The Sub-Committee met on December 4, 2017 and submits the following report to the full Committees. Members reviewed the York University Quality Assurance Procedures and the Summary of Principal Findings [Recommendations and Suggestions] of the May 2016 Audit of York University by the Quality Council.

1. Membership and Chair for 2017-2018

The Sub-Committee’s membership for 2017-2018 is as follows:

   Gerald Audette (Member designated by ASCP) Chair
   David Leyton-Brown (Member designated by APPRC)
   Joanne Magee (Member designated by APPRC)
   Alice Pitt (Vice-Provost Academic ex officio)
   Celia Popovic (Member designated by ASCP)
   Fahim Quadir (Dean of Graduate Studies ex officio)

Professor Audette agreed to Chair the Sub-Committee in 2017-2018. Robert Everett (APPRC) and Cheryl Underhill (ASCP) continue to serve as the Sub-Committee’s secretaries. Additional support is provided by Julie Parna (Office of the Vice-Provost Academic) and Hillary Barron (Office of the Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies). We were joined at the inaugural meeting by Associate Dean Michael Zryd of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Nina Unantenne of the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic.

2. Cyclical Program Reviews

   a. Cyclical Programs Reviews / Members Recommendations

Once review documentation has been assembled, and the Vice-Provost has provided a draft Final Assessment Report along with a Decanal Implementation Plan, full dossiers are assigned to individual members (and the secretaries) who are then responsible for attesting to the completion of the review, identifying issues of specific relevance, and making recommendations as to whether or not it is necessary or appropriate to convene a meeting with representatives of a program and the relevant Dean(s) / Principal to address concerns. This delegated approach has worked well, and it is normally not necessary to arrange face-to-face encounters. From time to time an earlier 18-month follow up report will be mandated if the matters raised in a review are pressing or if there is a significant lapse of time between the release of reviewers’ reports and receipt by the Sub-Committee.

At this meeting the Sub-Committee received documentation for the following:

   Communication and Culture (Graduate)
   Communication Studies (Undergraduate)
   Cinema and Media Studies
The Committee did not deem it necessary to arrange meetings to explore matters arising from any of the reviews. The Sub-Committee has asked that the follow-up report for Environmental Studies be submitted in twelve months rather than eighteen to align with processes underway intended to lead to the creation of a new Faculty composed of FES, Geography and potentially others. The 18-month follow up reports for Cinema and Media Studies and Physics and Astronomy must include a mapping of learning outcomes.

Documentation is attached as Appendix A.

b. Overall Impressions and General Issues

Members’ readings of the completed CPRs and Decanal Implementation Plans identified matters which warrant further consideration by the Sub-Committee and the parent committees, including the following:

- The FARs in this batch do vary in form and content, but the Deans and Principal are being guided toward a more consistent approach in terms of the layout of recommendations and progress, provision of appendices and the like.
- Dossiers contain the CVs of faculty members associated with programs. Currently there is no template, and the CVs in use are those that are submitted to the Deans and Principal. Thought should be given to a standardized format along the lines of those accompanying Tri-Council funding applications. This is something that may need discussion with the parties to the YUFA collective agreement.
- The CPR process for Communication and Culture is unique by virtue of involving both York and Ryerson (which will also sign off on the FAR). It also raised the question of how best to identify, foster and support opportunities for collaboration internally between graduate programs that have overlapping curriculum (or titles that include, for example, “Culture.”)
- In their self-studies and at other stages of the process, programs need to scan the environment and take account of the competitive postsecondary landscape.
- From time to time programs will make the case that quality cannot be assured unless additional appointments are made. At a time of resource constraint, it is important that programs continue to focus on quality improvements even in the absence of additional resources.
- ASCP’s efforts to develop pan-University nomenclature are welcome, timely and crucial, and should help to bring greater clarity about the nature of curriculum while encouraging planners to focus on their array. The UAP stresses the need to rationalize “overly complex degree requirements.” Some programs continue to have a labyrinthine structure of constituent offerings.
- Some 18-month follow-up reports did not wholly align with Decanal Implementation Plans.
- One objective of the UAP is to “ensure that the quality assurance framework is refined and respected including the submission of learning outcomes for every program and the alignment of assessment with learning outcomes.” We found that in some cases mapping had not been
completed. It is imperative that proponents of new proposals and programs undergoing reviews fulfill requirements.

- In some instances searches fail because the University does not have a spousal hiring policy, leaving programs under-resourced. The development of a policy should be taken up by the appropriate bodies.

3. Cyclical Program Review and Proposal Brief Documents

The template for new program briefs now contains a reference to experiential education based on UAP objectives. Experiential education is also a priority for the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development. This will undoubtedly be a key element of Strategic Mandate Agreement 3. Ways to promote the objective should be taken up by ASCP and APPRC so that the collegium has a clear understanding of expectations (on the understanding that not every program will provide the same experience, but every student must have opportunities).

The YUQAP needs to be revised to better reflect current CPR protocols as does the Senate Policy on Quality Assurance. We expect to bring recommendations for minor amendments to the Policy during the year, and will provide APPRC and ASCP with an updated YUQAP when amendments have been completed.

4. Quality Council “Self-Audit”

The provincial Quality Assurance Framework and the Quality Council are scheduled for an eight-year review in 2017-2018. In anticipation of an external review, and as part of a self-study phase, the Quality Council has invited universities to respond to a series of questions. In a covering memorandum to ASCP and APPRC, the Vice-Provost Academic provides additional context for a discussion of responses to these questions. Discussion at meetings of the full committees will be provided to the Vice-Provost Academic.

Documentation is attached as Appendix B.

5. Lessons from Quality Council Feedback on Proposals Approved by Senate

The Vice-Provost Academic advised that the Quality Council is returning proposals – sometimes multiple times – for greater clarity about new programs approved by Senate. Often the Council requires more information about how teaching and supervision needs will be met. The allocation of resources to new programs is not a subsidiary matter. It is fundamental to program development. A list of faculty members who are interested or expert in an area is not sufficient evidence that appropriate support will be provided to new programs.

Assessment of need and demand for a program is also essential, and proponents should be made aware of the data and support available to them. As members of the parent committees know, it can prove difficult to turn back a proposal at the Senate level that has been reviewed and approved through departmental and Faculty Council processes. Careful and thorough preparation of proposals prior to submission to Quality Council is imperative.
Joint Sub-Committee on Quality Assurance
Report to the Full Committees

6. 18 Month Follow Up Reports

There is a spate of 18 month follow up reports this year resulting from a lag in prior years. At the December meeting the Sub-Committee received and reviewed the follow up reports for the following programs:

- Administrative Studies, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
- Art History (MA) and Art History and Visual Culture (PhD), Arts, Media, Performance and Design / Graduate Studies
- Business Administration, Undergraduate and Graduate, Schulich / Graduate Studies
- Chemistry, Undergraduate and Graduate, Science / Graduate Studies
- Economics, Undergraduate, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
- French Studies, Undergraduate, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
- History, Undergraduate and Graduate Programs, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies / Graduate Studies
- Italian Studies, Undergraduate, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
- Kinesiology, Undergraduate and Graduate, Health / Graduate Studies
- Linguistics, Undergraduate, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
- Mathematics and Statistics, Undergraduate, Science
- Music, Undergraduate, Arts, Media, Performance and Design
- Nursing, MScN, Health / Graduate Studies
- Social Work, Undergraduate, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
- Sociology, Undergraduate/Graduate, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies / Graduate Studies
- Spanish, Undergraduate, Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
- Translation Studies/Traduction, Undergraduate and Graduate, Glendon / Graduate Studies
- Visual Arts, Graduate, Arts, Media, Performance and Design / Graduate Studies
- Gender, Feminist and Women’s Studies (PhD, MA), Gender and Women’s Studies (BA, iBA - LAPS and Glendon) Sexuality Studies (BA, iBA - LAPS), School of Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies

The Deans and Principal are now asked to “comment on the alignment between the initiatives above and the University Academic Plan” when submitting an 18-month follow-up report. The Sub-Committee applauds this innovation. However, it is noteworthy that many of the entries are either abstract or highly selective. Less attention is paid to Priority 1 – Quality, Innovative Programs for Academic Excellence – than would be expected.

In general, most programs are invested in change and desire to enhance the student experience. Yet some modifications we have seen are somewhat timid or lacking in clarity about the purpose of innovations or how progress will be monitored and measured. Implementation is often done in isolation rather than in full view of the external landscape or internal opportunities for synergies.

As the CPR process evolves at York, we expect to see a strengthening of the responsibilities of the Deans and Principal for facilitating, documenting and supporting enhancements. The Sub-Committee also favours greater consistency in reporting (through templates and clear guidance), breakdowns of enrolments that include international students, and much greater alignment between FARs and 18 month plans. We believe that some programs do not attend to matters of the greatest importance and do not always “close the loop” on worthy recommendations.
7. Changes to the Cyclical Program Review Schedule / De-Coupling of Graduate, Undergraduate Reviews / Suspension of Reviews

There is only one review scheduled for this year (Education). The Sub-Committee advises that undergraduate and graduate program reviews are now synchronized, as are those involving cognate programs housed at Keele and Glendon.

The Sub-Committee concurred with a recommendation of the Vice-Provost Academic to suspend the CPR for Science and Technology Studies. A site visit occurred but the review emphasized matters outside the Quality Assurance framework. The program can take the opportunity afforded by the suspension to undertake positive collegial preparatory discussions.

G. Audette, Chair of the Sub-Committee
Cinema and Media Arts, BA, BFA, MA, MFA, PhD
School of Arts, Media, Performance and Design (AMPD)

Cyclical Program Review – 2008 to 2015
Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan Executive Summary
Reported to Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance: December 4, 2017

Program Description

The BFA in Film Production at York University has the distinction of being the first university-based film school in Canada. The undergraduate program in production came into being in 1969 first as a BA, and then in 1971, it became a BFA (Specialized Honours) in Production with the creation of a separate BA in Film Studies, now called Cinema and Media Studies. In 2009, Canada’s first program in Screenwriting was created and offered as a BFA (Specialized Honours).

Within York University’s MFA Film, there are two degree programs: Screenwriting and Production. Both were established in 1978, and both are recognized internationally as two of the most innovative and dynamic MFA Film degrees in Canada, offering a challenging blend of theory and practice taught by working filmmakers and screenwriters. Both feature a five term, two-year course of study that blend coursework, workshops and field placements, which culminate in a thesis film or screenplay, accompanied by a support paper.

In January 1999, the joint degree program MFA (Film)/MBA (Arts & Media Administration) was introduced. It allows students to earn both degrees after an intensive three-year course of study. Graduates of this highly challenging program pursue careers that jointly utilize advanced creative and business skills, and are uniquely positioned for rewarding jobs in the film, television and new media industries.

There are two core graduate degree programs (MA and PhD) in Cinema and Media Studies at York University. The Masters in Film, established in 1978 was the first graduate program in Canada. The PhD was established in 2008 and was the first stand-alone doctoral program in cinema and media studies in English Canada. The MA is currently a five term, two year course of study compromising of coursework which culminates in a Major Research Paper. The PhD offers a specialization in three fields: 1.Cinema and Cultural Theory; 2.National and Transnational Cinemas; and 3.Cinema and Technologies of the Image.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration (new intake) 2015</th>
<th>Enrolment FTES 2015</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate BA/BFA</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MFA</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewers appointed by the Vice-Provost Academic:**

Marielle Nitoslawska, Professor of Film Production, Concordia University  
Jerry White, Canada Research Chair in European Studies, Dalhousie University  
David Skinner, Chair, Department of Communications, York University

**Documentation Provided to the External Reviewers**

Prior to the site visit, the external reviewers are provided with the following:
- Dean’s /Principal’s Agenda of Concerns
- Department/Program Omnibus Statement (where applicable)
- Program Self-Study Brief, which includes program structure, curriculum and learning outcomes, program reflection, enrolment and retention data, resources, student input and quality enhancement opportunities
- Faculty CVs
- University, Faculty and Program planning documents

**Site Visit:** October 6 and 7, 2016

The Review team met with the following individuals: Barbara Crow, Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies, Sean Brixey (Dean, School of Arts, Media, Design and Performance), Ali Kazimi (Chair, Cinema and Media Studies), Adam Taves, Acting Associate University Librarian, Kathryn Elder (Head, Sound and Image Media Library), Howard Wiseman (Screenwriting area head), Laurence Green (acting Film Production area head), John Greyson (MFA program director), Sharon Hayashi (MA and PhD program director), Larry Gilmore (manager, Studio Operations), Kenneth Rogers (Associate Dean Research, AMPD). They also met with groups of undergraduate students in production, screenwriting, and Film Studies; graduate students in production, screenwriting, and Film Studies; faculty members in production, screenwriting, and Film Studies; and administrative and technical staff.
The reviewers also toured facilities, including, production facilities at main campus, including equipment depot and storage, editing facilities, studios, etc.; off-campus production facilities (“Cine-Space” on Kipling avenue); and the graduate student lounge and library.

In addition, they attended a York-sponsored screening of online work at a downtown Toronto venue.

**Outcome:**
The Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance concluded that the Decanal Plan addressed the review recommendations. The Joint Sub-Committee on Quality Assurance requested that curriculum mapping for all of the programs be submitted to the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic by November 30, 2018. Progress on items in the Dean’s plan will be included in the Follow-up Report due June 2019. The next CPR will begin in the Fall of 2023.

**Strengths:**
The Reviewers made particular note of the library resource available to students, faculty and staff. “The Sound and Image Library holds one of the most outstanding collections of world cinema found in any Canadian university, and some of the films the library holds (mainly by Canadian experimental filmmakers) are very difficult to find elsewhere. The overall library situation is exemplary.

The strength of the faculty complement is impressive. The Reviewer Report stated, “Production faculty represent an impressive cross-section of varied cinematic practices, and collectively offer the breadth and diversity that has had, and continues to have, a direct impact on the diversity of the curriculum in the core undergraduate courses and in the unique profile of the MFA.” They also noted, “Cinema and Media Studies faculty represents a very wide range of specialization and the ability to deliver a diverse curriculum taught by bona fide experts in specific areas is certainly present.”

**Opportunities for Enhancement:**
The Review Report provided a fulsome and robust discussion of the materials included in the self-study, the Dean’s agenda of concerns, and the challenges and issues that were raised during the site visit.

The Review Report was detailed in its evaluation of the curriculum, the student outcomes, the faculty and staff complement and the resources challenges. The report included 10 detailed recommendations, the first five related to the curriculum and the other six related to the administration and resources required to support the program. The report’s summary of recommendations is appended and abbreviated below.

The recommendations regarding the curriculum are focused on the following:
1. York should consider eliminating the BFA in Screenwriting as a free-standing Program stream. There is clearly some excellent teaching going on there but there are long-term problems of faculty complement, low enrolments and disconnect from production that we think can be well-addressed by students who want to be screenwriters being encouraged to pursue a more general degree in production, one that would still allow them to avail of the clearly very high-quality teaching in screenwriting that York offers.

2. The undergraduate Production program should consider innovative curriculum solutions to improve the transition between the first two and the last two years of the program.

3. More effort should be made to integrate theory and practice within the undergraduate BFA; this effort should be paralleled by an initiative to bring some studies courses into meaningful interaction with the production realm.

4. The role of professional internships in the curricula of the Department should be reconsidered, both at the graduate and undergraduate levels.

5. The BFA course numbers & titles should be reviewed where needed. The BFA requirements no not provide a clear overview of the program, as they should.

With regards to administration and resources, there were six recommendations. The first of these recommendations was related to the volume of requests for student and faculty assistance. The second was related to the extensive service component assumed by faculty in the production program. The reviewers felt that both of these required immediate investigation.

Two additional recommendations focused on the requirement for policies to a) ensure adequate upgrading of digital technologies, and b) a sustainable equipment access policy to restore acceptable working conditions for the technical support staff of the depot area. Both are essential to maintaining the reputation, credibility and competitive advantage of the graduate and undergraduate programs.

**Dean’s Implementation Plan**

In her Implementation Plan, the Interim Dean of AMPD notes the following: “Like many disciplines, Film has experienced radical shifts related to the rapid introduction of new technologies. Film production remains a vibrant field and I am pleased to report that the current chair and I have had positive conversations related to potential curricular trajectories in the years ahead.

The Interim Dean has provided details about the proposed follow-up for recommendations made by the external reviewers. They are incorporated into the chart below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-up</th>
<th>First Responsibility for Follow-up</th>
<th>Final Responsibility for Follow-up</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating the BFA in Screenwriting</td>
<td>Discussion of a common first year curriculum</td>
<td>CMA Executive Committee; CMA Department</td>
<td>Dean’s Office and possibly AAPPC; Faculty Council</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examination and reassessment of the upper level Screenwriting</td>
<td>NOTE: In the MFA, Production and Screenwriting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular solutions to improve student transition from years 1&amp;2 to years 3&amp;4</td>
<td>Curriculum and student selection process for upper year courses to be examined and reassessed</td>
<td>CMA Executive Committee; CMA Department; Production Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Associate Dean Academic, AMPD</td>
<td>FW 2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better integration of theory and practice at the undergraduate level</td>
<td>Honours BFA stream in Media Arts</td>
<td>CMA Executive Committee; CMA Department</td>
<td>AMPD AAPPC; Faculty Council; Senate</td>
<td>Completed in 2016/17; launching in September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsideration of the role of professional internships at the undergraduate and graduate levels</td>
<td>Better use of support offered by the AMPD EE Administrator</td>
<td>CMA Executive Committee; CMA Department</td>
<td>EE Administrator and Associate Dean Academic</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a process for submission and approval of EE proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the use of opportunities available at CineSpace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of BFA course titles and numbers</td>
<td>All course titles and numbers to be reviewed for clarity of sequence</td>
<td>CMA Executive Committee; CMA Department</td>
<td>FW 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the heavy workload experienced by staff</td>
<td>Potential instances of staff being asked to perform duties beyond their job description to be identified and corrected. CineSiege to be staffed by a part-time summer student. Cases of faculty/staff negative interactions to be addressed. Explore possibility of increased banding for some positions and hiring additional personnel in Equipment Room.</td>
<td>CMA Studio Manager; Department Chair; Faculty Relations; HR; Dean; Department Chair; HR</td>
<td>FW 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address the heavy workload experienced by production area faculty</td>
<td>Current curriculum and number of student projects and screenings to be examined and re-assessed</td>
<td>CMA Executive Committee; CMA Department</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure ongoing commitment to equipment upgrades</td>
<td>Explore sponsorship opportunities for new equipment</td>
<td>AMPD Sr Development Officer; CMA Executive Committee</td>
<td>FW 2017/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a sustainable equipment access process</td>
<td>Develop guidelines for student use of equipment</td>
<td>CMA Studio Manager; CMA Executive Committee; Production Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>EO; Dean’s Office</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore hiring additional personnel in Equipment Room.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum mapping for all degree programs will be submitted to the Office of the Vice-Provost Academic by November 30, 2018. A report on the progress of the other initiatives will be provided in the Follow-up Report, due in June 2019.

Alice J. Pitt  
Vice-Provost Academic  
York University
Communication Studies, Undergraduate, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies

Cyclical Program Review – 2008 to 2015

Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan Executive Summary

Reported to Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance: December 4, 2017

Program Description

The Program in Communication Studies began in 1980/81 and the Department of Communication Studies was founded in 2009 in the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Registration (new intake) 2015/16</th>
<th>Enrolment FTES 2015/16</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Studies</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>Hons 165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewers appointed by the Vice-Provost Academic:

Brenda Austin-Smith, Associate Professor and Head of English, Film and Theatre, University of Manitoba
Darin Barney, Grierson Chair and Associate Professor, Communication Studies, McGill University
Annie Bunting, Associate Professor, York University

Documentation Provided to the External Reviewers

Prior to the site visit, the external reviewers are provided with the following:

- Dean’s/Principal’s Agenda of Concerns
- Program Self-Study Brief, which includes program structure, curriculum and learning outcomes, program reflection, enrolment and retention data, resources, student input and quality enhancement opportunities
- Faculty CVs
- University, Faculty and Program planning documents
Cyclical Program Review Process

An Undergraduate Program Review Committee was struck in July 2015 to take responsibility for the requirements of the self-study. The committee met with the Office of Vice-Provost (Academic), the Institute for Social Research (ISR), Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (OIPA, representatives of the Teaching Commons and alumni officers in the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies (LA&PS), to map out data collection strategies, timelines, and expectations for the self-study and cyclical program review. Inputs from the Program’s faculty members were sought through verbal and email correspondence including monthly Departmental meetings from September 2015 on, and these were incorporated into the self-study. A full-day Undergraduate Program Retreat was held on 3 May, 2016 to assess the strengths and weakness of the Program’s curriculum, course delivery and overall program directions.

Site Visit: January 11-13, 2017

The site visit for the Communications Studies program and the York/Ryerson Joint Program in Communication and Culture spanned three days and took place on both the York University campus and at Ryerson University. The undergraduate program was the focus of meetings on January 11 and the reviewers began with a meeting with Alice Pitt, Vice-Provost Academic and Barbara Crow, Dean of Graduate Studies. Meetings followed with the Chair of the Department, David Skinner, Undergraduate Program Director, Mary-Louise Craven, members of the undergraduate program committee, Associate Dean McMurtry, university librarians, undergraduate faculty and undergraduate students.

Outcome:
The Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance concluded that the Decanal response adequately addressed the review recommendations. Progress on the recommendations will be included in the Follow-up Report due June 2019. The next CPR will begin in the Fall of 2023.

Strengths:
The Reviewers noted the following in their summary statement, “Communication Studies provides its students with excellent instruction in the history, theory, and application of communications. The focus of the program is solidly academic, though experiential learning is a part of every level of instruction. Faculty are highly regarded researchers with impressive dossiers of publications, funding, and student supervision.”
Opportunities for Enhancement:

The Review Report indicates that the reading done before the site visit allowed them to identify the following as the most pressing issues:

--Program identity
--Student enrolment
--Student learning experience --Curriculum
--Facilities and staffing

With regards to the first item above, the Reviewers noted that based on their discussions with the program and the Dean’s Office, “The program is free to decide what approaches constitute its distinctiveness. But whatever it decides must be clear in all of its public communications, including its website and program literature, which can still create the impression that the program has a strong professional, even vocational, cast.”

The Reviewers were of the opinion that student enrolment and retention may continue to decline if the program determines that it will maintain its exclusive four-year degree as communications programs in other institutions increase. The reviewers provided some suggestions for open enrolments to non-majors but noted it will depend on what the faculty members determine about the program.

The reviewers noted that based on their meetings with students, that they “are indeed often unable to make connections between their program learning, and the "real world" use of their critical skills.” The International BA (IBA) degree offers added complexity for students trying to complete degree requirements. The Review Report states “students do not have a strong sense of the shape of the program, and of how the three streams take shape within it,” and that there is too much repetition in courses and assignments as they move from first year to upper year courses.

The reviewers noted that, “the program is suffering from the replacement of retired faculty with contract faculty.”
The Reviewer Recommendations are listed below:

Recommendation #1: that Communication Studies take steps to re-articulate its identity and its strengths as a program stressing a liberal arts ethos and critical analysis of communications and media.

Recommendation #2: that the program re-visit its enrolment goals and expectations in tandem with its re-articulation of identity.

Recommendation #3: that the department continue to work on communicating the program's currency and intellectual relevance to students.

Recommendation #4: that improvements be made to the academic advising of students in the iBA program, including, if possible, offering on-line degree audits to iBA students.

Recommendation #5: that the curriculum committee actively review and approve syllabi for all courses to guard against repetition of material and assignments.

Recommendation #6: that the curriculum committee consider assigning more introductory and 2nd year courses to contract academic staff, and assigning the preponderance of upper-year courses to permanent faculty.

Recommendation #7: that the department provide more formal TA orientation.

Recommendation #8: that the Faculty provide funds to hire a computer lab technician to support teaching in Communication Studies.

Recommendation #9: that the Communication Studies program be given new tenure-track hires in order to maintain its program coherence and quality.

**Dean’s Implementation Plan**

The Dean’s Implementation Plan offers a careful consideration of the Review Report and the recommendations, as well as the Program’s response. The Office of the Dean encourages the Communications program to decide about its focus and direction. This is, as has been noted, essential for students as they make decisions about which program to pursue. The Dean’s Plan states, "We would first, however, encourage Communications Studies to engage internally in a discussion about future direction while reflecting on the potential long-term consequences of the direction they choose. Careful attention should be paid as well to how the Program’s direction, whatever it may be, avoids duplication with other programs and departments in LA&PS in terms of curriculum and topic areas."

The plan notes that careful planning of enrolment and resourcing desires will
follow a decision about the pathway forward. Opportunities the program may wish to consider will be the option of a minor program or opening some courses to non-majors, as well as pathways from College partners such as Seneca College.

Students are not clear about the goals of the program as a whole and provided comments that highlight their confusion about the nature of the program. Students also identified repetition in courses, instructors and assignments as they progress through the program. A review of the curriculum would ensure “coherent ‘laddering’ of skills and knowledge and to avoid duplication.”

The Dean’s Implementation plan includes the chart below outlining actions and timelines to be followed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>First Responsibility</th>
<th>Final Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a thorough review of the strategic academic direction of Communication Studies</td>
<td>Communication Studies Department</td>
<td>Communication Studies Department submitting a report to the Dean</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a clear five-year enrolment and resource plan</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Review of the five-year plan by the Associate Dean Programs</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build clear in-program (and external) communication, student support, as well as relevant experiential education options for students</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Submission of appropriate learning outcomes and courses to the curriculum committee of LA&amp;PS</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold a “curricular retreat” to inform all teaching staff of the curricular goals of Communication Studies</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
<td>Report to the Associate Dean Programs on the results and usefulness of this retreat</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A report on the progress of these initiatives will be provided in the Follow-up Report which will be due in June 2019.

Alice J. Pitt
Vice-Provost Academic
York University
English Studies, Undergraduate Program, Glendon College

Cyclical Program Review – 2008 to 2015
Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan Executive Summary
Reported to Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance: December 4, 2017

Program Description

The English Department at Glendon was founded in 1966 and is one of the founding departments. Through its offerings in Literature and Drama, Linguistics and Language Studies, ESL and Applied Linguistics, and the Certificate in D-TEIL, the English Department plays a major role in furthering Glendon’s mission of bilingual excellence and a bilingual education in the Liberal Arts.

Degree options include Specialized Honours (BA and IBA), Honours (BA and IBA), 90-credit BA and double major and major/minors.

Students may also pursue the Certificate in the Discipline of Teaching English as an International Language, of particular interest to those who wish to teach English abroad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration (new intake) 2015</th>
<th>Enrolment FTES 2015/16</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English (BA)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33 Hons; 7 90-credit; 9 minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewers appointed by the Vice-Provost Academic:

Dr. Jeremy Lopez, University of Toronto
Dr. Maria Constanza Guzman, School of Translation and Department of Hispanic Studies, Glendon College, York University
Documentation Provided to the External Reviewers

Prior to the site visit, the external reviewers are provided with the following:
- Principal’s Agenda of Concerns
- Program Self-Study Brief, which includes program structure, curriculum and learning outcomes, program reflection, enrolment and retention data, resources, student input and quality enhancement opportunities
- Faculty CVs
- University, Faculty and Program planning documents

Cyclical Program Review Process

The self-study report was a joint-effort of the current and previous Acting Chairs. The document was distributed to the entire department on December 1st, 2016 inviting feedback (additional information, points of clarification, alternative points of view) until December 15, 2016. Online discussion afforded all members of the department the opportunity to participate in the preparation of the self-study report. Students provided input through a student survey.

Site Visit: March 1, 2017

During the site visit, the reviewers met with the Vice-Provost Academic, Alice Pitt, and the following individuals from Glendon: Principal Donald Ipperciel, Dany Savard, Acting Head of the Leslie Frost Library, faculty members, the administrative assistant and two groups of students, including majors and non-majors. In addition, e-mail communication from a faculty member was reviewed.

Outcome:
The Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance concluded that the Decanal response adequately addressed the review recommendations. Progress on the recommendations will be included in the Follow-up Report due June 2019. The next CPR will begin in the Fall of 2023.

Strengths:

The Reviewers stated, “The English studies curriculum is rigorous and wide-ranging,” and they noted the extraordinary amount of work that ensures ….students are well-versed in the English literary tradition, in linguistics, and in current critical and theoretical topics and fields of literary studies. The Reviewers noted the essential services provided by the ESL program for the bilingual mission of the College. “Small class sizes and strong faculty commitment give students the small-liberal-arts-college experience for which they have come to Glendon.”
Opportunities for Enhancement:

The Reviewers noted the challenges presented by the small instructional complement which means “that almost any given course will be offered once every two or three years”.

While the Reviewers understood that linguistics has historically been central to the identity of the Department of English Studies, it was not made clear by faculty or students why linguistics courses should continue to be offered, and required, when there is a separate program at Glendon in Linguistics and Language Studies in the Glendon Department of Multidisciplinary Studies.

The Reviewers also questioned what practical goal is achieved by “insisting on drama as a discrete area of focus, especially since no drama course (or set of drama courses) alone fulfills a program requirement. In fact, Drama Studies is offered as a major through the Department of Multidisciplinary Studies at Glendon.

The Reviewers made the following comment on resources. “The Department of English Studies does not have enough permanent faculty to deliver its program, or even a much reduced version of its program, easily and efficiently to students. Current faculty resources are stretched to maximum capacity.”

The Reviewers also noted that the lack of a Chair has impacted recruitment and complement planning.

Reviewer Recommendations and Dean’s Implementation Plan

The Principal at Glendon notes that the likelihood of the recommendations being successfully implemented is predicated on re-establishing proper departmental governance. An Interim Chair is in place for FW2017-2018. He also notes in his implementation plan does not include the recommendation to hire three new faculty members. The Principal notes that, “It will be important that we conduct a Faculty-wide discussion in order to reach general consensus on hiring priority among the departments/programs.”

The chart on the following page outlines the recommendations that are being considered and provides timelines for implementation.
A report on the progress of these initiatives will be provided in the Follow-up Report which will be due in June 2019.

Alice J. Pitt
Vice-Provost Academic
York University
English Studies and Creative Writing, Undergraduate, English Graduate Programs, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies

Cyclical Program Review – 2008 to 2015

Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan Executive Summary

Reported to Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance: December 4, 2017

Program Description

The English Department at York University in the early 1960s. Students may pursue a full range of undergraduate BA degree options in English (specialized honours through to a minor) as well as an honours or honours/minor in Creative Writing.

Since its inception (MA approved in 1965, PhD in 1968), the Graduate Program in English has focused on the theorized and historicized, critical analysis of literatures, with special emphasis on Canada’s distinctive contribution – namely, Canadian literature as a distinct field and participant in the development of Commonwealth studies, then postcolonial studies, the intersections of which include innovative research in the writings of diasporic and indigenous peoples and communities, theories of imperialism and its resistance, and globalization.

The Graduate Program in English is the only program in Canada to offer a Type II Graduate Diploma in World Literature which admitted its first students in 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Level</th>
<th>Registration (new intake) 2015/16</th>
<th>Enrolment FTES 2015/16</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English (BA)</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>Hons 146; 90-credit 76; minor 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>n/a (upper year options)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hons 16; minor 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reviewers appointed by the Vice-Provost Academic:

Martin Kreiswirth, Professor of English, McGill University  
Margery Fee, Professor of English, University of British Columbia  
Marlene Shore, Professor of History, York University

Documentation Provided to the External Reviewers

Prior to the site visit, the external reviewers are provided with the following:
- Dean’s/Principal’s Agenda of Concerns
- Program Self-Study Brief, which includes program structure, curriculum and learning outcomes, program reflection, enrolment and retention data, resources, student input and quality enhancement opportunities
- Faculty CVs
- University, Faculty and Program planning documents

Cyclical Program Review Process

The EN Unit (undergraduate department and graduate program) has approached “self-study” as a continual process since 2007-08, when the old Faculty of Arts English Department, the Atkinson Faculty English Department, and the Creative Writing Program in the Humanities Division began the process of merging to form a new EN Unit, housed in the new Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies.

In 2015 (graduate) and 2016 (undergraduate), in preparation for the Quality Assurance Coordinated Program Review, an extensive questionnaire was sent to all students in the Unit comprised of institutionally set questions allowing for program comparison data analysis, as well as a series of EN unit specific questions.

The methods used for the EN unit self-study comprised generation and analysis of numerical and qualitative responses to several crucial Faculty-wide benchmarks as well as additional unit-specific questions guided by the quality assurance, coordinated program review (CPR) template, including responses to the unit’s previous undergraduate program review, and others generated by the unit’s, the Faculty’s, and the University’s recent history. Two “town hall” meetings were held for undergraduate English and Creative Writing, and graduate English students respectively.
Site Visit: November 8, 2017

During the site visit the reviewers met with the Vice-Provost Academic, Alice Pitt, J.J. McMurtry, Associate Dean Programs, Sandra Whitworth, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, the Chair of the Department, the Coordinator of the creative Writing Program and representatives from the University libraries, Adam Taves and Lisa Sloniowski. The reviewers held a meeting with all levels of undergraduate students, faculty members from both of the undergraduate programs and the graduate program, the administrative assistant and two groups of students, including majors and non-majors.

Outcome:

The Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance concluded that the Decanal response adequately addressed the review recommendations. Progress on the recommendations will be included in the Follow-up Report due June 2019. The next CPR will begin in the Fall of 2023.

Strengths

The following statement, taken from the Undergraduate self-study document, describes the options for students, “To promote breadth and depth of knowledge appropriate to each major program in the discipline, the Department is able to provide a great variety of courses necessary for robust English literary study, including courses in historical periods from medieval to contemporary, in the literature of several nations (Canadian and post-colonial as well as English and American); in the various literary genres such as poetry, fiction, drama, non-fictional prose; and in criticism and in literary theory.”

The Graduate program self-study provides the following insight, “What enables any responsible engagement of literary study in an era of globalization is deep scholarship in national, generic, stylistic, and thematic traditions. Fields offered by the Graduate Program, therefore, are supported by specialized professorial training, research and publication, courses offered, directed readings supervised, and doctoral major field comprehensive examinations in”…. fields grouped into three types: nation, genre and focus.
Reviewer Recommendations and Dean’s Implementation Plan

For both the undergraduate and graduate programs, the Reviewers Recommendations fall generally into two categories: curriculum and the program renewal. The Dean’s Implementation Plan states, “I would like to compliment the reviewers and program for a thorough and considered report. While there are some issues of difference and emphasis, the program has presented itself in a clear and reflective manner.”

Noting the recommendations from the reviewers regarding resources and curriculum, the Dean’s Implementation Plan offers the following observation, “It seems that … there is a need for the Department of English to focus on its curriculum as a means of providing the Department with new intellectual life and direction. With this direction, issues of resourcing, complexity of degree, and student satisfaction could be addressed.” In other words, once the program review and any potential revision to the program are completed, a hiring plan can be formulated.

Similarly, there are recommendations related to the graduate program that relate to resource renewal and curriculum. The Dean’s Implementation Plan suggests that the program, “look at their fields of expertise at the graduate level to see what might be done to position the program for the future and perhaps look to areas of expertise that may appeal to both students and faculty going forward.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>First Responsibility</th>
<th>Final Responsibility</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a thorough review of the undergraduate curriculum focused on (1) majors, (2) “service” courses, and (3) online and EE</td>
<td>English Department</td>
<td>English Department with Associate Dean Programs and the Curriculum Manager of LA&amp;PS</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review class size at various year levels</td>
<td>English Department</td>
<td>English Department with Associate Dean Faculty Affairs through a workload document submission</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review relationship with the Professional Writing Program to identify opportunities and clarify relationship</td>
<td>English and Professional Writing Department</td>
<td>Meeting with Associate Dean Programs to discuss actionable items</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a recruitment strategy for Graduate English or review program structure</td>
<td>Graduate Program in English</td>
<td>Meeting with Associate Dean Graduate and Research to discuss opportunities</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review areas of expertise in Graduate teaching and research</td>
<td>Graduate Program in English</td>
<td>Graduate Program in English in consultation with Associate Dean Graduate and Research</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A report on the progress of these initiatives will be provided in the Follow-up Report which will be due in June 2019.

Alice J. Pitt  
Vice-Provost Academic  
York University
Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BScN Honours), Faculty of Health
York-Seneca-Georgian Collaborative BScN
2nd Entry BScN Program
Post-RN Internationally Educated Nurses (IEN) Program

Cyclical Program Review – 2008 to 2015
Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan Executive Summary
Reported to Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance: December 4, 2017

Program Description

The York-Seneca-Georgian Collaborative BScN program is offered collaboratively with Georgian College and Seneca College, is a geographically articulated model, the first 2 years of the 4-year curriculum are completed at one of the college sites. The final 2 years are completed at York University. The 2nd Entry BScN Program is a 2-year accelerated program begun in 2005 and is intended for learners with no previous nursing experience. The Post-RN Internationally Educated Nurses programs supports IENs residing in Ontario to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to successfully transition to practicing nursing in Ontario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Registration (new intake) 2015/16</th>
<th>Enrolment FTES 2015/16</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Entry BScN</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEN BScN</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative BScN</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewers appointed by the Vice-Provost Academic:

Dr. Olive Wahoush, Associate Director, Newcomer Health, Community and International Outreach, McMaster University
Dr. Robert Cribbie, Psychology, York University
**Documentation Provided to the External Reviewers**

Prior to the site visit, the external reviewers are provided with the following:
- Dean’s/Principal’s Agenda of Concerns
- Program Self-Study Brief, which includes program structure, curriculum and learning outcomes, program reflection, enrolment and retention data, resources, student input and quality enhancement opportunities
- Faculty CVs
- University, Faculty and Program planning documents

**Cyclical Program Review Process**

From the Self-Study Report: “In preparation for this self-study, School of Nursing leadership/administrative faculty and staff attended an orientation by the Associate Vic-President’s office. The Institute for Social Research (ISR) assisted the School in surveying students and alumni and submitted a report. The faculty met with collaborative partners at usual and annual retreats that focused on program review for both accreditation and preparing this self-study. In addition, both reviews were an item on monthly School of Nursing Council meetings for the 2015-16 academic year. Lastly, the School’s leadership team held separate meetings to consolidate input.”

**Site Visit:** Wednesday, November 3, 2016

The site visit for the Nursing BScN programs took place on the York University campus and began with a meeting with the Vice-Provost Academic Alice Pitt. The Itinerary offered the reviewers the opportunity to meet Dean of the Faculty of Health, Paul McDonald and with the following administrators of the Nursing programs:
- Janet Jeffrey, Interim Director, Nursing, York University
- Mina Singh & Nancy Sangiuliano, Associate Directors, York University
- Grace Ross & Monica Gola, Undergraduate Program Directors
- Pat Bradley, Undergraduate Program Coordinator
- Maria May & Nadia Torresan-Doodnaught (Seneca College)
- Deb Witmer, Nina Koniuch & Kathy Weatherall (Georgian College)
- York University Librarians

There were meetings with each group of students (Collaborative, 2nd Entry and IEN) as well as tours of the INSC Lab and Facilities where they met the director Laura Nicholson. The day ended with a meeting of the Nursing Faculty members.
Outcome:
The Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance concluded that the Decanal response adequately addressed the review recommendations. Progress on the recommendations will be included in the Follow-up Report due June 2019. The next CPR will launch in the Fall of 2023.

Strengths:
The Reviewers noted that the curriculum reflects the current state of nursing and that the courses offered seem appropriate. They noted, “There are opportunities with the reading courses and clinical practice options in year four to help students begin to understand their potential future roles in case management, capacity building, policy development and emerging specialist roles”. The Review Report affirms that curricular content is aligned with program goals, Nursing standards and the undergraduate degree level expectations. In addition, there was recognition for the innovation described here: “The clinical preparedness permit is a novel structure ensuring that students are prepared to enter the practice areas and likely represents York University favourably”. Evaluation and assessment of students is varied and effective, and relates directly to the type of course being taken.

Opportunities for Enhancement:
The Reviewers noted, “There were multiple reports from students regarding substantial overlap from one course to the next. Although overlap from course to course can help solidify knowledge, too much overlap can stunt development. Issues were also raised that course titles did not reflect the material being taught in those courses (which may relate to the overlap issue)”.

A number of issues were raised by students about the transition from the College site to the University site:
   a) Students from Georgian and Seneca Colleges expressed frustration that they were 'cut off' from library and other services at their College site when they transitioned to York. Students mentioned that access to their respective College site facilities might be helpful when they were completing clinical practice placements in Toronto and commuting time home close to their college site on a daily basis.
   b) Students in all programs did report that it was very difficult to obtain assistance from ‘Learning Disabilities Services’ and the ‘Writing Centre’ at York.

One concern among students was the amount of time available in the Nursing Simulation Centre, both for course work and for drop-in. Although there appeared to be a disconnect between the students’ perceptions of the amount of drop-in time at the simulation centre and the posted hours, it is imperative that sufficient time is allotted for drop-in so that students can hone their skills with different equipment, and in different situations. Drop in times also need to accommodate students who commute to outlying towns (which might already be the case, but could be reviewed to ensure that students are aware and to evaluate uptake).
The reviewers also made an observation about clinical placements and simulations suggestion that a rotation between the two might be an option.

Regarding the RN licensing examination results, the report notes that the Collaborative Nursing levels are improving. The 2nd entry program enjoys substantive success on par with most other programs in Ontario. The Reviewers noted that the IEN program is exceptional in terms of success in writing the NCLEX RN examinations.

Reviewer Recommendations and Dean’s Implementation Plan

The Dean’s plan thanks the reviewers for their investment of time and energy in the process as well as, “faculty, staff and students in the School of Nursing and our collaborative partners at Seneca and Georgian Colleges for their ongoing efforts to create an excellent set of programs”, and for their continuous improvement of our programs. He notes, “An important indication of our good standing is notice from the Canadian Association of Schools of Nursing that all of our programs have been granted accreditation for at least five more years.”

The list of specific recommendations for the Nursing programs is appended to this final assessment report. The Dean’s implementation plan addresses these 14 recommendations and the underlying concerns that gave rise to them by clustering them into four overarching themes. The Dean’s Plan describes them as these:

1. Enhanced enrolment and recruitment of students (recommendations 1, 4)
2. Improved oversight and coordination in planning, implementing and monitoring the curriculum and student evaluation (recommendations 2, 3, 5, 7, 12)
3. Potential alterations in the curricular design and delivery (recommendations 8, 10, 13)
4. Enhancing program resources including faculty complement, staff, clinical placements, and student transitions. (recommendations 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14).

The Dean’s Implementation Plan is also appended, however, this report provides the following summary of actions to be taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation theme</th>
<th>Action and Responsible Party</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced enrolment and recruitment of students</td>
<td>Undergraduate domestic enrolment must remain at current levels to maintain quality and remain within enrolment caps</td>
<td>Ongoing focus is on improving quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD program will launch in 2018</td>
<td>First cohort begins September 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase international student enrolments</td>
<td>Ad hoc Committee to present report to Faculty Council in Spring of 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved oversight and coordination of curriculum and student evaluation</td>
<td>MOU of the Collaborative Nursing Partners</td>
<td>Signed at the end of August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of reference established committee and sub-committee including membership, who chairs, the scope of work, more frequent meeting times, and a requirement to provide regular progress reports</td>
<td>Incorporated into the MOU, August 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub committees have been specifically designed to address curricular design and implementation, alignment and implementation of policy, as well as enrolment and other administrative issues</td>
<td>Incorporated into the MOU, August 2017</td>
<td>Subcommittees are meeting and a full report due in May 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage faculty in the collective design of the overall curriculum and inviting instructors to regularly identify where they believe potential unnecessary redundancy exists and to reduce curricular “drift”.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The partners in the collaborative program to meet more regularly, including two day retreats which build relationships and provide suitable time to discuss and work through both simple and more complex challenges.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routinely do high quality follow up surveys with all graduates, including but not limited to nursing.</td>
<td>Discussions have begun in the School of Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations in the curricular design and delivery</td>
<td>Ad hoc committee to examine alternative delivery models for the collaborative programs, including but not limited to delivery of all four years of curriculum at each site</td>
<td>Comprehensive review to be submitted to the Steering Committee in May 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing to identify at least two priority issues and to develop and implement one or more actions to address and improve faculty and staff culture and environmental support</td>
<td>Items and action plan to be finalized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Program resources</td>
<td>School of Nursing Director's position</td>
<td>On track to be filled by January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two professorial appointments – one filled; one declined.</td>
<td>One appointment filled as of July 1, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three CLA positions filled</td>
<td>July 1, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven additional tenure track positions approved</td>
<td>To be filled for July 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New opportunities for placement with CAMH, Humber River, University Health Network</td>
<td>Ongoing discussions and MOU renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A report on the progress of these initiatives will be provided in the Follow-up Report which will be due in June 2019.

Alice J. Pitt  
Vice-Provost Academic  
York University
1) Find creative ways to attract students into the PhD program including identifying high performing students in the BScN program with potential and, when appropriate, encourage them to proceed to graduate school and to seek out faculty positions.
2) Review the course curriculum with an emphasis on removing overlap and ensuring that the material taught in each course reflects the title and objectives of the course.
3) Put in place mechanisms to monitor faculty compliance with course outlines and approved evaluations of student performance. This will likely require an agreement on the boundaries of academic freedom. Students must be confident that they are being evaluated fairly and equitably.
4) Increasing the number of faculty members in order to be able to increase enrolment in the 2nd Entry and IEN programs. There is demand and a healthy pool of applicants so York should be benefitting from this situation. Obviously this will be a challenge given the small pool of qualified applicants, however it is worth putting in the effort (e.g., marketing) in order to develop the program.
5) More communication is necessary between the College and University administrators. This could come through College representation on the School of Nursing Council, more frequent meetings, etc. For example, consider meeting each semester rather than the current annual meetings.
6) Continually explore new opportunities and models for student placements. Although the simulation centre is valuable, it is imperative that students receive substantial time in human contact situations.
7) Explore ways of evaluating practicum instructors. Students reported that they received varying levels of instruction from one instructor to the next and felt that some were simply not competent for the position. Incorporating some sort of student evaluation system (if one is not already in place) could be very beneficial for ensuring that students are receiving valuable training.
8) Community Health needs to be more evident in curricular content and in experiential courses. This may also be part of new opportunities for student placements.
9) Explore options for new transition approaches from College sites to York. The PEP rally was an important welcome for those students who experienced it.
10) Consider online learning partnered with clinical placements at distance to reduce the commuting burden on students allowing them more opportunities to complete more of the program close to home.
11) Also continued access to libraries and other resources at the College sites after the students transition to York would provide enhanced opportunities for students who live close to the College sites.
12) An exit survey of graduated or graduating students would be a valuable addition to the current in-program survey. Students surveyed at the end of their program may provide more balanced information and information about employment.
13) Survey faculty and staff for information about quality of work life and for ideas for ongoing improvements based on their working experiences in the nursing programs.
14) Include a periodic review of administrative and other supports for the Nursing Programs at York. Ideally this will include administrative supports for faculty and supports for student health and advising. These are all important factors in the quality of experiences for Faculty and students.
Environmental Studies, Bachelor of Environmental Studies (BES), Master of Environmental Studies (MES) and PhD

Cyclical Program Review – 2008 to 2015

Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan Executive Summary

Reported to Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance: December 4, 2017

Program Description:

Founded in 1968, the Faculty of Environmental Studies (FES) at York University was the first of its kind in Canada. As an innovative experiment in graduate interdisciplinary pedagogy, with individualized Plans of Study, field experiences, and a qualitative grading system, FES began with the Masters in Environmental Studies program in 1969, including a focus on urban and regional planning. Over two decades later, in 1992, the Faculty expanded and developed an undergraduate (BES) and a doctoral program (PhD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Studies</th>
<th>Registration (new intake) 2015/16</th>
<th>Enrolment FTES 2015/16</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Environmental Studies (BES)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>96 Hons; 32 90-credit; 4 minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Certificates</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Environmental Studies (MES)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewers appointed by the Vice-Provost Academic:

Paul Robbins, Professor and Director, Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Dan Walters, Associate Professor, Department of Geography, Nipissing University
Steven Tufts, Associate Professor, Department of Geography, York University


**Documentation Provided to the External Reviewers**

Prior to the site visit, the external reviewers are provided with the following:

- Dean’s /Principal’s Agenda of Concerns
- Faculty Overview Statement
- Program Self-Study Brief, which includes program structure, curriculum and learning outcomes, program reflection, enrolment and retention data, resources, student input and quality enhancement opportunities
- Faculty CVs
- University, Faculty and Program planning documents

**Site Visit: Monday, November 21, 2016**

The review team began their visit with Alice Pitt, Vice-Provost Academic and Barbara Crow, Dean Faculty of Graduate Studies, the Dean, Noël Sturgeon, the Associate Dean Research, Ravi De Costa and University librarians. Following a tour of the campus and Environmental Studies building, the reviewers met with faculty and staff from the graduate program (Liette Gilbert, Graduate Program Director, Ouma Jaipaul-Gill, Graduate Program Assistant Rod MacRae, MES Program Coordinator, Anna Zalik, PhD Coordinator). The following coordinators also met with reviewers: Jennifer Foster, Planning Program Coordinator/Urban Ecologies Certificate, Leesa Fawcett, Associate Dean (Students), Traci Warkentin, Environmental & Sustainability Coordinator Mark Winfield, MES/JD Program, Peter Timmerman, Business & Environment Diploma Coordinator. The reviewers met with 18 staff members and had meetings with undergraduate students and two graduate student groups.

**Outcome:**

The Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance concluded that the Dean’s Implementation Plan adequately addressed the recommendations arising from the review process. Progress on the recommendations will be included in the Follow-up Report due June 2019. The next CPR will launch in the Fall of 2023.

**Strengths:**

The external review report noted that, “the major area of innovation in the curriculum and delivery of the program, one upon which the identity of the graduate program is centered, is its high level of integration and curricular flexibility.” The reviewers noted that graduate… “Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, moreover, and completely appropriate and in alignment with the relevant degree expectations at the Masters and PhD levels.”

The Reviewers wrote, “It must be noted that the research activity demonstrated in the appendices is significant and impressive in terms of faculty grants and output. FES researchers and instructors have an international reputation and publish in over 100 peer reviewed journals.”
Opportunities for Enhancement:

The Review Report provided a fulsome and robust discussion of the materials included in the self-study, the Dean’s agenda of concerns, and the challenges and issues that were raised during the site visit.

The reviewers made a number of observations and recommendations for the Programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Graduate Programs:

The reviewers noted, “The intensive individual plan of study approach, especially in the MES program, taxes faculty time and labor heavily. The experience of students seeking high-touch supervision absorbs faculty attention, potentially at the expense of undergraduate contact, PhD supervision, and other key activities.” They also observed that approximately 40% of students are pursuing the planning option, which is more course focused and meets the OPPI accreditation standards.

With regards to Faculty complement, “The Review Committee did, however, find that there was a mismatch in the allocation of faculty resources. Specifically, the amount of time dedicated to advising and supervising MES students dominates the workloads of several faculty members.” They expressed concern about the uneven distribution of advising and supervision amongst faculty.

The External Review Report and the Dean’s Agenda of Concerns noted that the time to completion, on average, in both MES and the PhD programs is longer than desirable (more than 6 terms in the MES and more than 17 terms in the PhD). The reviewers indicated the likelihood “that the unusual program structure and the mixed levels of commitment to PhD students, in particular, are contributing to the time to graduation.”

The Review Report offers an analysis of the Plan of Study approach for the MES. This has been an innovative part of the curriculum; however, there are concerns. The Report briefly explored the possibility “for creating three paths within the MES program: thesis: course based; and individualized study.” They also commented on the high credit load for the programs (72 credits) and on concerns about the complex admissions procedures and potential advising inconsistency for students. The reviewers noted concerns about additional staff resources required to use the in-house “dossier” system and wondered whether there was value for students in these processes.

The reviewers offered the following speculation for consideration: “A more course-focused, separate degree program in planning might be established to meet student demand and ease the overall burden of supervisory labor.” They stress that this idea need not result in changes to what makes the existing programs special.
Undergraduate Program

The Reviewers and the Dean noted the recent decline in enrolments in the undergraduate programs. The review report reflected on the student concerns about program flexibility, particularly in light of the prescribed first year courses, and access to the experiential learning opportunities due to time and financial constraints.

Students noted that sometimes upper year courses were not offered when they were ready to take those courses.

The external reviewers were supportive of a potential merger with Geography and Urban Studies and stated that, “A merger of these units would result in a Faculty structure consistent with other institutions.” They noted, however, that many groups expressed concern of the demands on faculty and staff resources to facilitate the transition and wondered about central support to undertake this.

Review Report Recommendations

The Reviewers concluded their report with a list of specific recommendations (appended) organized around five areas, focusing on the issues raised in the sections above.

1. Merger with Other Units
2. Undergraduate Program
3. MES program
4. PhD program
5. Faculty Complement

Dean’s Implementation Plan

Interim Dean De Costa has provided a Dean’s Implementation Plan document that responds to the Reviewer Report and the recommendations made in that report.

Early in his document he makes the following observation, “The review report emphasizes characteristics of FES programs (interdisciplinarity, individualized learning, critical inquiry and experiential education) that comprise our identity and strength, and which manifest themselves in our pedagogy and internal organization.
However, some of the challenges currently facing the programs (recruitment/enrolment and time to completion) must also be attributed to these commitments. Our task then is to reimagine these commitments in ways that enable us to become more effective and sustainable.”
He notes, “However, both the reviewers and the program response acknowledge an overarching need to provide more resources to our undergraduate program. Subsequently he makes this statement, “As the previous Dean noted in her Agenda of Concerns, the issues to do with program effectiveness and quality have significant budget implications, most seriously the challenges facing our undergraduate enrolment. While it is the responsibility of the Dean to manage the budget situation, the program responses to the reviewers’ report offers few new ideas to deal with this, in the short term at least.”

And again, when talking about the core characteristics of the Faculty he suggests, “Where our own approach, when understood in relation to other related academic endeavours, might be improved is in our urban and planning offerings. Reviewers suggest a dedicated structure internal to the Faculty be developed in this area, allowing greater visibility and coherence.

The Interim Dean makes notes of the advancement towards a merger with the Department of Geography and the possibility of including the Urban Studies program, although there is work to be done to achieve consensus with both groups.

The Implementation Plan includes a comprehensive chart incorporating the Review Report recommendations, the program response and the Dean’s Plan for implementation; this chart is appended to this report.

A report on the progress of these initiatives will be provided in the Follow-up Report which will be due in June 2019.

Alice J. Pitt
Vice-Provost Academic
York University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Faculty response/action (pages refer to “Responses to Reviewers” report)</th>
<th>Decanal Comment</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Progress/ timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase BES recruitment and retention</td>
<td>Increase school visits where possible; maintain strong conversion support; review retention issues.</td>
<td>Growing applicant pool is essential and the Dean will support those efforts. We need to consider international applicants and how to support them.</td>
<td>Dean’s Office, SEM group</td>
<td>2017-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge ENVS 1000 and ENVS 1200</td>
<td>Undergraduate program attempted this change in Spring 2017 but did not receive collegial support</td>
<td>1200 in its current configuration is not sustainable. The Dean urges the UCC to reconsider the proposal as part of the merger, addressing concerns raised.</td>
<td>UCC</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the “benefits and challenges of over prescribing the structure of the major”</td>
<td>FES adopted a more strongly prescriptive degree structure in 2014; review will need to be done as part of merger process.</td>
<td>Continue close monitoring of effects of earlier changes to program. Merger could see multiple undergrad programs, allowing for greater choice and flexibility for students.</td>
<td>UWG; UCC; FES Faculty Council.</td>
<td>2017-19: working timeline is to have curricular proposals ready April 2018; a complete package of governance and program changes to Senate in Fall 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to non-BES majors</td>
<td>Consider ways to appeal to undeclared majors.</td>
<td>Identification of courses offered for breadth will be identified as program offerings are developed with the merger; advance inter-faculty collaboration eg Las Nubes, Markham.</td>
<td>UPD; Dean’s office</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand access to experiential education</td>
<td>FES has considerable strength in experiential education but would be</td>
<td>Communicate EE offerings effectively; hire experiential education coordinator; create</td>
<td>Associate Vice President Teaching &amp;</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other BES innovation: capstones, first year seminars...</td>
<td>Merger discussions have encompassed a variety of innovations already</td>
<td>Dean’s office is strongly supportive of initiatives which make our undergraduate program(s) more appealing.</td>
<td>UWG; UCC</td>
<td>Through 2017/18, with proposals ready in Winter 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create distinct graduate planning program, including course-based program</td>
<td>Present challenges are desire to keep POS pedagogy and budget constraints; possible to be taken up in merger discussions.</td>
<td>Urban /planning colleagues seem disinclined to pursue this, though the merger (especially if it includes URST) may make that position unsustainable</td>
<td>Planning Sub-committee; GWG; MES PCC</td>
<td>Through 2017/18, with proposals ready in Winter 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline program requirements including POS</td>
<td>GPD/MES curriculum has presented a package of proposals to make MES administration clearer and less burdensome.</td>
<td>Proposed changes have been passed through Committee of Instruction and have much potential to improve program. However, we have not yet accepted collectively that the “one-size-fits-all” model is not working. We cannot continue to have a large, undifferentiated and very resource intensive program.</td>
<td>GPD; MES PCC</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen relationships between FES faculty and MES applicants</td>
<td>GPD did assign advisors upon admission to A students but impact appears minimal without follow-up by supervisors</td>
<td>Likely to be driven by changes to graduate funding formula. Dean to encourage faculty members to engage in recruiting graduate students to their research programs/grants.</td>
<td>MES PCC; Individual Faculty members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain MES enrolment targets</td>
<td>Maintain/grow (p10)</td>
<td>In the short-medium term this is unrealistic and contradicts most of the rest of the report: we have not met existing targets for some years and applicant pool is not deep. Moreover, SHARP means rebalancing undergrad vs grad commitments significantly so grad enrolment needs to be reduced in the short term. P/T option now in small pilot with 2 students.</td>
<td>Dean; SEM group</td>
<td>2018 targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop transition plan to post-GA environment</td>
<td>Responses document suggests it is too late for this (p11).</td>
<td>Graduate Fellowships have considerable benefits, which will become clearer over time. However, faculty researchers will need to seek external funding, leveraging the Fellowships that comprise graduate funding packages where possible. ADR to mentor junior scholars; FES internal research support to create incentives for external grant applications.</td>
<td>Dean; ADR</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address uneven supervisory workloads</td>
<td>The review advocated shifting resources to BES program from graduate programs and this will help. However, unevenness is both qualitative and quantitative. There remains a mismatch between graduate applicants and faculty research.</td>
<td>Dean to take this into account more effectively in making teaching and advising/supervising assignments. Changes to create an “interim supervisor” designation as a way towards better articulation of workload were recently rejected by collegium.</td>
<td>Dean; Committee of Instruction</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physics and Astronomy, Undergraduate and Graduate Programs, Faculty of Science

Cyclical Program Review – 2008 to 2015
Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan Executive Summary
Reported to Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance:
December 4, 2017

Program Description

A Department of Physics was established at York University in 1964, initially at Glendon College and subsequently at the Keele campus in 1965, as one of the three major participants with Biology and Chemistry in the Interdisciplinary Science (IS) Program. Students were first admitted to master's and doctoral degree Programs in Physics at York in 1968. In the late 1980s, the Department decided to expand its presence in astronomy and astrophysics. The resulting growth in astronomical research activity led in 1991 to the introduction of official Streams of study in astronomy in both the undergraduate and graduate Programs. In 2007 the Department introduced its Undergraduate Program in Biophysics.

The Streams available to BSc students in Physics and Astronomy programs are the following: Physics, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Applied Physics, Space Science. Students at the graduate level pursue an MSc or PhD in Physics or Astronomy.

The Graduate Program offers six fields of research activity:

- Astronomy and Astrophysics (AA)
- Atomic Molecular and Optical Physics (AMO)
- Biological Physics (BP)
- Chemical and Condensed Matter Physics (CCM)
- High Energy and Particle Physics (HEP)
- Earth, Atmospheric, Space and Engineering (EASE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Registration (new intake) 2015</th>
<th>Enrolment FTES 2015</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biophysics (BSc)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and Astronomy (BSc)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>11 Hons; 5 90-credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reviewers appointed by the Vice-Provost Academic:

Dr. Barbara Frisken, Professor, Department of Physics, Simon Fraser University
Dr. Stephen Godfrey, Professor, Department of Physics, Carleton University
Dr. Neal Madras, Professor, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, York University

Documentation Provided to the External Reviewers

Prior to the site visit, the external reviewers are provided with the following:
• Dean’s /Principal’s Agenda of Concerns
• Department/Program Omnibus Statement (where applicable)
• Program Self-Study Brief, which includes program structure, curriculum and learning outcomes, program reflection, enrolment and retention data, resources, student input and quality enhancement opportunities
• Faculty CVs
• University, Faculty and Program planning documents

Cyclical Program Review - Departmental Process (based on information in the Self Study Brief)

The process of self-evaluation began in the Fall of 2015 with the construction of two surveys, one for undergraduate students and one for graduate students. While the surveys were in the field, the Department Executive developed a plan for a department retreat to ensure dialogue would lead to an actionable set of proposals. Eight themes for discussion were developed and working groups of faculty, staff and students, worked on a theme to identify principal concerns and recommendations. A short summary of the recommendations was circulated before the Departmental Retreat, held at the McMichael Gallery on April 22, 2016. Attendees included the majority of faculty members, graduate students, staff, and one postdoctoral fellow. The retreat included small group discussions about the themes, and the Chair of the Department ended each session by summarizing what he thought represented consensus. The proceedings were recorded for future reference. The Chair of the Department subsequently prepared a draft “agenda of concerns” highlighting areas of the Programs needing improvement or enhancement and putting forward proposals for action. Because the various Programs have overlapping concerns, the agenda of concerns was presented in its entirety after the three Program self-studies rather than being broken up among them. Input from reviewers will assist with the finalization of actions the Programs should take in moving forward.

Site Visit: November 9-10, 2016

The Reviewers first met with Vice-Provost Alice Pitt and Dean of Graduate Studies, Barbara Crow. During the two days the reviewers also met with the Dean of Science, Ray Jayawardhana, Faculty of Science Associate Dean
Research, Sylvie Morin, Associate Dean Faculty - Buks van Rensberg, the Chair of the Department, Marshall McCall, the Undergraduate Program Director, Patrick Hall, PHAS GPD - Tom Kirchner, Previous GPD, Wendy Taylor, Science Librarians, John Dupuis, Genny Jon and Acting Associate University Librarian, Adam Taves. The reviewers held meetings with the undergraduate faculty and the graduate faculty, as well as meetings with undergraduate majoring in Biophysics and Physics and Astronomy, and also with graduate students. Professor Paul Delaney provided a tour of the York University Observatory and the reviewers toured the various laboratory facilities. In addition there was a meeting with York University Experience Hub (Technology Internship Program), Kathleen Winningham.

Outcome:

The Joint-Committee on Quality Assurance commended the Department for its well-designed process for developing the self-study. The Dean’s Implementation plan, which included the programs’ response to recommendations, was very thorough and clear. The committee concluded that the Decanal response adequately addressed the review recommendations. Progress on the recommendations will be included in the Follow-up Report due June 2019. The next CPR will begin in the Fall of 2023.

Strengths:

The reviewers made note of the following about the undergraduate programs: “A large proportion of the courses are taught by full-time faculty – 97% in 2015/2016. This demonstrates a strong commitment on behalf of the faculty to support of undergraduate education and a good alignment between the program needs and faculty resources. Students were highly complementary of the quality of teaching by their physics professors, and of how readily professors made themselves available to students outside of classroom hours.”

The Reviewers made note of the following for the research based MSc: “The methods and criteria for assessing student achievement are appropriate and effective relative to the expectations of the discipline and the program learning outcomes. In particular, the annual research evaluation stands out as an especially rigorous approach to assess student progress and achievement.”

The Reviewers lauded the Department annual workshop built around the Careers Toolbox developed by the American Physical Society and to an annual careers event with alumni for graduate students and noted that this would also be beneficial for prospective and registered undergraduate students. The Reviewers stated that the proposed workplace practice certificate which would include career-oriented skills is also an excellent initiative.
Reviewer Recommendations and Dean’s Implementation Plan

The Review Report provided a fulsome and robust discussion of the materials included in the self-study, the Dean’s agenda of concerns, and the challenges and issues that were raised during the site visit.

The reviewers provide a comprehensive set of recommendations for the Programs that is in strong dialogue with the self-study. Each recommendation is preceded by a discussion of the strengths of the program and opportunities for improvement.

In his response, the Dean provides an extensive response document, roughly grouped thematically, which incorporates the Department’s response and his own comments, and suggesting actions that might be taken where appropriate and identifying recommendations that are either out of scope for the CPR process or can only be determined once results of initial actions are known.

A significant focus is on recommendations related to curriculum mapping and curriculum review for both undergraduate and graduate programs. The consideration of many suggestions, for example new programs, would be determined after a full consideration of the curriculum mapping exercise.

The Dean’s implementation Plan ensures that recommendations related to research be explored immediately. Suggestions related to recruitment are either ongoing or will be undertaken. Space for the program and students, which will foster collegiality and collaboration, among other things, is an ongoing project.

A number of suggestions, acknowledged in the Dean’s Implementation Plan, are related to academic hiring, but not all of these lie within the purview of the department or even the Faculty of Science.

The final recommendation of the reviewers is, “That the Department should initiate a Long Range Planning process to set faculty hiring priorities over the next 5 to 10 years.” The Department Response, recorded in the Plan includes this statement, “There is a real opportunity for the Department to re-vitalize or even re-define itself, and it is logical to develop a long-range plan on how best to do so. The Dean closes his detailed Implementation plan with this acknowledgement of the importance of this activity with this statement, “The Dean welcomes a Long-Range Planning exercise within PHAS. Along with curriculum mapping, this is key to departmental sustainability and the maintenance of vital programs at both the undergrad and graduate levels.”

The full Dean’s Implementation Plan is appended to this report for review by the Quality Council.
A report on the progress of these initiatives will be provided in the Follow-up Report which will be due in June 2019.

Alice J. Pitt  
Vice-Provost Academic  
York University
**Cyclical Program Review – Physics and Astronomy programs**

**Response of Dean Ray Jayawardhana, Faculty of Science**

**and**

**Proposed Implementation Plan**

**April 21, 2017**

Programs Reviewed

1. Physics and Astronomy BSc, BSc Honours, Honours Major and Honours Minor programs
2. Physics and Astronomy BSc program
3. Biophysics BSc with Specialized Honours
4. MSc Physics and Astronomy programs with Coursework, Project and Thesis and Oral Exam
5. PhD Physics and Astronomy

The reviewers report contains the following comments (roughly grouped thematically) suggesting actions that might be taken, not all of which have subsequent recommendations or suggestions:

**Recommendations and Suggestions**

| Programs Reviewed | 3.1, 3.2 and 8.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 The Department should analyze course learning objectives and map them onto program level goals, in order to prepare students for a variety of outcomes and facilitate timely completion of their programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Use the development of course learning objectives to review different themes in the undergraduate curriculum and to compare math requirements with learning objectives of the prerequisite math courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 This applies to both undergraduate and graduate programs such as the course-based and project-based M.Sc. programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dept. Response:**

These recommendations align with Concern 7.1.1 in the Department's Self-Study. Agreement that course learning objectives must be established and be mapped carefully onto program-level expectations. Program-level expectations already in place for undergraduate programs, would be timely to review them. Program-level expectations, course learning objectives, have never been laid down for graduate paths of study. The Department also supports recommendation 3.1. It makes sense to track continuity and achievements in specific curricular themes as part of the mapping exercise.

A comprehensive analysis of course learning objectives needs re-evaluation of the mathematics pre-requisites required in PHAS. This was undertaken just prior to the last CPR, and the curriculum drastically modified as a result. The unit will work with the Mathematics Department to determine the best way to implement a new stream in Theoretical Physics. This is anticipated to have more mathematics requirements than any of the existing streams.

**Dean’s office Response:**

The Dean’s office strongly supports this initiative, especially because other undertakings are also contingent on mapping (e.g. altering fields of representation, Recommendation 7.1, and Biophysics courses, Recommendation 7.2), and because math content in particular has to be intimately linked and timed with the delivery of the Physics and Astronomy programs.
In addition, mapping may reveal areas that should be targeted for hires. This may be the program’s highest priority. But it may not require the use of a course mapping software, especially for the graduate programs. We encourage PHAS to liaise with CoTL, Teaching Commons and units in Science that have already undertaken this exercise.

Departmental commentary on this recommendation includes the acknowledgment that students who work at a job--to a great extent--and disabilities--to a lesser extent--increase the time taken, on average, to graduate. While these matters are not addressed by curriculum mapping, it is true that mapping will reduce any additional drivers of graduation delay.

### Implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Chair, GPD, UPD,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Training and assistance from the Registrar’s office or Teaching Commons with course mapping software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Training by Fall 2017 with curriculum map by Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 **That an additional half-time support person be assigned to the Department to help administer research programs.**

**Dept. Response:** The Department strongly endorses this recommendation. Research purchasing and accounting is a significant burden for all faculty members, and a detriment to research productivity. Improved web presence is urgently required. Website development and maintenance, which are crucial to recruitment and public outreach at both undergraduate and graduate levels, distract faculty from research and suffers badly due to insufficient human resources or skills. The same is true for our digital signage, for which there has been no addition of content in 10 years. The Department will aggressively seek from the Faculty of Science permission to hire another staff member to support research purchasing, research accounting, and website and digital signage needs.

**Dean’s Response:** While the Dean’s Office recognises that all units could use additional administrative support, the current budgetary reality does not allow for an increase in administrative support in the Faculty of Science. Under the new budget model, Faculty and Units revenues are directly tied to student enrolment in programs. In PHAS there is much room for growth in graduate and undergraduate programs. A significant increase in enrolment could justify growth in the unit’s allocated budget. It should be noted that research-based revenue in FSc cannot cover this kind of administrative support. Although there are no departments in FSc with administrative support for research programs, the Faculty does employ two Faculty Research Administrators who are responsible for post-award research administration on behalf of the entire FSc.

### Implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Dean’s Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Commensurate to program growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Review of possibility further administrative support as Department enrollments grow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 and 5.3 **5.2: That undergraduate students should have a common room only for undergraduates in the physics and astronomy programs and the biophysics program.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3: Whenever possible, faculty and graduate student offices be relocated to the main Physics building.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept. Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 An agreement was reached with the Department of Earth, Space Science, and Engineering (ESSE) to share a lounge on the first floor of the Petrie Science and Engineering Building. The reviewers were aware of this arrangement, and concluded that it was not good enough for PHAS majors. The unit is not entirely in agreement with this perspective, because the two departments that share the room have much in common. The unit proposes to survey undergraduate majors to determine the level of satisfaction with the shared common space. If there is a clear indication that an alternative is needed, we will consult with the Dean to determine if more space can be freed up in PSE. If no space can be found, we will endeavour to seek additional space for our students in Bethune College.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Department is aware of the importance of having faculty and graduate students in close proximity, and wishes to have offices for all departmental faculty in the PSE Building. Presently there is no room for expansion. PSE is shared with two other departments: Chemistry, and Earth, Space Science, &amp; Engineering (ESSE). The Department of PHAS has been forced to place its own graduate students in the Chemistry Building, occupying five offices there. Another office is used for sessional instructors. Department will enter into discussions with the Dean opening up space in PSE for most or all graduate students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Dean’s Response:** |
| The Dean’s office recognises the limited space available for students and Faculty members to meet. The space currently available for Science Units is insufficient and many Units are requesting more social and meeting space. While a dedicated room cannot be assigned to undergraduates in the physics and astronomy programs and the biophysics program, the Faculty will be investing in a pilot project to furnish some of the social space in Petrie Science and Engineering building. A few years ago resources were invested in renovating Petrie 317 and 317A into a seminar room and a small lounge area with a pantry. The Faculty of Science does make an effort to locate Faculty members close to their laboratory or research space. PHAS has to recognize that two Faculties occupy the building and that in Science this building is shared among four Units. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Dean’s Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Fall 2017 for completion of the social space pilot in PSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1 The Department should continue to offer opportunities for professional development for both undergraduate and graduate students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dept. Response:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department concurs, as emphasized in Concern 7.1.7 of the Self-Study and it will work with the three student clubs to involve alumni in a careers event annually. A faculty member will be assigned each year to take responsibility for organizing a workshop based upon the Careers Toolbox of the American Physical Society. In collaboration with the Faculty of Science, the Chair will reach out to non-science faculties at York to devise an approach for conveying skills in workplace practice to undergraduates and graduates in science. Of value to some undergraduates (but by no means the majority) may be the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certificate in Technology Entrepreneurship recently proposed by the Lassonde School of Engineering. Although intended initially for engineering majors, there is intent to expand this to science majors in the future. Described in the Graduate Self-Study Report, FGS supports the professional development of graduate students in various ways. We will reach out to the workshop organizers to see that more science-specific elements are added.

**Dean’s Response:**

The Dean’s Office supports initiatives that will improve the professional development of students. While a Certificate in Workplace Practice from outside the Faculty is a possibility in future, it is more likely that there will be a similar and more immediate credential offered through enhancements of the Faculty’s experiential education offerings, including a preparatory course for the workplace. A current Faculty review of experiential offerings will include the Physics internship course, which could have significant impact if numbers could be increased. The Department should encourage students to take advantage of PD opportunities offered by the Faculty (e.g., Science & Business workshops, media workshops) and the University (e.g., LaunchYU, FGS workshops).

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Chair, UPD, GPD, Teaching Commons, Dean’s office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>To be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.1 and 7.2**

7.1 The Physics Graduate Program should focus on its four research areas where there is direct involvement from Physics faculty members.

7.2 The Department should continue to work to provide a broader range of core graduate courses on a regular basis.

**Dept. Response:**

7.1 The reviewers singled out the field "Earth, Atmospheric, Space, and Engineering" (EASE) as an historical commitment rather than an active one, and "Chemical and Condensed Matter Physics" as not having direct involvement of faculty members in the Department of PHAS. In the case of the former, one faculty member in the Department is a space engineer and some astronomers engage in space missions. Regardless, what did not seem to be fully appreciated by the reviewers is the York model for graduate programs, which promotes interdisciplinarity by allowing for the appointment of qualified faculty members from outside of a guiding department. The reviewers' perspective is particularly problematic for the field "Earth, Atmospheric, Space, and Engineering". Besides representatives from the Department of PHAS, there are many faculty in the Lassonde School of Engineering in this field who are members of the Graduate Program in Physics and Astronomy by virtue of their common need for physics talent. The commitment is real, not historical. As a result, 25% of graduate students in the Program are working in EASE.

The Graduate Program has investigated what is required to alter fields of representation. At this time, the Graduate Program is not inclined to eliminate the field "Earth, Atmospheric, Space, and Engineering", but rather to simplify its name to "Planetary Physics". The Program reserves judgment on what to do about "Chemical and Condensed Matter Physics", pending completion of the mapping exercise and consultation with the faculty in the Graduate Program.
who are working in this field. Contrary to what the reviewers believed, "Biological Physics" is a field that the Graduate Program has gained approval to advertise.

The Department concurs with the recommendation that the Department (as against the Graduate Program) restrict its research focus to at most four fields.

Long-range planning will begin, as per Recommendation 9.4, to determine how to move forward.

7.2 Graduate Program in Physics and Astronomy is collaborating with the University of Windsor and Trent University to develop on-line graduate courses for sharing among the institutions. A proposal to eCampus Ontario led by the University of Windsor was recently funded, and discussions are now underway on how to proceed.

Subject to the outcome of our course mapping exercise and long-range planning exercise (Recommendation 9.4), we will also give some thought to developing a stream in Biological Physics that has core requirements that are aligned with the needs of graduate students working in this field.

Further expansion of course offerings is inadvisable before completion of the mapping exercise. The mapping exercise is likely to point to a need for discipline-specific courses that we either do not offer or that we are presently unable to mount routinely due to lack of faculty resources. The only way to rectify this is through additional hires in our core research areas as guided by our long-range planning process (Recommendation 9.4).

**Dean’s Office Response:**

The Dean’s Office concurs with the Department’s response that the Faculty community that delivers the graduate program does indeed include individuals from other departments, and, by allowing for a broader range of expertise, this enhances the overall program. Provided the graduate program can deliver current and vital graduate education in six fields, the Dean’s Office is in favour of continuing those fields, even if they rely to some extent on expertise outside the department. The Dean’s Office endorses the Departmental plan to continue to concentrate in four fields of research. The Dean’s Office has agreed with the name simplification from “Earth, Atmospheric, Space and Engineering” to “Planetary Physics”.

With respect to broadening the variety of course offerings to graduate students, the Faculty’s investment in Biophysics and commitment to it as a field of growth does mean that graduate courses in this area are advisable in the near future; again, program mapping is necessary to determine what will be suitable, and when, and we have to fulfil our obligations to students joining York in Biophysics. In addition, successful recruitment of graduate students is a condition precedent to obtaining resource support for increasing course offerings. Sharing e-courses with other small programs like Windsor and Trent is worthy of further consideration, and working with the Windsor initiative is supported, especially if it is cost effective.

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Chair, GPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Support for the four main research areas in the Department is ongoing. With respect to Biophysics grad courses, two things should proceed immediately. One is continued arrangements with Trent and Windsor if that is deemed by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Department to be cost effective and pedagogically sound. The other is the mapping process (training by Fall 2017 with a map by Spring 2018).

| 7.3, 7.4 and 8.3 | 7.3 The Department should engage local high school physics teachers and promote the strengths of the undergraduate program in order to increase enrolment.  
7.4 The Department should evaluate proposals to improve recruitment of domestic graduate students.  
8.3 Enhance recruitment of undergraduate students by establishing a few key recruitment events. |
| Department Response: | 7.3 The Department has hosted annually an evening for high school teachers dedicated to a research theme in physics or astronomy in which departmental faculty are active, despite having to go into debt to do so. In our self-study, we felt that an important but neglected audience was high-school counselors. The reviewers feel that our attention should continue to be directed toward high school teachers. Moving forward, we will be engaging both teachers and students through the Southern Ontario Large-Scale Time Coincidence Array (SOLTA), which is a project led by Professor Scott Menary to establish cosmic ray detectors at high schools across the province. Working with alumnus Michael Franchino (who teaches in Newmarket), approval has been gained for a new course for the Ontario high school curriculum in which students have the opportunity to build and operate a cosmic ray detector. It is our intention to host an annual "conference" at York with all participants to discuss both the process and results. To better inform teachers about our strengths, we propose at minimum to create a brief fact sheet for distribution at teachers' evenings and on-line. Additionally, we will give serious consideration to devoting a teacher's evening to education and will consider appointing a faculty member annually to liaise with teachers at the top schools in our catchment area. The Department's most urgent priority is to finish construction of its new website, which will give research a much higher profile than at present. The Graduate Program's most urgent priorities are to add more video content from its researchers and students and to establish websites for all members that lack one. The obstacle to all of these priorities is the lack of technical resources to assist. UIT can be utilized to implement the but presently there are no identifiable resources to develop and implement the look and feel or to maintain websites routinely. Recommendation 5.1 offers a path forward, namely the hiring of an additional staff member to take on the burdens of research administration.  
7.4 The most important graduate recruitment opportunity available to us is the Canadian Undergraduate Physics Conference (CUPC), which is organized annually by the Canadian Association of Physicists (CAP). Associated with the conference is a Graduate Fair at which Graduate Programs can be advertised. We propose to invest resources in improving our display and re-evaluating how we present ourselves at it. Also, we propose to seek funding to make it |
possible to send more of our own students to the conference, who are in many ways ambassadors for York and who could assist with the staffing of our booth. As soon as the subway is completed, the Department will engage with undergraduate students to develop a proposal to host the CUPC, which will enhance our profile immensely.

Another event with recruitment potential is the Canadian Conference for Undergraduate Women in Physics (CCUWiP). We would like to establish funds in our budget to routinely send students to the conference and to engage in related recruitment events.

The Department is committed annually to nominating a lecturer for the Canadian Association of Physicists Lecture Tour. The Department will also endeavour to engage with physics clubs across Southern Ontario.

8.3 Recruitment is an area in which the Department works extremely hard, as described in Section 4.4 of each of the undergraduate program self-studies. Although it is relatively easy for individuals to go out into the community, limitations in finances pose a major stumbling block to hosting events for high school students at York. For example, in 2014 and 2015, the Department held exclusive showings of first-run science fiction movies at a Cineplex theatre followed by question and answer sessions about the science. These attracted hundreds of high school students and their teachers. However, the Department went into debt doing this. The prizes and awards party of the High School Biophysics Contest had to be financed by the Chair himself. The Department does not even have a budget line for the High School Teacher’s Evening it holds annually. There are already two campus recruitment events, one in the Fall and one in the Spring, in which the Department is able to engage at no cost other than faculty time. The latter, in particular, targets applicants to the Department's programs, and we encourage students to attend through our phoning campaign. The Department is not against doing more, but it would have to identify a twist to attract good attendance and then seek funding from the Faculty of Science to support it.

Under Concern 7.3.1 of the Self-Study, the Department puts forward some low-cost ideas to enhance recruitment that don’t require bringing students to York. There is more to recruitment than increasing enrolments. Many faculty members are concerned about the quality of incoming students, and it has been suggested that we raise entrance standards. However, because of the importance of numbers to funding, caution is advisable. To create an elite program without the credentials to justify it would be folly. To be able to afford the inevitable decline in registrations that would follow an increase in the entrance requirement, we really need to focus first on attracting more top students than we are now. Our proposed new stream in Theoretical Physics may help. Growth in biophysics enrolments would help, too. Once the quality of applicants improves, we will be in a better position to sacrifice enrolments in favour of higher standards, if indeed there is justification to believe that nuances in performance in high school have a bearing on performance in university.

Dean’s Office Response: An improved web presence achieved through a more sophisticated Departmental website is seen by the Department as a necessity for improved engagement and outreach. The request to include more dynamic material like
video is a worthy goal. In fact, the Faculty of Science has produced a number of videos featuring faculty and students, and those featuring PHAS members should be added to the Dept web site as well with help from the FSc Communications Manager and IT Director.

The Dean’s Office recognizes the hard work and creativity that goes into the SOLTA project (as well as the High School Physics Teachers’ Night, and other outreach events that are undertaken), and has helped secure $30K in funding for SOLTA from the Bickell Foundation.

These initiatives are worthy as outreach, but as recruitment tools there does not seem to be any analysis that connects attendance and participation in these with recruitment. Additional or continued financial support of these initiatives at the Faculty level and the Department level should be assessed against their recruitment value. Could an assessment be made from attendance to determine if these undertakings yield applications to York Physics?

The plan to host the CUPC is a good idea; if it is contingent upon the completion of the subway, then the time has arrived to move forward with a plan, since the subway opening is December 2017 and planning such an event with the commitment of the organization will take considerably longer than that.

Indeed, there are a “number of good ways” identified to improve recruitment; probably, there should be an internal recruitment plan for both the undergraduate and graduate level that links the numerous ideas and initiatives that exist, that assesses their respective values for outreach and recruitment, and prioritizes them for execution. We agree that standards are to be protected, and that seeding our Physics programs with top students is a good approach for improving standards without losing enrolments.

The Dean is concerned about the low number of domestic graduate applications, and encourages the PHAS GPD and faculty members to be proactive in reaching out to colleagues at other institutions to nudge their students to consider graduate studies at York. Personal connections and guidance can have a direct (and relatively rapid) positive impact on graduate recruitment.

It should be noted that the Faculty worked closely with the Department on, and in one case even secured external support for, major Physics & Astronomy outreach events in the past couple of years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation:</th>
<th>7.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who</strong></td>
<td>Chair, UPD, GPD, Associate Dean Students, Associate Dean Graduate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Promotional material production, upgrading website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When</strong></td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department should evaluate other Biophysics programs offered in Southern Ontario and promote the unique aspects of the York program, and work to recruit York students in order to increase enrolment in the Undergraduate Program in Biophysics.
**Dept. Response:** The first challenge to attracting students is to inform them what biophysics is all about. We have made progress on that front through our biophysics website. We have also implemented an Ontario-wide High School Biophysics Contest. Lack of administrative support severely impairs maintenance of the website and the administration of the Contest. Continuation of the Contest will require the identification of sponsors.

Our uniqueness is in the breadth of training that our Biophysics Program offers. Unfortunately, most students with interests in the life sciences want to go into medicine, and consequently are attracted to medical physics programs. Somehow we have to confront that reality without compromising our goal of giving students the tools needed to apply physics to confront biological problems no matter where they arise. This may be as simple as renaming the Program "Biophysics and Medical Physics", given that issues relevant to medicine, such as MRI, are already integrated into courses.

We agree that a study of other biophysics programs in the province is warranted at this stage. As an outcome, we could envision developing a comparator that highlights the attributes of our Program relative to others. With new hires, we also will have the opportunity to introduce a course devoted to medical physics into the undergraduate curriculum.

We completely agree that an experiment or two with a biophysical emphasis should be introduced into the first-year laboratory sequence.

**Dean’s office Response:** Biophysics is a recent endeavour and it does take time to have the presence of new programs become known and to reach a level of maturity in terms of enrolments. It has been supported by being targeted in the “This Is...” campaign. The Dean’s Office support of Integrated Science is involved in improving the stature of Biophysics, since that program has purposefully increased awareness of this as an undergraduate program choice.

The proposed name change to include “medical” would align our program’s name with some other such programs at other institutions. It might be premature to do that, although in the short term promotional material could draw attention to the application of Biophysics to medical matters.

We know that the Department is seeking to be not extravagant in recommending the hiring of a half-time person for various tasks (Recommendation 5.1): research support, web enhancement, and now Biophysics outreach. We have already indicated that under the new budget model, such expenditures are linked to enrolments, but in any event, it does seem that a half-time position with assigned tasks of supporting such disparate things as research administration, improvement of the Department’s web presence, and also to assist in the administration of a Biophysics outreach event seems to be too many diverse tasks spread too thin. While each of these may deserve support, we are not convinced that a new half-time person is the best way to achieve the goals associated with each of them.

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Review by departmental and Faculty Curriculum Committees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>The review of Biophysics promotional material to ensure that readers know that medical applications are relevant should occur immediately to have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
appropriate promotional materials as soon as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.6</th>
<th>Ensure that discipline specific expectations including typical program GPA’s are taken into account when allocating Tri-Council M.Sc. scholarships within the University.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Response:</td>
<td>Proportionately, the Graduate Program should receive just as many NSERC scholarships as other programs in the Faculty of Science, at the very least. Based upon our experience with adjudications in the Faculty of Graduate Studies, we believe that GPAs are not the problem. Rather, our students have difficulty describing the context of their research to the adjudicators, the majority of whom do not work in physics, overwhelming them with technical details at the expense of the big picture. The Program has mounted sessions to guide students on how to write proposals, but interest from the graduate community has been muted. We will continue to strive to provide students with guidance with their applications in an effort to improve the success rate. At the same time, it is true that discipline-specific expectations are not properly taken into account in the current adjudication model used by the Faculty of Graduate Studies. For NSERC scholarships, a group of adjudicators from various programs are engaged to rank applications across all NSERC disciplines without having expertise in metrics such as typical publication rates outside their own research field. We will continue to lobby for a model that ensures that the adjudicators have greater familiarity with the standards used in the disciplines of the applicants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s office Response:</td>
<td>The AD Research and Graduate Education will be discussing with FGS to first understand how the awards are adjudicated and to establish practice that do not disadvantage some disciplines over others in STEM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Implementation: | **Who**  
GPD, Associate Dean Research and Graduate Education  
**Resources**  
None  
**When**  
This should be explored immediately |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.1</th>
<th>Work to make the Department culture more friendly and inclusive by organizing regular social events, increasing attendance at colloquium and increasing the number of friendly gathering spaces within the Department.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Response:</td>
<td>Department concurs, having flagged these problems in Concerns 7.1.3 and 7.1.4 of the Self-Study. Department has already managed to improve attendance at colloquia drastically simply by creating more attractive posters advertising them. Adding variety to the snacks on offer is a good idea. We have identified some funding to establish a study space on a trial basis in one of the alcoves of Petrie. If this proves to be successful, then we will aim to equip most alcoves on the second and third floors of the building in a similar manner, benefiting from what has been learned from the trial. In 2015, the Department made an arrangement with the Department of Earth, Space Science, and Engineering to share a common room established by them across the hall from their administrative offices. It has become quite a popular destination for our majors. The three clubs of the Department as well as the Physics and Astronomy Graduate Executive are the primary vehicles for promoting socialization. The Department Executive will work with them to identify additional avenues for enhancing the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perhaps the most serious deficiency right now is the lack of a lounge for faculty and graduate students. The Department will work with the Dean's office to correct this problem. If a choice had to be made, the Department would favour the establishment of a common space for faculty and graduate students in Petrie over additional common space for undergraduates in Petrie.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean’s office Response:</th>
<th>The Dean’s Office supports the initiative listed above. For the past few years there have been several social and networking events organized by the Dean’s Office (e.g., Science Unplugged). Better PHAS participation to these events may provide neutral ground to bring people together to hear a PHAS colleague or student present short talks or to acknowledge PHAS awardees. These activities would be cost neutral to PHAS and could be supplemented by PHAS specific events.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Chair, UPD, GPD, Dean’s Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.4 Support the Faculty’s efforts to promote York as a place where people do science.

**Dept. Response:** Department is already heavily engaged in Faculty promotion efforts, and will continue to be so. Members routinely visit schools a part of the Science Speaker's Bureau, and participate in numerous events organized annually by the Faculty, especially at GTA libraries, such as the York Science Forum with famed theoretical physicist Lisa Randall (Dark Matter and the Dinosaurs: The Astounding Interconnectedness of the Universe). We also send delegates to the University Fair annually.

**Dean’s office Response:** The Department does indeed work with the Faculty in initiatives related to our public image as a place for science research, and we agree that will continue.

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Dean’s Office and department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.5 Develop a new undergraduate program in Theoretical Physics.

**Dept. Response:** This recommendation echoes proposals associated with Concern 7.4.1 of the Self-Study. It should be clarified, though, that the Department envisions introducing a new Stream, not a new Program. Department has already drafted a tentative curriculum, and is currently seeking input from its faculty and the Department of Mathematics and Statistics as to what would be appropriate mathematical requirements. Unfortunately, there is a significant obstacle to ambitions to creating a Stream that is more than a simple re-packaging of existing courses. There are only 5.5 theoreticians in the Department, two of whom are nearing retirement age. As a result of administrative relief, effectively there are only 4.5 from the standpoint of teaching. Because of the Department’s increased service teaching burdens (e.g., Integrated Science), the Department is short-staffed, and theoreticians must be fully utilized to teach undergraduate majors and graduate students. Additional staffing will be crucial to the long-term success
of the proposed Stream to enable us to enrich the curriculum with additional courses and to give more opportunities for undergraduates to undertake theoretical research in PHYS 4310.

**Dean's office Response:**
This proposal involves at least three new courses, and the Department recognizes that there are only 5.5 Theoreticians in the Department, two of whom are near retirement age, and only 4.5 of whom are currently available for teaching.

It is not correct to consider Physics teaching in *Integrated Science* as service teaching, although it is true that currently the instructor: student ratio is low in that program. This will change somewhat next year and presumably thereafter.

In this year’s small cohort of 23 students, one student had initially expressed an interest in continuing in Physics yet two have chosen physics (in one case, Biophysics) and a third is considering a Physics minor.

The learning outcomes mapping exercise for programs and courses should consider the proposed Theoretical Physics program at the same time to assist in the assessment of whether it should be launched. If resource dilution is likely, then it is probably not a worthwhile initiative at this time.

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Chair, UPD, Curriculum Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8.6 and 8.7**

8.6 Review workload of the undergraduate programs.
8.7 Explore ways to spread out upper level physics exams with the Registrar’s Office.

**Dept. Response:**
As far as we can tell from the Student Survey, lab courses are the biggest source of concern about workload. We have already re-evaluated demands in the second-year lab, and the workload has been reduced somewhat. The course mapping exercise that we will be undertaking will provide an opportunity to review workloads further, conceivably even motivating us to significantly modify the curricula. For example, it has been suggested that we reduce the number of required courses, but increase credit-weightings of those with tutorials, thereby encouraging a more focused approach to learning. PHYS 4061 may be unique in Canada in its emphasis on laser physics, and is one of our calling cards. We are reluctant to curtail it much. However, we will work with the instructor to ensure that the workload is kept under control.

Undergraduate Program Director has designed requests to the Registrar’s Office for reasonable exam spacing for both the fall and winter term courses for upper year majors. They were submitted for the first time in calendar year 2016, and it is anticipated that they will be submitted routinely in all future semesters.

**Dean’s office Response:**
Mapping will also assist with workload assessments. Each exam period, the Physics Undergraduate Program Director communicates with the Associate Dean of Students to identify potential problems with exam scheduling, and the Associate Dean argues for these changes on behalf of the department, usually with 100% success.

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Dean’s Office and the Registrar’s Office for exam planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department for mapping, enlisting the assistance of the Registrar’s Office or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>The mapping exercise should proceed during the second half of 2017. Improving the exam schedule is an ongoing endeavour between the Dean’s Office and the Registrar’s Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>The Teaching Commons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 8.8 and 8.9 | 8.8 Review the laboratory theme and the computational theme to see if practical physics can be strengthened.  
8.9 Monitor and refine changes to the computational physics theme in undergraduate and graduate programs. |

| Dept. Response: | 8.8 We agree that pedagogical improvements to laboratory education are warranted. Indeed, the Department is undertaking a major upgrade of the second-year laboratory course in physics by modernizing the experiments, by innovating to maximize the pedagogical impact of the experiments, and by tailoring exercises to suit modern needs of majors. Funding for equipment in the amount of $46,000 was acquired through the AEF in 2016. The remainder of the funding needed for equipment ($235,000) has just been committed by the Faculty of Science (via AEF and its own budget, spread over two years). Also, the Senior Advisor for Institutional and Space Planning has recently committed to funding lab renovations. Further adjustments to the lab program are likely following completion of the course mapping exercise. In setting future curricular directions, it is particularly important for us to establish distinctions between non-academic and academic needs and the balance of computational versus laboratory themes in practical physics.  
8.9 The Department agrees that there is room for improvement in the computational arena right now, as emphasized in Concern 7.1.2 of the Self-Study. To alleviate deficiencies in training, the Department is committed to creating an integrated undergraduate/graduate course in computational physics. |

| Dean’s office Response: | The Dean supports this academic exercise. However, PHAS should be mindful that adding a theme or stream would further dilute resources. A careful analysis of such addition to student enrolment and retention would be needed to justify added courses (i.e., resources). |

| Implementation: |  
Who | Chair, UPD  
Resources | To be Determined  
When | Spring 2018 |

| 8.11 | Schedule regular meetings between the TIP (Technology Internship Coordinator in LAPS) coordinator and the PHAS undergraduate curriculum committee. |

| Dept. Response: | This appears to be a response to Concern 7.3.7 in the Self-Study. The Department's perspective was to pull out of TIP altogether and to have the Faculty of Science develop its own internship program. Right now, the Faculty of Science is seeking AIF funding to advance experiential education, which will include re-development and re-vitalization of internship and co-op programs. Until FSc decides how to move forward, it makes sense for the Department to |
work more closely with TIP, at least at the level of establishing routine communications. We will ask our Internship Coordinator to set this up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean’s office Response:</th>
<th>This is a good idea for the benefit of both Faculties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Internship Coordinator and Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.12 and 9.1</th>
<th>8.12 Review TA training and identify improvements needed to provide an enriching experience for both students and TAs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 All TAs should participate in training to foster mutual respect in all of the forms laid out by the Department’s Diversity Committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dept. Response:**

This recommendation relates to Concern 7.2.7 in the Self-Study. The Department will seek additional funding to employ senior TAs annually to take charge of at least one first or second year tutorial session, subject to facility with English. It will assess also the viability of establishing a help desk for more senior undergraduates, courses for which do not presently have formal tutorials associated with them. Also, we will ask the TA supervisor to provide a training session annually to provide advice on how best to conduct TA duties and to emphasize the expectations of the jobs.

**Dean’s office Response:**

The Dean’s office recognises the need to offer additional TA training. This issue is not limited to PHAS and the Dean’s Office would support the development of Faculty wide TA training module with some discipline-specific modules. Discussion will be undertaken with all Units to limit duplication.

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Chair, GPD, UPD, Dean’s Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>August - September 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.2 and 9.3</th>
<th>9.2 Develop a university procedure for spousal hiring.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.3 That the Department work to increase the number of female faculty by aggressively seeking out qualified female candidates in future searches and by implementing best practices for recruiting and retaining women in physics by, for example, including a woman on all search committees and defining new positions in broad terms of expertise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dept. Response:**

In recent years, the Department has had to confront this issue twice. In neither case could anything be done for the spouse. Once, the top candidate went to another institution, which was able to find a position for the spouse on short notice. York's current policy is that all searches be open, so even if a position could be created for a spouse, the spouse would have to compete for it: http://acadjobs.info.yorku.ca/spousal-hiring-at-york-university. The Department strongly supports the development of a policy on spousal hiring, and will lobby the Dean of the Faculty of Science to work with the administration to come to an arrangement that everyone understands. We will impress upon administrators that hiring of appropriately qualified spouses may be a useful strategy for addressing severe gender imbalances that exist in a
A variety of disciplines across campus.

**Dean’s office Response:**
Although there is not a formal spousal hiring procedure at York University, the University and Faculty have been very proactive in assisting couples to find work on campus. While hiring of two academics is quite challenging, the Faculty is committed to support attracting and retaining the best candidates in academic searches.

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Chair, Dean’s office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.4 That the Department should initiate a Long Range Planning process to set faculty hiring priorities over the next 5 to 10 years.

**Dept. Response:**
Department has been reluctant to develop a long-range hiring plan because so many previous plans have gone nowhere. Lately, we have instead discussed regularly what the next priority for hiring should be, informed by recent hires and strategic opportunities. This has worked well. However, circumstances have changed. On a four-year horizon, 8 faculty members will reach or exceed retirement age, 4 of which are in astronomy and astrophysics. Two of them have already declared retirement dates. There is a real opportunity for the Department to re-vitalize or even re-define itself, and it is logical to develop a long-range plan on how best to do so. We will begin the planning process imminently.

**Dean’s office Response:**
The Dean welcomes a Long-Range Planning exercise within PHAS. Along with curriculum mapping, this is key to departmental sustainability and the maintenance of vital programs at both the undergrad and graduate levels.

**Implementation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>