

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 95 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

May 15, 2002

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, May 15, 2002 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Ruth Gallop (In the Chair)
Professor Kumar Murty (Vice-Chair)
Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Vice-President
- Policy Development and Associate
Provost
Professor Vivek Goel, Vice-Provost,
Faculty
Mr. Adam Chapnick
Professor Mary Chipman
Professor Donald Cormack
Professor Frank Cunningham
Dr. Inez Elliston
Professor Luigi Girolametto
Professor Lynne C. Howarth
Ms Vera Melnyk
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor Robert Reisz
Professor Keren Rice

Professor Arthur Sheps
Professor J. J. Berry Smith

Non-Voting Assessors:

Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the
Governing Council
Dr. Sheldon Levy, Vice- President,
Government and Institutional Relations
and Interim Vice-Provost, Students
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Secretariat:

Ms Susan Girard
Ms Cristina Oke, Secretary

Regrets:

Ms Rakhi Bhavnani
Professor Sherwin Desser
Professor James Donaldson
Professor David Jenkins
Professor Annelise Jorgensen

Mr. Janakan Satkunasingham
Ms Heather Schramm
Ms Catherine Seymour
Mr. Arnon Vered

ITEM 3 IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**Report Number 95 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
May 15, 2002**

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 94 of the meeting of April 17, 2002 was approved.

3. Business Arising from the Report

There was no business arising from this Report.

4. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference - Revisions

The Chair invited Mr. Louis Charpentier, Secretary of the Governing Council, to introduce the item. Mr. Charpentier explained that one of the objectives for Governing Council for this governance year had been to update the terms of reference of all its committees and boards. The intent of updating the terms of reference was to reflect current practice, to clarify the particular function of each body and the relationships among the various bodies, to provide new wording, where necessary, to incorporate new requirements for accountability, and to remove ambiguity or vagueness from the terms. The process of updating the Terms had involved review and comment first by the Committee's Assessors and then by the Agenda Planning Group.

Mr. Charpentier reviewed the proposed changes, which included:

- clearly-stated membership, quorum and terms of office;
- clarification of ambiguities both in the body of the text and by means of footnotes, where appropriate;
- clarification of the determination of 'major' or 'minor' proposals and of the approval process for academic program proposals;
- the addition of sections on the general and specific monitorial responsibilities of the Committee; and
- the addition of a section on Committee procedures.

Professor Tuohy expressed thanks, on behalf of the administration, for the review of the terms of reference and the resulting revisions.

A member, after remarking that the Provost-designate had referred to the governance structure of the University of Toronto as 'cumbersome', asked whether the current number and configuration of committees and boards were necessary, and whether a review of their work had been undertaken. Mr. Charpentier replied that the last major governance review had been completed in the 1987-88 academic year. A decision to undertake a similar comprehensive review of the University's governance structure would have to be made by the Governing Council and would involve wide consultation with the University community. The current review of the terms of reference was intended only to update the terms consistent with the principles approved in the Report of the Chairman's Advisory Committee on Governance, 1988 (Balfour Report). A major reconsideration of the

**Report Number 95 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
May 15, 2002**

**4. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference – Revisions
(cont'd)**

structure was not contemplated at this time. Another member commented that the governance structure of the University of Toronto was complex and, if it was cumbersome, it was because of the transparency and accountability of the decision-making.

A member noted that the membership was shown as “approximately 31” and she asked under what circumstances the membership would be less than 31. Mr. Charpentier referred to the footnote which stated that the size of the Committee could be varied up or down with the approval of the Chair of the Governing Council if sufficient Governing Council or Academic Board members were not available.

A member asked about the use of the verb ‘consider’ to describe the work of the Committee. Mr. Charpentier replied that neutral language had been used in the terms to allow for the variety of actions that the Committee could take. The Committee could approve, recommend for approval, reject or refer back proposals. In some cases, the Committee had final decision-making authority and the result of its consideration could be to approve a proposal, defeat it, refer it back to the administration with specific advice for change or, in unusual circumstances, approve revisions following debate. In other matters, the Committee's responsibility was to make a recommendation to the Academic Board if it agreed that the proposal should be approved. The outcome of the Committee's consideration would then be a recommendation for approval. If members of the Committee did not agree that the proposal should go forward, the Committee could vote to refer it back to the administration or they could vote against the proposal. In the latter case, the proposal would go no further.

The Chair noted that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs was the only body that reviewed academic programs outside the division in which they were developed, and therefore the Committee played a key role within the University.

A member said that divisions were still unclear about approval procedures, and suggested that a working group be established to clarify these issues. Another member suggested that a table summarizing the various levels of approval required would be useful. Mr. Charpentier indicated that such a table could be prepared.

A member expressed her pleasure at receiving revised terms of reference and complimented the Office of the Governing Council on its support of members of committees and boards.

The terms of reference had been distributed with a companion document, the *Guidelines for Divisional Submissions*. Mr. Charpentier reviewed the proposed revisions to the *Guidelines*. He explained that the revisions were intended to reflect the terms of reference and to clarify the approval process.

Members discussed the range of decisions available to the Committee: approve, recommend to the Academic Board, reject, receive for information and refer back to the originating body. It was noted that the cover sheets that were prepared for agenda items clearly stated the action sought. A member suggested that the range of action described in Section 4.4 Academic program proposals would be better placed in Section 3: Function.

**Report Number 95 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
May 15, 2002**

**4. Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Terms of Reference – Revisions
(cont'd)**

Professor Goel reminded members that the Governing Council was the ultimate decision-making body in the University. The Governing Council delegated authority for certain decisions to its committees and boards, as well as to divisional councils. The terms of reference for the Committee would be approved by the Governing Council. The *Guidelines for Divisional Submissions* was a policy document created by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and, while Governing Council approval was required, the Committee had the authority to change the *Guidelines*.

The Chair suggested that the first sentence of the second paragraph of the *Guidelines* could be included in Section 3 of the terms of reference. Mr. Charpentier stated that the terms of reference could be redrafted in light of the suggestions that had been made, and the revised document circulated to Committee members before it was forwarded to the Academic Board for consideration.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT, subject to the understanding that the document will be revised and circulated to Committee members, the proposed revised Terms of Reference for the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs dated May 10, 2002, and attached hereto as “Appendix A”, be recommended in principle to the Academic Board for approval, effective July 1, 2002.

Members reviewed the proposed changes to the *Guidelines on Divisional Submissions*.

It was duly moved and seconded,

THAT the revised *Guidelines for Divisional Submissions* dated May 10, 2002 be recommended to the Academic Board for approval, effective July 1, 2002.

Several members expressed their view that they would appreciate more time to consider the document. After discussion, the motion was withdrawn, on the understanding that it would be brought to the first meeting of the Committee in the next academic year. Professor Tuohy indicated that the substance of the revised *Guidelines on Divisional Submissions* would be included in the table of approvals that members had requested be added to the terms of reference.

Mr. Charpentier thanked Committee members for their thoughtful debate and advice.

**5. Report on Student Awards Established, Amended and Withdrawn: July 1, 2000 -
June 30, 2001**

Ms Swift explained that the receipt of this report was one of the monitorial responsibilities of the Committee. She noted that 214 new awards had been established in 2000-01, comparable to the number established in the previous year. In her view, the matching programs offered by the government and by the University encouraged donors to contribute to awards.

**Report Number 95 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
May 15, 2002**

5. Report on Student Awards Established, Amended and Withdrawn: July 1, 2000 - June 30, 2001 (cont'd)

A member asked whether the value of an award would decrease if the return on the endowment decreased. Ms Swift replied that the amount indicated the payout from the preserved endowment, and that the value of the award would not decrease.

A member asked why awards were withdrawn. Ms Swift replied that the withdrawal of an award usually reflected a change of mind or circumstance of the donor.

A member asked how many awards were cancelled due to the withdrawal of a student from an academic program. Ms Swift replied that it was relatively unusual to cancel an award. The amount of the award, the time the student had been registered, and the costs involved in the year-to-date were taken into account, and the award adjusted accordingly.

A member noted that the Policy on Student Awards allowed for the establishment of awards to improve the participation of certain groups of students, and asked how many such awards had been established. Ms Swift replied that only one such award had been established during 2000-01. The number established normally ranged between 1 and 5 annually.

6. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Tuohy wished members a happy and productive summer. She informed members that a framework for a revised administrative structure across the three campuses would be introduced at the Planning and Budget Committee and then at the Academic Board meeting in June. A member commented that the proposed use of the term 'Vice-Chancellor' for the Principals of the University of Toronto at Mississauga and the University of Toronto at Scarborough might be confusing to other institutions. A member observed that the faculty at the University of Toronto at Mississauga were looking forward to the implementation of the framework.

Professor Goel reported that the use of anti-plagiarism software was being examined. It was hoped that the use of such software would start next year.

Dr. Levy informed members that the motion approved at the Governing Council meeting of May 2, 2002 would require a significant amount of study, and that, since the Committee had responsibility for student support policy and practices, the results of the study would be first reported to this Committee.¹

Ms Swift indicated that she had nothing further to report at this time.

7. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held in the fall at a date to be determined.

¹ It was RESOLVED

THAT there be no further substantial increase in tuition fees for the JD Program in the Faculty of Law until the Governing Council is satisfied that there has been no reduction in accessibility due to the 2002-03 tuition increase and no career distortion due to previous substantial increases based upon a comprehensive Accessibility and Career Choice Review to be conducted through the Provost's Office.

**Report Number 95 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs –
May 15, 2002**

8. Other Business

The Chair noted that this was her final meeting. She expressed her thanks to all who had served on the Committee during the past year for their creative, interesting and thoughtful discussions. She thanked Professor Kumar Murty for his assistance as Vice-Chair. She also thanked the assessors, Professor Carolyn Tuohy, Professor Vivek Goel, Dr. Sheldon Levy, Professor Ian Orchard, and Ms Karel Swift for their tireless efforts in assisting members in carrying out the responsibilities of the Committee. She recognized the support provided by staff of the Office of the Governing Council.

A member expressed his thanks to the Chair and Vice-Chair for their work.

Professor Tuohy, on behalf of the Committee, thanked the Chair for her service to the Committee. She noted that Professor Gallop had been a member since July 1996, and had served as Vice-Chair from 1998-2000, and as Chair since July 2000.

Professor Tuohy recalled that during Professor Gallop's time as Chair, the Committee had dealt with several major items, including the Strategic Research Plan, new graduate programs in a number of areas, amendments to the Toronto School of Theology Memorandum of Agreement and the recent Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) Audit. In recognition of her term as Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, Professor Tuohy presented Professor Gallop with a token of appreciation.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Secretary

Chair

May 23, 2002