changes for their patience, and thanked the members present for attending to consider these motions.

a. History Specialist Program, Department of History

This proposal revolves around defining two key senior course options for specialists, a Methodology Option and a Thesis Option. The Methodology Option reflects closely the learning experience currently in the curriculum, with its focus on academic skills. This option gives students options for smaller classes where current research tools and methods are presented, and students may creatively present their research and findings. The new Thesis Option will allow students to work on longer papers requiring deeper research and advanced analysis/presentation, and will prepare students explicitly for graduate study.

MOTION (a): THAT the proposed changes to the History Specialist program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.
The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion arising from the motion. On the vote the motion was carried.

The Chair then explained that most of the remaining motions could be divided into pairs consisting of a motion concerning a Major program and a motion concerning a Specialist program offered by the same unit. The motions in each of these pairs would be introduced together but voted on separately. Vice-Dean Klassen proceeded to introduce the motions.

b. Jewish Studies Specialist Program, Anne Tanenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies
c. Jewish Studies Major Program, Anne Tanenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies

The Anne Tanenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies presents two proposals, pertaining to the specialist and major programs. The key element of change is the elimination of mandatory “areas of concentration” that students would have needed to select and complete in order to complete the program. Instead, these areas will be options, save for students who enter the specialist already with the needed language skills – those students will still need to select a cluster of courses from an area of study. Historically, both the specialist and the major used areas of concentration to help focus students in preparation for graduate level study, but this proved too constraining for many students who enroll in the programs with no intent to pursue graduate study. Instead, the Centre plans to offer in-person counseling to help students curate their course selection if they intend to pursue graduate study.

MOTION (b): THAT the proposed changes to the Jewish Studies Specialist program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.

The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion arising from the motion. On the vote the motion was carried.

MOTION (c): THAT the proposed changes to the Jewish Studies Major program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.

The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion arising from the motion. On the vote the motion was carried.

d. Sociology Specialist Program, Department of Sociology
e. Sociology Major Program, Department of Sociology

The Sociology Department proposes changes to both the specialist and major programs. These changes are similar to the History program changes, so students in the Specialist will be able to take a suite of courses to allow them to develop research skills intensively. The 100- and 200-level courses have been redesigned to offer a more rigorous “scaffolding” of core content and hence of the learning experience for students. The specialist program does not have specialist-exclusive courses, and for students in the major these core courses are generally required and there are fewer options within them. This change effectively aligns much of the core learning experience across the specialist and the major. Two new 100-level half courses have been
designed to provide, first, an introduction to sociology and the sociological perspective, and then, in the next course, an introduction to social research processes. Vice-Dean Klassen noted that this has been a largescale change done in consultation with 17 academic units impacted by the change. Vice-Dean Klassen congratulated Sociology for their intensive consultative process in planning these curriculum changes.

**MOTION (d): THAT the proposed changes to the Sociology Specialist program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.**

The motion was moved and seconded.

A member asked whether consultation was generally a rule. If other council members have no understanding of the changes it should be ensured that the consultation was good. Seventeen units is good but is that the same for others? Vice-Dean Klassen noted that consultation is key for curriculum change. In comparison, the Jewish Studies proposals did not involve the same degree of change. Proposals ask for evidence about consultation. Proposals don’t always get it right so the Curriculum Committee meeting is crucial to see who cares more about proposed changes. Consultation is key to the process. Vice-Dean Klassen noted that this meeting of Council was essentially the last step in the consultation process; by now we hope we’ve answered questions but if there are important outstanding questions this would be the time to raise them. Vice-Dean Klassen noted that Sociology had done an exemplary job of consultation.

A member asked about consultation undertaken with undergraduate students. Professor Christian Caron from the Department of Sociology answered that over about the last 18 months the department spoke through the undergraduate student union with about 50-60 undergraduate students in 3rd-4th year, which is a significant portion of the students in these years. Students talked about their experience in the program and changes they wanted to see. A significant part of the changes was driven by student concerns with navigating the program. The only formal step missing was a thorough survey, but selective consultation had been done. Vice-Dean Klassen noted that students are on all Undergraduate Curriculum Committees and ask many of the best questions as part of the process.

On the vote the motion was carried.

**MOTION (e): THAT the proposed changes to the Sociology Major program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.**

The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion arising from the motion. On the vote the motion was carried.

f. Vice-Dean Klassen noted in introducing the motions from the Department of Human Biology that these motions continue the work of aligning programs with teaching strengths and available resources. This is especially true in the case of making use of new laboratory facilities, which bring more mandatory laboratory courses and are exciting for students and faculty. These changes better demonstrate completion requirements and enrolment
requirements, resulting from a department self-study in 2014-15. **Neuroscience Specialist Program, Human Biology Program**

g. **Neuroscience Major Program, Human Biology Program**

The proposed changes in the Neuroscience Specialist reduce total credits from 13.5 to 12.0 to make it easier for students to complete the program in four years and take a supplemental minor program. Changes in the introductory courses have been made in keeping with the status of the field, and a neuroimaging course has been introduced with Psychology. Entry requirements have also been adjusted. For the major, the total credits remain the same, but with different alignment of topics, and an upper-tier lab course is now required. Additionally, the Major is now proposed to be a limited enrolment program so that access to upper year lab courses is ensured. Consultation has been done with the Dean’s office, Vice-Dean Poppy Lockwood, faculty, and students.

**MOTION (f): THAT the proposed changes to the Neuroscience Specialist program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.**

The motion was moved and seconded.

A member asked how wide the consultation was since the member teaches in this area and had not been consulted about these changes. Ms. Gianna Leggio from the Department of Human Biology explained that the changes speak to Vice-Dean Klassen’s comment about teaching resources. There is a need to support equally the Health and Disease program, and the Neuroscience program is focusing on function and structure. In the Specialist, completing 12 FCEs allows students to do a major in Immunology where they are encouraged to take courses on complementary topics. HMB consulted every unit in the Faculty of Medicine, and each unit signed off on the proposed changes. HMB consulted with students, who had requested courses in neuroanatomy and imaging. The member asked whether there can be a rule about feedback since it seems that consultation was not there, and that there should be mandatory consultation. Vice-Dean Klassen responded that consultation begins with Associate Chairs and it is at the department level that there would be consultation with the member but a department can’t be asked to consult with every faculty member. Vice-Dean Klassen suggested that the member speak to his Chair.

A member asked why there was a reduced mathematics requirement for entering the program. Ms. Leggio said the change was a half credit less in mathematics for the specialist, since most students are already taking a mathematics course. This could be MAT136H, PHY131H, PHY152H, or introductory Computer Science because it is becoming important in the life sciences. Most life sciences students do a full course in MAT and a full course in PHY, but the program requirements in the FCE total include a lab course.

A member asked why PSY100H was dropped from the first-year requirements. Ms. Leggio explained that was part of the consultation with other units, resulting in the conclusion that BIO120H was more important and the FCE total was capped at 8.0.
On a vote, the motion was carried.

**MOTION (g): THAT the proposed changes to the Neuroscience Major program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.**

The motion was moved and seconded.

A member raised a concern about the move to a restricted program since we need to have options for students and there are fewer open programs available. The member also asked, for this and the remaining HMB proposals, if more details could be given about program objectives on social and ethical responsibility. The current text mentions courses students might take. Ms. Leggio explained that social and ethical responsibility themes are integrated into many courses. Several service learning opportunities are available. All students take bioethics as a requirement. At the intro level, in HMB202H, there are elements about health and disease systems and the course must make reference to providers for those systems. The changes are not going to do away with these objectives, they are integrated into courses. So that’s why there is a list of courses. Regarding enrolment, the Neuroscience Major is limited because of lab space, and the department wanted a lab to be required because it is what students are asking for. In total, there are 350 spaces but as we ramp up this may change. There are now 320 students in the program. If we are making the lab mandatory we can’t hold them in any room. The member followed up to ask if the text could be re-written since this was not said in the form regarding social and ethical responsibility. Professor Franco Taverna responded that the form does say “such as”, and that just about all courses at the upper year level have at least one short component in this area.

The member asked if the form could be amended since it would be helpful if they were specific about at least one course. The chair said it was too late to amend the document but not too late to amend the motion.

**MOTION: THAT Motion (g) be amended to require that the proposed changes to the Neuroscience Major program make clear how students in the program encounter social and ethical issues.**

The motion to amend Motion (g) as indicated was moved and seconded. On a vote the motion was carried.

**MOTION: THAT Motion (g) as amended, be approved.**

On a vote the motion was approved.

h. Fundamental Genetics and its Applications Major, Human Biology Program
i. Fundamental Genetics and its Applications Specialist, Human Biology Program

For Fundamental Genetics programs, the course options are changing and offer more choice for upper year courses, and a higher year lab or research based course is now mandatory. In consultation with the Department of Biochemistry and other programs some courses were modified.
MOTION (h): THAT the proposed changes to the Fundamental Genetics and its Applications Major program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.

The motion was moved and seconded.

A member asked why BIO220H was removed as a requirement. Ms. Leggio confirmed that BIO220H is still required in the genetics program.

A member raised the issue regarding the social and ethical learning outcomes that he had raised earlier in connection with motion (g), and asked if the same changes could be made as a friendly amendment to all the other Human Biology proposals. Ms. Leggio responded that this could be done and agreed on the importance of the amendment. Vice-Dean Klassen asked how this could be accomplished. The Chair responded that a friendly amendment is still an amendment. The member asked if it should be to the effect that the forms be revised in the way described in motion (g) as amended. The Chair said that it would be acceptable for Council to proceed that way. The member asked if the motions the amendment will apply to could be enumerated. The Chair responded that the motions could be referred to by letter. The discussion is currently at motion h, so the amendment would apply to motions h through n. This was confirmed for the minutes.

On a vote the motion was carried, as amended.

MOTION (i): THAT the proposed changes to the Fundamental Genetics and its Applications Specialist program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.

The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion on the motion. On a vote the motion was carried, as amended.

j. Human Biology Major, Human Biology Program

For the Human Biology Major program, the number of FCEs remains the same, but changes have been proposed to upper year pre-requisites, and a larger elective course list is now available with options for Chemistry and Biochemistry in consultation with those units.

MOTION (j): THAT the proposed changes to the Human Biology Major program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.

The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion. On a vote the motion was carried, as amended.

k. Global Health Major, Human Biology Program

l. Global Health Specialist, Human Biology Program

Changes have been proposed to the Global Health programs to align with consultation with the Dalla Lana School of Public Health. In the Major program, a course on the social aspects of global health is now required. A required biology course becomes optional following consultation with the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. A wider range of course options from
other departments are now available, and Biochemistry has been removed from the requirements in consultation with the Department of Biochemistry. In the Specialist program the total credits have been reduced to make the degree more manageable. Course options have now been consolidated into two lists to make it easier for students to find their way through. Following consultation with Indigenous Studies and Anthropology, courses in those units are now options. Ms. Leggio added that an ethics course will now be required for the Specialist.

**MOTION (k): THAT the proposed changes to the Global Health Major program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.**

The motion was moved and seconded.

A member asked in regard to the negotiations with the Dalla Lana School of Public Health whether there was an agreement for Dalla Lana to be teaching courses. Vice-Dean Klassen indicated this was at the UCDF stage, which allows divisions without undergraduate teaching to partner with undergraduate units to bring teaching into departments. Ms. Leggio responded that this was part of a larger plan, in which Dalla Lana would be involved in more undergraduate teaching. Instead of creating their own program, they would teach in the Human Biology programs. They had an expert to advise them on what is important to Global Health and on how to reshape and reform the program. For example, the Specialist used to be 15.5 FCE, but the program is now very cohesive, and lists classes that some Dalla Lana faculty already teach. Their involvement means HMB can shape the program with their feedback, and allows them to shape undergraduate education without administering an entire program from scratch. HMB started monthly consultations with Dalla Lana in December 2015, and wrapped up in October 2016.

On a vote the motion was carried, as amended.

**MOTION (l): THAT the proposed changes to the Global Health Specialist program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.**

The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion. On a vote the motion was carried, as amended.

m. Health & Disease Major, Human Biology Program
n. Health & Disease Specialist, Human Biology Program

In keeping with the department self-study, changes have been proposed to Health & Disease programs to ensure a lab or research-based course is required to meet the learning outcomes identified in 2015. For the Major, a statistics course is not required, and course options have been revised in consultation with other units. In the Specialist program, the total FCEs have been decreased to allow flexibility for students. Courses in research, and the structure and functions of the human body, have been incorporated, and a course option from Ecology and Evolutionary Biology has been added based on consultation with that program.

**MOTION (m): THAT the proposed changes to the Health & Disease Major program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.**
The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion. On a vote the motion was carried, as amended.

**MOTION (n):** THAT the proposed changes to the Health & Disease Specialist program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.

The motion was moved and seconded. There was no discussion. On a vote the motion was carried, as amended.

Vice-Dean Klassen thanked Ms. Leggio and Professor Taverna for representing the department to speak to the motions.

**o. Environmental Geosciences Specialist, Earth Sciences Program**

Changes to the Environmental Geosciences Specialist program come about from the desire to serve both students who aim to certify as professional geoscientists, and those who do not have that objective. The proposed changes were needed to offer flexibility with fewer constraints and make it easier to finish in four years. The credits required have been reduced, but the capstone course options have been broadened, and eligible courses have been developed for the Earth & Environmental Systems Major. Students in this program will now have more options.

**MOTION (o):** THAT the proposed changes to the Environmental Geosciences Specialist program, as described in the attached proposal, be approved effective for the academic year 2017-18.

The motion was moved and seconded.

A member asked a question regarding the difference in form for this motion. Vice-Dean Klassen noted this was partly because the program learning outcomes were not changing. Professor Grant Henderson from the Department of Earth Sciences confirmed this, and said that they were making the program less restrictive while keeping the same outcomes. In follow-up, the member noted that the proposal was harder to assess since it was on a different form. Vice-Dean Klassen noted that changes are explained in a different area of the form, and said the proposal was reviewed by the Vice Provost Academic Programs. The Faculty has adopted a new Curriculum Management system this year and is experiencing some growing pains with the documentation generated. Future motions will certainly conform to the same template.

On a vote the motion was carried.

5. **Proposal for the closure of the Master of Urban Design Studies (M.U.D.S.) (For Approval) – Joshua Barker, Vice-Dean, Graduate Education**

Vice-Dean Barker introduced the motion by explaining that the Master of Urban Design Studies Program commenced a few years ago and that demand has been low. Enrolment of approximately 10 students per year was expected but historically it has been only 2-3 students. There are currently no registered
students, and closing the program will free up faculty resources. For these reasons the program was suspended. There is currently one lapsed student in the program who is under the time limit to be re-introduced. This student has been informed that they will be supported in the program until closure. There has been attentiveness to student needs and no desire to close programs and leave students “high and dry”. There has been extensive consultation on student needs.

MOTION: THAT the proposed closure of the Master of Urban Design Studies (M.U.D.S.) in the Faculty of Arts and Science, to which admissions have already been suspended as described in the attached proposal, dated November 3, 2016, be approved, with an anticipated program closure date of August 31, 2020.

The motion was moved and seconded.

A member asked how the Planning program feels regarding the closure. Professor Richard Di Francesco, Associate Chair, Department of Geography and Planning, confirmed that they conducted consultation with aligned units, though not with program alumni.

A member asked if it is fair to say a similar program is offered through the Daniels Faculty. Vice-Dean Barker confirmed that this was the case, and that core courses are offered through the Faculty of Arts and Science, so students in Arts and Science still have access to this learning.

On a vote the motion was carried.

6. Summary of the Final Report from the Admissions Business Process Reengineering for the Faculty of Arts & Science – Nelson De Melo, Registrar, Trinity College

Since time remaining was short, the Chair asked Mr. De Melo if he was able to give a summary of the Admissions Business Process Reengineering (BPR) within the remaining time. Mr. De Melo said that he could do this but it was hard to anticipate questions. The Chair then asked Council if there was other business to raise. A member expressed interest in a question about other motions. The Chair confirmed there would be other business to come, so asked Mr. De Melo to proceed and see how the time went.

Mr. De Melo recalled that he was last in Council in October to give update on the BPR as a project overview. In addition to the summary today, videos are available on the website (to be made available with these minutes which were produced by students, and members are encouraged to view them following the meeting. The Faculty undertook a BPR sponsored by the Dean. The BPR team held discussions with colleagues, conducted research, and talked to many units, Deans, and Principals, and brainstormed solutions, with the goal to present a report to the steering committee. Today’s summary covers what has happened between the October briefing and now.

At present, students are given many deadlines and experience confusion. There are many questions about things that should be straightforward, and students need to be empowered to make choices, and we should not obfuscate the process. The goal is to provide clarity, transparency, and ease of access,
while promoting breadth and offering excellent communication with students, and to ensure they are happy and successful. The process is served by guiding principles, to “meet students where they are”, to be a student-centred process, to ensure timely and unified processes, and to work with advisors. The review took nine weeks and pulled apart existing processes, making recommendations to be pulled through the implementation process. These recommendations will be broken apart and pulled into projects. A steering committee will review the plan and consult people who should be involved, with further consultation and committee work expected. The recommendations of the report include: simplified deadlines and procedures, integrated applicant portal and communications, responsive online planning tool, new admission categories, streamlined community selection process, and aligned first-year opportunities. Many recommendations will build on things that are already happening. The online planning tool will interface with human interaction, for example “what kind of programs should I go into?”, “what college should I apply to if I don’t want to cook my own meals?”. As well, enrolment categories serve the student’s program trajectory rather than the degree outcomes. We will look to align these, for example trajectories in Arts, Science, or Commerce. Overall, there is a need to communicate to students that breadth is possible within these degree outcomes.

A member asked about the proposal to make qualified international students without language proficiency a conditional offer. Will the offer be revoked if the language proficiency is not met? Mr. De Melo responded that this would be a matter of implementation, but in theory we would pull the offer if a student did not meet requirements. Ms. Deborah Robinson, Faculty Registrar, responded that right now all offers are conditional and we do pull about 60 each year, usually in August. In terms of language, there are now a number of students who write the English Language Proficiency Exam in April, and if they do not write they can’t get a Visa, so in that sense there would be no point applying without writing the ELPE. Part of the reason for making a conditional offer is the incentive, and being able to attract top scholars. However, we would not hesitate to pull an offer, though it is hard, and if we make an early conditional offer we are in a better position to pull it.

The Chair thanked Mr. De Melo for the presentation and for making it within the available time.

7. Other Business

The Chair asked for any items of other business.

A member asked about changes to curriculum and stated that consultation is deficient because there were some changes in the member’s program but he had not been consulted. The member said that he would have suggested changes if he had known changes to the Neuroscience program were coming, and feels consultation was deficient. If someone has a course in a program they should know about changes. The member said that he felt the proposal should be sent to all people who have courses to prevent problems. The Chair confirmed that this point had been recorded in the minutes.

8. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made and carried. The meeting was adjourned at 4:49pm.