

UTQAP Cyclical Review: Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan

1. Review Summary

Programs Reviewed:	Rehabilitation Science, MSc, PhD Speech-Language Pathology, MSc, PhD
Unit Reviewed:	Rehabilitation Sciences Institute
Commissioning Officer:	Dean, Temerty Faculty of Medicine
Reviewers (Name, Affiliation):	Prof. Alice Aiken, Vice-President, Research & Innovation, Dalhousie University Prof. William Miller, Associate Dean of Health Professions Education, Faculty of Medicine University of British Columbia Prof. Christopher Moore, Dean, College of Health & Rehabilitation Sciences, Boston University
Date of Review Visit:	April 7-8, 2021
Date Reported to AP&P:	October 26, 2021

Previous UTQAP Review

Date: October 8 – 9, 2015

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Significant Program Strengths

- Very strong faculty research profiles
- High quality of incoming students
- Impressive breadth and depth of elective offerings
- Unique and desirable specializations offered through the Collaborative Programs
- Close relationships with well-respected and well-recognized health and rehabilitation institutions create excellent opportunities for students to learn outside the classroom

Opportunities for Program Enhancement

The reviewers recommended that the following be considered:

- Reconsidering the program's curriculum and structure, including access to courses, research methods offerings, and translational research coverage
- Increasing international student recruitment to maintain the program's high quality and expand the RSI's impact on training and research in the field
- Further strengthening and maintaining relationships with cognate units and external institutions
- Reflecting on potential challenges associated with the Institute's new EDU:B structure

Current Review: Documentation and Consultation

Documentation Provided to Reviewers

Confirmation/Agreement Letter; Terms of reference; Self-Study Report; Faculty CVs; Schedule; Previous Review Report (2015-16), the Dean's and Director's Responses, and FAR-IP; Dean's Report 2019; Temerty Faculty of Medicine's Strategic Plan (2018-2023); University of Toronto Towards 2030.

Consultation Process

The reviewers met directly with the following individuals/groups via Microsoft Teams:

1. Dean and Vice Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions
2. Vice Dean, Strategy & Operations
3. Director (on administrative leave)
4. Acting Director
5. Rehabilitation Sciences Sector Department Chairs (OSOT, PT, SLP)

6. Academic Affairs Committee
7. Faculty & Staff Development Committee
8. Communications & Community Relations Committee
9. Programs & Curricula Committee
10. Student Affairs Committee
11. Students – Rehabilitation Sciences & Speech-Language Pathology
12. Research – Interim Vice Dean, Research & Innovation; Vice President, Research, Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital; KITE Institute Director; Head, Division of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre
13. Cognate Graduate Units
14. Directors of Collaborative Specializations
15. Full Professors
16. Associate Professors
17. Assistant Professors
18. Administrative Staff
19. Executive Director, Temerty Office of Advancement

Current Review: Findings and Recommendations

1. Undergraduate Program(s) (n/a)

2. Graduate Program(s)

Unless otherwise noted, all bulleted comments apply to all programs reviewed.

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Overall Quality
 - ▶ RSI trainees make substantial contributions that strengthen the output of their mentors, and enhance RSI's influence in participating disciplines
 - ▶ Collaborative Specialization directors commented on the excellence of RSI students
- Objectives
 - ▶ Ongoing integration of Rehabilitation Sciences and Speech-Language Pathology degree programs has great appeal in terms of shared degree objectives and with regard to providing structure for shared curricular objectives
 - ▶ Learning objectives are clear, appropriate and align with graduate degree expectations
 - ▶ Interdisciplinarity is very important among core disciplines as well as outside traditional rehabilitation sciences
- Admission Requirements
 - ▶ Student Affairs Committee reported that admissions processes are clear and collegial, with some flexibility for underfunded students as needed

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Curricular changes implemented in response to the previous UTQAP review include new courses in knowledge transfer, expansion of existing course content, and a new Rehabilitation Leadership Rounds seminar series
 - ▶ Recent efforts of “very engaged” curriculum committee have focused on curriculum updates, online teaching during the pandemic, ensuring courses are addressing evolving issues in equity, diversity and inclusion, and areas of student interest such as non-traditional career opportunities
 - ▶ Curriculum is designed and delivered in appropriate format
 - ▶ Courses taken outside the RSI, including at other departments or other universities, may be counted toward students’ degree programs
 - ▶ Guaranteed access for set numbers of RSI students in quantitative and qualitative methods courses offered by other University divisions
 - ▶ Impressive focus on teaching and learning quality control
- Innovation
 - ▶ Innovative learning outcomes are designed to prepare students for careers within and beyond academia
- Accessibility and diversity
 - ▶ Reports that applications from international students have increased
 - ▶ Noting that tuition for international PhD students is now the same as for domestic students, reviewers observe that this may help with international student recruitment
 - ▶ RSI doing well in prioritizing diversity and accessibility
- Assessment of learning
 - ▶ Rigorous evaluation of students leads to RSI’s excellent reputation
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Students are engaged and proud to be part of their programs, and note feeling very supported by RSI in the direction of their studies
 - ▶ RSI student union focuses on supporting students with program engagement and on creating a positive social environment
 - ▶ Students noted that opportunities to be involved in the RSI in many different ways and to varying degrees is a strength of the department
 - ▶ Curricular changes implemented after last UTQAP review appear to be well received by students
 - ▶ Enthusiastic communications committee working on outreach, promotion, and metrics; reviewers note helpful inclusion of students on the committee
 - ▶ Positive marketing efforts include investments in website updates and additional communications support staff
- Quality indicators – graduate students
 - ▶ High quality students are successful in obtaining prestigious scholarships
 - ▶ Time to completion is monitored as mandated by the Government of Ontario
 - ▶ Current students “are considered change agents given involvement in numerous philanthropic activities for a broad range of causes”

- Quality indicators – faculty
 - ▶ Faculty include 20 research chairs and hold fellowships in 25 societies
 - ▶ RSI faculty have won 30% of graduate teaching awards in the Temerty Faculty of Medicine
- Quality indicators – alumni
 - ▶ RSI alumni make “considerable impact” working within government institutions, and major teaching hospitals, as well as through commercialization via entrepreneurs
- Student funding
 - ▶ Internal funding available, particularly for people in equity-deserving groups

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Admissions requirements
 - ▶ Reviewers note concern regarding admissions requirement that incoming students have commitment from a faculty member with adequate funding, particularly that it disadvantages junior faculty in their efforts to attract and mentor students
- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Student reports that some required course content is not relevant, or not particularly useful
 - ▶ Student concerns regarding availability of desired/required courses; reports of courses not being offered or students otherwise unable to enrol in courses needed for their area of study
 - ▶ “It remains unclear whether enhanced curricular offerings through RSI are a priority”
- Student engagement, experience and program support services
 - ▶ Students feel that MSc and PhD courses could be separated
 - ▶ Students would appreciate more courses taught by RSI faculty
- Quality indicators – graduate students
 - ▶ Reviewers note that student satisfaction scores for some individual courses seem low
 - ▶ Reviewers note lack of clarity regarding average times to completion for Master’s and PhD programs
- Student funding
 - ▶ Faculty mention financial constraints as a challenge
 - ▶ Faculty stipend requirements noted as “the biggest impediment to growth of grad students in labs”; challenges include the cost of living in Toronto and the fact that TAs and RAs are not counted toward stipend requirements

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Admissions requirements
 - ▶ Consider alternative funding approaches, including providing ‘backstop’ funds to guarantee a student’s funding for their entire program “on the likely prospect that the mentor or student would secure funding in the reasonable future”

- Curriculum and program delivery
 - ▶ Consider course themes to address student concerns that some course material is not relevant
 - ▶ Reviewers note curriculum review and refresh as a “critical area of growth” and recommend strategic curriculum development, with a focus on careers beyond academia
 - ▶ Develop roles for rehabilitation clinician scientists to participate in the curriculum
 - ▶ Work with hospital partners to model non-academic careers for students
 - ▶ Provide tangible incentives for department chairs to support shared course offerings; “A vibrant student community is highly valued by MSc and PhD students, who depend on their peers for acculturation into the scientific community, for exchange of ideas, and for creating and sharing a productive learning milieu”
- Innovation
 - ▶ Reviewers note industry partnerships as a possible area in which to develop experiential learning opportunities
- Accessibility and diversity
 - ▶ Consider alternative funding models to support the accessibility of RSI programs
- Quality indicators – graduate students
 - ▶ “It is essential that incentives are in place for both student and supervisor for timely completion of degree”
- Student funding
 - ▶ Consider whether TAs and RAs could be included in funding packages
 - ▶ Seek additional fellowships from the University for student funding

3. Faculty/Research

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Overall quality
 - ▶ “Excellent, exemplary and complementary composition of core and external faculty who cover a broad area of research and are productive and generally well funded”
- Research
 - ▶ Faculty are world leaders in research; U of T ranked first in North America for publications in Rehabilitation Science
 - ▶ Reviewers note that the World Health Organization reached out to RSI for consultation during the COVID-19 pandemic
 - ▶ External researchers attracted to RSI faculty due to the high quality of RSI students, and the interdisciplinary nature of RSI programs
- Faculty
 - ▶ Faculty members are very engaged in RSI’s scientific reputation
 - ▶ Faculty value diversity and feel it provides a rich experience for students
 - ▶ Early career researchers report feeling very welcomed and supported

- ▶ Faculty and Staff development committee provides “well-received” mentorship for new faculty
- ▶ Faculty recruitment efforts have been bolstered by international outreach, partnerships, and conference participation
- ▶ Faculty workshops instituted by RSI Faculty Development Committee have been well received
- ▶ Faculty development is built into the RSI’s strategic plan and can draw upon Temerty Medicine’s creation of a Research Entrepreneur in Residence program, and an EDI plan
- ▶ Early career faculty receive funding support for recruitment of two masters students
- ▶ Many RSI faculty are considered experts in commercialization of products that have significantly improved function and reduced disability

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Research
 - ▶ Expansion of clinical programs requires time and attention from faculty and administration, which challenges for RSI to fulfill its research mission
 - ▶ RSI itself is not able to provide research start-up funds for newly-hired faculty other than assistance with graduate student funding.
- Faculty
 - ▶ As an EDU-B, RSI has no permanent faculty; reviewers note this as a “primary challenge”
 - ▶ Reviewers note concern regarding inconsistency of clinical departments’ prioritization and allocation of faculty workload between clinical programs and graduate teaching and research within RSI; departmental workload practices may reduce incentives for faculty to teach and conduct research in RSI
 - ▶ Concern that requirement for up-front funding commitments by faculty disadvantages junior faculty in their efforts to attract and mentor students despite the financial support to partially fund/support the faculty members first 2 MSc students

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Research
 - ▶ Consider supporting team grant applications, particularly for junior faculty
 - ▶ Emphasize RSI’s interdisciplinary profile, including links to hospitals, in faculty recruitment efforts
- Faculty
 - ▶ Consider flexibility in up-front funding requirement for junior faculty, including an option to fund a PhD student instead of two MSc students
 - ▶ Harmonize faculty workload practices between RSI and clinical programs, with increased support for RSI’s teaching and research mission

- ▶ Reviewers note importance of mentorship for senior faculty members
- ▶ Formal mentorship and other opportunities for building relationships with senior researchers would be helpful for junior faculty
- ▶ Consider whether clinical departments could each designate a “research grad coordinator” to support RSI administration
- ▶ Consider providing funding for hospital-based faculty to teach RSI courses

4. Administration

The reviewers observed the following **strengths**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ RSI has “vibrant, active” internal and external relationships, with representatives in numerous collaborative programs, local rehabilitation hospitals, and specialty oriented interdisciplinary hubs
 - ▶ Some cognate units report good involvement and strong alignment with the RSI; others acknowledge good future opportunity for shared instruction
 - ▶ Reviewers note many positive comments on effectiveness of RSI Mentorship circle and Townhall events; remote partners noted that using distance media for these engagements has been very helpful during the COVID-19 pandemic to help them to feel more connected with the RSI community
 - ▶ Staff seem very committed to RSI and staffing in administrative roles has been stable
 - ▶ Clinical program chairs all mentioned that the EDU-B model works well, noting that “cross-pollination among the three rehab professions and beyond is a real asset”
 - ▶ Interdisciplinarity with clinical programs and other University departments noted as a real strength
 - ▶ RSI faculty’s focus on integrated knowledge translation enables strong links with the local clinical community
- Organizational and financial structure
 - ▶ RSI structure facilitates training and research interactions among interested faculty both within and outside host departments; participating faculty are drawn from across the University and the hospital network by the opportunity to mentor graduate students whose primary focus is rehabilitation related
 - ▶ Engagement of the current Senior Advancement Officer, as part of increased focus on the Rehabilitation Sciences Sector within the Faculty’s strategic plan, will enable additional opportunities for RSI program stability, early career investigator support, student recruitment, scholarships and international student engagement
 - ▶ Dedicated RSI Director position has enabled stability
 - ▶ Participating external faculty appreciate for RSI as a focal point for their interests that are often unrepresented in their primary departments
 - ▶ Student affairs committee has streamlined processes for admissions, awards etc.
 - ▶ Admirable amount of administrative support for RSI ensures that their trainees feel supported

- ▶ RSI's budget is "quite substantial" and supported by funds from other University sources
- ▶ RSI leadership is "a particular strength"
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ RSI appears well aligned with the University's mission, especially with regard to the intent of an EDU:B
 - ▶ RSI has done a superlative job in addressing its key objective of establishing a collaborative hub for research, scholarship, and advanced training
 - ▶ Participants consistently spoke of the high value they assign to the shared objectives and values of RSI in rehabilitation
 - ▶ Curriculum innovation currently in progress has brought the RSI community together and provides "a good model for how partnership can happen and grow"
- International comparators
 - ▶ Comparison with other programs in Canada and North America reveals an extraordinarily high level of productivity among RSI-affiliated faculty
 - ▶ "Unsurpassed" breadth of opportunities for graduate students, with active collaborations and interactions across a very broad range of areas and units
 - ▶ RSI's degree of interdisciplinarity, and its "large and extensive collaborative environment" are distinguishing characteristics among its peers

The reviewers identified the following **areas of concern**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ Lack of incentives for faculty whose primary appointment is with an affiliated hospital to teach in RSI programs
 - ▶ Some comments that rehab hospitals outside of the University Health Network did not feel as closely aligned with RSI
- Organizational and financial structure
 - ▶ Reviewers note that the admissions and awards focus of the Student Affairs committee "seems to be a very narrow focus" and noted concern that the group described working separately on things rather than working together as a committee
 - ▶ Reviewers note that space is "limited and not ideal"
 - ▶ RSI lacks the financial resources to provide incentives for other units to teach in RSI programs; current arrangement relies on the "good natures of Department Chairs in prioritizing RSI curriculum, which disadvantages these highly talented students"
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ Reviewers note that it is unclear how RSI's mission aligns with the Faculty of Medicine's
 - ▶ Reports that RSI faculty feel that the Faculty's emphasis is focused on the medical undergraduate program rather than the research graduate programs

The reviewers made the following **recommendations**:

- Relationships
 - ▶ Consider ways to provide incentives for hospital-affiliated faculty to teach in RSI programs
 - ▶ Reviewers note that “interdisciplinarity is key to success” and recommend increased interaction and collaboration with other units, including formalized agreements to facilitate the development of shared courses
 - ▶ Consider expanding interdisciplinary outreach to include social sciences as well as international partners
 - ▶ Continue using distance media to support increased engagement with partners in remote hospitals
- Organizational and financial structure
 - ▶ RSI Directorship has enabled program stability and “could use continued investment moving forward”
 - ▶ Consider potential roles for postdoctoral fellows in RSI, including teaching, mentorship, and supporting extracurricular activities
 - ▶ Optimize staff complement to address issue of staff workload and provide additional support in key areas such as recruitment
 - ▶ Additional space resources such as a dedicated meeting space would benefit RSI
 - ▶ Consider ways to optimize RSI’s organizational and financial structure within the Faculty of Medicine
 - ▶ Consider providing instructional funds to RSI tied to enrollments and program requirements, to allow the Institute to buy out faculty time from participating units and incentivize teaching in RSI programs
 - ▶ Consider expanded priorities for the Student Affairs committee, e.g., student wellness
 - ▶ Consider work-share arrangements to optimize available space
- Long-range planning and overall assessment
 - ▶ RSI is a sufficiently funded program that could benefit from additional investment to ensure continued status as a world leader
 - ▶ Leverage large pool of potential mentors to further expand RSI programs
 - ▶ Consider ways to incentivize sector-level faculty participation in RSI
 - ▶ A greater focus on community building, including small internal grant programs, career development activities, or RSI-housed shared resources, could provide immediate and substantial benefits



Patricia Houston, MD MEd FRCPC
Acting Dean and Vice Dean, Medical Education

September 14, 2021

Professor Susan McCahan
Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Division of the Vice-President & Provost
University of Toronto

Dear Susan,

DEAN'S RESPONSE | UTQAP Review of the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute

On behalf of the Temerty Faculty of Medicine at the University of Toronto, I would first like to thank the reviewers, Professors Alice Aiken, William Miller, and Christopher Moore for a fulsome and rigorous review of the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute (RSI) on April 7-8, 2021. On behalf of Temerty Medicine, I would also like to thank Professor Angela Colantonio, Director, RSI, and Professor Yana Yunusova, Acting Director, RSI, the administrative staff, and all those who contributed to the preparation of the outstanding self-study report. I also wish to thank the numerous administrative staff, trainees, and faculty members who met with the external reviewers and provided invaluable input.

The reviewers reflected that “*Comparison with other programs in Canada and North America reveals an extraordinarily high level of productivity among RSI-affiliated faculty. The breadth of opportunities for graduate students is unsurpassed, with active collaborations and interactions across a very broad range of areas and units.*” Temerty Medicine greatly appreciates the insightful and comprehensive report provided by the reviewers. It serves as an invaluable guide for future strategic directions and program enhancements of the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute. I am in full agreement with the responses of Professors Colantonio and Yunusova as Director and Acting Director, respectively. The following response and implementation plan has been developed after consultation with them.

1. **Reviewers' Comment:** “*Participation in RSI activities relies heavily on the goodwill of administrators and faculty participants. The mission of RSI could be strengthened by incentivizing at the sector level faculty participation in RSI. For example, new hires might be approved with the stipulation that some agreed-to effort level in RSI is protected. The Director's influence would be enhanced with the capacity to further incentivize participation by faculty.*”

Decanal Response: RSI has expanded the number of graduate coordinator positions and is planning for the imminent appointment of 2 full-year graduate coordinators and an Associate Director position. Consideration is also being given to a second Associate Director position. As recommended, enhanced collaboration will be sought with Chairs of the cognate departments and Directors of affiliated research institutes to include RSI contributions in the annual faculty Progress Through the Ranks (PTR). In addition, consideration will be given to prioritizing student financial support for faculty who contribute to the educational and administrative activities of RSI.

2. **Reviewers' Comment:** *"Participants consistently spoke of the high value they assign to the shared objectives and values of RSI in rehabilitation. Some even recognize RSI as their primary intellectual home. Greater focus on community building might provide immediate and substantial benefit."*

Decanal Response: To address this concern, RSI is actively pursuing new opportunities for collaboration across the sector, such as through development of the Virtual Rehab Education and Research Centre. RSI is also working across the sector on shared initiatives to advance equity, diversity, inclusion, Indigeneity, and accessibility. To advance these goals, a cross-sector committee has been established and is pursuing initiatives related to communications. RSI will also aim to enhance partnerships with more affiliated research institutes, including those with a central focus on mental health and the wellbeing of marginalized populations. These partnerships will benefit from RSI's representation across departments in Temerty Medicine, and from University-wide collaborations with the Faculties of Kinesiology & Physical Education, Pharmacy, Nursing, Arts & Science, Engineering, and Music and from the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education.

Strengthening the RSI's community through partnerships dovetails with Temerty Medicine's strategic priority to develop rehabilitation research and clinical capacity. Together, the Vice Dean, Partnerships, RSI Director, and Rehabilitation Sciences Chairs will work towards enacting and communicating shared strategic initiatives.

3. **Reviewers' Comment:** *"It remains unclear whether enhanced curricular offerings through RSI are a priority. One faculty member noted that teaching in RSI is 'actively discouraged' given the burgeoning needs of the clinical programs in the cognate departments. If a shared didactic experience among RSI students is a priority, department chairs require tangible incentives to support these course offerings. A vibrant student community is highly valued by MSc and PhD students, who depend on their peers for acculturation into the scientific community, for exchange of ideas, and for creating and sharing a productive learning milieu." Students commented that core program courses are not always useful or available.*

Decanal Response: Curricular redesign and refresh is a key priority for RSI, which recently completed a comprehensive review of core curricula of the MSc and PhD programs in Rehabilitation Sciences. Accordingly, RSI formalized program objectives and implemented new elements to meet these objectives, including a review and re-alignment of course content, re-visioning and reformulation of the role of the supervisory committee, and changes in the nature and expectation of the comprehensive exam. The Programs and Curricula Committee is developing evaluation components for each program, including updated course evaluations. Course evaluations will be closely monitored as a tool to optimize learner experience. Review and redesign of the Practice Science Program is underway and will be completed in 2 to 3 years.

Over the last 2 years, significant progress has been made in ensuring access to outside courses needed for RSI students to complete their studies. In the next 4 to 5 years, specializations will be further developed within RSI for training, such as in Biomedical Engineering, Neuroscience, Motor Control, and Health Policy, in partnership with existing collaborative programs. RSI reports that over the last 2 years, all students have been successful in accessing needed outside courses and that they have negotiated for guaranteed places for students taking qualitative methods courses. Over the next 5 years RSI will proactively monitor student access to courses, and continue to maintain positive relationships with outside departments/faculties that provide courses that students need.

Course evaluations of courses offered by RSI will also be monitored continuously to assess impact of curriculum redesign. It is important to recognize the challenge of providing relevant core material for the breadth of research conducted in RSI, which ranges from basic inquiry to health policy in an interdisciplinary context. The direct applicability of course content varies significantly according to students' particular course of study. Because of RSI's commitment to interdisciplinarity, students are exposed to a broad range of material that may not be seen as immediately applicable to their own research. RSI will investigate what course evaluation indicators may be used to capture interdisciplinary learning, as well as more clearly articulate the implications of being in an interdisciplinary program in terms of student expectations and learning objectives.

4. **Reviewers' Comment:** *Recommendation to explore alternative approaches to the current requirement for "up-front" funding for applicants entering RSI programs; an alternative approach could have several possible benefits including increased diversity and international composition of the student body, and opportunities for junior faculty members to begin mentoring students earlier in their careers.*

Decanal Response: RSI currently requests "up-front" funding of approximately 2 years from faculty with respect to prospective students. During this time, it is expected that students/faculty will work towards continued funding. RSI also implemented a funding policy to specifically support junior faculty, which currently provides up to two-thirds of the required student stipends. This support has been used to leverage important applications such as Canada Research Chairs. Junior faculty are also being mentored to use more proactive recruitment strategies to successfully attract trainees.

RSI is very committed to providing funding to increase the diversity of our student body particularly for students from under-represented groups. In recent years, RSI fully funded Indigenous students for a minimum of 2 years and have dedicated Ontario Graduate Scholarship awards for students from underrepresented groups. RSI's advancement activities have included funding to support diverse students, including specific funding for Indigenous students. RSI plans to collaborate on larger student scholarship advancement initiatives. RSI's Communications and Community Relations Committee has designed and piloted a highly successful recruitment strategy already implemented this year; this strategy will need to be enhanced in future years. RSI will continue working with a Temerty Medicine recruiter, as well as other University staff, to support increased representation of students from other countries.

The next UTQAP review of the Rehabilitation Sciences Institute is scheduled in 2024-25. In 2022-23 we will follow up with the Director on the implementation of the external reviewers' recommendations and, later that year, provide you with an interim report on the status of the implementation plan.

Sincerely,



Patricia Houston, MD, MEd, FRCPC
Acting Dean | Vice Dean, Medical Education
Professor, Department of Anesthesiology & Pain Medicine

cc: Lisa Robinson – Vice Dean, Strategy & Operations
Justin Nodwell – Vice Dean, Research & Health Science Education
Lynn Wilson – Vice Dean, Clinical & Faculty Affairs
Anastasia Meletopoulos – Academic Affairs Manager
Daniella Mallinck – Director, Academic Programs, Planning & Quality Assurance, Office of the Vice Provost, Academic Programs
Angela Colantonio – Director, Rehabilitation Sciences Institute

3. Committee on Academic Policy & Programs (AP&P) Findings

The spokesperson for the reading group reported that the summary did a good job of reflecting the full report.

In response to questions from the reading group, Professor Angela Colantonio, Director, Rehabilitation Sciences Institute, highlighted:

- Time-to-completion data was collected and actively monitored by Rehabilitation Sciences Institute (RSI) staff.
- The Student Affairs Committee terms of reference would be undergoing review with the consideration of expanding its mandate, possibly to include mental health.
- The role of postdoctoral fellows at RSI and commented that their roles would be discussed in future faculty town halls and executive meetings to develop a more structured plan to capture contributions.

No follow-up was requested.

4. Institutional Executive Summary

The reviewers noted that “RSI has done a superlative job of addressing its key objective, establishing a collaborative hub for researchers from across the region to engage in research, scholarship, and advanced training”; they praised the unsurpassed breadth of opportunities for graduate students to collaborate and interact across a broad range of areas; the significant curriculum revisions that are currently underway to modernize and improve program quality; the high quality students who are “proud to be part of RSI”; the outstanding, productive and well-funded core and external faculty, and the committed and effective staff members; and finally, they commended the institute for its “vibrant and active” interdisciplinary connections with cognate units. The reviewers recommended that the following issues be addressed: continuing to develop and refresh RSI program curricula; exploring alternative approaches to the current requirement for “up-front” funding for applicants entering RSI programs; providing incentives to increase engagement and to attract clinician scientists with primary appointments in hospitals to teach in RSI programs; taking full advantage of opportunities for interdisciplinary connections with cognate units, and continuing to expand RSI’s relationships into new areas; improving communications with participating departments regarding workload, and recognition for teaching and supervising students in RSI programs; and enhancing strategic alignment with the Faculty of Medicine. The Dean’s Administrative Response describes the Faculty, unit and programs’ responses to the reviewers’ recommendations, including an implementation plan for any changes necessary as a result.

5. Monitoring and Date of Next Review

In 2023 the Dean will follow up with the Chair on the implementation of the external reviewers’ recommendations and, will provide an interim report to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs by December 2023 on the status of the implementation plans.

The next UTQAP review of the Rehabilitation Sciences will be commissioned in 2025.

6. Distribution

On January 15, 2022, the Final Assessment Report and Implementation Plan was posted to the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs website and the link provided by email to the Dean of the Temerty Faculty of Medicine, the Secretaries of AP&P, Academic Board and Governing Council, and the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. The Dean provided the link to the Chair of the Department.