

REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND AWARDS
(SCAPA)

Brescia University College: Certificate in Religious Education

Wording of Degree Diplomas

New Modules: Major in Biochemistry; Major in Philosophy at Brescia University College

BSc in Medical Biophysics

Annual Report of Provost's Undergraduate Program Review Committee

Annual Report on the Status of Reviews of Graduate Programs

New Scholarships and Awards

FOR APPROVAL

1. **Brescia University College: Certificate in Religious Education**

Recommended: That a Certificate in Religious Education be introduced in the Religious Studies and Philosophy Department at Brescia University College, effective September 1, 2003.

NEW CALENDAR COPY

(Insert on page 325, 2003 UWO Calendar following Certificate in Community Development)

CERTIFICATE IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Certificate in Religious Education is offered through the Department of Religious Studies and Philosophy at Brescia University College. It is designed to provide students with a program of studies which will prepare them to choose the teaching of religion of the Intermediate-Senior curriculum in Religious Education in the Catholic Schools of Ontario as one of their teaching subjects on application to an Ontario Faculty of Education. It is open to all persons interested in education in a religious context.

Students may pursue the Certificate concurrently with their degree program. All courses count towards the student's undergraduate degree. The Certificate is composed of 3.0 required courses and 2.0 courses to be selected from an approved list.

Admission Requirements

Enrolment is based upon the completion of at least two years of study toward a BA degree, with a minimum overall average of 70% in 2.0 or more courses in Religious Studies none of which are below 60%.

Progression Requirements

Successful completion of the Certificate requires a minimum of 5.0 courses in Religious Studies with an average of 70% or more including the following:

Courses

3.0 courses: Religious Studies 026F/G, 028F/G, 191F/G, 217a/b, and either Religious Studies 137 or 243E

2.0 courses* from: Religious Studies 011, 121F/G or 211F/G, 130, 140 or 223E, 142E, 150E, 192F/G, 216F/G, 251F/G, 252F/G, 253F/G, 271F/G, 290F/G, 291F/G

* Up to 1.0 of these courses may be substituted from the following: Philosophy 023F/G, 142E, 143E or 253E, Family Studies 200, Psychology 153, Sociology 235 or, with permission, another course chosen prior to registration in consultation with the Chair of the Religious Studies and Philosophy Department, Brescia University College

Background:

The Certificate in Religious Education is designed to provide students with a program of studies which will prepare them to choose the teaching of the Intermediate-Senior curriculum in Religious Education in the Catholic schools of Ontario as one of their teaching subjects on application to an Ontario Faculty of Education.

Each year of the four-year Religious Education curriculum approaches the topics covered from the perspective of scripture, profession of faith, moral development, prayer and sacramental life, and family life education. The required courses in the Certificate provide a foundation in scripture, ethics and contemporary theology. Two optional courses from a list of electives enable students to complete the five courses required for admission to a faculty of education with religion as a teaching subject and to pursue topics which will assist them in teaching the intermediate-senior curriculum, including World Religions or Philosophy if they so choose.

The Certificate in Religious Education may also be of interest to persons working or volunteering in other religious educational contexts.

2. **Wording of Degree Diplomas**

Recommended: That effective for Spring Convocation 2005, all Bachelor/Baccalaureate degree diplomas have the name of the Bachelor/Baccalaureate degree with the Honors Specialization, Major(s), or Specialization module earned by the student and “With Distinction”, if appropriate.

Background:

The reform of the University’s undergraduate curricula will require new wording on the degree diplomas received by graduates of the new programs. Because of the wide range of modular choices that will be available to students and the resulting complexity of the combinations, SCAPA has determined that it will not be possible to list Minor modules earned by the student.

Students enrolled in programs starting September 2004 will be able to graduate with degrees made up of the new modules. In practical terms, they will be able to graduate beginning in June 2005. At that time, the shift from listing Honors programs and/or Three-Year programs will be phased out.

Details covered in students’ transcripts will not be affected. Transcripts will document all of the information on the student’s record including full names of all modules completed and any specific award or distinction attained throughout the student’s time at Western.

3. **New Modules: Major in Biochemistry; Major in Philosophy at Brescia University College**

Recommended: That effective September 1, 2004, the new Major modules listed below be approved:
SCIENCE

- Major in Biochemistry
- BRESCIA
- Major in Philosophy

Background:

These modules should have been included in the last (and final) SUPR Report to Senate in October 2003.

FACULTY OF SCIENCE

MAJOR IN BIOCHEMISTRY

Admission Requirements

Completion of first-year requirements, including Chemistry 020 or 023 and Biology 022 or 023 with a minimum mark of 60%.
1.0 course from: Mathematics 030, Calculus 050a/b, 051a/b, 081a/b, 091a/b, Linear Algebra 040a/b, Applied Mathematics 026

Physics 020, 024, 028a/b and 029a/b, or the former Physics 022, 025

Module

6.0 courses:

0.5 course: Biochemistry 280a

1.0 course: Chemistry 213a/b plus 223b or the former Chemistry 253

0.5 course: Biology 281b

0.5 course from: Biology 244a or Statistical Science 222a/b

2.5 courses: Biochemistry 381a, 380b, 382b, 410a, 420b

1.0 course from: Biochemistry 385a, 386b, 400a, 430b, 440a, 445a/b, 450b, 463b, 465a.

BRESCIA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

MAJOR IN PHILOSOPHY

Admission Requirements

Completion of first-year requirements, with a grade of 60% or more in a Philosophy 020-level course

Module

6.0 courses:

1.0 course from: Philosophy 200F/G, 201F/G, 210F/G, 211F/G

5.0 additional courses in Philosophy at the 200 level, at least 2.0 of which must be at the 300 or 400 level.

4. **BSc in Medical Biophysics**

Recommended: That effective September 1, 2003, the Honors Medical Biophysics programs be revised to reinstate the BSc Program in Honors Medical Biophysics that was removed from the calendar when the BMSc program was introduced.

Background:

In June 2000, Senate approved that effective September 1, 2003, students would no longer be able to graduate with a BSc in Biophysics. However, the Faculties of Science and Medicine & Dentistry now propose to reinstate the BSc program in Honors Medical Biophysics, effective immediately.

Reinstatement of the Honors BSc program is recommended to accommodate students (e.g., those from the Chemistry or Physics programs who have in the past transferred to the BSc Honors Medical Biophysics program in year three) who do not have the prerequisites for the new BSc Honors Medical Biophysics program, but satisfy the requirements for the traditional BSc Honors Medical Biophysics program. The deletion and addition of courses reflect an updating of topics such as Digital Image Processing that are now offered in the undergraduate program.

FOR INFORMATION

1. **Annual Report of the Provost's Undergraduate Program Review Committee**

The Report of the Provost's Undergraduate Program Review Committee (PRC) is attached as [Appendix 1](#).

2. **Annual Report on the Status of Reviews of Graduate Programs**

The Report on the OCGS Appraisal of Graduate Programs at The University of Western Ontario During the Third Cycle (1996/97 - 2002/03) is attached as [Appendix 2](#).

3. **Report on Scholarships and Awards**

SCAPA has approved on behalf of the Senate the following Terms of Reference for new scholarships and awards for recommendation to the Board of Governors through the Vice-Chancellor:

Legal Aid Ontario Award (Faculty of Law)

Awarded annually to a student or students at the completion of third year Law who have made an outstanding and continuous contribution to legal aid, clinical practice and/or public interest law. Recipients also will have demonstrated academic excellence (B+ average or higher). Students will be nominated or may apply directly by letter with accompanying resume by April 1 to the Student Services Office in the Faculty of Law. In order to recommend a recipient, Legal Aid Ontario, in consultation with the Dean, will name a representative to a committee to be appointed by the Dean, Faculty of Law. The Dean, Faculty of Law, will make the final selection. This award is made possible through the generosity of Legal Aid Ontario.

Value: \$2,000 is available annually, and up to 3 awards will be made from this amount

Effective: May 2003 and ending in April 2006

Margaret Rand Memorial Award in Visual Arts (Faculty of Arts, Visual Arts)

Awarded to a full-time or part-time student (minimum 3 courses) in Year 2 or beyond of an Honors Bachelor degree with an Honors Specialization or double Major in Visual Arts; a Four-Year Bachelor degree with a Specialization or Major in Visual Arts; or, a Three-Year Bachelor degree with a Major or double Minor in Visual Arts. Candidates must have achieved an 80% average in their last full year of study (5 courses or equivalent taken part-time) and demonstrate financial need. Preference will be given to candidates who registered at Western as mature students and who can demonstrate a plan to continue their work in Visual Arts personally or professionally. Students must apply for this award. Applications will be available, in August, through the Office of the Registrar and the Department of Visual Arts and must be submitted by October 31 along with an essay (maximum 250 words) describing the candidates plan to pursue Visual Arts. The Office of the Registrar will determine financial need and the Chair of the Department of Visual Arts will select the recipient. This award was established by Dr. Charles G. Rand in memory of his wife Margaret Rand through Foundation Western.

Value: 1 at \$1,000

Effective Date: May 2004

This award is offered through the Ontario Student Opportunity Trust Fund (OSOTF) program, and recipients must meet Ontario residency requirements.

Barry Connell Steers Scholarship (Faculty of Social Science)
Value: 1 at \$750

Criteria effective May 2003: Awarded to a full-time student enrolled in his or her third or fourth year of studies in an Honors Economics, Honors History or Honors Political Science program, or a combined honors program which includes Economics, History or Political Science, based on a minimum 80% academic average. The recipient will be selected by the Faculty of Social Science Scholarship Committee. This scholarship was established in honor of her husband, Mr. Barry Connell Steers (BA '51, HBA '51, LLD '89), on the occasion of his 75th birthday, by Mrs. Martha Steers (BA '51), Mr. Con Steers (HBA '76), Ms. Sara Steers (HBA '81) and Mr. Gregory Steers through Foundation Western.

Criteria effective May 2004: Awarded to a full-time student enrolled in his or her third or fourth year of an Honors Specialization or double Major in an honors degree which includes Economics, History or Political Science, based on academic achievement (minimum 80% academic average). The recipient will be selected by the Faculty of Social Science Scholarship Committee. This scholarship was established in honor of her husband, Mr. Barry Connell Steers (BA '51, HBA '51, LLD '89), on the occasion of his 75th birthday, by Mrs. Martha Steers (BA '51), Mr. Con Steers (HBA '76), Ms. Sara Steers (HBA '81) and Mr. Gregory Steers through Foundation Western.

Report of the Provost's Undergraduate Program Review Committee (PRC)

Background and Context

This is the fifth report of the Provost's Undergraduate Program Review Committee, the first having been brought forward to Senate and the Board of Governors in June 2000, the second in April 2001, and third in March 2002, and the fourth in November, 2002. As required by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents, PRC was established in 1998 to oversee the review process at Western. In approaching this task, the Committee focussed on reviews done in conjunction with the appointment process of Chairs at the departmental level, Directors in the case of Schools, and Deans in non-departmentalized Faculties.

In most of the cases listed below, the reviews took place departmentally. There was, in this cycle, one review of a Faculty-based undergraduate program – the Honors Business Administration program in the Richard Ivey School of Business. The review of Nursing was done in connection with the search for a new Director of the School.

The thirteen departmental/program review summaries which follow were prepared by individual committee members, who reviewed documentation provided by the units and the reports of the external reviewers and then consulted with the units to determine specific actions occasioned by the consultants' reports. Finally, the PRC summary was reviewed by the appropriate Chairs, Directors and Deans, and their comments incorporated into a final report on the review process. Deans, Directors and Chairs were free to request a meeting with the Chair of the PRC and the designated reviewer to resolve any outstanding issues.

Program reviews contained in this report include:

- Department of Classical Studies, Faculty of Arts
- Department of French, Faculty of Arts
- Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts
- Department of Biology, Faculty of Science
- Department of Computer Science, Faculty of Science
- Department of Earth Sciences, Faculty of Science
- Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science
- Department of Physics and Astronomy, Faculty of Science
- Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Science
- Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
- Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering
- Program in Nursing, School of Nursing, Faculty of Health Sciences
- Honors Business Administration Program, Richard Ivey School of Business

Department of Classical Studies

Preamble

The Department of Classical Studies is a small department with eight core faculty, two part-time instructors and three supporting faculty members from other departments. The department offers undergraduate courses in Greek, Latin and in Classical Studies. In addition, the department offers a MA program that permits students to specialize in Archeology, Greek, Latin or Greek and Latin. While it is possible to complete the MA in one year, it generally requires two years of study.

Basis for the Report and Summary

The external reviewers, Elaine Fantham from Princeton University and Martin Cropp from University of Calgary, visited Western on October 29th and 30th, 2001. They submitted their report at the end of November, 2001. The reviewers summarized the outcome of the meetings as follows:

“Our meetings left us confident that the department has established its value to the Faculty of Arts and deserves and enjoys the trust of the Provost, the Dean and officers of the Graduate School.”

The external reviewers’ report was very pragmatic and constructive. In sizing up the department, the reviewers noted that the department was in transition with three out of nine faculty members recently retired and four more due to retire within seven years. They also noted the high level of scholarship and publication within the department.

The report specifically dealt with undergraduate, graduate programs, scholarship and research and human resources under separate headings. The recommendations appear to reflect reviewers who were generally pleased with the current state of the department but were suggesting possible ways to rationalize activities to further enhance both the productivity of the department as well as the attractiveness of the department’s course offerings.

Department Response

I met with Prof. Chris Brown, the Chair of the Department of Classical Studies, to discuss the recommendations made by the external reviewers. The discussion significantly increased my understanding of the Classical Studies department and it was evident that Prof. Brown had seriously considered the recommendations and implement changes in areas he believe appropriate.

PRC reviewer: Darroch (Rick) Robertson

Department of French

Preamble

The Department of French offers six specific programs to undergraduate students, including a four-year honors program (with four permutations), a four-year general program (with two permutations), a three year general BA in French, and three certification programs.

Basis for the Report

The basis for this Report is a “Brief of Appraisal” document prepared as part of a unit self-evaluation process in June 2002, and an external appraisal prepared by Professors Bishop (Dalhousie) and Lessard (Queen’s) subsequent to their unit assessment visit of October 2002. The report is also based on an interview of the Department Chair, Prof. Clive Thomson undertaken by the writer in December 2002.

The Review Process and Departmental Response

The external referees have presented a comprehensive review of the functioning of the French department, including the undergraduate program. Their report accepts as a premise that for some years now it has been difficult for university French Departments in English Canada to recruit undergraduate

students for programs in French. This was cited as an important context for the fact that the French Department at Western has experienced declining enrolments in its Honors and Three-Year Programs.

The French Department's self-evaluation report indicates a strong commitment to update and improve programs. Several innovations have or will be implemented: Oral language courses have been streamlined courses have been created in Business French; new "Minors" are being proposed; a new language lab is open; provision has been made to cope with increased enrolments attributable to the double cohort. It is the goal of the Department of French to work toward the goal of achieving an undergraduate program that will appeal both to specialist and general interest students.

In their report the external referees were highly complimentary of the efforts mounted by the French Department at Western to engage in honest and critical self-review, and to take concrete steps to improve the content and appeal of its undergraduate programs. In particular, the reviewers commented favourably on the completion and/or tangible progress made on all of the above initiatives including the new multi-media lab; the development of business French courses; the creation of courses emphasizing oral proficiency; the establishment of new minors; the upgrading of the departmental website; and the increased integration of programs in French language, literature, linguistics and culture.

The external reviewers observed that the Department already had taken concrete steps to make positive changes to the undergraduate program. Funding has been secured for intensified outreach, recruitment and promotional activities. Work is ongoing on several initiatives including the updating of French and Quebec civilization courses; the creation of a large enrolment course in French to be taught in English; the development of courses in women's writing; and, the reassessment of the Department's grading practices. The external reviewers expressed all confidence in the ability of the Department of French and its leadership to carry these reforms forward to fruition.

Both the reviewers and the faculty recognize that there is a good deal of work yet to be done with respect to the promotion and development of undergraduate programs in French. The external reviewers respectfully suggested that the Department review whether there any "clienteles" among the undergraduate community that had been overlooked by its recruitment efforts. They also suggested that French courses be developed that might be cross-listed in art, philosophy and sociology. In response to this suggestion, the Department will offer at least one such course in the forthcoming academic year.

PRC Reviewer: Rande Kostal, Faculty of Law

Department of Philosophy

Preamble

The Department of Philosophy of the Faculty of Arts at The University of Western Ontario has a nominal strength of 25 full-time professors, two of whom are joint appointments. It is a comparatively large philosophy department, by Canadian standards. It should be noted, however, that the department is somewhat bifurcated between the philosophers of science (about one-quarter) and those faculty working in other fields.

According to the Department Brief produced in 2001, the department's "absolute priority has long been its doctoral program." The honors undergraduate program is listed as its second priority. As a result of a departmental review held in 1998, the honors program was restructured so that it might become "a locus of choice for bright undergraduate students seeking an education in the liberal arts." This is a report on

the reports which have purported to evaluate the relative success, or otherwise, of the honors and other undergraduate programs in philosophy.

Basis for the Report

This report is based on three sources: 1) four volumes of documents generated by the department further to its external review; 2) the External Appraisers' Report; 3) interviews both with the Chair (Dr. John Thorp) and the two external consultants. I have restricted my attention to matters relating to undergraduate education.

Programs

The Departmental Brief describes the undergraduate curriculum as follows: "The Philosophy Department has three different undergraduate programs: an Honors program, a four-year program, and a three-year Area of Concentration." The Area of Concentration program will soon be made defunct further to wider curricular reforms in the University. It will be replaced by a Minor in Philosophy. The Department also cooperates with other departments in the University to offer Combined Honors programs (wherein students devote about one third of their studies to philosophy courses). The Department also offers a number of highly subscribed "service" courses to students from other disciplines. Since this review, the Department has added a Certificate in Ethics Program and Minors in Ethics and in Philosophy of Science, and is considering adding other Minors in History of Philosophy and possibly in Feminist Philosophy.

In 2001, the Honors program had an enrolment of some 90 students. The four-year program is much smaller, consisting of a handful of students. It is expected that within the next few years, the numbers in the Honors program will increase by about 10%. The Department's goal is to continue to improve and promote the Honors program until the numbers reach an "optimal size" of about 150 students. It is further hoped that as a result of curricular reforms, "many students in the University will avail themselves of the formal option of a Minor in Philosophy."

Summary

The Honors program is the main focus of undergraduate training in the Department. During his tenure as Chair, Dr. John Thorp reports that he made a concerted effort "to give these students a strong sense of inclusion in an exciting intellectual community." A common room and faculty-student mentorship program were introduced to promote this goal. The undergraduate Philosophy Club also was revitalized. In the judgment of Dr. Thorp and the external appraisers, these initiatives have borne fruit in the form of growing enrolment and improved student morale.

The Department has engaged in some self-questioning about the efficacy of the Honors program. In some quarters, it is thought that the program is geared too much to the relatively small number of students who plan to undertake graduate work in philosophy. According to this line of thinking, the program is too inflexible in requiring (for instance) that all students take (and pass) a course in formal logic. It is supposed that this requisite is off-putting to many prospective students. On the other hand, many members of the Department think that the most distinctive and valuable feature of the Honors program is its core requirements and general rigour. This view was endorsed by the external consultants, who attested that Western's undergraduate program in philosophy was "easily as demanding as the best programs in North America." By all accounts, the formal logic party is larger than the flexibility party, but this issue will continue to be a matter for Departmental discussion.

It would appear from the limited evidence available that most philosophy students, particularly those students enrolled in the Honors program, feel a very strong affinity to their Department. Professor Thorp's leadership in this regard is widely credited and admired.

Final Summary

The Department of Philosophy believes that its undergraduate programs are in good shape. Enrollments are growing and most students are strongly engaged with their philosophical studies. The reviewers expressed concern that every effort be made to ensure that female students feel welcome and supported within the Department's programs. The Department shares this objective and will give appropriate consideration to the reviewers' concerns in future planning in this domain.

The great majority of students studying philosophy are in the Honors program. The program is demanding and widely admired. Every year, it feeds students to top graduate schools in philosophy and professional schools. Apart from some minor "tweaking" (there have been suggestions that the program might be improved by more course offerings in modern Continental philosophy), the Honors program will continue more or less unchanged for some years to come. There does not appear to be any pressing justification for thoroughgoing change.

PRC reviewer: Rande Kostal, Faculty of Law

Department of Biology

Preamble

The Department of Biology was formed from the merged Departments of Plant Sciences and Zoology on July 1, 2002. The merged Department is one of the larger departments of the Faculty of Science with over 40 faculty members. Presently the Department offers several undergraduate degrees: a 3-year BSc in Biology, a 4-year General BSc in Biology and a 4-year honors BSc in one of seven specialty programs: Biology; Cell Biology; Ecology & Evolution; Genetics; Plant Biochemistry & Molecular Biology; Plant Sciences; and Zoology. In addition, the Department contributes to undergraduate teaching in several programs outside Department and the Faculty of Science. An external review of the Department of Biology was carried out on December 16-17, 2002 by Drs. Brian Hall (Dalhousie), William Taylor (Waterloo) and Gregory Taylor (Alberta). A new chair, Dr. Brock Fenton (York) will take over from Dr. Jack Millar in October, 2003.

Basis for this Report

My report is based on the self-study reviews produced by the Departments of Plant Sciences and Zoology in 2002, the external reviewers' report and the Academic Plan of the Faculty of Science, as published in the Western Science Newsletter of January 2003. Because of scheduling difficulties, I did not have the opportunity to meet with the external reviewers in December 2002. I met with Dr. Mark Bernards, chair of the Department of Biology Undergraduate Education Committee on June 25, 2003.

Summary

Traditionally, the old Departments of Plant Sciences and Zoology were responsible for biology teaching in first year science programs – up to 2,000 students are enrolled in these courses. Several things appear to have contributed towards a spirit of reform of this undergraduate teaching in the merged Department. These include the merger itself, the investment of significant resources, both financial and personnel (a

new teaching support position) the arrival of a new external chair and the interdisciplinary goals of the Academic Plan of the Faculty of Science. The Department is seeking to reform, consolidate, and streamline its programs to meet the modern needs of biology graduates. Under the auspices of the Undergraduate Education Committee, curriculum reform is well underway and includes a complete revamping of first year biology courses using a hierarchical approach. Students will be introduced to molecular, cellular, organism, and 'system' biology in sequence. The number of honors programs has also been reduced and reorganized – again guided by the hierarchical approach mentioned. Starting in 2004, students will have a choice of graduating with a (general) specialization in biology or in one of five honors programs: Biology; Genetics; Cell & Developmental Biology; Comparative Physiology; and Ecology & Evolution. Presently, a large number of 3rd and 4th year undergraduate courses are offered by the Department with variable enrollments. These courses are also being examined to determine which might be amalgamated and which simply dropped. This reform is being carried out also with a view to support the new program structure and also to broaden and strengthen graduate course offerings which are a weaker part of the overall teaching program of the Department.

At the time of their visit, the external reviewers were pleased by Departmental commitment to undergraduate program reform. They were excited by revision of the first year classes but expressed some concern with the large number of classes in individual specialty areas given to upper year students. The reviewers encouraged the Department to reduce the number of undergraduate courses and programs offered, some of which has already been accomplished as outlined above. The reviewers were supportive of the overall Academic Plan of the Faculty of Science and the role that Department of Biology could play in this, both in interdisciplinary teaching and research.

Review Process

The reform of undergraduate teaching and programs has been 'quick off the mark' in the newly-merged Department. First year classes and labs are being completely redesigned and reform of upper year courses is also planned. The external review supported these changes and encouraged the Department to continue with this reform.

PRC reviewer: Peter Flanagan, Departments of Medicine and Biochemistry

Department of Computer Science

Preamble

The Department of Computer Science offers programs at the undergraduate (BSc) and the graduate level (MSc and PhD). It also offers concurrent degree programs such as Computer Science and Law (BSc/LLB). In all there are 22 different undergraduate programs (in the form of combinations of courses of the standard program). It also carries out service teaching of computer science courses in other departments such as Engineering. There are 30 Faculty members and 13 administrative or other staff. The Department has a Chair (current Dr. Bauer), an undergraduate Chair (Dr. Doug Vancise) and a graduate Chair (Dr. Hanan Lutfiyya). The Department is also quite research intensive.

Basis for the Report

The basis of this report is a Self Study document provided by the department (Dated: Feb 18, 2002), and the report of the external reviewers (dated: April 16, 2002). The external reviewers were Dr. Rick Bunt (Saskatchewan), Dr. Wayne Enright (Toronto) and Dr. Jane Fritz (UNB). A joint meeting between the

external reviewers', the Provost and this member was held at the Provost's office where the comments and concerns of the reviewers were heard and discussed.

The Review Process and Departmental Response

The external referees have presented a thorough analytical review of the functioning of the department. Overall the reviewers identify the undergraduate program as a "solid program" and "effectively managed". Specific issues and comments of the reviewers are as follows:

- Physical infrastructure (labs + systems support) is very good, however there is high enrolment in most course sections and the teaching load is high or at the same level as for other research intensive computer science departments in the country.
- Reduce the number of electives offered at the senior level of the program.
- Control (reduce) the enrollment of students to better manage the teaching loads: require first year calculus of all students entering the program
- Removing some CS courses and replacing with math courses.
- Open better communication lines with departments or faculties to which service courses are being offered. Also improved strategies need to be developed to improve communication lines within the department.
- Develop a strategic plan for recruitment and retention of faculty, budgeting issues and for controlling the quality and intake of students into the program. This strategic plan should be a Department wide exercise involving all the faculty members.
- Do not launch any additional programs without the strategic plan in place.
- Relations with Engineering: The two main concerns were the issue of Software Engineering (being offered by both Engineering and CS) and service teaching issues. The first one is a broader issue and its resolution depends on what happens in the national stage. The second issue of service teaching can be resolved with more communication between CS and engineering.

Response of the Department

The following points address issues raised in the draft report prepared for the Department of Computer Science by Professor Amarjeet Bassi. This response was prepared by Dr. Doug Vancise (Undergraduate Chair) and Dr. Stephen Watt (Past Chair) following review of the draft report by the departmental executive committee.

The department finds it difficult to reduce the number of electives, as most of them are high enrollment courses with an average of 45 students per course. The department agrees that stronger first-year mathematics requirement is necessary and increasing the mark requirement in Computer Science 027a/b from 60 to 65 or higher for program entry is being considered as well as the replacement of some CS courses with math courses. The department is proceeding with the development of a Bioinformatics program. The adoption of Western's new undergraduate degree structure with one minor, one major, one or two specializations, and a handful of "advanced minors" will simplify the overall program structure. The Department of Computer Science and the Faculty of Engineering are currently actively engaged in continuous efforts fostering contact at all levels between the units, including a Software Engineering barbeque inviting all faculty and students in both CS and Engineering working in the area. Most recently, the Faculties of Science and Engineering signed an agreement on the future of Software Engineering programs. The tone of the interactions between the Department of Computer Science and the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering is quite positive and healthy.

PRC reviewer: Amarjeet S. Bassi, Faculty of Engineering

Department of Earth Sciences

Preamble

The Department of Earth Sciences was formed from a merger of the Departments of Geology and Geophysics in 1993. The Department offers core undergraduate programs in geophysics, geology and environmental geology and a number of joint Honors and Pass programs with Applied Mathematics, Chemistry, Geography, and Physics.

Summary of Review and Recommendations

This section is based primarily on the 2002 appraisal of the Department of Earth Sciences that was prepared by Dr. J. Hall, Dr. N. James and Dr. G. Jarvis as well as on the self-studies provided by the department.

The reviewers gave the department accolades on several scores. They described it as “one of the outstanding geoscience institutions in Canada” and as a centre of “outstanding research and teaching.” It received high praise for the calibre of its senior and junior faculty. It was commended for its plans to introduce a new course structure for all three core programs and for its new Internship Program. The reviewers also commented on the high calibre of the students graduating from the Department of Earth Sciences.

In spite of these very positive attributes, the reviewers discussed an “underlying unease about the future,” stemming from two sources: large numbers of retirements and decreases in student enrolment. Over the last nine years, the department has lost nine faculty members and five more retirements are expected in the next two years. The decrease in faculty resources undermines the strength and integrity of the program. To address this shortfall, the reviewers recommend that additional faculty members be hired to teach Earth Science courses related to resources (especially metals and energy), to offer instruction in the use of the Geoscience Information System, to bolster teaching in core courses, and to provide field courses.

Declining enrolments mirror trends seen in geoscience departments across the country. Nevertheless, the declines endanger the integrity and viability of the program and make it harder to argue convincingly for additional faculty resources. To its credit, the department has undertaken strong outreach efforts and, as a result, enrolments are expected to increase for next year. The reviewers recommend that the department continue to work to ensure that its offerings remain attractive to students, to modernize the image of geoscientists and to publicize the employment opportunities after graduation so that the profession will appear more appealing.

Departmental Response and Subsequent Actions

The Department is cognizant of the importance of keeping undergraduate enrolment numbers up, and has taken a number of steps including introducing a new Honors program (with Biology), and devoting a significant effort into outreach activities. There are some positive signs. Comparison of enrolment totals for August 24, 2001 (1096) with that for August 23, 2002 (1141) shows a small increase (4%).

The wave of retirements over 2001-03 will result in loss of faculty expertise in two key core areas: (a) Structural Geology-Tectonics, (b) Historical-Precambrian Geology. The Reviewers recommend appointment of replacement faculty to cover these two areas and to provide instruction in the use of the Geoscience Information System.

The Department is currently in the process of appointing a new faculty member in Geophysical Geodesy, who will be teaching the use of the Geoscience Information System. A faculty appointment in Structures /Microstructures /Earth Material Science was requested in the 2002-03 budget proposal from the Department to the Dean and a detailed submission is being prepared for the Provost. In writing its long term plan, the Department will give serious consideration to the need to make an appointment in Historical-Precambrian Geology.

The Department, with the support of the Faculty of Science, is exploring the possibility of introducing a Liberal Arts Program in cooperation with other faculties (especially Arts and Music). The new program will be directed towards that portion of the undergraduate population that is considering teaching in primary or secondary school. This is a timely effort since the new primary and secondary school curricula include Earth and Space Sciences as teachable subjects.

The Ontario Government will establish Professional Certification for Geologists and Geophysicists within 5 years. The Department is in the process of defining Advanced Minors to meet the various requirements for Professional Geologists, Professional Geophysicists and Professional Environmental Geologists.

The present undergraduate curriculum includes two degree-granting programs, Geology and Geophysics. Under the new degree system, there will be three majors offered, Geology Geophysics and Environmental Geology. There will be Minors and specialization in each.

Reflections on the Review Process

The three external reviewers provided very positive assessments of the Department. The problems that they identified were primarily due to external developments (i.e., inadequate resources to hire the required new faculty and a nation-wide trend towards dropping enrolments).

On August 26th, 2002, I met with Dr. Mansinha, Chair of the Earth Sciences Department, and Dr. Nesbitt, Chair of the Earth Sciences Curriculum Committee, both of whom were helpful and cooperative. The Department has been successful in acquiring further positions and in increasing its enrolment through vigorous outreach programs. It has not sought merely to make minor revisions to its programs but has undertaken a careful and thorough redesigning of its offerings.

PRC reviewer: E. Riddell-Dixon, Department of Political Science

Department of Mathematics

Preamble

The Department of Mathematics was reviewed on the occasion of a Chair selection process in 2002-03.

Basis for the Report

This report is based on a Self Evaluation document the report of the two external reviewers Prof. Max Karoubi (Université Paris) and Prof. John Bland (Toronto). A joint meeting between the external reviewers', Prof. Alan Weedon and this member was also held where the comments and concerns of the reviewers were heard and discussed.

The Review Process

The external referees have presented a review of the department which focused on research and some aspects of undergraduate and graduate teaching. One area which was not addressed was the large service teaching being done by the department. The reviewers felt very positively about research productivity and quality of the research as well as several research based initiatives in the department. The reviewers proposed that future faculty positions should be targeted in specific research areas. The reviewers met with both graduate and undergraduate students and noted the high opinion of teaching instruction and close attention paid by individual faculty members. There was an issue with regard to the small number of honors students. The department is taking steps towards increasing the student enrolment through better outreach activities and summer camps.

The reviewers felt that the math content of courses in first year should be strengthened to allow the students to perform better in the second (more difficult) year. There is a successful undergraduate seminar series and a graduate seminar series has also been initiated. The reviewers also suggest a committee to coordinate the undergraduate programs. Overall the program has been well managed. The department should continue to raise its profile by promoting the program in high schools. The reviewers did not find any significant concerns to be commented upon.

Response of the Department

This report was discussed with Prof. Rick Jardine. Prof. Jardine agreed with the general comments noted above and did not feel that there were any other outstanding issues which were not covered.

PRC reviewer: Amarjeet S. Bassi, Faculty of Engineering

Department of Physics and Astronomy

Preamble

Physics and Astronomy (PA) officially formed on July 1, 1996. Amalgamated from two freestanding departments, PA currently comprises one administrative unit, even though its undergraduate course programming continues to offer degree programs largely defined by the two different streams of Physics and Astronomy. These programs now include:

- 4-year BSc in Honors Astronomy
- 4-year BSc in Honors Astronomy and Geophysics
- 4-year BSc in Honors Physics
- 4-year BSc in Honors Physics with Computer Science Minor
- 4-year BSc in Honors Physics and Geophysics
- 4-year BSc in Honors Medical Physics (either Physics or Biology options)
- 4-year BSc in Honors Science of Materials
- 3-year BSc in Physics (also a joint 3-year diploma with Fanshawe)

Having listed these programs, I would observe that, with the new Senate driven program modules coming in 2004, this list will alter itself somewhat. However, the PA's intended program modules exist only as a raft of proposals floating in a SUPR ocean, and these changes do not at this time affect the outcome of the recent review of PA.

Department Self Appraisal

Nearly 500 pages of program copy, course descriptions, research achievements, faculty profiles, and course syllabi, the PA self-appraisal is a paragon of the departmental self-report: it is convincingly thorough, and thoroughly tedious. Of particular importance to PRC are the following issues: declining enrolments; and curriculum update. Clearly, these issues are interrelated.

At the time of the last self-appraisal in 1997, PA faced abysmally low enrolments in its programs, and declining enrolments in its first-year offerings. Although this is a continent wide problem in physics/astronomy departments, the current chair (M. Cottam) felt that the problem was more serious at UWO due to departmental reluctance to revise and update quite narrowly-focused programs with increasingly dubious student appeal.

Since the 1997 report, PA has responded to this crisis by introducing several new courses, and two new program streams. The new courses include Physics 022 (Physics for Biological and Health Sciences); the new programs are the 4-year BSc in Medical Physics, and the 4-year BSc in Materials Science. First-year enrolments have surged since 1997, jumping from 1238 first-year registrations in 1997, to 1566 in 2002. Preliminary data also indicates that this curricular experiment has been successful for the Medical Physics stream at least, with Honors program registrants increasing from 15 in 1997, to 37 in 2002. By any quantitative measure, these initiatives must be considered a success.

The transition has not been entirely smooth. There are for example concerns among PA faculty that Physics 22 was implemented without much consultation. Still others find the new curricular innovations to be intellectually “fashionable,” if not problematically desperate attempts to increase the number of beans in the PA pot. New programs also cost money, of which there appears to be only trace amounts in the PA environs.

External Review

The report provided by Drs Leonard Feldman (Vanderbilt), Lothar Lilge (Princess Margaret Hospital), and Tony Moffat (Université de Montreal) in their External Appraiser’s Report believe that PA would benefit from greater outreach to other disciplines and project groups. In addition, more community events for PA would increase collegiality. The report also observes that, with the introduction of a newly promising Medical Physics stream, the teaching burdens of those associated with the program have increased, and PA needs to be responsive to these demands while permitting faculty to retain their research commitments. The successful recruitment of a CRC-II in Medical Physics will partially address this problem; however, CRCs are not exactly being appointed to teach first-year service courses. The External Appraiser also noted that a number (four, to be exact) of faculty carry a much higher teaching burden than the unit’s Normal Workload, although their recommendations on this particular issue were somewhat unclear. What is clear to the External appraisers is that the new Medical stream is crucial to the teaching mission of the department, and that the next chair needs to continue to build on the Medical stream, as it is clearly good business in all regards. Luckily the department has some new and energetic young faculty eager to meet these burdens, and if they tip a few of the sacred cows of the PA curriculum on their way, the External Appraisers believe such efforts will be worth it.

Department Response

In what follows, I quote directly from an email received by M. Cottam:

Several of the reviewers comments about the number of upper-level undergraduate courses have already been addressed in the last several months through the restructuring into majors, minors, etc, required for all departments (with effect from 2004). This has led to the elimination of some courses that had low enrolments in order to make way for the new undergraduate programs. It also allows us to keep teaching loads at a reasonable level (i.e., close to the current level of about 4 half-courses for someone on a normal workload, and this is typical for many departments in the Faculty of Science). The significant increase in our undergraduate enrolments in Years 2-4 in 2002-2003 has been encouraging. The Physics 022 course (a non-traditional physics course intended for biology or health science students) continues to have increased enrolments. In fact, the Biology Department (as part of its program revisions for 2004) has requested that we introduce a half-course version which will become a minimum physics requirement for all its students.”

In response to a question I raised regarding uneven teaching load, Professor Cottam writes: “I do not believe that our teaching loads are high (for someone on a normal workload) -- see my remarks above. We have some faculty (four, I believe) with a higher teaching load, but this (as you point out) is because they do minimal research.”

Conclusion

In terms of the mandate of PRC, the conditions and expectations of the Departmental Review, as it relates to undergraduate program issues, have been met in this review cycle.

PRC reviewer: Bryce Traister, Department of English

Department of Psychology

Preamble

Western’s Department of Psychology was established in 1931, offering both undergraduate and Master’s programs. The department awarded its first doctorate in 1953. At the time the department prepared its most recent self-study report, and the external reviewers made their on site visits, there were forty-eight full-time faculty members in the department whose teaching assignments and research expertise embraced one or more of the eleven disciplinary ‘areas’ into which the department has been organized. These areas are: Animal Cognition, Behavioural and Cognitive Neuroscience, Clinical, Cognition, Developmental, Educational, Industrial-Organizational, Measurement, Personality, Sensation and Perception, and Social. At the undergraduate level the department offers a four year honors program leading to a BA, a four year honors program leading to a BSc, and a three year general program leading to a BA. Now approved by the Subcommittee on Undergraduate Program Review (SUPR), and ready for implementation in the Fall of 2004 is a four year (non honors) program with both ‘major’ and ‘minor’ modules in psychology. Students are not formally admitted to any of these programs until second year. In addition the department offers combined honors programs with Computer Science, Linguistics, Philosophy, Physiology, and Women’s Studies.

Basis for the Report

This report is based on the self-study document assembled by the Department of Psychology for the external referees, in anticipation of their visit in October, 2002; on the meeting I attended with Dr Alan Weedon (Vice Provost) and two of the three referees—Dr Kenneth Dion (University of Toronto) and Dr Alistair MacLean (Queen’s University)—on October 22, 2003; on the reports written individually and independently by Drs Dion and MacLean, and that of the third referee, Dr Richard C. Tees (the

University of British Columbia); and, finally, on an interview I had with the departing department chair, Dr James (Jim) Olson on Monday, 23 June 2003.

Summary

The reviews of the department's undergraduate programs have been, and continue to be very favourable. The department, while serving a very substantial proportion of the university's undergraduate population overall, nevertheless is able to offer a rich and varied range of courses to its own students. And while the size of its fourth year honors class has ballooned to roughly 130 students (from a more normal size of 90 to 100) in the past two years, the department remains committed to counseling and assessing fourth year honors theses. The referees note that the undergraduate teaching evaluations are consistently strong. The only two issues bearing (rather indirectly, to be sure) on the undergraduate programs that prompted cautionary remarks from the referees was the number of specialty streams nurtured by the department, and the matter of space and facilities.

Recommendations

1. The reviewers noted that few other departments in North America are able to maintain excellence in as many subdisciplinary areas as has been the case at Western. It was suggested that such matters as faculty hiring in the coming years might be better served by a more selective attention to disciplinary strength. In fact, the department has addressed this very issue since the reviewers's visits. The areas of 'Personality' and 'Measurement' have been amalgamated, as have 'Cognition' and 'Sensation and Perception' (now called 'Cognition and Perception'). Other amalgamation strategies are also currently being considered. Program changes will also likely occur to reflect the new restructuring of undergraduate programs across the University.

2. Concern was expressed about phasing out use of the 1200 seat capacity Alumni Hall for one section of Psychology 020, and using a new 800 seat lecture theatre in its place. Such a move will necessitate the creation of additional sections in the course. The department will have to work with the Faculty of Social Sciences and central timetabling (through the Office of Institutional Planning and Budgeting) to ensure that the most effective use of human and physical resources is maintained. The Dean has indicated that he will ensure that appropriate resources are directed toward the first-year offerings.

The Review Process

The three external reviewers are to be congratulated for carrying out their assessments and compiling their reports so responsibly and conscientiously. There is no doubt in my mind that the undergraduate programs in psychology are not only in a good state of health, but that, as well, they have been evaluated with good rigour and attention to detail. I found my meeting with Dr Olson to be extremely informative, and helpful. He, too, is to be congratulated for steering the department well during his term as chair.

PRC reviewer: Richard Semmens, Department of Music History

Department of Microbiology and Immunology

Preamble

The Department of Microbiology and Immunology was predated by the Department of Bacteriology and Immunology. The current department was formed in 1978. It now serves a range of courses to its own and other departments within the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, and to the Faculties of Science, and

Health Science. The Department relies on teaching support for these courses from professors and instructors who are permanently housed within its department, but also from members outside the Department, e.g., the Robarts and Lawson Research Centres, and the London Health Sciences Centre. These personnel may primary, cross-appointed, or hold adjunct status in the department.

The undergraduate students who take courses in Microbiology and Immunology are enrolled in the following programs: 3 year BSc in Biology, 4 year General Bachelor of Medical Sciences, 4 year Bachelor of Medical Sciences in Honors Microbiology and Immunology.

Basis for the Report

This report is based on the Department's internal self-review (July, 2001), an external review by Dr. L. Babiuk from the University of Saskatchewan and Dr. J. Gauldie of McMaster University (submitted June, 2002), and a follow up meeting with Dr. W. F. Flintoff, the Acting Chair of the Department (October 4, 2002).

Summary

The undergraduate students who take courses in Microbiology and Immunology are enrolled in the following programs: 3 year BSc in Biology, 4 year General Bachelor of Medical Sciences, 4 year Bachelor of Medical Sciences in Honors Microbiology and Immunology.

The external reviewers agreed with the departmental internal report in saying that the department has become one of the best of its kind, nationally and internationally. These reviewers had few concerns and the points they raised will be briefly outlined here along with the Acting Chair's response.

There is a strong departmental commitment to its undergraduate program as evidenced by the relatively high student evaluations of their courses. One concern of both the external and internal reviews was the need to maintain this strong commitment after the retirements of people who are dedicated to the undergraduate program. Dr. Flintoff expressed his awareness of this issue and provided reassurance of the Department's commitment to the undergraduate program. Although quality of service has been maintained in the face of a steady reduction of funding, Dr. Flintoff expressed the need for extra resources to be allocated to the department.

An important issue raised in the external report was that of job description of persons working for the department, especially new hirings and those in alternate workload situations. This has been an ongoing issue that has now been addressed and is about to become formalized.

A final concern of the external reviewers was the innate tensions between the emphases of the clinical hospital settings, the research institutes, and the university department. Trying to influence any one of these to maintain programs and personnel in the face of present government funding issues is obviously a difficult task. Although the external reviewers claimed that some programs might be in jeopardy, Dr. Flintoff replied that this was perhaps an overstatement, and the issue was well known even through a previous external review. He stated that the situation did need careful, ongoing monitoring. One solution that is under discussion is the merger of Clinical Microbiology with Infectious Diseases in the Department of Medicine.

The Review Process

In summary, the internal review was meticulously carried out, the external review addressed some of the issues that had been of internal concern, and the follow-up interview with the acting department head revealed an acute understanding of the issues and commitment to the undergraduate program.

PRC reviewer: Robert Sandieson, Faculty of Education

Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering

Preamble

This review was done in conjunction with the accreditation review of the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board in 2000-01.

Basis for the Report

The writer interviewed Dr. S Rohani, Chair of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering on December 5, 2001. In addition, the questionnaire prepared by the Department for the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) and the CEAB report from the visit of Dr. T.D. Vassos and his team from CEAB in November 2000 were reviewed by the writer.

Summary

As of July 2000, the Department consisted of fifteen full-time faculty with the addition of 11 adjunct faculty, most of whom participate in graduate student supervision, student co-supervision and publish papers. At that time there were some 166 full-time undergraduate students and 40 graduate students in the Department. The Department is active in research and has achieved a national and international reputation in areas such as fluidization, reactor engineering and biochemical engineering. In keeping with its ability to attract extensive research grant funds (\$1.6 million in 1999/2000) from publicly-funded granting agencies and industry, there are three research centres in the Department with plans to integrate these into a single Research Institute.

The Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering offers several streams to students in Year 2-4, including Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, Biochemical/Environmental, Chemical Engineering and Management, Biochemical Engineering and Medicine, Chemical Engineering and Law. The Department has an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee which is responsible for continuous monitoring and evaluation of its curriculum. A Student/Faculty retreat was held in 1999-2000. The Department Chair and several faculty members counsel students in all years in which engineering interact with the Department.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, the CEAB report was favourable to the Department as indicated by a six-year accreditation period. Two concerns were raised: a) in regard to the formal title of the undergraduate program; and b) a perception by CEAB that the Department might offer additional accreditation units (AUs) in order "to demonstrate innovation and to achieve the special goals that a particular engineering school may have for an education in engineering". During the writer's meeting with Dr. Rohani, he indicated some changes are being implemented to address these concerns and this information has been communicated to CEAB.

PRC reviewer: Peter Flanagan, Departments of Medicine and Biochemistry

School of Nursing

Preamble

The evolution of nursing education at Western is characterized by historical events and responses to societal and health care issues. It all began following World War I, when, in 1920, the first certificate course in public health nursing, funded by the Canadian League of Red Cross Societies, was inaugurated at Western. In 1947, Western became the first Canadian university to have a Dean of a Faculty of Nursing, Edith McDowell. The first Canadian Master of Science in Nursing program was launched in 1959. University-wide restructuring resulted in a merger of the Faculty of Nursing with the Faculties of Kinesiology and Applied Health Sciences in 1997, when Dr. Carroll Iwasiw was appointed Director. The educative- humanistic-caring baccalaureate nursing program was initiated, and Western's participation in delivery of nursing administration courses overseas began, online with Norway and face-to-face with Russia. Dr. Carole Ann Orchard, formerly director of the School of Nursing at Memorial University, Newfoundland, has been appointed as the new Director, starting in the summer of 2003.

Basis for the Report

This report is based on the Departmental Self-Evaluation, the reviewer's report, plus an interview with the retiring Director, Carole Iwasiw. The review of the School of Nursing was carried out in the Fall of 2002 by:

Denise Alcock, Dean of Health Sciences at the University of Ottawa, retired
Yvonne Brown, Dean of the College of Nursing at Saskatoon,
Deborah Tamlyn, Dean of the Faculty of Nursing, University of Calgary; now at Dalhousie.

Programs offered by the School of Nursing

The School of Nursing offers five programs:

- A. a four-year BscN program that accepts 125 students per year into Year One, rising shortly to 135. All nursing graduates are now required to have a University degree, so that students who begin their programs at Fanshawe College will, after two years, transfer to Western. The first group of 75 students from Fanshawe will enter Western in September 2003.
- B. a Post-RN Bachelor of Science in Nursing
- C. a Master of Science in Nursing
- D. a Primary Health Care Nurse Practitioner Certificate Program
- E. a PhD program that was approved in September 2002. There are currently about 300 people with PhD's in Nursing in Canada, enough for about six for each Nursing program.

Summary

The School has an outstanding undergraduate program that is one of the strongest in Canada. University Nursing Programs used to be ranked, with Western routinely at the top in Ontario. The current data shows that Western's students rank in the 90th percentile on each of the 13 topics of the Provincial Licensing Examination. The School recently received a five-year accreditation from the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing.

The team carried out a thorough and complete review of the School. These reviewers state that the health of the programs is fragile, and that significant support from the Office of the Dean is required if Western's pre-eminent reputation for this historically outstanding program is to be maintained. There is currently not enough Faculty and Staff to support the teaching of 700 undergraduates in a program that involves a great deal of mentoring and practicum experiences. Currently the School has 14 faculty, 9 are doctorally prepared, and 7 have tenure. There are six support staff, reduced from ten a few years ago. Permission has been received to make immediately two new Tenure Track appointments, plus two limited-term positions of up to three years who will be responsible for classroom and clinical teaching, scholarly activity and service in the BScN program. The School has requested permission to make three further appointments in 2004-2005, two in 2005-2006 and one in 2006-2007. These appointments are crucial to the success of the School. One additional staff member is to be appointed soon. The staff are geographically isolated, and find communication difficult.

The quality of the undergraduate program is due to the dedication and commitment of four individuals with Masters Degrees holding five year contracts, who have indicated that this pace cannot be maintained. Professors are "at the point of recoil" from the stress of multiple tasks and responsibilities. The minimum requirement is two professors assigned to each year of the program.

Space is a major concern because of the current lack of suitable classrooms and office space. They have been promised the return of the Dean's Office, and the Let's Talk Science space in 2004. This basement space is windowless.

In summary, this program is a jewel that has become a little tarnished over the last few years. The appointment of a new Dean, a new Director, the availability of several new positions between now and 2007, plus the expansion into new space will help return it to its preeminent position within the Canadian nursing profession.

PRC reviewer: Patrick Whippey, Department of Physics and Astronomy

Honors Business Administration Program

Preamble

The undergraduate program offered by the Richard Ivey School of Business is known as the HBA program (Honors Business Administration). It is a four-year program with the first two years of study being carried out in one of the Faculties of Arts, Science or Social Science and the last two years of study in the Business School. Admission to the program is competitive and is limited (222 students in 2002). There are two paths to the admission to the program: standard admission – after at least two years of broad university studies; and special pre-admission directly from high school for outstanding candidates (a conditional acceptance). The HBA program also has joint HBA/Engineering, HBA/Health Sciences, HBA/Law options and most recently HBA/Medical Science.

Basis of the Report

Ivey's Self Assessment Report to the European Foundation for Management Education (efmd) Quality Improvement Systems (EQUIS), prepared in April 2002, the external reviewer's report, also prepared in April 2002, e-mail exchanges and a meeting with Dr. Rick Robertson, Director of the HBA program, in June 2003. The external reviewers were Joe Shlesinger, Director of Bain & Company and Gary Sundem, Associate Dean for Masters Programs of University of Washington Business School.

Summary of Reviewers' Comments

The external reviewers' report focused mainly on the strategic issues of Ivey School with a relatively small section on the program-specific issues relating to the HBA program. The reviewers were impressed with many aspects of the Ivey School and commented on the success and accomplishments of the School in the last seven years. Of particular relevance to this report are their comments on the increased quality of incoming HBA and MBA students and the increase of Ivey's ranking to the top 20 in the world.

However, the reviewers' raised a question about the structure of the HBA program. Currently, the HBA program is structured similar to the MBA program but the HBA program is more of a regional program and has a different competitive environment than the MBA program. The reviewers also questioned the financial model of the HBA program because the production process of HBA is similar to that of MBA but the HBA tuition is much less. The reviewers suggested improving the financial model either on the revenue or cost side. Finally, the reviewers expressed the concern that the HBA tuition, even at the current level, could turn the program into an elite one that is not affordable by a large number of students.

Response of the Director of HBA Program

The Director accepts that the structure of HBA needs to be changed to reduce its consumption of faculty resources. In the past, when the enrolment of the HBA program was smaller (e.g. 144 students), it was not a significant issue to have the HBA program structured similar to the MBA program. Given the possible future growth of the HBA program, Ivey is examining ways to control the cost HBA program.

The Director shares the reviewers' concern about the affordability and, thereby, the accessibility of the HBA program. Ivey has tried to increase scholarships, awards and loan programs but these have not kept pace with increases in tuition. There is no easy solution to the problem. Ivey is trying to slowly increase the size of scholarship endowments coming from HBA alumni.

Reflections on the Review Process

The review was thorough and detailed. The external reviewers' report was very constructive and helpful.

PRC reviewer: Liwen Vaughan, Faculty of Information and Media Studies

Conclusion: Update on Western's Undergraduate Program Review Process

Western's undergraduate program review process was audited in 1998 by a team appointed by the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee of the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents. In its report, UPRAC was supportive of the processes in place at the time the reviews were conducted and advanced suggestions and recommendations to bring Western's processes into total conformity with UPRAC/OCAV undergraduate program review guidelines. All these comments have been integrated into Western's present guidelines for program review. The UPRAC auditing team will again visit Western to conduct a new series of audits of selected program reviews in the Fall of 2004 as part of the second round of program review audits of Ontario universities.

This report, submitted through SCAPA to the Senate and Board of Governors, addresses the institutional accountability requirements of the UPRAC/OCAV guidelines by documenting the procedures used in undergraduate program review at Western and their thoroughness and rigour.

**Report on the OCGS Appraisal of Graduate Programs at The University of Western Ontario
During the Third Cycle (1996/97 - 2003/04)**

**Prepared by the Faculty of Graduate Studies
Updated October 2003**

Starting in 1967, the publically funded Universities in Ontario agreed, voluntarily, to submit all proposed new graduate programs to a process of appraisal ("Standard Appraisal") financed and administered at arm's length by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS). The Universities agreed to put aside their autonomy, and to offer new graduate programs only where they had been found by OCGS to meet a minimum quality standard. In 1982, this appraisal process was extended to existing graduate programs, meaning the Universities agreed that currently offered graduate programs would be periodically appraised ("Periodic Appraisal") on a seven year cycle, and that the programs would be withdrawn, or measures taken to improve them, if they were found to be below the minimum quality standard.

Periodic and Standard Appraisals are undertaken by an Appraisal Committee consisting of 28 senior faculty with established scholarly reputations and experience in graduate affairs, who are drawn from the 17 publically funded Ontario Universities upon nomination by the Graduate Deans. The Committee is divided into 4 panels of seven members each, and each panel meets once a month in Toronto during the months of September through June. Each panel includes a member from each of the six broad disciplinary groups: Humanities, Social Sciences, Applied Sciences, Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, and Professional Disciplines. The panels evaluate the academic quality of proposed or existing graduate programs and for each program makes a recommendation to OCGS concerning the program's implementation, continuation or modification. The evaluation and recommendation is based upon consideration of a written brief supplied by the program through the Dean of Graduate Studies of the University, the reports of External Consultants sent to the University to review the program, and a written response to the External Consultants' reports provided by the Dean of Graduate Studies on behalf of the University. The External Consultants are established authorities in the discipline of the program under review, possess experience in graduate affairs, normally come from Universities outside of Ontario, and are chosen by the Appraisal Committee from a list provided by the program under review. Prior to 2000-2001, the Appraisal Committee sent External Consultants to approximately 30% of the programs submitted for review, and only did so if the Committee felt the need for advice from experts in the discipline of the program; as a result of a change in policy at OCGS, the Appraisal Committee now appoints External Consultants for all programs under review. In a further reversal of policy, OCGS now asks that where possible External Consultants visit together and write joint reports, rather than visiting and reporting independently as previously.

Recommendations from the Appraisal Committee are placed before OCGS for approval. Meetings of OCGS are held monthly from September through June, and are attended by the 17 Graduate Deans in Ontario. When OCGS votes to accept or reject a recommendation, it does so based upon whether or not the procedures of appraisal have been properly followed, and does not debate the substance of the recommendation; in this way conflict of interest is avoided and the appraisals process is maintained at arm's length from the graduate deans and the Universities. The work of the Appraisal Committee is facilitated by a full-time Executive Director and secretariat housed in the offices of the Council of Ontario Universities in Toronto; policies and guidelines are established by OCGS to define for the Appraisal Committee the criteria it should use to determine if programs meet the minimum quality standard.

The outcome of a Standard Appraisal of a proposed new graduate program is one of the following:

- The program is approved to commence, in which case it can commence the recruitment and admission of students.
- The program is not approved to commence.
- Approval of the program is deferred for up to one year to allow the University to fulfil certain conditions.

Approval by OCGS of the commencement of a new program is required by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities before the Ministry will allow students registered in the program to be included in the University's BIU count.

The outcome of a Periodic Appraisal of an existing program is that the program is placed in one of the following categories:

- Good Quality
- Good Quality with Report
- Conditionally Approved
- Not Approved

A program judged of "Good Quality" is considered to have the following characteristics:

- the faculty complement is appropriate for the level and scope of the program
- core faculty are actively engaged in research in the disciplinary areas of the program
- physical resources are adequate
- enrollments are appropriate for the resources available
- curriculum design is appropriate
- students complete the program and in a timely manner
- students' experience in the program is appropriate for the degree sought

The category of "Good Quality with Report" means that the program is of Good Quality at the time of the review, but that monitoring is required because significant changes are expected in the next seven years. Anticipated retirements are a frequent reason for requiring a report. Reports are usually due two or three years after the date of approval by OCGS of the Appraisal Committee's recommendation and must address issues identified by the Appraisal Committee.

The category of "Conditionally Approved" means that the program is not currently meeting the Good Quality standard, and that specified improvements must be made. Normally a Report is required after two or three years to demonstrate that the improvements have been made and Good Quality achieved.

The category of "Not Approved" means that a program fails to meet the Good Quality standard and that major improvements are required. In such cases admission of students to the program must be suspended, and a Standard Appraisal must occur before the program can be resumed; submission of a Standard Appraisal brief cannot occur before two years following the OCGS decision to accept a recommendation from the Appraisal Committee that a program not be approved.

OCGS is now in the third seven-year cycle of Periodic Appraisal of existing graduate programs, and this third cycle commenced in 1996-97.

In the 1996-1997 cycle the following programs were submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

Anatomy & Cell Biology (MSc, PhD)
Biochemistry (MSc, PhD)
Classical Studies (MA)
Education (Counselling) (MEd)
Educational Studies (MEd)
Medical Biophysics (MSc, PhD)
Microbiology & Immunology (MSc, PhD)
Pathology (MSc, PhD)
Pharmacology & Toxicology (MSc, PhD)
Physiology (MSc, PhD)

The outcomes of these Periodic Appraisals was as follows:

Anatomy & Cell Biology

The program was approved to continue in September 1996 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. In making its recommendation the Committee noted that masters times-to-completion appear to be long and indicated that at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal it will be looking for success in achieving timely completion rates.

Biochemistry

The program was approved to continue in November 1996 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. In making its recommendation, the Committee noted that it expects the faculty complement to be maintained.

Classical Studies

The program was approved to continue in October 1996 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Committee noted that success in maintaining quality in the following areas will be important for the success of the next Periodic Appraisal: productivity of the faculty; admissions standards; financial support of graduate students; the library budget.

Education (Counselling)

The program was approved to continue in March 1997 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Committee noted that the Centres of Specialization and Research Groups, in particular the Counselling Psychology Research Group, have enriched the scholarly life of the program and serve to develop the research and scholarly activities of the graduate students.

Educational Studies

The program was approved to continue in March 1997 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Committee noted that the Centres of Specialization and Research Groups have enriched the scholarly life of the program and serve to develop the research and scholarly activities of the graduate students.

Medical Biophysics

The program was approved to continue in March 1997 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Committee's recommendation was contingent on the closure of the field of Membrane and Cellular Biophysics; the Committee also noted that continuation of the field of Hemodynamics and Cardiovascular Biomechanics would require replacement of anticipated retirements.

Microbiology & Immunology

The program was approved to continue in November 1997 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr B. Elliot, Queen's University; Dr J. Menezes, Hospital Ste Justine, Montreal; Dr S. Rosenberg, University of Alberta) sent to review the program and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The University was required to monitor times-to-completion in the program closely, and the Appraisal Committee will review progress in this area at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal.

Pathology

The program was approved to continue in November 1996 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's

brief. The recommendation of the Appraisal Committee was contingent on the closure of the field in Oral Pathology.

Pharmacology & Toxicology

The program was approved to continue in June 1997 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief.

Physiology

The program was approved to continue in November 1996 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisal Committee indicated that at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal it will be looking for evidence of continued success in maintaining recent improvements in times-to-completion, as well as the implementation of measures to ensure breadth in the students' program of study.

In the 1997-1998 cycle the following programs were submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

Business (PhD, MBA)
Comparative Literature (MA)
French (MA, PhD)
Geology (MSc, PhD)
Geophysics (MSc, PhD)
Kinesiology (MA, MSc, PhD)
Molecular Biology (MSc, PhD)
Spanish (MA)
Theoretical Physics (MSc, PhD)

In addition, the PhD program in Rehabilitation Sciences was submitted for Standard Appraisal and was approved to commence in June 1998

The outcomes of the Periodic Appraisals were as follows:

Business The program was approved to continue in October 1997 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisal Committee indicated that it was impressed by the quality of the program's brief, and the space and resources available to students.

Comparative Literature The program had been approved to commence in June 1994 and was approved to continue with the categorization of **Good Quality** in May 1998 based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of an abbreviated brief. The Appraisal Committee indicated that at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal it will be assessing the cohesion of the program and the effectiveness of its leadership, and will be looking for evidence that the program has achieved maturity sufficient to distinguish itself from other literature programs in the University.

French The program was approved to continue in November 1997 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisal Committee indicated that at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal it will be looking for evidence of successful attention to the issues of times-to-completion and attrition in the program.

Geology The program was approved to continue in March 1999 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of two External Consultants (Dr R.M. Clowes, University of British Columbia; Dr D.S. Chapman, University of Utah; McGill University) sent to

review the program in April and June 1998, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Appraisal Committee noted the number of approaching faculty retirements and expressed the hope that the hiring of replacements would respect the need to ensure suitable expertise in the fields of the graduate program; an assessment of whether the faculty resources are sufficient for the scope of the program will be a focus of the next appraisal. The Committee also noted that efforts are being made to improve times-to-completion in the program, and will be looking for evidence of improvement at the time of the next appraisal.

Geophysics

The program was approved to continue in May 1999 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of two External Consultants (Dr R.M. Clowes, University of British Columbia; Dr D.S. Chapman, University of Utah; McGill University) sent to review the program in April and June 1998, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is due April, 2002, and must address whether the Department's hiring plan to renew faculty in the face of retirements has been implemented; in the absence of such implementation it is expected that the Geophysics program will be closed and integrated as a field into the Geology program. The Report must also provide details of the implementation of a qualifying examination into the program.

Kinesiology

The program was approved to continue in October 1999 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of three External Consultants (Dr C. Alain, University of Montreal; Dr R. Moore, University of Colorado; Dr J. Duda, Purdue University) sent to review the program in September and October 1998, and January 1999, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is due May 2001, and must provide evidence that the program has introduced a sufficient number of graduate courses to meet the needs of the students, and must provide details of the faculty hired in each of the Bioscience and Socio-cultural fields of the program.

Molecular Biology

This collaborative program was approved to continue in April 1998 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief.

Spanish

The program was given **Conditional Approval** to continue in January 1999 with a **Report** due in December 2000. This was based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of two External Consultants (Dr R.A. Young, University of Alberta; Dr J. Perez-Magallon, McGill University) sent to review the program in April 1998, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. Conditional approval to continue was given contingent on the University hiring two additional faculty approved by the Faculty of Graduate Studies to participate in the program, and freezing the enrolment until such hiring had occurred. The requirements of the Report were that it must provide the CVs of the faculty hired and details of how graduate courses have been developed to replace double-numbered courses offered concurrently to graduate and undergraduate students.

Theoretical Physics

This collaborative program was approved to continue in April 1998 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief.

In the 1998-1999 cycle the following programs were submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

Astronomy (MSc, PhD)
Communication Sciences & Disorders (MSc, MCISc)
Engineering Science (MEng, PhD)
Epidemiology & Biostatistics (MSc, PhD, Certificate)
Family Medicine (MCISc)
Neuroscience (MSc, PhD)
Nursing (MScN)
Orthodontics (MID)
Physics (MSc, PhD)

A Report was also submitted on the graduate program in Plant Sciences (MSc, PhD).

In addition, two proposed new programs were submitted for Standard Appraisal. These were the PhD program in Education Studies, which was approved to commence in March 1999, and the Joint PhD program in Educational Studies (to be offered in collaboration with Brock University, Lakehead University and the University of Windsor), which was approved to commence in October 1999.

The outcomes of the Periodic Appraisals and the Report were as follows:

Astronomy The program was approved to continue in June 1999 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Report is due May 2002, and must provide evidence that the University has adhered to the plan for faculty renewal described in the program's brief.

Communication Sciences & Disorders
The program was approved to continue in January 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr Y. Joannette, Institute de gériatrie de Montréal; Dr A. Durieux-Smith, University of Ottawa) sent to review the program in May and June 1999, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is due November 2002, and must provide evidence that: the objectives and curriculum of the MSc and MCISc streams have been differentiated in accordance with the plans articulated in the University's response to the External Consultants; the plans to reduce the need for the preparatory year have been effective; faculty resources for the program have been protected in the face of new programs and increased enrolments in the Faculty of Health Sciences; effective leadership of the program has been achieved; the issue of financial support of students in the MSc stream has been resolved.

Engineering Science The program was approved to continue in January 2001 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr G.A. Dumont, University of British Columbia; Dr J. Jones, Simon Fraser University; Dr A.E. Elwi, University of Alberta) sent to review the program in April, May, and November 1999, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants.

Epidemiology & Biostatistics
The program was approved to continue in March 2001 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr P.N. Corey, University

of Toronto; Dr S. Shapiro, McGill University; Dr R. West, Memorial University) sent to review the program in October 1999, and January and March 2000, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is due in November 2002, and will describe how the program has added to the current strength of the Biostatistics field through increased interaction with Western's graduate program in Statistics.

- Family Medicine The program was approved to continue in September 1999 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Report is due June 2002, and must provide evidence that the program's conversion to a distance delivery format has been achieved successfully, that a plan to ensure infrastructure for the program has been developed and implemented, and that steps have been taken to reverse the decline in the number of female and visa students enrolled in the program.
- Neuroscience The program was approved to continue in April 1999 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The addition of two fields to the program (Pathology and Imaging) was also approved.
- Nursing The program was approved to continue in January 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 1998, a revised brief submitted in October 1999, the reports of two External Consultants (Dr J. Storch, University of Victoria; Dr L. Gottlieb, McGill University) sent to review the program in February and March 1999, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The outcome of the Periodic Appraisal was a proposal by the School of Nursing, approved by the Internal Appraisal Committee of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, and by OCGS, to direct the focus of the program exclusively on the masters level preparation of Nurses for entry into Nursing Doctoral programs; prior to this decision, the program was also designed to provide professional upgrading to Nurses in practice. Accordingly, the emphasis on research has been increased, and the part-time stream of the program has decreased in size.
- Orthodontics The program was approved to continue in December 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr E. Rossouw, University of Toronto; Dr W. Wiltshire, University of Manitoba) sent to review the program in October and November 1999, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. This recommendation will go to OCGS for approval in October 2000. The Appraisal Committee is recommending that enrolment in the program not be increased above present levels unless additional faculty and physical resources are available.
- Physics The program was approved to continue in January 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of the External Consultants (Dr A. Delgarno, Harvard University; Dr W. Plummer, University of Tennessee; Dr G. Rostoker, University of Alberta) sent to review the program in May, June and July 1999, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. A condition of approval was that the program cease to advertise the field of Atomic and Molecular Physics.
- Plant Sciences This program had been approved to continue in November 1996 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of

the program's brief submitted in June 1995, the reports of External Consultants (Dr C. Peterson, University of Waterloo; Dr D.H. Vitt, University of Alberta; Dr A.W. Galston, Yale University) sent to review the program in April and June 1996, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report was due December 1998 and was to provide evidence that faculty renewal consequent on retirements had occurred, that planned program restructuring had occurred, and that concerns raised by graduate students had been addressed. The program was approved to continue in June 1999 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the Report submitted.

In the 1999-2000 cycle the following programs were submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

Computer Science (MSc, PhD)
Environmental Science (MSc, MA, PhD)
History (MA, PhD)
Music (MA, MMus, PhD)
Occupational Therapy (MSc, MCISc)
Physical Therapy (MSc)
Sociology (MA, PhD)
Software Engineering (MSc)
Visual Arts (MA, MFA)

Reports were also submitted on the Graduate Programs in Journalism, Philosophy and Zoology.

The outcomes of the Periodic Appraisals and the Reports were as follows:

- Computer Science The program was approved to continue in October 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 1999, the reports of External Consultants (Dr H. Muller, University of Victoria; Dr J. Fritz, University of New Brunswick; Dr J.G. Rokne, University of Calgary) sent to review the program in February and March 2000, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Appraisal Committee indicated that at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal it will be expecting a report on how the program has acted on issues raised by the External Consultants, which were: retention and attrition of students; the need for more physical resources; overhaul of the comprehensive examination.
- Environmental Science The program was **Approved to Continue** in January 2001, with an addendum **Report** based on the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 1999, along with additional information subsequently requested from the University. The **Report** is due in November 2002 and must address a number of issues. These include: a description of the outcomes of changes underway to the program's courses and administrative structure; clarification of which programs are participating in the collaborative program, and evidence of their support; data on the number of students participating in the program; indication of compliance with collaborative program guidelines being established at OCGS.
- History The program was approved to continue in December 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 1999, the reports of the External Consultants (Dr A. Ray, University of British Columbia; Dr J. Reed, Harvard University; Dr R.A. Rempel, McMaster University) were sent to review the program in April

2000, and the University's response to the reports. The Report is due in October 2003, and must either: provide the CVs of the newly hired faculty, along with a firm plan, including a senior administration commitment of resources, for future appointments; or describe the restructuring of the program to reduce present coverage, so that the program is viable within existing resources. The Appraisal Committee noted the seriousness of the issues of faculty renewal and the need to encourage increased participation of the core faculty in the program, and asked that the Report also: redefine the program's fields, ensuring the viability of core faculty to support them; provide the names of the core faculty associated with each field; indicate the number of PhDs admitted annually to each of the fields; describe changes to the structure of the masters and doctoral programs and the impact of these changes on times-to-completion.

Journalism

This program had been approved to continue in November 1996 and categorized as **Conditionally Approved** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in June 1995, the reports of External Consultants (Dr E.F. Einsiedel, University of Calgary ; Dr T.F. Simon, Michigan State University) sent to review the program in February and March 1996, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. A Report was required by October 1999, but was deferred with permission to April 2000, and was to provide: a faculty staffing and development plan, including an outline of efforts to encourage faculty research and their ability to attract research funding; a description of how the curriculum has been revised to integrate the professional and academic courses in the program, taking into account the changing character of the communication industries. The Appraisal Committee recommended that program be approved to continue and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon a review of the Report submitted in April 2000. This recommendation was approved by OCGS in October 2000. In making its recommendation, the Appraisal Committee signalled that at the time of the next appraisal it wishes the Periodic Appraisal brief to address the following issues: the appropriateness of the high proportion of non-tenure stream faculty delivering the program; the appropriateness of the balance between academic and professional elements of the program; the qualifications of the core faculty.

Music

In October 2000 OCGS approved a recommendation from the Appraisal Committee that the program be approved to continue and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr M. Cyr, University of Guelph; Dr K. Hamel, University of British Columbia; Dr J. Richmond, University of Florida) sent to review the program in April 2000, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is required by October 2003, and must provide information on measures taken to reduce times-to-completion in the program, and on faculty renewal, especially in the Composition area.

Occupational Therapy

The program was approved to continue in January 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisal Committee indicated that at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal it will be looking for a report on the following issues: the impact of the newly introduced Occupational Therapy MCIsc program and the Rehabilitation Sciences PhD program on the MSc program, especially on the faculty supervisory loads; the appropriateness of the faculty complement.

- Philosophy This program had been approved to continue in November 1996 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in June 1995. The Report was due August 1999 and was to provide evidence that measures to improve times-to-completion in the program had been successful. The program was approved to continue in January 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the Report submitted.
- Physical Therapy The program was approved to continue in January 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisal Committee indicated that at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal it will be looking for a report on the following issues: the impact of the newly introduced Rehabilitation Sciences PhD program and the possible move to the graduate level of the current undergraduate professional BSc program in Physical Therapy, on the MSc program, especially on the faculty supervisory loads; the appropriateness of the faculty complement.
- Sociology In October 2000, OCGS approved a recommendation from the Appraisal Committee that the program be approved to continue and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr E. Gee, Simon Fraser University; Dr V. Piché, Université de Montréal; Dr V.F. Sacco, Queen's University) sent to review the program in March and April 2000, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is required by October 2003, and must provide information on faculty renewal, given retirements expected over the next three years.
- Software Engineering This is offered as a joint collaborative masters program by graduate programs at Universities which are members of the Consortium for Graduate Education in Software Engineering (CONGESE). Members of the consortium are: Carlton University, the University of Ottawa, Queen's University, the University of Toronto, the University of Waterloo, The University of Western Ontario and York University. The program was approved to continue in November 2001 following successful Periodic Appraisal of the parent Computer Science programs at each of the participating universities.
- Visual Arts The program was approved to continue in March 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisal Committee signalled that at the time of the next appraisal it wishes the Periodic Appraisal brief to address the issue of the appropriateness of the faculty complement.
- Zoology This program had been approved to continue in June 1996 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in June 1995. The Report was due February 1999 and was to demonstrate how the field of Animal Physiology and Biochemistry was to be supported given the faculty retirements scheduled to occur in these areas. The program was approved to continue in June 1999 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the Report submitted.

In the 2000-2001 cycle the following programs were submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

Geography (MA, MSc, PhD)
Political Science (MA, PhD)

Public Administration (MPA)

In addition, four new programs and a new program field were submitted for Standard Appraisal and a request was submitted to change the name of the MA in Visual Arts to the MA in Art History. This name change was approved by OCGS in March 2001. The new programs and field were:

- a Joint program in Design and Manufacturing leading to the degree of MEng, to be offered jointly with McMaster University, the University of Toronto, and the University of Waterloo. The program was approved to commence in July 2000;
- a new professional masters program in Physical Therapy leading to the degree of Masters of Physical Therapy (MPT); The program was approved to commence in May 2001;
- a new interdisciplinary program in Biomedical Engineering offered through collaboration of the Faculties of Engineering Science, Medicine & Dentistry, and Health Sciences leading to the degrees of MEng and PhD; The program was approved to commence in June 2001;
- a new field in Leadership in the Masters of Education in Educational Studies; The program was approved to commence in February 2001;
- a PhD in **Nursing. This program was approved to commence in June 2002.**

In addition, in the 2000-2001 cycle Reports were submitted for the following programs:

Kinesiology (MA, MSc, PhD)
Spanish (MA)

The outcomes of the Periodic Appraisals and the Reports were as follows:

Geography	In June 2001 OCGS approved a recommendation from the Appraisal Committee that the program be approved to continue and categorized as Good Quality with Report based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr D. Barber, University of Manitoba; Dr N. Roulet, McGill University; Dr B. Warf, Florida State University) sent to review the program in February and April 2001, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is required by May 2004, and must provide information on faculty hiring that has occurred as well as plans for future faculty hiring, particularly as it impacts on the field of Human Geography. The Report must also describe curriculum restructuring that has occurred, especially at the masters level where a need was identified to provide students with an opportunity for in-class intellectual interaction with a critical mass of other students.
Kinesiology	This Report was submitted in May 2001; following its review the Appraisal Committee of OCGS recommended that the program be approved to continue and categorized as Good Quality . This recommendation was accepted by OCGS in November 2001.
Political Science	In September 2001 the Appraisal Committee recommended that the program be approved to continue and categorized as Good Quality based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 2000, the reports of External Consultants (Dr C. Andrew, University of Ottawa; Dr J. Jennings, University of Birmingham, U.K.; Dr Wolinetz, Memorial University) sent to review the program in May and June 2001, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Appraisal Committee indicated that at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal it will be expecting a report on 1) the viability of the local government field, and faculty renewal in this area; 2) the effect on the program of a proposed expansion of the PhD enrolment; 3) the effect of measures to increase the research culture in the program. The

Appraisal Committee's recommendation was accepted by OCGS in September 2001.

Public Administration In June 2002 the Appraisal Committee recommended that the program be approved to continue and that it be classified as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in June 2001, the joint report of External Consultants (Dr Ian Macdonald, York University, and Dr. Paul Thomas, University of Manitoba) sent to review the program in December 2001, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The field "Local Government" was approved. The Report is required by September 2004 and must provide information on the outcome of the curriculum review, and the program consensus on the nature and content of the curriculum, keeping in mind the provision of the OCGS By-Laws and Procedures Governing Appraisals (section 10.4.4) that "the number of undergraduate courses or combined courses in which undergraduate students predominate should be less than one third of the total course requirement for the degree". The Report must also describe plans to ensure that sufficient faculty resources are in place for viable delivery of the program.

The Appraisal Committee's recommendation was accepted by OCGS Council in July 2001.

Spanish The Report was submitted in November 2000; following its review, the Appraisal Committee recommended that the program be categorized as **Good Quality** and that the issues of faculty resources and course offerings be re-examined at the time of the next Periodic Appraisal. This recommendation was accepted by OCGS in January 2001.

In the 2001-2002 cycle the following programs were submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

Anthropology (MA)
Applied Mathematics (MSc, PhD)
Chemistry (MSc, PhD)
Economics (MA, PhD)
Journalism (MA)
Library & Information Science (MLIS, PhD)
Mathematics (MA, PhD)
Statistics (MSc, PhD)

In addition, two new collaborative programs, two new PhD programs and one new MA/PhD program were submitted for Standard Appraisal, and a letter of intent was submitted for a new section of the Executive MBA program to be offered in downtown Toronto. OCGS has also been asked to approve a change in the name of the MEd in Counselling so that it can be known as the MEd in Counselling Psychology. The new programs were:

- a new Collaborative program in Scientific Computing to be offered at the MSc and PhD levels through collaboration of the existing programs in Applied Mathematics, Astronomy, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Geophysics, Geography, Physics, Physiology, and Statistics. This was approved to commence by OCGS in September 2001;
- a new Collaborative program in Biostatistics to be offered by the existing programs in Statistics and Epidemiology & Biostatistics, and leading to the MSc and PhD degrees. This was approved to commence by OCGS in October 2001;
- a new PhD program in Comparative Literature. This was approved to commence by OCGS in June 2002.

- a new PhD program in Theory & Criticism. This was approved to commence by OCGS in October 2002.
- a new MA and PhD program in Media Studies. This was approved to commence by OCGS in June 2002.

In addition, in the 2001-2002 cycle Reports were submitted for the following programs:

Astronomy (MSc, PhD) in May 2002
Family Medicine (MCIsc) in June 2002
Geophysics (MSc, PhD) in April 2002

The status of the Periodic Appraisals and Reports is as follows:

Anthropology	The program was approved to continue in July 2002 and categorized as Good Quality based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Harvey Feit, McMaster University, Dr. Jonathan Driver, Simon Fraser University) sent to review the program in April 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants.
Applied Mathematics	The Periodic Appraisal is still in progress. The OCGS Appraisal Committee is reviewing the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. John C. Clements, Dalhousie University and Dr. Mark D. Whitmore, Memorial University of Newfoundland) sent to review the program in February 2003, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The OCGS Council will meet on Nov 17, 2003 to review the program.
Astronomy	The program had been approved to continue in July 1999 and was categorized Good Quality with Report based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 1998. The Report was due May 15, 2002 and was to provide information on faculty recruitment according to the staffing plan included in the university brief. The program was approved to continue in June 2002 and categorized as Good Quality based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the Report submitted. In the next Periodic Appraisal, the Committee will carefully review the numbers of faculty and students in the program.
Chemistry	The program was approved to continue in October 2002 and categorized as Good Quality based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Stan Brown, Queen's University, Dr. Russell Boyd, Dalhousie University and Dr. Brian James) sent to review the program in March 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants.
Economics	This program was approved to continue in January 2003 and categorized as Good Quality based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Charles Beach, Queen's University and Dr. Mark Bills, University of Rochester) sent to review the program in July 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. Among the issues to be addressed in the next Periodic Appraisal will be: stabilization of the core faculty complement, the effect of recent and current changes to the program's curriculum and requirements, and the effectiveness of measures to reduce doctoral withdrawal rates.
Family Medicine	This program had been approved to continue in September 1999 and was categorized Good Quality with Report based upon the Appraisal Committee's

review of the program's brief submitted in July 1998. The Report was due June 15, 2002, and was to provide information on computer facilities, the number of students enrolled by year and the number of applicants to the program with analysis of gender and citizenship, data on the number of students selecting each stream (thesis vs project) and their time to program completion, and to provide assurance that students enrolled in the degree program and Special Students receive the attention required. The program was approved to continue in September 2002 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the Report submitted.

Geophysics

This program had been approved to continue in May 1999 and was categorized **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 1997, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. David S. Chapman, University of Utah; Dr. Ron M. Clowes, The University of British Columbia) sent to review the program in the Fall of 1998, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report was due April 2002 and was to address the status of the implementation of the department's faculty hiring plan as it impacts on the Geophysics graduate program and the implementation of a qualifying examination. The program was approved to continue in May 2002 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the Report submitted.

Journalism

Submission of the Periodic Appraisal brief for Journalism was postponed to March 2002 from July 2001 due to structural revisions in the program and insufficient resources to prepare briefs for both Journalism and Library Science. The program was approved in November 2002 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in February 2002, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Enn Raudsepp, Concordia University, and Dr. Patrick Washburn, Ohio University) sent to review the program in July 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. In the next Periodic Appraisal the Committee will give particular attention to whether there is an academic and research component appropriate to an MA program. The Committee will also give attention to clarification of the graduate learning environment in graduate studies in the program, and the frequency and extent of the use of doctoral students as teaching assistants in graduate courses in the program.

Library & Information Science

The program was approved to continue in March 2003 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of the External Consultants (Dr. Alvin Schrader, University of Alberta, and Dr. Barbara Moran, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) who reviewed the program in October 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The issues to be addressed in the next Periodic Appraisal will be: times-to-completion; results of recruitment efforts to achieve the target intake; diversification of the location of PhD study of faculty; whether PhD students teaching Master's courses have the independent and recognized expertise and teaching experience such that they might have been hired as sessional or part time instructors in the subject even if they were not doctoral students, rather than being given this graduate teaching assignment as a means of financial support; brief information on the specific Master's courses taught over the intervening seven years by doctoral students, and the qualifications of those doctoral students for these graduate teaching assignments.

- Mathematics In October 2002, the Appraisal Committee recommended to OCGS Council that the program be approved to continue and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Victor Nistor, Pennsylvania State University, and Dr. Donald Passman, University of Wisconsin) sent to review the program in June 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. This recommendation was approved by OCGS Council in October 2002.
- Statistics In October 2002, the OCGS Council approved the Appraisal Committee's recommendation that the program be approved to continue and categorized as **Good Quality with Report**, based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in June 2001, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Murray Burke, University of Calgary and Dr. Jean Vaillancourt, University of Ottawa) sent to review the program in March 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is required by July 2005 and must provide information on faculty renewal in the Actuarial Science field (CVs or any new faculty hired since the submission of the Periodic Appraisal brief). The Report must also describe modifications to the structure and requirements of the graduate curriculum so as to comply with section 10.4.4 of the OCGS By-Laws and Procedures Governing Appraisals (i.e. provide data on graduate and undergraduate enrolments in courses in 2001-02, 2003-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05, indicating which courses are in the Actuarial Science field). The following fields have been identified and approved by the Appraisal Committee: Statistical Theory and Methods; Actuarial Science.

In the 2002-2003 cycle the following programs were submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

English (MA, PhD)
Philosophy (MA, PhD)
Psychology (MA, PhD)
Theory & Criticism (MA)

In addition, three new programs were submitted for Standard Appraisal and there were requests submitted to change the name of the MA in Mathematics to MSc and the MA in Psychology to MSc. In addition, there was an introduction of parallel MSc and MCISc streams in Occupational Therapy and there were revisions to the Master of Music in Education and also, the introduction of a part-time stream. The new programs were:

- a new PhD program in Anthropology. This program has been approved by OCGS Council in June 2002.
- a new MSW program in Social Work. This program has been approved by OCGS Council in October 2002.

In the 2002-2003 cycle, Reports were submitted for the following programs:

Communication Sciences and Disorders (MSc, MCISc) in November 2002
Environmental Science (MA, MSc, PhD) in November 2002
Epidemiology (MSc, PhD, Cert) in November 2002

Communication Sciences and Disorders

This program had been approved to continue in January 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr Y. Joannette, Institute de g riatrie de Montr al; Dr A. Durieux-Smith, University of Ottawa) sent to review the program in May and June 1999, and the University's response to the reports

of the External Consultants. The Report was due November 2002, and was to provide evidence that: the objectives and curriculum of the MSc and MCIsc streams have been differentiated in accordance with the plans articulated in the University's response to the External Consultants; the plans to reduce the need for the preparatory year have been effective; faculty resources for the program have been protected in the face of new programs and increased enrolments in the Faculty of Health Sciences; effective leadership of the program has been achieved; the issue of financial support of students in the MSc stream has been resolved.

The program was approved to continue in March 2003 and categorized as **Good Quality** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the Report submitted November 2002.

English

The Periodic Appraisal is still in progress. In September 2003, the OCGS Appraisal Committee recommended to OCGS Council that the program be approved to continue and categorized as **Good Quality**, based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in June 2002, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Marjorie Stone, Dalhousie University and Dr. Jo-Ann Wallace, The University of Alberta) sent to review the program in March 2003, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. Among the issues to be addressed in the next Periodic Appraisal will be: the doctoral qualifying examinations, the relationship between guaranteed funding for doctoral students and average times-to-completion, Master's and Doctoral completion rates and equity issues among faculty, including gender and cultural diversity. The Appraisal Committee's recommendation will likely go to OCGS Council in November.

Environmental Science

The Periodic Appraisal is still in progress. In January 2001 OCGS approved a recommendation from the OCGS Appraisal Committee that the program be approved to continue and categorized as **Approved to Continue** with an addendum **Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 1999, along with additional information subsequently requested from the University. The Report was required by November 2002 and was to address a number of issues which include: a description of the outcomes of changes underway to the program's courses and administrative structure; a clarification of which programs are participating in the collaborative program and indication of compliance with collaborative program guidelines being established at OCGS. The Report was submitted December 2002 and in February 2003, the OCGS Appraisal Committee recommended that the program be **Approved to Continue**. In June 2003 the list of participating programs was finalized. A decision from OCGS Council is anticipated in November 2003.

Epidemiology

This program had been approved to continue in March 2001 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. P.N. Corey, University of Toronto; Dr. S. Shapiro, McGill University; Dr. R. West, Memorial University) sent to review the program in October 1999 and January and March 2000, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report was due November 2002 and was to provide information on the need to enhance the educational opportunities in the Biostatistics component of the program and on whether a collaborative program in Biostatistics had been introduced and what benefits are provided thereby to students.

Following submission of the Report January 2003, the program was approved to continue by OCGS Council in June 2003 and categorized as **Good Quality**.

Philosophy The program was approved to continue in September 2003 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Margaret Atherton, University of Wisconsin, Dr. David Copp, Bowling Green State University and Dr. Susan Haack, The University of Miami) sent to review the program in February and March, 2003, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is due October 2006 and should provide information on: faculty renewal and the replacement of upcoming retirements; demonstration of compliance with the provision of the OCGS By-Laws and Procedures Governing Appraisals (section 10.4.4) that "the number of undergraduate courses or combined courses in which undergraduate students predominate should be less than one third of the total course requirement for the degree"; the effectiveness of measures to reduce times-to-completion and withdrawal rates; response to the student concerns raised by the consultants. Among the issues to be addressed in the next Periodic Appraisal will be gender balance and divisions within the faculty.

Psychology The Periodic Appraisal is still in progress. In February 2003, the OCGS Appraisal Committee reviewed the brief and decided to proceed to a full appraisal with two consultants, who were to review the program in May 2003. In April 2003, it became apparent that one of the consultants was not eligible to participate in the review because of a previous affiliation with the University. The May visit was subsequently cancelled and OCGS is now attempting to replace the ineligible consultant so that the Appraisal can continue.

Theory & Criticism Theory and Criticism (M.A.)
In September 2002, the Appraisal Committee recommended that the program be approved to continue and categorized as **Good Quality with Report**, based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in June 2002, the joint report of External Consultants (Dr. Rebecca Comay, University of Toronto, Dr. Evelyn Cobley, University of Victoria, and Dr. Hillis Miller, University of California, Irvine) sent to review the program in May 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report is required by September 2005 and must provide information on updated data in table 5.1.1 from the brief, providing new enrolments, withdrawals and graduations in the Master's Program by year of admission, including the data in the brief, and extending the table to cover the entering cohorts of 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004. The Report must also describe the effectiveness of measures undertaken to improve the attrition rate. The Appraisal Committee's recommendation was accepted by OCGS Council in October 2002.

In the 2003-2004 cycle the following programs were submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

Anatomy and Cell Biology (MSc,PhD)
Biochemistry (MSc,PhD)
Biomedical Engineering (MEd,PhD)
Classical Studies (MA)
Education (MEd, PhD, Joint PhD)
Medical Biophysics (MSc,PhD)
Microbiology and Immunology (MSc,PhD)
Pathology (MSc,PhD)
Pharmacology and Toxicology (MSc,PhD)

Physiology (MSc,PhD)
Plant Sciences (MSc,PhD)
Zoology (MSc,PhD)

One proposal was submitted for Standard Appraisal:

- a new Master of Laws (LLM), the first graduate program to be housed in the Faculty of Law

In addition, a Hong Kong satellite of the domestic Ivey MBA program was approved by OCGS, and there was an addition of a course-based stream to the Master of Arts degree program in Music Theory.

In the 2003-2004 cycle, Reports were submitted for the following programs:

History (MA, PhD) in October 2003
Music (MA, MMus, PhD) in October 2003

All Periodic Appraisals are still in progress.

Anatomy and Cell Biology
In progress

Biochemistry In progress

Biomedical Engineering
In progress (An Abbreviated brief was submitted in June 2003, since the program's Standard brief was approved by OCGS Council in June 2001.)

Classical Studies In progress

Education In progress

History The Periodic Appraisal is still in progress. The program had been approved to continue in December 2000 and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief submitted in July 1999, the reports of the External Consultants (Dr A. Ray, University of British Columbia; Dr J. Reed, Harvard University; Dr R.A. Rempel, McMaster University) were sent to review the program in April 2000, and the University's response to the reports. The Report was due in October 2003, and was required to either: provide the CVs of the newly hired faculty, along with a firm plan, including a senior administration commitment of resources, for future appointments; or describe the restructuring of the program to reduce present coverage, so that the program is viable within existing resources. The Appraisal Committee noted the seriousness of the issues of faculty renewal and the need to encourage increased participation of the core faculty in the program, and asked that the Report also: redefine the program's fields, ensuring the viability of core faculty to support them; provide the names of the core faculty associated with each field; indicate the number of PhDs admitted annually to each of the fields; describe changes to the structure of the masters and doctoral programs and the impact of these changes on times-to-completion. The Report was submitted October 2003. The University is waiting for the recommendation of the Appraisal Committee.

Medical Biophysics In progress

Microbiology and Immunology
In progress

Music In October 2000 OCGS had approved a recommendation from the Appraisal Committee that the program be approved to continue and categorized as **Good Quality with Report** based upon the Appraisal Committee's review of the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr M. Cyr, University of Guelph; Dr K. Hamel, University of British Columbia; Dr J. Richmond, University of Florida) sent to review the program in April 2000, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants. The Report was required by October 2003, and was to provide information on measures taken to reduce times-to-completion in the program, and on faculty renewal, especially in the Composition area. The Report was submitted October 2003. The University is waiting for the recommendation of the Appraisal Committee.

Pathology In progress

Pharmacology and Toxicology
In progress

Physiology In progress

Plant Sciences In progress

Zoology In progress

In the 2004-2005 cycle, the following programs will be submitted for Periodic Appraisal:

Business (MBA, EMBA, PhD)
Comparative Literature (MA, PhD)
French (MA, PhD)
Geology (MSc, PhD)
Geophysics (MSc, PhD)
Kinesiology (MA, MSc, PhD)
Spanish (MA)

At the time of the last review of these programs, the Appraisal Committee made the following recommendations and specific comments:

Business **Good Quality**
The Appraisal Committee indicated that it was impressed by the quality of the program's brief and the space and resources available to students.

Comparative Literature **Good Quality** (MA program)
At the time of the next Appraisal, the Committee will be assessing the cohesion of the program and the effectiveness of its leadership, and will be looking for evidence that the program has achieved maturity sufficient to distinguish itself from other literature programs in the University.
The PhD program was approved in June 2002.

French **Good Quality**
The Appraisal Committee will be looking for evidence of successful attention to the issues of times-to-completion and attrition in the program.

Geology

Good Quality

The Appraisal Committee noted the number of approaching faculty retirements and expressed the hope that the hiring of replacements would respect the need to ensure suitable expertise in the fields of the graduate program; an assessment of whether the faculty resources are sufficient for the scope of the program will be a focus of the next Appraisal. The Committee also noted that efforts are being made to improve times-to-completion and will be looking for evidence of improvement at the time of the next Appraisal.

Geophysics

Good Quality with Report, followed by **Good Quality** after review of the Report

Kinesiology

Good Quality with Report, followed by **Good Quality** after review of the Report

Spanish

Conditional Approval with Report, followed by **Good Quality** after review of the Report