

ITEMS REFERRED BY SENATE

**Faculty Appointment and Promotion Procedures: Scientists
Employed by Institutions Affiliated with The University of Western
Ontario**

Annual Report on the Status of Reviews of Graduate Programs

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

Report of the Academic Colleague

Announcements and Communications

FOR APPROVAL

1. **Faculty Appointment and Promotion Procedures: Scientists Employed by Institutions Affiliated with
The University of Western Ontario**

Recommended: That the Board of Governors approve the *Faculty Appointment and Promotion Procedures: Scientists Employed by Institutions Affiliated with The University of Western Ontario* (Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry) document (**Annex 1**) effective July 1, 2002, replacing (a) *Appointment and Promotion Procedures: Faculty Employed by Robarts Research Institute Affiliated with The University of Western Ontario* and (b) *Conditions of Appointment: Clinical Departments and Clinical Appointees in Basic Science Departments (1988)*.

Background:

Since 1988, the University has had formal procedures under the *Appointment and Promotion Procedures: Faculty Employed by Robarts Research Institute Affiliated with The University of Western Ontario* document for scientists located at the Robarts Research Institute to be appointed to the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry. Some of these scientists are employed by the University on a full-time basis and a few hold tenure with the University and are Full-Time Members of the Bargaining Unit. Others hold non-salaried appointments on a non-full-time basis. Some of these appointees (salaried and non-salaried) hold Sequential Term appointments with the University. In order to have an appointment with Sequential Term, a detailed review of the candidate's performance was required involving assessments by the Department and Faculty Committees, as well as the Senate Committees on Promotion and Tenure structured under the *Conditions of Appointment* document. With the introduction of the Collective Agreement between The University of Western Ontario and the University of Western Ontario Faculty Association, the Senate Committees on Promotion and Tenure are not required and have been disbanded. Therefore, it is necessary to develop an appointment and promotion process to bring the Robarts appointments process in line with structures under the Collective Agreement.

Also, since 1988, a number of basic scientists in the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry have held appointments in clinical divisions or clinical departments within the Faculty under the terms of *Conditions of Appointment: Clinical Departments and Clinical Appointees in Basic Science Departments*. A few of these basic scientists are employed full-time by the University, are Members of the Bargaining Unit, and covered by the provisions of the collective agreement. Many others are not full-time employees at the University and are not eligible for membership in the Bargaining Unit. In the past, the promotion procedures for these basic scientists required review by the various Promotion and Tenure Committees, including the Senate Committees on Promotion and Tenure. It is necessary to have an appointments and promotion process for this important group of members of academic staff at the University.

The Faculty Appointment and *Promotion Procedures: Scientists Employed by Institutions Affiliated with The University of Western Ontario* (Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry) document has been developed to provide an updated procedure for the appointment and promotion of scientists employed not only by the Robarts Research Institute, but also by the affiliated hospitals and other similar institutions. It is important to recognize the valuable contributions to the University made by these scientists. In exchange, these appointments will ensure they maintain their status with the University and, where appropriate, provide a mechanism for them to continue with their supervisory duties involving graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.

FOR INFORMATION

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

See [Annex 2](#).

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

See [Annex 3](#).

3. **Report of the Academic Colleague on the 262nd Meeting of the Council of Ontario Universities**

See [Annex 4](#).

4. **Announcements & Communications**

Academic Administrative Appointments

Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry

M.J.P. Potter, Chair, Department of History of Medicine, July 1, 2002 - June 30, 2007

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
London Canada



**FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES:
SCIENTISTS EMPLOYED BY INSTITUTIONS
AFFILIATED WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
(Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry)**

Approved by the Faculty: September 18, 2002

Approved by Senate: October 18, 2002

Approved by the Board of Governors: _____

**FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES:
SCIENTISTS EMPLOYED BY INSTITUTIONS
AFFILIATED WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
(Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry)**

PREAMBLE

These *Faculty Appointment and Promotion Procedures: Scientists Employed by Institutions Affiliated with The University of Western Ontario* (hereinafter *Appointment and Promotion Procedures*) set forth the academic ranks, terms and procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, granting and renewal of Sequential-Term Appointments, and termination affecting Scientists in clinical and basic departments in the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry.

The University of Western Ontario recognizes that a faculty member is free to criticize the University and to take controversial stands on public issues. The faculty member, however, should not purport to speak for or on behalf of the University, unless specifically authorized to do so, nor will he or she use his or her appointment or rank at the University in the furtherance of any position taken by such an appointee. Such freedom does not confer legal immunity or legal defense in respect of positions taken.

Faculty members appointed under these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures* are required to comply with the policies, rules and regulations of the University and to declare any real or potential conflict of interest.

Any intellectual property arrangements be covered by any tripartite agreement or in the absence thereof, the provisions of the Collective Agreement.

The policies and procedures below shall apply to those individuals defined herein as Scientists who:

- (1) are full-time employees of an institution or similar organization affiliated with the University and who normally hold an earned doctorate or equivalent qualification;
- (2) are not full-time employees of the University;
- (3) are paid directly by the affiliated institution;
- (4) ordinarily receive no remuneration from The University of Western Ontario although in exceptional cases may receive a small stipend;
- (5) may hold a cross-appointment in the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry or a casual appointment elsewhere within The University of Western Ontario; and
- (6) are not eligible for Membership in the Bargaining Unit of The University of Western Ontario

The appointment to the University under these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures* shall be in accordance with the terms of any tripartite agreements or any other duly-approved successor affiliation agreement in existence between a hospital, an institute, a regional centre, or any similar affiliated organization and the University.

Definitions

- (1) The "University" means The University of Western Ontario as established in the *University of Western Ontario Act* ("the Act").
- (2) The terms "academic staff," "Faculty," "Provost," "Dean," "Department," and related terms shall be interpreted in accordance with the Act and policies approved by the Senate and the Board of Governors.
- (3) "Institutions" includes any Hospital or similar organization (e.g., Robarts Research Institute, London Regional Cancer Centre Research Laboratories, London Health Sciences Centre Research Inc., Lawson Research Institute) that is affiliated with The University of Western Ontario where the affiliation has been duly approved by the Board of Governors.
- (4) "Scientist" means any full-time employee of the affiliated institution with an earned doctorate or equivalent qualification appointed pursuant to these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures*.

- (5) "Appointment" means appointment, subject to the approval of the University, to a basic or clinical department of the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry at The University of Western Ontario and ordinarily does not entail any remuneration from the University.
- (6) "Reappointment" means the renewal of an Affiliated Limited-Duties, Affiliated Limited-Term or Sequential-Term Appointment in accordance with the provisions set out below. A reappointment in accordance with these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures* does not ordinarily entail any remuneration from the University.
- (7) "Promotion" means a change in rank from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or a change in rank from Associate Professor to Professor. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor may not occur without the granting of a Sequential-Term Appointment.
- (8) An "Affiliated Limited-Duties" Appointment involves a minimal contribution to the University and is for a specified period, not to exceed five years, and is renewable. Tenure does not apply to such appointments. An Affiliated Limited-Duties Appointment may not extend past the effective date of retirement.
- (9) An "Affiliated Limited-Term" Appointment is for a specified period, not to exceed three years, and is renewable. Reappointment is neither promised nor guaranteed. Tenure does not apply to such appointments. An Affiliated Limited-Term Appointment may not extend past the effective date of retirement. It is expected, although not required, that an Affiliated Limited-Term appointment would lead to a Sequential-Term Appointment within seven to ten years of the initial Affiliated Limited-Term appointment.
- (10) A "Sequential-Term" Appointment is for a specified period, not to exceed five years, and is renewable. Tenure does not apply to such appointments. A Sequential-Term Appointment may not extend past the effective date of retirement.
- (11) A "Cross" Appointment is an appointment made to another academic unit pursuant to the policies and procedures established by the University.
- (12) A "Casual" Appointment is an appointment made to an academic unit pursuant to the policies and procedures as outlined in the *Procedures for Casual Academic Appointments of Faculty at The University of Western Ontario*.
- (13) "Letter of Appointment or Reappointment" means the letter to the prospective appointee signed by the Dean of the Faculty. This document specifies the academic contract type (Affiliated Limited-Duties, Affiliated Limited-Term, Sequential-Term), the starting and end date of the appointment, the academic rank, the academic responsibilities of the appointee, and the provisions for an annual performance evaluation to be conducted by December 1 of each academic year for those appointed on an academic-year basis or by July 1 of each calendar year for those appointed on a calendar-year basis.
- (14) "Rank" means the academic rank of Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor and is subject to the approval of the University.
- (15) "Conditions of Appointment: Physicians" means the *Conditions of Appointment: Physicians Appointed in Clinical Departments and Clinical Divisions of Basic Science Departments (1999)* as amended from time to time.
- (16) "Bargaining Unit" means all persons employed as members of the academic staff at The University of Western Ontario and represented by The University of Western Ontario Faculty Association, as defined by the Certificate of the Ontario Labour Relations Board, 4482-97-R dated May 26, 1998 as amended from time to time.
- (17) "Collective Agreement" means the legal document covering terms and conditions of employment between the University of Western Ontario Faculty Association and The University of Western Ontario, as ratified by the Board of Governors on June 28, 2000 and as amended from time to time.

A - APPOINTMENTS

Appointments and Reappointments

- (1) Appointments and reappointments shall have a contract type of:
 - Affiliated Limited-Duties (i.e., up to five years in duration)
 - Affiliated Limited-Term (i.e., up to three years in duration)
 - Sequential-Term (i.e., up to five years in duration)
- (2) Academic ranks shall be:
 - Lecturer
 - Adjunct Professor
 - Assistant Professor
 - Associate Professor
 - Professor
- (3) Affiliated Limited-Duties Appointments shall be made at the rank of Adjunct Professor.
- (4) Affiliated Limited-Term Appointments shall be made at the rank of Lecturer or Assistant Professor
- (5) Sequential-Term Appointments shall be made at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in accordance with the appointments procedures below.
- (6) An Affiliated Limited-Duties, Affiliated Limited-Term or Sequential-Term Appointment may be renewed at the discretion of the University but in no case will a renewal be considered unless the Scientist continues his or her full-time appointment at the affiliated institution and has satisfactorily performed his or her academic responsibilities at the University.
- (7) Failure to reappoint to any position does not constitute dismissal. Reappointment is neither promised nor guaranteed.
- (8) An Affiliated Limited-Term reappointment may include a change of rank from Lecturer to Assistant Professor.
- (9) All appointments and reappointments are conditional upon the continuance of full-time employment at the affiliated institution and satisfactory performance at the University [see Section D, Resignation and Early Termination].
- (10) The appropriate rank for an Affiliated Limited-Term or Sequential-Term Appointment shall be determined at the time of initial appointment and shall take into account the appointee's qualifications, experience, and achievements.
- (11) An Affiliated Limited-Duties, Affiliated Limited-Term or a Sequential-Term Appointment at any academic rank under the provisions of these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures* does not carry tenure.

Appointment Procedures

- (1) Basic Departments: In the case of each Affiliated Limited-Duties and Affiliated Limited-Term Appointment or Reappointment and each initial appointment with Sequential-Term status made under these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures*, the Appointments Committees in basic departments, as structured under the Collective Agreement, shall recommend the appointment to the Dean. The structure of the Appointments Committee may be amended in these cases only to include one additional faculty member within the Department or Faculty holding an appointment under these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures*. In the case of an initial appointment with Sequential-Term status, the Dean shall place the curriculum vitae of the recommended candidate, together with any other supporting documentation, before the appropriate Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Recommendations shall be forwarded to the Provost in accordance with the procedures for

recommending appointments under the Collective Agreement. No other part of the Collective Agreement shall apply unless specifically set out herein.

- (2) Clinical Departments: In the case of each Affiliated Limited-Duties and Affiliated Limited-Term Appointment or Reappointment and each initial appointment with Sequential-Term status made under these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures*, the Appointments and Promotion Committees in clinical departments, as structured in *Conditions of Appointment: Physicians*, shall recommend the appointment to the Dean. In the case of an initial appointment with Sequential-Term status, the granting of the Sequential-Term Appointment will be considered by the Faculty Appointments and Promotions Committee as constituted under the *Conditions of Appointment: Physicians*. Recommendations shall be forwarded to the Provost in accordance with the procedures for recommending appointments under the *Conditions of Appointment: Physicians*. Each appointee to a clinical department will hold a cross appointment to a basic department within the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry which will carry the responsibility for administering the process for promotion and/or granting of subsequent Sequential-Term Appointments as described below.
- (3) All Scientists shall receive a Letter of Appointment or Reappointment signed by the Dean [see Definitions 13].

B - PROMOTION AND/OR GRANTING OR RENEWAL OF SEQUENTIAL-TERM APPOINTMENT

- (1) Scientists with Affiliated Limited-Term Appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor are eligible for promotion to Associate Professor with Sequential-Term status.
- (2) Scientists with Sequential-Term Appointments at the rank of Associate Professor are eligible for promotion to Professor and the renewal of Sequential-Term status.
- (3) The procedures and criteria for promotion and/or granting or renewal of Sequential-Term Appointments shall be in accordance with the procedures and criteria for promotion and granting of tenure as specified in *the Promotion and Tenure* Article of the Collective Agreement, except that
 - a) probation and tenure shall not apply;
 - b) the structure of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee may be amended in these cases only to include one additional faculty member within the department holding an appointment under these *Appointment and Promotion Procedures*; and elected by the Department and, if applicable, one additional faculty member from the clinical department, selected by the Clinical Department; this committee will thereafter be called the Department Scientist Promotion Committee;
 - c) the performance to be assessed will be in the areas of academic responsibilities as outlined in the Letter of Appointment or Reappointment which will be included in the file; and
 - d) any grievances arising therefrom will be administered as outlined in Section C below.

No other part of the Collective Agreement shall apply unless specifically set out herein.

- (4) Promotion and the granting or renewal of Sequential-Term Appointments shall be considered by the Department Scientist Promotion Committee.
- (5) The Department Scientist Promotion Committee and Dean shall each forward a recommendation to the Provost.
- (6) The Provost shall either approve or deny the recommendation of the Department Scientist Promotion Committee and the separate recommendation from the Dean, and shall so notify the faculty member, the Dean and Chair of the Department.
- (7) The Provost's decision may be grieved in accordance with the procedures in Section C below..

C - GRIEVANCES

Grievances of Provost's Negative Decision Regarding Promotion and/or Granting or Renewal of Sequential-Term Appointment

- (1) A Researcher may grieve a negative decision of the Provost to an Ad Hoc Grievance Committee within four weeks of the date of notification of the negative decision.
- (2) Grievances shall be submitted to the Director of Faculty Relations stating clearly, in writing, the grounds for such a grievance. Such grounds are restricted to procedural defects and/or the unreasonableness of the decision.
- (3) The structure of the Ad Hoc Grievance Committee will be as follows:
 - i) One tenured faculty member of the University, selected by the Appellant and agreed to by the Dean.
 - ii) One tenured faculty member of the University, selected by the Dean and agreed to by the Appellant
 - iii) One tenured faculty member of the University, selected by the Provost.

By mutual agreement of all parties, no more than one tenured member may be substituted by a non-tenured faculty member of the University.

- (4) The powers of the Ad Hoc Grievance Committee will be limited and are set out as follows:
 - i) The Ad Hoc Grievance Committee may not alter or amend this document;
 - ii) The Ad Hoc Grievance Committee shall confine its deliberations to the strict wording and claim outlined in the grievance;
 - iii) The Ad Hoc Grievance Committee shall have the power to send a grievance back to the Provost with a recommendation for reconsideration;
 - iv) The Ad Hoc Grievance Committee may overturn any decision the Committee determines to be unreasonable.
- (5) The Ad Hoc Grievance Committee shall notify all parties of its decision, which shall be final, in writing and with reasons within one week of its final meeting on that case.

D - RESIGNATION AND EARLY TERMINATION

Resignation

A Scientist may terminate his or her appointment at the end of any academic year (i.e., June 30) during the term of the appointment provided that he or she has given three (3) months notice, in writing, to the University and the affiliated institution. Resignation at any other time may be permitted only with the prior approval of the University, in extraordinary circumstances.

Early Termination by University Prior to End of Appointment

Continuance of any University appointment made in accordance with the provisions of this document is predicated always upon continuance of employment at the affiliated institution and satisfactory performance at the University. Should employment at the affiliated institution cease, the University appointment will terminate automatically at the same time and the University will have no further obligations to the Scientist. If it is determined through the annual performance review that the Scientist's performance at the University has fallen below a satisfactory level, the appointment will cease at the end of the academic year, i.e., June 30, for those appointed on an academic-year basis, or for those appointed on a calendar-year basis, the end of the calendar year, i.e., December 31. The termination of the University appointment under these circumstances does not constitute dismissal.

E - TERMINATION

On the recommendation of the President, the Board of Governors may terminate the appointment of a Scientist during the period of the appointment should the standard of conduct fall below the minimum acceptable standard expected of scientists at this University.

Report on the OCGS Appraisal of Graduate Programs at The University of Western Ontario During the Third Cycle
(1996/97 - 2002/03)

Prepared by the Faculty of Graduate Studies
Updated October 2002

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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals Committee from a list provided by the program under review. Prior to 2000-2001, the Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisals 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 Appraisals Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisals 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 Appraisals Committee's review of an abbreviated brief. The Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 (MESc., MEng, PhD)

Epidemiology & Biostatistics (MSc, PhD, Certificate)
Family Medicine (MCIsc)
Neuroscience (MSc, PhD)
Nursing (MScN)
Orthodontics (MclD)
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. Joanne, 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 December 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals Committee's review of the program's brief. The

Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals Committee's review of the program's brief. The Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 MEdSc 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 Appraisals 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 Appraisals 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 have been 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.
Journalism (MA) in March 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. OCGS has identified External Consultants and FGS is contacting them about a joint visit in February 2003.
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	The Periodic Appraisal is still in progress. The OCGS Appraisal Committee is reviewing the program's brief, the reports of External Consultants (Dr. Charles Beach, Queen's University and Dr. Mark Bils, University of Rochester) sent to review the program in July 2002, and the University's response to the reports of the External Consultants.
Journalism	The Periodic Appraisal is still in progress. The OCGS Appraisal Committee is reviewing the program's brief, 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.
Library & Information Science	The Periodic Appraisal is still in progress. The OCGS Appraisal Committee has reviewed the brief and has selected OCGS 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. The University is waiting for the reports of the Consultants.
Mathematics	In October 2002, the Appraisal Committee has 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.
Statistics	In June 2002, the Appraisal Committee recommended to OCGS Council 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 will be 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.

- a new MA and PhD program in Media Studies. This program has been approved by OCGS Council in June 2002
- 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 must be 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

All Periodic Appraisals with the exception of Theory and Criticism are still in progress. At the time of the last review of the programs submitted for Periodic Appraisal, the Appraisal Committee made the following recommendations and specific comments:

English

In making its recommendation that the program be approved and categorized as **Good Quality**, the Appraisal Committee commented on the high standards for student recruitment and on the care taken to incorporate graduate students into the academic life of the department and to involve them in the research work conducted by faculty members. The Committee also noted with pleasure the policies regarding the financial support of graduate students.

Philosophy

Good Quality with Report

Psychology

Good Quality

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 will be 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)

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

Anatomy and Cell Biology

Good Quality

Biochemistry

Good Quality

In making this recommendation the Appraisals Committee expects that the current faculty complement will be maintained.

Biomedical Engineering

An Abbreviated brief is due in June 2003, since the program's Standard brief was approved by OCGS Council in June 2001.

Classical Studies

Good Quality

The Appraisals Committee commented that the University will have to continue to monitor the productivity of the faculty, the admission standard, the graduate support and the library budget.

Education	MEd (Educational Studies): Good Quality MEd (Counselling) Good Quality Med (Counselling Psychology) approved by OCGS March 1997 PhD Education Studies and Joint PhD in Educational Studies approved by OCGS December 1999
Medical Biophysics	Good Quality
Microbiology and Immunology	Good Quality
Pathology	Good Quality
Pharmacology and Toxicology	Good Quality
Physiology	Good Quality
Plant Sciences	Good Quality with Report
Zoology	Good Quality with Report

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

Background and Context

This is the fourth 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 the third in March 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 Media, Information and Technoculture program in the Faculty of Information and Media Studies. This review was done in connection with the FIMS decanal search.

The ten 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 and Deans, and their comments incorporated into a final report on the review process. Deans 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 English, Faculty of Arts
- Department of Applied Mathematics, Faculty of Science
- Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Science
- Program in Media, Information and Technoculture, FIMS
- Department of Biochemistry, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
- Department of Medical Biophysics, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry
- Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering
- Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering
- Department of Mechanical & Materials Engineering, Faculty of Engineering
- Integrated Engineering Program, Faculty of Engineering

Department of English

The Department of English was evaluated in November 2001 by Professor Anne Lancashire, University of Toronto, and Noreen Golfman, Memorial University of Newfoundland. The Acting Chair at the time, Professor J. Douglas Kneale, has since been appointed Chair. The department, which *has a long and distinguished history of significant contributions, - in research, in teaching, in creative writing and drama*, has recently seen the worst of times and now happily is looking forward to the best of times. The department experienced the loss of nine faculty members in 2000-2001. With the full support of the Dean and the central administration, 5 new positions in 2001-2002 have been made, with another five planned for 2003-2004. The recent appointments comprise one Full Professor, Dr. Russell Poole described as *one of the world's leading scholars in Old Norse-Icelandic literature*, three Associate Professors, Dr. Julia Emberley, Dr. M. J. Kidnie and Dr. Matthew Rowlinson plus one Assistant Professor, Dr. Jan Plug. The department has a long tradition of expectation that its members will teach at all levels from first year to graduate, while maintaining vibrant research activities. Members of the department have won two 3M awards, two OCUFA

awards, three Bank of Nova Scotia University Student Council awards, one Marilyn Robinson award, and five Edward G. Pleva awards. The new appointments will ensure that this tradition is maintained.

Film is a new discipline that is responsible for 20% of the current enrolment. In addition, the Faculty of Information and Media Studies (FIMS) has requested that their undergraduate students be admitted to some film courses. Of the five upcoming appointments, two will be in Film, two in Literature, with the last one in Theory. Four of these will be at the Assistant Professor level. An honors program in Film Studies will be offered starting in September 2002.

At the time of the review, there was vigorous debate, now concluded, over the role of the first year courses, as well as English 200. A series of reforms have been submitted that define all the first year English Courses as Foundational, which *introduce students to a range of literary texts from different periods; provide practice in literary analysis; and foster an understanding of literary forms, genres, and methods of interpretation; these courses also integrate training in English composition and university-level essay writing, including specific training in grammar and rhetoric, style, reasoning, and documentation.* English 200 has been replaced by four half courses, with students required to take any two before entering fourth year. English 300 has been redesigned. These reforms introduce a new level of flexibility into student choice.

The Undergraduate Writing Program is on the verge of a significant expansion because the Department of Psychology will require all its students, currently 950, to take a half-course in writing. Other units in the University are considering introducing a similar requirement. This program will become an independent unit, no longer the responsibility of the English Department.

It was a dark moment a few years ago when the Drama program was discontinued. Western has a long tradition of drama through the work of James Reaney and Thomson Highway. The chair is planning to reintroduce elements of the program, because the most frequently asked question at outreach activities is "*Do you have a Drama Program?*". The minor in Dramatic Literature will be introduced in September 2002. David French, a distinguished Canadian playwright will be the writer in residence for 2002-2003.

Dr Kneale believes that the department, at this most exciting point in its story, is in the middle of a renaissance with morale better than ever. This is *renewal at its best.* At the recent Department retreat, the focus was on the upcoming appointments, with some lesser time devoted to curriculum affairs. There was present a wonderful sense of consensus. The department is big enough to do both the traditional and new emerging innovative contemporary studies, exemplified by Dr Groden's hypertext edition of James Joyce. The department is well situated to restore and advance its force as a front-ranking department of English.

PRC Reviewer: Patrick Whippey, Department of Physics and Astronomy

Department of Applied Mathematics

Preamble

The Department of Applied Mathematics of the Faculty of Science is one of two applied mathematics departments in Canada. The undergraduate programs consist of two three-year BSc programs, one of which is joint with Computer Science, eight four-year honors BSc programs, four of which are joint with closely allied science departments, and a five-year Applied Math and

Engineering program. In addition, two new joint programs are coming on-line: Applied Quantitative Information Technology, and Math Education.

There are approximately 50 undergraduate students in the BSc programs, half of whom are enrolled in the four-year honors program. The relatively small enrolment is due, in part, to the demanding nature of the programs. The department has an emphasis on quality over quantity and the enrolment is not expected to increase significantly in the next decade. The Department has a faculty complement of 15 tenured and tenure-track members, supplemented by two and one-half temporary positions. The Department is heavily engaged in providing mathematics service courses to other departments of UWO and providing essentially all of the mathematics requirements of the Faculty of Engineering.

Basis of the Report

Departmental self-study prepared in 2001, the external reviewer's report received in June 2002, a meeting with the external reviewers and the provost in Jan. 15, 2002, and a meeting with Professor Rob Corless (current chair of the Department) on July 23, 2002.

Summary and Response of the Department Chair

The external reviewers' report is detailed and constructive with a specific section devoted to the undergraduate program. The reviewers were favourably impressed by the Department in general. They commented on the Department's research strengths, its collegial culture, and the lead roles it played in securing external funding for several large-scale research projects.

The reviewers were very impressed by the high quality of students of the Department and were satisfied with the course outlines, exams, and class sizes. They applaud the Department for its initiative in developing the two new undergraduate programs, both of which are considered to be interdisciplinary and well-conceived to meet an important need. On the other hand, the reviewers recommended a larger enrolment in the undergraduate program. They felt that emphasizing financial mathematics may help to reach this goal. The department has taken steps in this direction and expect to see a growth in enrolment.

While the reviewers considered the department's faculty profile (10 Full Professors, 3 Associate Professors and 5 Assistant Professors) to be standard for a mature department, they recommended increasing the size of the tenure-tenure stream component to approximately 20. This is considered to be the preferred way to solve the problem of using a large number of sessional instructors. Professor Corless acknowledges that this has been an ongoing problem in the Department for years and that the situation became worse in the past year. The department is working with the senior administration to increase the number of fulltime faculty members through establishing a research chair and increasing enrolments.

The department has a large service teaching load with a broad range of courses offered to students in Science and Engineering. The success of the ATOP program (Access to Opportunities Program) resulted at a significant expansion in Engineering enrolment and subsequently a large increase in the department's service teaching load. This contributed to the problem of large number of sessional instructors as noted above. The reviewers recommend that the Faculty of Science and Faculty of Engineering work together to correct this deficiency. Professor Corless agrees with the problem identified and expects the collaborative efforts from the Faculty of Engineering in correcting the problem.

The reviewers were pleased to see the successful integration of computing and information technology into the undergraduate program. However, they expressed concern that funds for computer lab renewal seem to be awarded on an ad hoc basis and recommend that the lab renewal funds be part of the department's budget. While Professor Corless concurs with the reviewers' comments and recommendations in this regard, he finds no room in the current budget to do so unless there is an increase in the department's budget. It is hoped, however, that the success of the endowment fund will provide the lab renewal funds.

The department's success in large research initiatives in recent years has resulted in an increased need for support staff and space. The reviewers recommend an increase of one position in the support staff. The space problem may be alleviated if the Faculty of Science's re-allocation plan goes through.

Reflections on the Review Process

The review was thorough and detailed. Proper review procedures were followed. Recommendations by the reviewers have been considered by the Department and steps have been taken to address the issues raised. The external reviewers' report, while very constructive and helpful, was delayed for a fairly long period of time. Prompter submission of the review report is recommended for future reviews.

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

Department of Sociology

Preamble

The department of Sociology undergraduate enrolment is over 4,000 students, making it among the largest in Canada. Programs include a three-year B.A. and a four-year Honours B.A. The department has a complement of 25 full time tenured or probationary faculty, two of whom are joint with other departments, one limited-term Assistant Professor, and one permanent Instructor. Approximately 12 persons are also employed as limited-duty instructors to assist with undergraduate teaching. Two University initiatives have limited enrolment growth in Sociology in recent years. One is the introduction of a four-year program in Administrative and Commercial Studies. The other is the development of a "social science-type" degree program in Health Sciences and Media and Information Technology. While these programs draw interested sociology students to the University, their more applied nature attracts some students who may otherwise have been Sociology majors. In response to these new programs, the department developed a slate of 300 level courses that are open to, and of special interest to, students in these other programs and demand for them has been high. As well, a new introductory essay course in sociology has been developed for ACS students.

Basis of the Report

Departmental self-study prepared in August 2001, non-confidential external appraisal reports from consultants Neil Guppy and Richard Wanner received in October and November of 2001 and completed as a part of a chair selection process, and a meeting with Kevin McQuillan, Chair of the department, on February 15, 2002.

Summary and Response of the Department Chair

The external reviewers' reports were complete and paid good attention to the undergraduate program. Reviewers had extensive information about the program prior to their 2-day visits when they met with administrative personnel at the Department and University levels, and with departmental graduate students, faculty and staff. The reviewers both expressed strong praise for the department, ranking it as one of the best in Canada. They lavished high praise on the performance of the outgoing chair, Professor McQuillan. Several suggestions were made in their reports for improvement, but as noted by Professor Wanner, these comments were to be "understood as constructive and in the context of an essentially positive evaluation".

Professor Wanner noted that the program was in "good shape". Although enrolment numbers have been fairly stable over the past 5 years, the department had done well in addressing the challenges posed by program expansions within the broader University context. The department has been innovative in the opportunities it has seized to attract students. Good teaching was also considered to be a high priority and therefore a strength within the program.

Professor Wanner stated his concerns that there was considerable overlap in two of the Statistics and Methods courses offered at the third-year level. Professor McQuillan agreed and noted that the undergraduate committee is reviewing the courses now with several suggested improvements being considered.

It was also noted that the presence of many upper level courses with small enrolments provided good research exposure to students. However, there is little opportunity for Honours students to engage in independent research. Professor McQuillan agreed and noted that the senior thesis course had been re-instituted with a current enrolment of approximately 10 students.

Professor Guppy noted that while the program is "solid" with "strong emphases on methods and statistics, social psychology and theory" there was less emphasis on what "young people appear to find attractive". He suggested that the strength of the departmental scholars may not be reflected in the courses, their titles, or descriptions. Professor McQuillan stated that the department desired to keep course titles and descriptions relatively broad allowing for flexibility as new content areas emerge, but noted that the substance of the more attractive topics was present. Curriculum review to address labeling and related issues is currently underway.

Professor Guppy also suggested that there should be more collaborative learning, field work courses, internship opportunities, and service learning. He noted that while the sociology program has excellent teaching, some innovative changes in the type of learning opportunities offered may be beneficial. Professor McQuillan suggested that many of these suggestions were difficult to put into practice. Resources for coordination of external placements and liability issues arise. For example, some areas of concentration (e.g. criminology) could pose challenges to student safety in external placements. Experiences in less dangerous areas are being considered, for example in healthy aging, and methodology.

It was also noted that the faculty appear to be stretched and that much is being asked of them. Professor McQuillan noted that two replacement positions are in place. Professor Guppy noted that consideration in hiring for these positions should emphasize finding faculty with no previous training at Western in order to keep the faculty from becoming insular.

Lastly, it was suggested that the method of undergraduate counseling needed to be revisited. Professor McQuillan noted that the department changed this position from that of temporary staff

to permanent staff and that the information provided to the students and the manner of its distribution would be addressed.

Reflections on the Reviewing Process

Overall, the review was exhaustive and objective. While the significant strengths of the department were clearly articulated, suggestions for areas of improvement were also made. The outgoing chair was quite comfortable with the review and appeared to have a good handle on how the department is handling the issues and could do so in the future. The chair noted that the comments from the reviewers are being considered by the Undergraduate Committee in the context of changes that will be made to allow new program to conform to the university-wide reform of the undergraduate programs.

PRC Reviewer: Prudence Allen, Faculty of Health Sciences
Undergraduate Program in Media, Information and Technoculture

Preamble

The Faculty of Information and Media Studies (FIMS) was created in July, 1997, the result of the merger of two existing graduate schools (the Graduate School of Journalism, and the Graduate School of Library and Information Science), and the formation of a new undergraduate stream in Media, Information, and Technoculture (MIT). From the start, the faculty committed itself to a multidisciplinary and collaborative approach to teaching and research. This approach is reflected, in part, by a number of cross appointments among the faculty complement. By July 1, 2001, there were 26 full-time members, including 4 cross appointed to Computer Science, Law, Sociology, and Visual Arts. The teaching assignments of faculty members typically involve them in at least two of the three 'streams' FIMS embraces (Journalism, Library Science, and MIT). The MIT programs, in particular, have been designed with interdisciplinarity in mind. Besides 3- and 4-year BA degree programs and an honors BA program in MIT, there are combined honors programs offered jointly with Computer Science and Geography, as well as several other approved combinations with programs in the Faculties of Arts and Social Science. There is also a recently launched Western/Fanshawe Collaborative Program in Media Theory and Production, offering concentrations in Broadcast Journalism, Multimedia Design and Production, and TV Production. With the exception of this collaborative program with Fanshawe (which offers ample practical and technological training, and opportunities for hands-on experience), the MIT undergraduate degree programs are largely humanities-based. In this respect they may be unique in the context of North American communications programs.

Basis for the Report

This report is based on the documentation assembled by FIMS for the external referees in anticipation of their visit in April, 2001; on the report, dated April 30, 2001 of the external reviewers (Dr Christopher Dornan, Director of the School of Journalism and Mass Communications at Carleton University, Dean Joanne Marshall of the School of Information and Library Science, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Professor Liora Salter of the Osgoode Hall Law School at York University); and finally on an interview undertaken by the authors of this report with Dean Catherine Ross and Associate Dean Gloria Leckie of FIMS on May 23, 2002.

Summary

The external reviewers recommended expanding the rhetoric of interdisciplinarity with courses common to all the programs in the faculty, and argued that at the same time the individual units in

the faculty need to strengthen their separate identities in order to develop and maintain their reputations inside and outside UWO. In addition, the reviewers proposed an expansion of internship and co-op programs, perhaps with Fanshawe College; a greater emphasis on computer-based learning and “hands-on” skills; less emphasis on cross-appointments with other faculties since this results in divided loyalties and a reduced opportunity for the faculty to reach its potential; and improved communication across the faculty. More specifically, the reviewers argued that the undergraduate program (called by them “Media Studies”) is similar to many other Canadian programs and should develop in the direction of two streams, one based on research and theory, the other a practical approach. At the same time, they noted that the UWO program is unique in providing practical and technical skills in the context of a ‘social science’ degree. The program, the reviewers proposed, could use the appointment of one or more mid-career, full-time faculty members to anchor it and to provide a more coherent set of undergraduate courses. The reviewers concluded with an expression of great support for the dedication and vision with which the members of FIMS -- faculty, staff, and students -- had passed through some difficult years after the amalgamation.

Catherine Ross and Gloria Leckie provided a useful and different perception of FIMS. They noted that although two faculty members recently left for CRC appointments elsewhere, five (possibly six) new appointments have been made in the Faculty, all of them individuals capable of teaching in at least two of the faculty’s areas of concentration. Two of the appointments are at the senior level, and a new Film Studies appointment is also in the works, so that MIT students can have access to registration in film studies courses. Current faculty members overlap extensively on the program committees, and they discuss their programs at length, particularly with respect to the core courses in the Media, Information and Technoculture program. The integrated approach is one of the faculty’s greatest strengths, and during the academic year 2000-2001 the MIT program was revised and improved following an extensive and very consultative process. The current program is not a Media Studies program, but a Liberal Arts degree with a large helping of critical thought about the media. That said, FIMS agreed that the new Multimedia Centre would benefit the faculty’s programs when FIMS moves to the north campus building. The joint degree/diploma with Fanshawe has already had over five hundred applicants for its forty available places, so the cut-off entrance average will be about 86%. Innovative thinking is also continuing with respect to internship opportunities. Given its own review of the MIT program, FIMS is confident that its revised goals and objectives are consistent with those of the university’s broader undergraduate curriculum reform. More thinking may be needed in order to develop new minors modules, especially collaborative ones, since scarce resources and the incorporation of the joint students with Fanshawe into streams with unavoidable enrolment limitations make it impossible for FIMS to accommodate a new influx of students. However, careful planning may allow for some new and collaborative minors.

The Review Process

In their short time on campus, the external reviewers did not quite capture the great benefits of the synergy underway at FIMS, although since they arrived at a time of some upheaval this is perhaps not surprising. The MIT program continues to develop and improve. Both of the PRC reviewers found the Faculty open to thinking about minors in interdisciplinary areas such as Popular Music and Popular Culture, areas which interest our home departments.

PRC Reviewers: Richard Semmens (Department of Music History), and Jane Toswell (Department of English)

Department of Biochemistry

Basis of Review:

Self-Assessment Documentation provided by the department; External Reviewers' Reports. External Reviewers: Dr. Robert Mackenzie, Associate Dean Research, McGill University, Dr. Joel Weiner, Associate Dean Research, University of Alberta. Due to schedule conflicts, I was unable to meet with the external reviewers when they made their visit to campus.

Departmental Self-Study

The departmental self-study was a detailed, well-organized document that provided valuable background on the department. It included a useful statement of mission and goals and a summary of the department's organization structure and head count. The department's undergraduate and graduate programs were summarized as well as the research programs the department has been and is involved in.

Highlights of the External Reviewers Report:

The reviewers conducted their visits on October 24-25, 2000 and submitted a report dated November 4, 2000. The reviewers believe that research leadership was "the most critical issue to the success of the Department in next five years." As a result most of the items discussed in the review dealt with research and graduate education with only limited discussion of undergraduate education. This focus is not surprising given that both reviewers are associate deans of research at their respective universities.

Positive Points

The reviewers provided significant praise for the leadership provided by the Chair, Dr. Lo. They indicated that he:

- is a very capable administrator,
- actively encouraged faculty to apply for funding from external sources,
- provided leadership through the creation on the new BMSc Degree, and
- is largely responsible for the very high level of morale in the department

The reviewers believe that department has an active Honors program with a good selection of courses and research opportunities. They believe that new BMSc Program will enhance these opportunities.

Concerns and Issues

The reviewers also indicated several issues that the department must address in the future. Again, most of these issues address factors somewhat outside undergraduate education. One issue addressed that the Chair is the primary driver of the BMSc program and that if he continues to fulfil this role that administrative support be provided so that he can complete his other roles. This suggestion arises from a concern that the significant administrative responsibilities of Dr. Lo have restricted the time he can devote to his research program.

The reviewers raised other issues relating primarily to graduate programs, space limitation and research. Because these issues do not relate directly to the department's undergraduate program they have not been discussed in this report. However, these issues are listed in Appendix A of this report.

Response of the Department Chair

I met with Dr. Lo on August 31st to discuss the report. We both recognized that because of the background of the external reviewers, they focused on the research activities of the department. We did discuss that total course enrolment in the department's undergraduate courses was 1,383 in 1999-2000 having experienced a slight increase over a five-year period. However, it is important to realize that undergraduate enrolment in the biochemistry department is significantly influenced by enrolment in the science faculty.

We also discussed the positive steps that the both the chair and other faculty members have taken to promote the department to current undergraduate students as well as to high school students. I was impressed with the proactive steps being taken to promote both the department and the university.

Reflections upon the Review Process

Once again having the opportunity to meet a faculty member from another department was a very worthwhile experience. It provided an opportunity to talk about how we could work together to enhance opportunities for students in each of our departments. As a result, we plan to meet in October to discuss how to progress in this area.

I must echo the positive comments made by the external reviewers for the leadership provided by Dr. Lo. He is an enthusiastic individual who is very much devoted to enhancing his department.

Appendix A

Issues Raised Not Directly Related to Undergraduate Programs

- **Department Stature:** Core members think that the stature of the department within Canada is not very high. Believes leadership to achieve departments research potential is key here.
- **Space and Renovation:** Concern about need for additional space and planned four phase renovation program for the Medical Science Building will cause a significant loss of scientific productivity.
- **Graduate Student Stipends:** Student stipends after paying tuition is low and so hurts recruiting.
- **Postdoctoral Fellows.** Department has small number of postdoctoral fellows given the number of faculty.
- **Salary awards:** Current number of faculty members with external salary awards is low.
- **Research Institutes:** Department improving its relationship with faculty in various research institutes.
- **Expanding role of the Department:** The department has a tendency to be a "good citizen" and wants to help and solve problems in the University. There is a concern that the growing number of issues they are involved with will lead to a loss of focus, particularly in the research area.

PRC Reviewer: Darroch (Rick) Robertson, Richard Ivey School of Business

Department of Medical Biophysics

Preamble

The Department of Medical Biophysics was founded as a department of biophysics (a more common name for such units in North American universities) in 1946. It has offered graduate programs since its creation and, since 1965, has offered an honors undergraduate program as well. Structurally it is probably the smallest department at Western, with a core complement of just three faculty members (one of these, the chair). On the other hand, its physical plant is likely one of the largest and most diffuse, including teaching and research facilities not only in the Medical Sciences Building on campus, but as well in the Lawson Health Research Institute (University Hospital, St Joseph's Hospital, and Victoria Campus), the London Regional Cancer Centre (Westminster site), and the Robarts Research Institute. The department's teaching and research missions are supported by a complex of adjunct and/or cross appointments, numbering 37 in total, whose efforts are coordinated by the core faculty members.

Basis for the Report

This report is based on the Self Study document prepared by the department, and dated September, 2002; on the report, dated January 8, 2002, of the external reviewers (Drs Peter Ottensmeyer and Ian Smith), who conducted their appraisal at Western on January 2-3, 2002; and finally on an interview I undertook with Dr Peter Canham (chair of the department) and Dr Ian MacDonald (coordinator of the undergraduate program) on March 21, 2002.

Summary

The undergraduate program in medical biophysics is elected by a comparatively small number of students: in the current academic year there are 7 registered honors students. Undergraduates formally register in the program in their third and fourth years, more often than not with a view to subsequent graduate study (but not invariably in medical biophysics). The program is flexible, responding effectively to the varied backgrounds of its entering students, and offering enriched areas

of specialization for its continuing ones. Its design, and the breadth of its coverage distinguish it from most North American undergraduate programs in biophysics. The report of the external referees concluded the program 'prepares the undergraduates very well for graduate research.' (page 2). But the report dwells rather briefly (it might be argued 'too briefly') on an assessment of the undergraduate program (and, for that matter, on the graduate ones). Its principal focus, rather, is on the current structure of the department, and its continuing viability as an independent unit with such a small core of fulltime appointments. The various strategies for restructuring the department proposed in the report of the external assessors are clearly *not* a product of concerns about the quality of the programs themselves, which are praised (however briefly). Their proposals aim, rather, to spread the administrative chores associated with running the programs a little more widely.

Recommendations

Because the referees identified no weaknesses in the undergraduate program, there does not appear to be any need for special action at this time. If the department were to investigate some of the restructuring models proposed, it might identify ways to streamline the administration of the undergraduate program, but such an exercise likely would have little impact on its overall quality which is deemed, at any rate, to be very good.

Drs. Canham and MacDonald are watching developments in other units with interest. The new Bachelor of Medical Sciences program will exploit some of the courses and infrastructure in medical biophysics, and a proposed new program in Medical Physics offered by the Department of Physics and Astronomy will almost certainly make similar requests for these resources. The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry will have to monitor these developments closely, and to make sure that, notwithstanding an effort to maximize resources, the quality of the programs in medical biophysics is not placed in jeopardy.

The Review Process

The department self-study document is admirably objective. The report of the external reviewers, although centered on structural and administrative questions, reveals no shortcomings in the undergraduate program. One might hope for additional detail in reports of future external appraisals, but overall the undergraduate program review process in the current cycle seems to have been adequately thorough.

PRC Reviewer: Richard Semmens, Department of Music History

Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

Basis of Review:

Self-assessment documentation provided by the department for chair appraisal and for accreditation by Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board; CEAB accreditation decisions (which are not directly referred to herein); self-assessment documentation prepared by department for review by Ontario Council of Graduate Studies; two external reviewers' reports (Dr. B.J. Adams, Professor and Chair of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Toronto, who made his departmental visit in November 2000 as part of the accreditation process; and D. Burn, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Waterloo, who made his departmental visit on 16 February 2001); conversations with Acting Chair E. Yanful, with the external reviewer who provided the assessment of undergraduate education (Barry Adams), and with Associate Dean R. Baddour. On 21 June 2002, the new Chair, E. Yanful, and the Dean, F. Berruti, met with the PRC Committee.

Departmental Self-Study

The department has been through some difficulties in the last twenty months. At the time of the OCGS review in 1999-2000, the chair was K. Rowe; at the time of the CEAB accreditation, the acting chair was Ian Moore; when the departmental self-study was compiled the acting chair was R. Baddour; and from July 2001 the acting chair has been E. Yanful. Despite the apparent lack of continuity, the department has smoothly effected a curriculum review, recruited two major new research chairs with a third senior appointment now in the process of accepting an offer, appointed new junior faculty two of whom have just won Premier's Excellence in Research Awards, and continued to expand as necessary to conform to the requirements of the steadily-growing undergraduate enrolment in the faculty. The self-study comprehensively surveyed the undergraduate program and its options (Civil and Structural Engineering, Environmental Engineering, and options in Management and in Law), the graduate program and research activities, and the facilities including laboratories, computing and shop facilities and the associated laboratories, the most prominent of which are the Boundary Layer Wind Tunnel and, more recently, the Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction. Given the particular obligations the faculty has with respect to accreditation, the self-studies also provided detailed information about modules in each undergraduate course, and the ways in which the program fulfilled the CEAB requirements.

Highlights of the External Reviewers' Report

Don Burn in his report noted that the graduate program is strong and the research profile is very impressive, although this strength is not balanced across all research areas. The age profile of the faculty is very young, given recent retirements and departures, but the appointment of the two research chairs should help. The previous chair, K. Rowe, was very highly regarded, and his departure had caused some morale problems and uncertainties during the transition to a new chair. More specifically Burn recommended that the new chair create a culture of mentoring in the department, and take advantage of the potential synergy with the two research chairs by expanding its expertise in the environmental area. Barry Adams characterized the department as exemplary, as remarkably effective--at times self-sacrificial--in deploying its resources given its relatively small size and budget, and as having high quality faculty with leadership in particular research areas and a tradition of success in gaining both research funds and teaching awards. However, the department's chronic weakness is a limited base budget and space. In the short term, the department needs to consolidate its curricular developments and other innovations and to bolster its morale. Adams was particularly impressed by the department's innovative methods of delivery of some courses, including the fourth-year design project in collaboration with the City of London, and by the enormous reputation of the unique endeavour which is the Boundary Layer Wind Tunnel Laboratory. Finally, the appraiser noted the very heavy teaching loads and administrative duties of the faculty.

More specifically, Adams raised eight concerns: a) the need to replace R.K. Rowe in terms of leadership, expertise, and research activity; b) uncompetitive compensation for recently-appointed faculty; c) support staff suffering lack of progress in salary improvement and higher workloads; d) coverage of the Civil Engineering field in the curriculum is almost too selective; e) teaching loads are high; f) shortage of research/laboratory space; g) rigidity of the curriculum, especially the need for more program flexibility in the complementary studies courses in the humanities and social sciences; h) the fear that the Department's creativity in developing fractional appointments and innovative technical staff appointments might incur the inappropriate penalty of withdrawal of support.

Response of the Department Acting Chair

I met with Dr. E. Yanful on 15 November 2001. He noted first that a senior appointment in Geotechnical engineering is in process, and will replace part of the expertise lost with Professors Rowe and Moore. The budget issues raised by both appraisers were certainly a concern, although less serious since the declining expenditures were partly a result of departures the situation would improve with new hires. The department expects to stabilize its expenditures shortly and to increase the budget in consonance with the continuing increase in student numbers. However, the department is concerned by the number of fractional appointments (with the Wind Tunnel) it carries and by a lack of flexibility in its undergraduate teaching assignments, which can mean that individual faculty members simply cannot be replaced when on leave. The proposed Advanced Technology Centre will house two of the other departments now crowded into the Engineering Sciences Building, and the department expects to solve its space problems in the wake of that departure. Insofar as they could be addressed without reference to salary negotiations for the faculty and the staff, morale issues were being addressed in the context of a highly collegial department (and market adjustments may help). The department is now recovered from the shock of the departure of some of its leading figures, and it has enough human resources and resiliency to move forward--and two new young faculty members as well. Yanful hopes that the teaching load, currently four half-courses per faculty member, may be reduced to three for research-intensive faculty. Finally, a new chair is to be appointed within the next week.

For a few of the issues raised by the appraisers, Yanful referred me to the Associate Dean, R. Baddour. We discussed the courses in complementary studies or non-technical electives (Humanities and Social Sciences) permitted by the faculty. The faculty has plans to expand these offerings, and is also interested in other concurrent programs since students are particularly drawn to Engineering (especially Civil Engineering) at Western because of the option programs in Management and in Law. The faculty may also investigate the range of optional first-year courses students take outside the faculty. Finally, the faculty plans to improve the quality of the website as a recruitment tool.

In light of the time lapse and of the modified audit procedure used in this case, I concluded this review with a phone call to Barry Adams. He agreed that the new appointments would be of significant benefit to the department's research profile and its graduate teaching, but noted that neither of the senior appointments (George Nakhla, Slobodan Simonovic) should be diverted into departmental leadership or administration from their primary commitments. On the other hand, he felt that the department holds at the moment a cohort of young and extremely dedicated faculty members who are providing remarkable leadership and developing many skills. His principal concern is that the university, by over-working these department members, is mining a non-renewable resource of goodwill. They need to be properly compensated, properly supported, and acknowledged for their accomplishments.

Adams also clarified for me his comments about the rigidity of the curriculum, noting that the department offers thin coverage in Transportation Engineering, Surveying, and to some extent in Hydraulics Engineering. It is now building up its program in Environmental Engineering, and given that this is not a large department, its difficult choices to specialize seem to have been good ones. The students here, by self-selection since the department offers several options, do not seek the minimal path of simply becoming technically competent in Civil Engineering. UWO is already, therefore, teaching engineers a wider range of skills than is accepted practice. Other schools of engineering in the region are now recognising that they too need to provide more flexibility so that their students develop communication skills, managerial abilities, the skills of entrepreneurship, and awareness of all kinds of societal concerns that might affect their work or be affected by their work. The Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Western is therefore engaged in a

fruitful and healthy competition for undergraduate students with its peer departments in southern Ontario.

Reflections on the Reviewing Process

This department, having suffered major losses, is very quickly recovering, making new appointments, and continuing to develop major initiatives. The Faculty as a whole may add some further options for complementary studies and for the much-desired flexibility that the department and faculty are adding to their degrees (e.g. the possible addition of courses in English, Comparative Literature, the Diploma in Ethics, the Certificate Program in Writing).

The Faculty of Engineering Science can fairly claim that it undergoes reviewing yet more frequently than the rest of us. In this case, despite the somewhat stretched timeline, the review and appraisal process were handled scrupulously and fairly.

PRC Reviewer: M.J. Toswell, Department of English

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Preamble

Electrical and Computer Engineering, the largest department in the Faculty of Engineering Science, recently enjoyed a substantial growth made possible from provincial, University, and private funding. The department has established two new programs - Computer Engineering and Software Engineering, and significantly improved the existing Electrical Engineering Program. Enrolment has doubled since 1996-1997 to a current quota of 180 students distributed across the three programs. Concurrent programs are also available in Computer Science and Business. The department takes pride in its good foundation in electrical and computer engineering, its well rounded and mature electrical engineering program, and its Industry Internship for selected third year students.

Provincial funding was obtained for fourteen new faculty positions and 3.5 staff positions, 12 designated for ECE and two for other Engineering programs. Three additional positions were created through the University's Special Faculty Renewal Initiative (SFRI) including two with Computer Science and one with Medical Biophysics. The department faced the challenges imposed by such a large increase in faculty with the institution of a mentoring system to foster growth in teaching excellence among the less experienced faculty, maintaining balance in quality of teaching and research across the department. The faculty hold substantial external research funding and have collaborative arrangements with notable outside institutions including Robarts and the Integrated Manufacturing Technology Institute. The new recruitments have enabled the department to increase their areas of specialization providing a broader range of electives and experiences for their students in Software and Biomedical Engineering; Wireless communication; Information engineering; Real-time systems; VSLI and Microelectronics; Robotics and Controls; Electrostatics and Electromagnetics; Power systems and Power Electronics; and Biomedical Engineering.

Basis of the Report

Questionnaires prepared by the department for the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) providing an overview of the three programs offered, dated September 19, 2000; a confidential accreditation report from CEAB dated June 27, 2001. This report was written based

on a report from a team of external reviewers led by Dr. T.D. Vassos in November 2000. I also had the pleasure of meeting with Dr. R.V. Patel, Professor and Chair on November 7, 2001.

Summary

The CEAB is a professional accreditation board. As such, it focuses in a very detailed way on course selection, number of hours provided in key content areas, and the type and degree of professional and technical support provided to the students. In terms of department resources for the undergraduate program, the committee suggested that a plan to fill academic staff vacancies be articulated, that additional technical support be recruited, and that limits in space and facilities be addressed. These concerns likely resulted from the recent, rapid, expansion of the programs. In regard to course selection and administration the committee suggested that the students' choice of complimentary studies in humanities/social sciences be expanded; that the number of Academic Units be increased to promote greater breadth in the programs, including increases in course offerings in some specific areas; and that some courses and lab components be better coordinated. The committee also suggested that more faculty be licensed engineers and that the amount of engineering science and engineering design taught by licensed engineers should be increased. These comments attest to the level of detail at which the review was directed.

Response of the Department Chair

Dr. Patel was very positive about the review and keenly aware of the areas of concern. He had well articulated plans to meet the suggestions of the committee. In response to the suggestions regarding facilities and resources he reported a plan to hire at least one academic staff within the year, others pending available space. A manager for the undergraduate teaching labs was being hired at the time of our meeting and approval had been obtained for an additional lab support staff. The construction of the new engineering facility, with over 55000 square feet of space, will resolve the majority of the space issues and has the added benefit of reuniting components of the department that are currently housed in disparate locations on campus.

In response to the course suggestions, Dr. Patel reported that options for expansion in humanities/social science offerings is under way; a new course has been added to the curriculum, the lab component of some courses will be expanded to increase the number of Academic Units, and the coordination of lecture and lab components of some key courses has been facilitated by restructuring of components and encouraging better communication between faculty responsible for the lecture and lab components.

The problem of too few licensed engineers on faculty is a temporary problem resulting from the recent expansion. Many new faculty arrived from non-Canadian Accredited programs and, although they have applied for licensure, the process is lengthy and time consuming. Most are currently waiting for approval of their applications.

Reflections on the Reviewing Process

Dr. Patel has a very clear vision for the department and is well aware of what it will take to see that vision put into practice. The rate of growth in both the number of students and the number of programs offered has been significant and offers challenges which the faculty appears to be meeting. The review was thorough and detailed and plans are in place to address all concerns.

PRC Reviewer: Prudence Allen, Faculty of Health Sciences

Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering

The review by the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) was led by Dr. T.D. Vanos P.Eng on November 5, 6 and 7, 2000. The department is an amalgamation of the former Mechanical Engineering and Materials Engineering. Currently having 19 FTE positions with one vacant, its potential is enhanced by the presence of the NRC's Integrated Manufacturing Technologies Institute (IMTI) on campus that provides for the development of a research thrust in Manufacturing Engineering.

The department is authorised to accept 80 students, has 100 enrolled, and could accommodate 160. The program was first evaluated by the Provost's Undergraduate Review Committee in July 1999 in connection with the appointment of the new Chair, Dr Sheasby. The following concerns, raised in the first report, have been addressed:

- The department has hired a new staff member into the Materials group.
- The department is offering the *Materials Engineering* option.
- A compulsory *Materials Selection* course is being offered.
- A major role of the new chair is to nurture the new Faculty to ensure the success of their efforts to establish strong research programs.

A new initiative has been taken to strengthen the integration of *Design* into the program. Dr. Brian Thompson has been appointed to an NSERC Chair to coordinate the teaching of design across the Mechanical and Materials program, with the intent to extend it to the whole Faculty. As much design as possible is done on computers, with half a day each week devoted to using the facilities at the IMTI. The Sunstang solar car will be used as a major vehicle for this project.

There are plans for a new building which will form the first mega-project for the design program. It will include space for a student activity centre, computers, library interface, workshops for projects such as Sunstang. Private funding is being sought.

The CEAB noted that strengths of the Department are a strong effective Chair, a stable Faculty with strong recent recruits, fine Thermo-Fluids and Materials groups, good communications between the Chair and the students, and strong laboratory courses.

The Engineering undergraduate enrolment in year one has increased from about 300 to 450 during the last five years, and it is a challenge to teach the students so as to maintain and enhance the program. The Department is working hard and effectively to meet the needs and expectations of the students, the University and the CEAB.

PRC Reviewer: Patrick Whippey, Department of Physics and Astronomy

Integrated Engineering Program, Faculty of Engineering

The review by the Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) was led by Dr. T. D. Vassos P. Eng. on November 5, 6 and 7, 2000. "Integrated Engineering" is not a department in the Faculty of Engineering. The Integrated Engineering Program, therefore, comprises courses drawn from programs in the Departments of Electrical and Computing Engineering, Mechanical and Materials Engineering and Chemical and Biochemical Engineering.

The principal objective of the Integrated Engineering Program is to provide graduates with a broadly-based non-specialized engineering training. The need for such a program was based on a

survey of Ontario manufacturing companies. The curriculum of the Program is overseen by a Curriculum Committee whose membership include representatives of each of the four engineering departments, a student and Dr. R. Buchal, who is also a member of the Department of Mechanical and Materials Engineering Department. Administrative assistance is provided through the Office of the Associate Dean - Academic Affairs. The functioning of the program depends very heavily on Dr. Buchal's coordination. However, Dr. Buchal is able to devote only a small portion of his time to this function.

CEAB granted an accreditation term of three years, indicating confidence in the Program, and identified the following issues:

- A need to increase the laboratory experience content for the Integrated Engineering students (this issue has been addressed)
- The roles, responsibilities and level of authority of the Curriculum Committee and the (Integrated) Engineering Coordinator need to be clarified (this issue is being discussed in the Faculty at this time)

It is a challenge to obtain course offerings for Integrated Engineering students, for example the practical experience mentioned in the report, because of prerequisites imposed by the department offering it. The Program Coordinator was confident, however, that agreement could be obtained at the Curriculum Committee which would ensure appropriate offerings to Integrated Engineering students and which would satisfy CEAB requirements. It is possible that additional resources will be required to maintain the stability of this Program.

PRC Reviewer: Peter Flanagan, Department of Biochemistry

Update on the University'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 of the audit, UPRAC was supportive of the processes then in place and offered both suggestions and recommendations for its improvement. All of these comments by the auditors have been integrated into guidelines and supporting documentation for undergraduate program reviews at the University and in the Affiliated Colleges.

Western is now in full conformation with provincial program review standards, as set out by the Audit Committee and the Council of Academic Vice-Presidents. This report, submitted through SCAPA to Senate and the Board of Governors, addresses the institutional accountability requirements of the guidelines by documenting the rigour and thoroughness of undergraduate program review at Western.

Report of the Academic Colleague

262ND Meeting of the Council of Ontario Universities

October 18, 2002

The major topic of discussion at this meeting of the Council was, not surprisingly, the double cohort. While there continues to be uncertainty about the number of applications for September, 2003, indications from the secondary schools suggest that the number will be higher than expected. A key assumption in the government's plans was that only 60% of those in the first cohort of the new curriculum would complete their programme in four years. Information from secondary school officials suggests that university-bound students are having less difficulty with the new curriculum than anticipated, and as many as 75-80% of these students may apply for admission to university for the 2003-04 academic year. There was a consensus among those present that the universities would have to accommodate the larger numbers.

Although the uncertainty over the double cohort has kept the issue of growth at the top of the agenda, future discussions between the universities and the province are likely to address issues of quality. The academic colleagues will address the problem of measuring quality in their upcoming meetings. The discussion of the question at Council touched on the now-released report from the Globe and Mail on students' perceptions of the quality of the university experience. There was general agreement that, despite the methodological flaws in the report, it responds to a clear desire among members of the public for more information on issues of quality.

The representative from AUCC (Robert Best) reported encouraging news that the Government of Canada will extend funding for the indirect costs of research for another year. The goal remains to make this a permanent feature of federal support for research. There are continuing discussions of the arrangements under which teaching hospitals receive funding from the CIHR. The position of the universities is that government support for health research is best channelled through the universities, and COU will continue to advocate for this position with CIHR.

The most exciting news for academic researchers was contained in a presentation on the Ontario Scholars Portal, which seeks to build an on-line university catalogue that draws on the resources of all Ontario universities. The development work is continuing but the system can be accessed at <http://scholarsportal.info/>

Kevin McQuillan
Academic Colleague