UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Excerpt from REPORT NUMBER 206 OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

November 24, 2016

5.   *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream*

Professor Regehr gave an overview of the proposed new *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotion in the Teaching Stream*. She noted that it had arisen from the work of the Special Joint Advisory Committee (SJAC), which had addressed changes to the University's Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) between the University and the University of Toronto Faculty Association (UTFA).[1] Professor Regehr acknowledged Professor Cynthia Messenger, President of UTFA, and spoke of the collaborative process that had led to the development of the *Policy*.

The proposed *Policy*, which had been approved by UTFA on October 18, 2016, subject to approval by the Governing Council, outlined criteria for promotion to the ranks of Professor, Teaching Steam, and Associate Professor, Teaching Stream. The proposed *Policy* had been developed with reference to the existing *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions*, and each division would produce its own procedures consistent with the proposed *Policy*. The criteria for promotion to Professor, Teaching Stream in the proposed *Policy* were divided into two main sections, "Excellent Teaching" and "Educational Leadership and/or Achievement and Ongoing Pedagogical/Professional Development", to be sustained over many years.

Professor Regehr explained that the *Policy* contemplated a single departmental Promotions Committee to review candidates for promotion in the teaching stream and in the tenure stream. At least five tenured or continuing faculty at the rank of Professor, and/or Professor, Teaching Stream, with at least one faculty member at the rank of Professor, Teaching Stream, would be included in the Committee membership when a teaching stream candidate was being considered. The proposed *Policy* diverged from the *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions* in some ways. For example, there would be no level of Presidential review for promotions under the proposed *Policy*. As well, the proposed *Policy* incorporated reference to the Tri-Campus Framework as it applied to the promotions process.

During the Board's discussion, a member asked how a Promotions Committee might assess a candidate's efforts with respect to innovation and experimentation in teaching. Professor Regehr affirmed the University's commitment to innovation in teaching and pointed to existing funds available to faculty members.[2] She said that promotions and tenure committees were experienced in evaluating candidates who had not yet achieved their desired outcomes with regard to innovative ideas, whether in research or teaching, but who had articulated important lessons from such experimentation.

---

[1] Professorial rank and other changes to the Teaching Stream were approved by the Governing Council on June 25, 2015. See http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=11261.
[2] http://www.provost.utoronto.ca/link/Funds.htm

A member pointed to the importance of clarity with respect to the teaching excellence criteria that would be used for promotion in both the tenure stream and the teaching stream. Professor Regehr confirmed that the process would evolve over time. As with the tenure stream, the promotions process for the teaching stream would be rigorous. Professor Regehr clarified further that, upon creation, academic positions were identified as either teaching stream or tenure stream. Professor Sioban Nelson, Vice-Provost, Faculty and Academic Life and Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, added that, while tenure stream candidates for promotion shaped their portfolio to reflect their strengths in research and/or teaching, teaching stream candidates for promotion would clearly be evaluated on excellence in teaching.

A member commented that, in addition to tenure stream and teaching stream faculty, there was also a large body of non-tenured, clinical faculty within the University, particularly in the Faculty of Medicine. Professor Regehr noted that those appointments fell under a separate *Policy for Clinical Faculty*.

> On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried
>
> YOUR BOARD RECOMMENDED
>
> THAT the proposed new *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions in the Teaching Stream* be approved, effective December 16, 2016.

6. *Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment*

The Chair outlined the governance approval path for the proposed *Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment*. The proposed *Policy* was being provided to the Academic Board and the Business Board for information. On November 28, 2016, the proposed *Policy* would be considered by the University Affairs Board for recommendation for approval by the Governing Council. Governing Council would then vote on the *Policy* at its meeting of December 15th.

Professor Regehr gave a presentation on the proposed *Policy*. Highlights included the following.

- The proposed *Policy* would apply to all members of the University community, and access to the same supports and services would be provided to all students, faculty, and staff.
- Principles underlying the *Policy* included the University's commitment to reducing barriers to disclosing and reporting sexual violence, due process and procedural fairness, and the provision of appropriate support and accommodations.
- A number of key revisions had been made to the initial draft in response to input received from the University community.
- Dr. Terry McQuaid had been hired as Executive Director, Personal Safety, High Risk & Sexual Violence Prevention and Support, and the appointment of a Director, Sexual Violence Prevention & Support Centre, would be announced shortly.
- Next steps in the University's Action Plan would include the creation of a companion guide to the *Policy* for University members, development of operating procedures for the Centre,

continued work on training and education, and the alignment of other University policies and guidelines with the *Policy*.

A question was raised about the definition of sexual violence in Bill 132, Ontario's sexual violence and harassment legislation, and the need for possible safeguards with respect to academic freedom. In response, Professor Regehr indicated that it was the University's position that there was no conflict with the key principle of academic freedom.[3]

---

[3] The initial draft *Policy* had contained a clause addressing academic freedom, however that was removed from the final version.