

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT 132 OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**

**October 31, 2006**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, October 31, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. in the Falconer Room, Room 102, Simcoe Hall.

Present:           Professor Michael Marrus (In the Chair)  
                  Professor Brian Corman, Vice-Chair  
                  Professor Clare Beghtol  
                  Mr. Ewen Weili Chen  
                  Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-President and Provost  
                  Professor Avrum Gotlieb, Chair, Planning and Budget Committee  
                  Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost, Academic

Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Regrets:           Professor Dickson Eyoh  
                  Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Chair, Committee on Academic Policy and  
                  Programs

In Attendance:   Professor Douglas McDougall, Vice-Chair, Committee on Academic Policy and  
                  Programs  
                  Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Acting Assistant Provost

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 131 of the meeting held on September 26, 2006 was approved.

**2. Business Arising**

There was no business arising from the report of the previous meeting.

**3. Review of Academic Programs and Units**

The Chair reminded members that, under the *Framework for Accountability of Reviews of Academic Programs and Units*, the Agenda Committee was responsible for determining whether there were any issues of general academic importance arising from the reviews that should be discussed at the Academic Board. Members had received the summary of the Reviews and the Report of the May 31, 2006 meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) at which the reviews had been discussed.

Professor Goel explained that, prior to January 2001, members of AP&P had received reviews throughout the year. Beginning in 2001, the Committee had scheduled an annual meeting that was dedicated to consideration of all the reviews that had been completed in the previous academic year. All members had been expected to read the review summaries prepared by the Office of the Provost. However, members had 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.

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

In 2005, a new process had been introduced. Each member had been expected to read approximately three reviews in detail, and to be prepared to report on their review and to discuss whether the summary had accurately reflected the review, whether the administrative response had adequately addressed the issues raised in the review, and whether there had been 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.

Professor McDougall informed members that the process had worked well at the May meeting. Professor Goel noted that among the three recurring themes that had appeared in the reviews were:

- Tri-campus matters;
- Space requirements;
- Graduate program development and governance.

Professor Goel emphasized the importance of the review process. The requirements for accountability had been developed internally, and the reviews were taken seriously by the University. It was agreed that this point would be included in the cover memorandum to the Executive Committee.

A member asked whether the suggestion, included in the review, that the School of Continuing Studies (SCS) offer degree programs was being considered. Professor Goel explained that the current Director of SCS had taken up the position in January 2006, and was leading a strategic planning process at the School that would include careful consideration of the recommendations of the reviewers.

A member asked what the impact was of a reviewer identifying a unit as the best in Canada, even though the reviewer was not from a peer institution. The member asked whether there were guidelines concerning the choice of external reviewers. Professor Goel replied that there were guidelines for the selection of external reviewers, and that the individuals were required to be internationally recognized for their scholarship. He agreed to include the criteria for the choice of reviewers in the documentation for the 2007 review meeting.

It was agreed that there were no general academic issues arising from the consideration of the reviews that warranted discussion by the Academic Board. It was also agreed that Professor Marrus would draw the attention of members of the Academic Board to the Report of the Agenda Committee and the discussion of the Reviews.

In accordance with the *Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units*, the Executive Committee would receive the review report and record of the AP&P discussion, and consider both in light of its responsibility for monitoring the review audit process, identifying any changes required in the process, and discussing any major unresolved issues with the President and Provost.

### 4. Academic Board Agenda – November 15, 2006

Members reviewed the agenda for the November 15th meeting. Professor Goel indicated that his report would include the Multi-Year Agreement with the provincial government, and ranking and grading issues.

### 5. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday December 12, 2006 at 2:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

November 13, 2006

37811