

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 94 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

April 17, 2002

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, April 17, 2002 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Kumar Murty (In the Chair)
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President
- Policy Development and Associate
Provost
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost,
Faculty
Mr. Adam Chapnick
Professor Sherwin Desser
Dr. Inez Elliston
Professor Luigi Girolametto
Professor Lynne C. Howarth
Professor David Jenkins
Professor Keren Rice
Professor Arthur Sheps

Professor J. J. Berry Smith

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor Heather Munroe-Blum, Vice-
President, Research and International
Relations

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard
Ms Cristina Oke

Regrets:

Ms Rakhi Bhavnani
Professor Mary Chipman
Professor Donald Cormack
Professor Frank Cunningham (teaching)
Professor James Donaldson
Professor Ruth Gallop
Professor Annelise Jorgensen

Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Robert Reisz
Mr. Janakan Satkunasingham
Ms Heather Schramm
Ms Catherine Seymour
Mr. Arnon Vered

In Attendance:

Mr. Jason Bechtel, Intellectual Property and Contracts Counsel
Dean Ron Daniels, Faculty of Law, Chair, Task Force on Intellectual Property relating to
Instructional Media
Professor Joan Foley, Chair, Program and Curriculum Committee, UTSC
Professor Bernard Katz, Associate Dean, Division I, School of Graduate Studies
Dr. Peter Munsche, Assistant Vice-President, Technology Transfer

**Report Number 94 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
April 17, 2002**

ITEMS 4 AND 5 ARE RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Remarks

The Chair noted that Professor Heather Munroe-Blum has been appointed Principal of McGill University, beginning January, 2003. The Chair wished her success and the members offered their congratulations.

1. Time of Adjournment

On motion duly moved and seconded,

It was agreed

THAT the meeting adjourn no later than 6:00 p.m.

2. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 93 of the meeting of February 6, 2002 was approved.

3. School of Graduate Studies: Changes to Admission Requirements

The Chair recalled that the Committee had considered one item of business by mail when the meeting of March 6 was cancelled. The proposal had been supported with no dissenting votes. He asked that the motion be confirmed at this meeting.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed changes in admission requirements as outlined in the memorandum from the School of Graduate Studies dated February 12, 2002, for 2002-03.

4. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Specialist Joint Program in Paramedicine with Centennial College

The Chair drew to members' attention a letter from Professor Kennedy indicating that the proposal had been approved by University of Toronto at Scarborough's (UTSC) committees. He welcomed Professor Joan Foley to the meeting. He noted that the Planning and Budget Committee would review the planning and resource implications of this program.

Professor Tuohy said that this was the third program from UTSC offered in conjunction with Centennial College. She endorsed the proposal and suggested that Professor Foley be invited to add any comments. Professor Foley noted two changes to the proposal. The current diploma at Centennial College in this area was two years in length, not three as indicated. Secondly, the AMB course designator listed in the proposal was used for Ambulatory Care courses; the course designator for the Paramedicine courses would be PMD.

**Report Number 94 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
April 17, 2002**

4. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Specialist Joint Program in Paramedicine with Centennial College (cont'd)

A member asked about the mechanism for ensuring the quality of the courses taught at Centennial College. Professor Foley responded that it was the same as for the other programs, namely, the content of the courses had been reviewed by the appropriate academic Divisions at UTSC and they were satisfied that the courses met the requirements. There was no formal vetting of performance but if concerns arose, there was an opportunity to give notice. This proposal used the same approach to joint programs as did the others. Professor Tuohy noted that this was consistent with the University's practice regarding joint programs with colleges, which was to develop specially designed, integrated programs in areas in which the University and the College had particular complementary strengths, as opposed to developing more generic "degree completion" programs.

In response to a question about the fees, Professor Foley indicated that the fees would be regulated. The bachelor's program weight would be two BIUs from the second year onward. If the program developed a professional content, UTSC might look at establishing a new degree.

A member asked a number of questions about the program. Professor Foley commented that Centennial College currently took students directly from high school for the two-year diploma program. There have been changes in the field which indicated that university training would be preferred and the joint program would reduce the total time of the individual programs by one year. There would be no problem with the two institutions using different course designators since each institution recorded its own results. With respect to the courses taken on the Warden Woods campus, arrangements would be made to simplify students' travel arrangements by holding them on different days from those at UTSC.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the proposal for the establishment of a new Specialist Program in Paramedicine, offered jointly with Centennial College, as described in the submission from the University of Toronto at Scarborough, dated April 10, 2002, as amended, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, effective September, 2003.

5. Copyright Policy

The Chair welcomed Dr. Peter Munsche, Professor Daniels and Mr. Bechtel.

Professor Munroe-Blum recalled that she and the Provost had jointly created a Task Force on Intellectual Property relating to Instructional Media which had been chaired by Professor Daniels. A draft report had been widely circulated and consultations were held on all three campuses. Comments were taken into account by the Task Force in drafting its final report. The result was the three motions before the Committee today, one of which proposed a new Copyright Policy. She expressed her appreciation of Professor Daniels' leadership of the Task Force.

Professor Daniels recalled that the mandate of the Task Force had been to make recommendations regarding the University's intellectual property policy pertaining to new instructional media, after reviewing current policies here and at other institutions and

**Report Number 94 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
April 17, 2002**

5. Copyright Policy (cont'd)

consulting the University community. New instructional media (NIM) was defined as new technologies to record and disseminate pedagogical materials. This could include placing course texts “on line” and providing new methods of interacting with students. NIM required a significant investment of resources and faculty time and although all works had great academic value, few had any commercial potential. Problems might arise with new types of conflict of interest and concerns about the use of the University’s name. Policies on those two topics plus those on copyright, computer software and inventions had been reviewed. The following deficiencies were identified. The copyright policy granted the University ownership of works created with “non-trivial” use of University resources, although in practice the University’s right had not been asserted. An exemption for printed articles and books was problematic in the context of NIM since it invited comparisons between digital and traditional texts. The software policy was found to apply to only some aspects of NIM.

Professor Daniels explained that as a result of the foregoing, a number of recommendations were proposed. A new copyright policy would replace the current policy and that on computer software. The Inventions Policy would be retained with an amendment to the definition of “invention.” The default position would be that the author owned the copyright. The University would own copyright only if the work was made in the course of employment (other than for teaching and research) or when the University specifically commissioned a work. A contract could be created contrary to the default positions. Investment of University resources would trigger revenue sharing provisions upon commercialization, but not the assertion of ownership. A very important feature was the definition of “substantial use of University resources”. Finally, Professor Daniels drew attention to the flowchart showing commercialization of a work.

A member spoke in support of the new policy and commended the thorough and comprehensive job done by the Task Force. It clearly showed where the rights reside but also recognized the contribution of the University. She thought it was a very fair policy.

Another member also complimented the Task Force for drafting a clear, simple and elegant policy. He had a question about a particular contract he had entered into with a graduate student. Mr. Bechtel responded that it was always wise with any University-commissioned work to have a written agreement which clearly laid out the rights and responsibilities of both parties.

In response to a question, Mr. Bechtel said that teaching assistants were covered under the policy as administrative staff.

A member praised the details in the document and commented on the clarity of the concept of employment and release time. Professor Daniels pointed to 1.11 on page 2 in the policy which described the substantial use of University resources, including release time from regular duties. Divisions were encouraged to develop their own definition. The Task Force had spent a great deal of time in consultations on this particular point. Mr. Bechtel confirmed the importance of having agreements for contract work at the outset.

**Report Number 94 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
April 17, 2002**

5. Copyright Policy (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the University of Toronto Copyright Policy, dated April 9, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "B", be approved.

THAT the University of Toronto Policy on Copyright and Other Proprietary Rights (May 19, 1977) and the University of Toronto Policy on Computer Software (April 14, 1988) be repealed.

THAT the University of Toronto Inventions Policy be amended as outlined in the memorandum from Vice-President Heather Munroe-Blum, dated April 8, 2002, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "C".

6. Canada Research Chairs Program: Revised Strategic Plan

The Chair noted that this item was one presented for information but asked if members would deal with the item now before Professor Munroe-Blum left the meeting. He recalled that the document had been sent to members with the cancellation notice of the March meeting. He asked if members had any questions about the Plan. There were no questions.

7. School of Graduate Studies: MA in English - New Field in Creative Writing

The Chair welcomed Professor Bernard Katz for this and the following items from the School of Graduate Studies.

Professor Tuohy introduced the proposal noting that the new field was aimed at students with strong academic backgrounds and promise as writers. They would be developing their skills in the context of a doctoral-stream master's program. The program would be 18 months in length and contain a writing project worth two full-course equivalents.

A member noted that the Committee had seen a number of programs recently where the trend appeared to be to shorter programs. This one was longer. Professor Katz responded that the course-work programs were 12 months but the thesis option programs took longer. These students would be eligible to continue on to a doctoral program. The creative writing portion meant extra time. Professor Tuohy made a general comment about the thesis option programs, noting that there was another such program later on the agenda. All graduate departments were encouraged to review their programs and to make sure that the programs they offered were appropriate to the particular discipline. In some cases, such as some recently approved by the Committee, this would lead to the elimination of thesis options; in other cases, it could lead to the addition of a thesis option.

A member asked whether these students would be competitive with respect to admission to the doctoral program. Professor Katz commented that there were very few creative writing doctoral programs. It was critical that these master's students be equipped to enter a conventional doctoral program. The Department and the School were very excited about this program which represented a departure from the normal programs.

**Report Number 94 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
April 17, 2002**

7. School of Graduate Studies: MA in English - New Field in Creative Writing (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal for the establishment of a new field in Creative Writing in the MA program in English, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated February 12, 2002, effective September 2003.

8. School of Graduate Studies: Diploma in Information Studies (Dip.I.St.)

The Chair noted that Dean Howarth from the Faculty of Information Studies was a member of the Committee and could respond to questions.

Professor Tuohy explained that this was a proposal for a post-master's diploma program for those with a master's degree who wished to upgrade their skills and knowledge. She noted that the proposal was being presented to the Committee by the School of Graduate Studies rather than by the Faculty of Information Studies, following procedures of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal for the establishment of a Graduate Diploma of Advanced Study in Information Studies (Dip.I.St.), as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated February 12, 2002, to commence September, 2002.

9. School of Graduate Studies: Policy on Extensions for the Completion of Graduate Course Work

Professor Goel introduced the proposal to change program regulations concerning completion of course work. The framework outlined the process for obtaining an extension of deadline. The changes to the two course grades proposed were within the division's jurisdiction as outlined in part II of the Grading Practices Policy.

A member asked if these changes were more or less better for the graduate students. Professor Katz responded that currently there was no standard policy. Extensions were at the discretion of the course instructors. Graduate co-ordinators had urged the School to consider drafting a policy. In this new policy, the graduate units would approve extensions. He noted that the representatives of the Graduate Students' Union on the SGS Council had supported the motion. The new policy would address perceived unfairness in the old process where, for example, a student handing a paper in on time might receive the same grade as one handing a paper in 8 months late. Professor Goel said that this made the procedures consistent with other divisions. It was hard to make successful appeals without rules.

**Report Number 94 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
April 17, 2002**

9. School of Graduate Studies: Policy on Extensions for the Completion of Graduate Course Work (cont'd)

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed School of Graduate Studies Policy on Extensions for the Completion of Graduate Course Work, dated February 28, 2002, effective September 1, 2002.

10. School of Graduate Studies: Enrolment Policies and Procedures - Good Academic Standing and Satisfactory Academic Performance

Professor Tuohy noted that this proposal was basically a rewording of existing policy. There was one clarification to be drawn to the attention of the Committee, namely, the time period in the current section referred to the end of the fourth year of registration in the program. This has been clarified in the proposal to be the end of the third year if the student entered with a master's degree or the fourth year otherwise.

A member commented that the proposal referred to a full-time program "as opposed to a flexible-time program." She asked whether the School was planning to tackle this particular aspect of the flexible-time program. Professor Katz indicated that the problem was the definition of the program although the first years of the flexible-time program were the same as those in the full-time program. He suggested that if those divisions with flexible-time programs wanted to explore this issue that they do so and that they propose a system-wide solution. The member said that she was sensitive to this issue as those students in the full-time program felt the program structure was confining while the structure of a flexible-time program appeared more relaxed.

A member wondered about the effect of increasing work hours for teaching assistants (TA) with the reality of finishing in three years. She thought the chances were remote. She asked whether there was any flexibility in applying the new policy. Professor Katz said that the departments would have discretion in extending the deadline. He would be concerned to know that students took longer than three years to complete their course work. The member agreed but suggested there might be some exceptions.

Professor Goel hoped that the guaranteed funding package would reduce the individual TA's hours. He understood that the recent contract with that group had reduced the number of hours of TA time that could be counted towards the funding guarantee. Another member commented that his understanding of the effect of the guarantee was to increase the hours. He said that the point of the policy was to move the students to the thesis writing part of the doctoral program as quickly as possible.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed changes to Enrolment Policies and Procedures regarding Good Academic Standing and Satisfactory Academic Performance, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated March 21, 2002, effective September 2002.

11. School of Graduate Studies: Master of Information Studies - Thesis Option

Professor Tuohy noted that this item proposed adding a thesis option to the existing program, the opposite of a number of recent proposals the Committee had reviewed.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposal for the establishment of a thesis option in the Master of Information Studies program, as described in the submission from the School of Graduate Studies dated March 21, 2002, effective September 2002.

12. School of Graduate Studies: PhD Program in Drama - Direct Admission

Professor Tuohy explained that the program was seeking a change in the admission requirement above the minimum named in the general regulations of the School, namely, a B+.

In response to a member's comment, Professor Katz said that this trend was more and more the norm in the humanities. He personally agreed with the A- admission requirement. He believed that referring to the B+ in the regulations sent out misinformation since that grade was no longer competitive for entry into the doctoral program. Departments rarely accepted an entry grade lower than A-. The departments were moving to direct entry because of the competition for new students and many other universities used direct entry. Students were focused right from the beginning of their program and it was having a salutary impact on their progress. His department has had direct-admission requirement the longest time, five years, and he confirmed the students did well and finished faster. A member remarked that he would like to see the A- standard apply to all programs.

A member asked about admission requirements from master's programs but Professor Tuohy suggested that this was a broader issue.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The proposed direct admission requirement to the PhD program in Drama, namely a grade average of at least A- in a bachelor's degree program or its equivalent from a recognized university, as described in the submissions from the School of Graduate Studies dated March 21, 2002, effective September 2002.

13. Items for Information

(a) School of Graduate Studies: Collaborative Program in Editing Medieval Texts

There were no questions on this item.

**Report Number 94 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
April 17, 2002**

13. Items for Information (cont'd)

(b) School of Graduate Studies: PhD Program in Astronomy and Astrophysics - Direct Admission

A member noted the deletions on the last page of the submission referring to doctoral candidates' participation in the department's weekly seminar series and the point that those wishing to terminate their doctoral studies may request consideration for award of the master's degree if the requirements have been successfully completed. Professor Katz said the latter was part of the general regulations and it was not necessary to repeat it. With respect to the former, there were questions about how the participation was to be enforced and what criteria and benchmarks were to be used. The Department has been asked to reconsider this point.

(c) School of Graduate Studies: Master of Music - Opera Option within Performance Field

There were no questions on this item.

14. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Tuohy reported that no report had as yet been received from the UPRAC auditors concerning their visit late last fall and that she would keep the Committee informed.

Professor Goel had nothing to report at this time.

15. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the date of the next meeting was May 15, 2002.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Secretary
April 17, 2002

Chair