UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

OFFICE OF THE VICE-PROVOST,
ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

November 20, 2026

Teaching and Administrative Staff, Students, and Alumni
Toronto School of Theology

Dear Colleagues,

The University of Toronto commissions periodic external reviews of programs and the units in which they reside as part of its commitment to quality assurance. These reviews provide an unparalleled opportunity to secure the expert advice of leaders in the field concerning academic and administrative issues and to assess our performance against other leading international programs. The final report of the reviewers and the response of the Executive Director to the review are presented to University governance and are made broadly available to faculty, staff, students, alumni and community partners. The review helps to provide guidance for quality improvement and future directions.

I am pleased to inform you that an external review team for the programs offered conjointly by the Toronto School of Theology and the University of Toronto has been established and will be visiting the School from **March 8-10, 2027**. Its members are:

- **Mai-Anh Le Tran,** Associate Professor of Religious Education and Practical Theology, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
- **Gilles Routhier,** Professeur titulaire and Dean Emeritus, Faculty of Theology and Religious Sciences, Université Laval
- **Graham Ward,** Emeritus Regius Professor of Divinity, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Oxford

I have attached, for your information, a copy of the terms of reference for the review.

We will be working closely with the Executive Director's Office to arrange the schedule for the review visit, including meetings with a broad range of constituencies that will provide the reviewers with the opportunity to hear a wide range of views.

Comments and suggestions from teaching and administrative staff, students, alumni and members of the Toronto School of Theology community are welcomed. These may be submitted through our website, here: https://www.vpacademic.utoronto.ca/provostial-review-comments/

Simcoe Hall, 27 King's College Circle, Room 225, Toronto ON M5S 1A1 Canada
Tel: +1 416 978-0490 • vp.academicprograms@utoronto.ca • www.vpacademic.utoronto.ca

Sincerely,



Nick Rule
Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

cc.
Darren Dias, Executive Director, Toronto School of Theology
Ruth Maddeaux, Registrar, Toronto School of Theology
Elizabeth Neilly, Executive Assistant to the Executive Director, Toronto School of Theology
Caitlin Burton, Acting Director, Academic Programs, Planning and Quality Assurance, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Emma del Junco, Academic Reviews and Planning Specialist, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Alexandra Varela, Academic Reviews and Planning Specialist, Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

2026-27 UTQAP Provostial Review of the U of T/TST Conjoint Programs: Terms of Reference

Framework for UTQAP reviews:

UTQAP processes support a structured approach for creating, reflecting on, assessing and developing plans to change and improve academic programs and units in the context of institutional and divisional commitments and priorities.

The University of Toronto (U of T), in its *Statement of Institutional Purpose (1992)*, articulates its mission as a commitment "to being an internationally significant research university, with undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs of excellent quality." Thus “quality assurance through assessment of new program proposals and review of academic programs and units in which they reside is a priority for the University…:

> The quality of the scholarship of the faculty, and the degree to which that scholarship is brought to bear in teaching are the foundations of academic excellence. More generally, all of the factors that contribute to collegial and scholarly life — academic and administrative complement, research and scholarly activity, infrastructure, governance, etc. — bear on the quality of academic programs and the broad educational experience of students. (*Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units* (2010))

The University’s approach to quality assurance is built on two primary indicators of academic excellence: the quality of the scholarship and research of faculty; and the success with which that scholarship and research is brought to bear on the achievement of Degree Level Expectations. These indicators are assessed by determining how our scholarship, research and programs compare to those of our international peer institutions and how well our programs meet their Degree Level Expectations.

Reviews provide the opportunity to celebrate successes, identify areas where we can do better and vigorously pursue improvements.

Terms of Reference:

The Terms of Reference are intended to establish the parameters of the cyclical review process and provide the framework of the review report.

Issues that are addressed through existing, specific University procedures are considered **out of scope** for UTQAP reviews (e.g., individual Human Resources issues, specific health and safety concerns). **Any such issues raised at any point during a review process** (self-study, site visit, review report) **must immediately be brought to the attention of the commissioning officer and routed through appropriate University channels for resolution**.

Programs under review:	Program	Degree Conferred Conjointly by U of T and the following Member Institution(s)
	Undergraduate	
	Master of Divinity	Emmanuel, Knox, Regis, St. Augustine's, St. Michael's, Trinity, Wycliffe
	Master of Psychospiritual Studies	Emmanuel: • **Streams:** Spiritual Care, Social Service • **Foci:** Christian Focus, Muslim Focus, Buddhist Focus (must be registered in the Spiritual Care stream), Interfaith Focus (must be registered in the Spiritual Care stream) Knox: • **Streams:** Spiritual Care, Social Service • **Focus**: Jewish Focus (must be registered in Spiritual Care stream) Regis and St Michael's jointly: • **Streams:** Spiritual Care, Social Justice Ministries, Spiritual Direction

		Trinity: • **Streams:** Spiritual Care, Social Justice Ministries, Spiritual Direction Emmanuel & Knox: • **Category 2 Certificate:** Spiritual Care and Psychotherapy in conjunction with the MPS degree program *(must be registered in Spiritual Care stream)*
	Master of Religious Education	St. Augustine's, St. Michael's
	Master of Sacred Music	Emmanuel
	Master of Theological Studies	Emmanuel: • **Stream:** Theology, Spirituality and the Arts • **Foci:** Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, Interfaith Knox Regis: • **Stream:** Theology, Spirituality and the Arts St. Michael's: • **Stream:** Theology, Spirituality and the Arts Trinity: • **Stream:** Theology, Spirituality and the Arts Wycliffe: • **Stream**: Urban Community Development
	Category 1 Certificate in Theological Studies	Emmanuel, Knox, Regis, St. Augustine's, St. Michael's, Trinity, Wycliffe

	Category 1 Certificate in Theology and Interreligious Engagement	Emmanuel, Regis, St. Augustine's, St. Michael's, Trinity, Wycliffe
	Graduate	
	Master of Theology	Emmanuel, Knox, Regis, St. Michael's, Trinity, Wycliffe
	Master of Arts in Theological Studies	Emmanuel, Knox, Regis, St. Michael's, Trinity, Wycliffe
	Doctor of Ministry	Emmanuel, Knox, Regis, St. Michael's, Trinity, Wycliffe
	Doctor of Philosophy in Theological Studies	Emmanuel, Knox, Regis, St. Michael's, Trinity, Wycliffe
Faculty/Division:	Toronto School of Theology	
Commissioning officer:	Vice-President and Provost	
Date of scheduled review:	March 8 – 10, 2027	

Reviewers are asked to comment explicitly upon the following:

1 Program(s)

The quality of each academic program and the learning environment of the students in each program must be addressed explicitly in the self-study and the external reviewers' report.

For each discrete program that is part of the review as defined in the Terms of Reference, please consider and comment on the following:

1.1 Program objectives and key features

a) Consistency of the program's objectives with the institution's mission and U of T's/the division's/unit's academic plans, priorities and commitments, including consistency with any implementation plans developed following a previous review
b) Evidence that the following have been substantially considered in the context of the program and its associated resources:

- Universal design principles and/or the potential need to provide mental or physical disability-related accommodations, reflecting the University's *Statement of Commitment Regarding Persons with Disabilities*
- Support for student well-being and sense of community in the learning and teaching environment, reflecting the work of the Expert Panel on Undergraduate Student Educational Experience and the commitment to establishing a Culture of Caring and Excellence as recommended by the Presidential and Provostial Task Force on Student Mental Health
- Opportunities for removing barriers to access and increasing retention rates for Indigenous students; for integrating Indigenous content into the curriculum in consultation with Indigenous curriculum developers; and for addressing any discipline-specific calls to action, reflecting the commitments made in *Answering the Call: Wecheehetowin: Final Report of the Steering Committee for the University of Toronto Response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*
- Opportunities for removing barriers to access and increasing retention rates for Black students; for promoting intersectional Black flourishing, fostering inclusive excellence and enabling mutuality in teaching and learning, reflecting the commitments made in the *Scarborough Charter* and consistent with the recommendations of the *Anti-Black Racism Task Force Final Report*
- Opportunities for fostering an equitable, diverse and inclusive teaching and learning environment, reflecting the values articulated in existing institutional documents such as the *Statement on Equity, Diversity, and Excellence*, the *Antisemitism Working Group Final Report*, the aforementioned reports, and future institutional reports related to equity, diversity and inclusion

c) (Where appropriate) Unique curriculum or program innovations, creative components, significant high-impact practices

d) Initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment.

1.2 Program requirements

a) Appropriateness of the program's structure and the requirements to meet its objectives and program-level learning outcomes, including the structure and requirements of any identified streams (undergraduate), fields or concentrations (graduate)

b) Appropriateness of the program's structure, requirements and program-level learning outcomes in meeting the institution's applicable undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations

c) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the mode(s) of delivery (i.e., means or medium used in delivering a program; e.g., lecture format, distance, online, synchronous/asynchronous, problem-based, compressed part-time, flex-time, multi-campus, inter-institutional collaboration or other non-standard forms of delivery) to facilitate students' successful completion of the program-level learning outcomes
d) Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study and is appropriate for the level of the program

1.3 Program requirements for graduate programs only

a) Clear rationale for program length that ensures that students can complete the program-level learning outcomes and requirements within the time required
b) Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take all of the course requirements from among graduate-level courses; evidence of sufficient graduate-level courses that students will be able to meet this requirement
c) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion

1.4 Assessment of teaching and learning

a) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the methods for assessing student achievement of the program-level learning outcomes and degree level expectations
b) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the plans to monitor and assess:
    - The overall quality of the program
    - Whether the program is achieving in practice its proposed objectives
    - Whether its students are achieving the program-level learning outcomes
    - How the resulting information will be documented and subsequently used to inform continuous program improvement

1.5 Admission requirements

a) Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements given the program's objectives and program-level learning outcomes
b) Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if applicable, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, e.g., minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios and how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience

1.6 Resources

In making assessments related to resources here and in 1.7, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.

Given the program's class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

a) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment
b) If applicable, discussion/explanation of the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and sessional faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience (see Quality Assurance Framework Guidance)
c) If required, provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities
d) Adequacy of the administrative unit's utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources
e) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support and laboratory access

1.7 Resources for graduate programs only

In making assessments related to resources here and in 1.6, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.

Given the program's class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes:

a) Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate
b) Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students
c) Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty

1.8 Quality and other indicators

a) Evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the program and commitment to student mentoring)

- The quality of the scholarship of the faculty, and the degree to which that scholarship is brought to bear in teaching

b) Any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience

c) Quality indicators related to students (e.g., grade level for admission; applications and registrations; attrition/retention rates; times-to-completion; final year academic achievement; graduation rates; scholarly output; success rates in provincial and national scholarships; competitions; academic awards; student in-course reports on teaching; and commitment to professional and transferable skills)

d) Quality indicators related to program graduates (e.g., rates of graduation; employment six months and two years after graduation; postgraduate study; "skills match"; and alumni reports on program quality when available and when permitted by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA). Auditors will be instructed that these items may not be available and applicable to all programs.)

e) Any additional indicators of quality identified by the division or academic unit, including but not limited to data to support the assessment of progress towards fulfilling the plans, priorities and commitments identified in 1.1.a and 1.1.b

f) How the program compares to the best in its field among peer institutions in Canada, North America and internationally, including areas of strength and opportunities

2 Faculty/Research

- Scope, quality and relevance of faculty research activities.
- Appropriateness of the level of activity relative to national and international comparators.
- Appropriateness of research activities for the undergraduate and graduate students in the Toronto School of Theology.
- Faculty complement plan.
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human resources. *In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.*

3 Relationships

- Strength of the morale of faculty, students and staff.
- Scope and nature of relationships with cognate Faculties, academic departments and units.

- Extent to which the Toronto School of Theology has developed or sustained fruitful partnerships with other universities and organizations in order to foster research, creative professional activities and to deliver teaching programs.
- Scope and nature of the Toronto School of Theology's relationships with external government, academic and professional organizations.
- Social impact of the Toronto School of Theology in terms of outreach and impact locally and nationally.

4 Organizational and Financial Structure

- The appropriateness and effectiveness of the Toronto School of Theology's organizational and financial structure.
- The appropriateness with which resource allocation, including space and infrastructure support, has been managed. *In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution's autonomy in determining priorities for funding, space and faculty allocation.*
- Opportunities for new revenue generation.

5 Long-Range Planning Challenges

- Consistency with the University's academic plan.
- Appropriateness of:
  - Complement plan, including balance of tenure-stream and non-tenure stream faculty
  - Enrolment strategy
  - Student financial aid
  - Development/fundraising initiatives
  - Management and leadership.

6 International Comparators

Assessment of the programs under review relative to the best in Canada/North America and internationally, including areas of strength and opportunities.