



### **3. Review of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)**

Professor Smith explained that the process used by AP&P for the June meeting had been changed. For the past several years, all members had read the review summaries prepared by the Office of the Provost for the meeting dedicated to consideration of reviews. This process had been more manageable than the previous process, in which members read each review as it became available. However, members felt that by relying on the summaries, rather than reading the reviews themselves, some of the accountability and audit functions performed by the Committee had been lost.

For 2005, a new process had been introduced. Each member had been expected to read approximately three reviews in detail, and be prepared to report on their review and to discuss whether the summary accurately reflected the review, whether the administrative response adequately addressed the issues raised in the review, and whether there were any other issues that required consideration by the Committee. One member had been designated as the lead reader for each review, and had reported in depth to the Committee. A total of 22 reviews had been considered in the two-hour meeting. Some issues had been raised that had not been highlighted in the summaries. Representatives from the units that had been reviewed had been present at the meeting to answer questions. Members of AP&P had been satisfied that this approach had enhanced the accountability of the process.

A member of the Agenda Committee suggested that consideration be given to incorporating in the report of the meeting at which reviews were considered the written comments of members who were not able to attend the meeting. It was agreed that this suggestion could be discussed as part of the next review process.

Professor Goel emphasized the importance of having a process of internal peer review in place at the University for accountability. This was a requirement of the University Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC), which looked at the policy and procedures in place at each institution for reviews of academic programs and units to ensure that they had met the required standard. As part of the audit, individual programs were selected and the approval process was reviewed to ensure that the University approval process had been followed.

Professor Goel reminded the Committee that a revised policy on reviews of academic programs, and accompanying Guidelines, had been approved in December 2004 and had come into effect on September 1, 2005.

On motion duly moved and seconded

**YOUR COMMITTEE ENDORSED**

The changes to the process of considering the reviews of academic programs that had been implemented by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs in June 2005.

It was agreed that there were no general academic issues arising from the consideration of the reviews that warranted discussion by the Academic Board.

### **4. Academic Board Agenda – November 24, 2005**

The members discussed the agenda for the November 24, 2005 meeting. Professor Goel indicated that his report would be brief, and would include updates on government relations and the budget.

#### **4. Academic Board Agenda – November 24, 2005 (cont'd)**

The Chair reminded members of the undertaking to address concerns raised in the discussion at the June 2005 meeting of the Academic Board of agenda item 30 (c), Reports of the Academic Appeals Committee in the presentation of the recommendations arising from the *Report on the Sub-Committee to Review Guidelines for Academic Appeals*. It was agreed that a written document containing links to the appropriate information would be prepared by the Provost's Office for the Academic Board.

It was agreed that the Graduate Enrolment Expansion discussion would begin with a powerpoint presentation, and would address the issues raised at the meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee on November 1, 2005. Members would be encouraged to read Report Number 105 of the Planning and Budget Committee prior to the meeting of the Academic Board, and to build on that discussion, rather than repeat the points that had been raised. The principles for expansion that had been suggested at the meeting of the Planning and Budget Committee would be presented to the Board for discussion.

#### **5. Approval Process for Academic Administrative Appointments**

Professor Cummins recalled that, at the previous meeting of the Agenda Committee, members had discussed the process of approval of academic administrative appointments, and ways in which the approval process might be changed to increase governance accountability.

It had been noted that, in the past, concerns had been raised at the Academic Board about the role of the Board in approving academic administrative appointments. Prior to 2004-05, the process had been that members had received a list of names, positions and departments. There had been no expectation that information be provided about the details of the search process or the successful candidate. In 2004-05, a template had been developed by the Office of the Vice-President and Provost to provide additional information about the successful candidate, and to confirm that the search process had been conducted in accordance with the *Policy on the Appointment of Academic Administrators*.

Professor Goel had highlighted three objectives of a further revised process:

- strengthened governance oversight of the approval process;
- the ability to have more in-depth discussion on the search process;
- shortened approval timelines to meet the demands of the current market with respect to faculty hiring.

There was consensus that it would be appropriate to consider revising the approval process for academic administrative appointments by delegating approval to a smaller body, such as the Agenda Committee. It was agreed that the Vice-Chair would present this proposal to the Academic Board on November 24 for discussion.

#### **6. Date of the Next Meeting**

The Chair noted that the next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday November 29, 2005 at 2:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 16, 2005