

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**May 25, 2007**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Friday, May 25, 2007 at 9:30 a.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak (Chair)  
Professor Douglas McDougall  
(Vice-Chair)  
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,  
Academic  
Professor Derek Allen  
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz  
Ms Linda B. Gardner  
Ms Bonnie Goldberg  
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard  
Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack  
Professor Sioban Nelson  
Professor Janet Paterson  
Professor Cheryl Regehr  
Professor J. J. Berry Smith

Miss Maureen Somerville  
Ms Johanna L. Weststar

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor John R. G. Challis, Vice-  
President, Research and Associate  
Provost  
Dr. Tim McTiernan, Assistant  
Vice-President, Research

Secretariat:

Mr. Neil Dobbs  
Mr. Henry Mulhall

Regrets:

Professor Gage Averill  
Mr. Ryan Mathew Campbell  
Mr. Tim Corson  
Professor Luc De Nil  
Professor Dickson Eyoh  
Professor David Farrar

Mr. Billeh Hamud  
Dr. Wajahat Khan  
Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles  
Mr. Matto Mildenerger  
Professor John Wedge

In Attendance:

Professor Cristina Amon, Dean, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering  
Mr. Jason Bechtel, Counsel, Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost  
Professor Paul W. Gooch, President, Victoria University  
Professor Rick Halpern, Principal, New College  
Professor Charles Jones, Acting Dean, University of Toronto at Mississauga

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean – Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science

Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

Professor Jens-Erik Mai, Vice-Dean, Faculty of Information Studies

Professor Mayo Moran, Dean, Faculty of Law

Professor Carol Rolheiser, Associate Dean, Teacher Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

Professor Catharine Whiteside, Dean, Faculty of Medicine, and Vice-Provost, Relations with Health Care Institutions

ITEM 4 CONTAINS A RECOMMENDATION TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report 129 (March 28, 2007) was approved.

**2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07**

**(a) Policy and Process**

The Chair said that the Governing Council Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units stated that “reviews are important mechanisms of accountability.” The “Accountability Framework” that guided the reporting process stated that governance should ensure “that University administration is monitoring the quality of academic programs and units and is taking the necessary steps to address problems and achieve improvements.” The terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs placed that responsibility primarily on the Committee. The record of the Committee’s discussion would be forwarded to the Academic Board’s Agenda Committee, which would review it and determine if the Board needed to consider specific issues of academic importance.

The Chair recalled that she had asked each team of members to take lead responsibility for three or four reviews, and to deal with the following questions:

- (i) Did the summary accurately reflect the review report?
- (ii) Did the administrative responses address the issues identified?
- (iii) Were there any questions/comments/issues that should be brought to the attention of the Committee?

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007****2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)****(a) Policy and Process (Cont'd)**

The Deans responsible for the various units and programs or their designates were in attendance to respond to any questions or concerns that might arise. If the Committee's lead readers were satisfied that the summary was complete and that all issues had been dealt with, they were asked simply to report that. There was no need to comment further. If, on the other hand, the Committee took the view that there were unresolved issues that should be considered by the Agenda Committee, the Chair would make that conclusion clear so that it could be reflected in the Committee's Report. For ease of reference, the Committee's discussion is reported below in the order the reviews appear in the review document.

**(b) Provostial Reviews**

**(i) Faculty of Law.** One of the Committee's lead readers said that the review of the Faculty of Law was highly positive. The Faculty was described as one of the world's outstanding law schools, and it enjoyed strong leadership. It continued to meet its goals. Morale was high. It had an outstanding retention record and an excellent sense of public service. It was consistently increasing diversity within the Faculty and was drawing excellent visa students. It was aggressively addressing the issues it faced including the urgent need for additional space. Dean Moran recorded her thanks to the external reviewers for their positive review and helpful suggestions.

**(ii) New College.** One of the Committee's lead readers said that the summary provided a satisfactory representation of the review. The member was, however, concerned that of the sixteen recommendations in the review, the administrative response, as reported in the summary, had dealt with only two of them.

Principal Halpern said that New College had given attention to all of the recommendations. The review had observed that the increasing complexity of the College's operations suggested the need for a reassessment of its administrative structure, and it had proposed the reestablishment of the position of Vice-Principal. A new Vice-Principal would take office on July 1, 2007, and the group of the College's senior administrative officers were meeting regularly to, among other things, consider the recommendations of the review report. Most of the recommendations, although not all, had been discussed by the College Council on more than one occasion.

The Chair said that the Agenda Committee might wish to request a follow-up report concerning the implementation of the fourteen recommendations contained in the review report that had not been addressed.

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)**

**(b) Provostial Reviews (Cont'd)**

Principal Halpern said that the review and its recommendations had been a great help to him in his assuming office as Principal.

**(c) Victoria University Review: Victoria College**

One of the lead readers said that the review was a very detailed and thorough one. The review reflected the extraordinary strengths of Victoria College. The summary was also thorough, and the administrative response was excellent, addressing all of the points raised. The review exercise was a model.

Professor Gooch expressed his gratitude to the reviewers, especially the external reviewers, who had provided very good advice, and he was pleased that the Principal had acted upon it.

**(d) Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering**

**(i) Institute for Aerospace Studies.** One of the lead readers reported that the review made it clear that the Institute offered the best programs in Canada and had the potential to be one of the leading aerospace departments in the world. It concentrated on areas of excellence, and its research was of very high quality. A real issue was that the Institute did not receive the high level of external recognition it should. In part, the problem was the Institute's past practice of concentrating its faculty hiring on its own graduates. The administrative response had, however, addressed this issue and other recommendations.

Dean Amon reported that new appointments to the Institute would target faculty from other institutions. The Institute was also addressing another need; it was working to broaden its applicant pool in an effort to improve the diversity of its faculty.

**(ii) Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry.** One of the lead readers reported that the summary was accurate. The Dean's administrative response showed that she was well aware of the issues and was responding to them. The review cited numerous highly positive factors. The programs in biomedical engineering and in pulp and paper engineering were widely renowned. The undergraduates in the Department's programs were outstanding and received excellent training. Graduate students enjoyed a high success rate. Alumni relations were very strong. The review made recommendations in six areas, and the administrative response indicated that the Department was making good progress in addressing the recommendations.

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)**

**(d) Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (Cont'd)**

**(iii) Department of Civil Engineering.** One of the lead readers reported that the review of this remarkable Department was positive and favourable. The administrative response made it clear that the Department was working to implement the recommendation for more interdisciplinary research that would be international in scope and that would also reflect the urban solutions focus of the undergraduate curriculum. The Department was also clearly making a strong effort, with the aid of funding from the Academic Initiatives Fund, to increase diversity among its faculty and students, particularly to attract more women.

Dean Amon added that the Academic Initiatives Fund grant would be used to seek increased diversity in all Departments in the Faculty, including the Institute for Aerospace Studies, in which review the issue had also arisen.

**(iv) Edward S. Rogers Sr. Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering.** One of the lead readers said that the review had been excellent, concise and thorough and had concluded that the Department was an excellent one in all ways. The administrative response had addressed each recommendation. The member praised the process, the outcome and the administrative response.

**(e) Faculty of Arts and Science**

**(i) Department of Anthropology and the Semiotics and Communications Theory Program.** One of the lead readers said that the summary reflected the review, and the administrative response had addressed each point raised. The administrative response concerning the Semiotics and Communications Theory Program, however, did not make it clear whether action would be taken to sustain this program, which rested largely on the work of a single tenured faculty member.

Professor Klausner replied that the Faculty of Arts and Science did intend to work with Victoria College to assist the Program, but it was clear that the future of the Program was on the line.

Professor Klausner added that the Faculty of Arts and Science was revising the process for reviews of smaller programs, which were currently a part of the review of a larger associated department.

**(ii) Commerce Program.** One of the lead readers said that while the summary reflected the points made in the review report, it lacked the sense of urgency contained in the full report. While it was made clear that the Program was an asset to the University and had

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)**

**(e) Faculty of Arts and Science (Cont'd)**

real potential to become a national or even international leader, there were several major concerns. There was unevenness in the quality of teaching. In addition, there were problems with the governance of the program, and there was need for a remedy that would replace the *ad hoc* nature of the collaboration between the faculty in commerce (in the Rotman School of Management) and that in economics (in the Faculty of Arts and Science). Those problems had persisted since the previous review of the program, and there was clearly work to be done in dealing with them. The administrative response, however, was clearly lacking when compared to the other reviews before the Committee. There appeared to have been no tangible steps put into place to deal with the problems, especially with relation to the non-curricular recommendations, including: the need to “brand” the program to reestablish its position in the market for undergraduate business education, the need to restructure the governance of the program, and the need to improve career guidance for students. The member asked whether progress was being made, perhaps in informal discussions, that had not been reflected in the formal administrative response. Was progress being impeded by the governance problems of the program, with responsibility for teaching shared by two different divisions?

Professor Klausner replied that the member’s summary was an accurate one. There were two aspects to the recommendations concerning the program: curricular and other. It was appropriate to deal first with the curricular recommendations before initiating actions concerning the other recommendations. Discussions between the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Rotman School of Management were on-going, and responses to the recommendations were not yet available. Professor Klausner said that the discussions would be pursued to a conclusion so that the answers could be provided to the questions raised by the reviewers.

**(iii) Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations.** One of the lead reviewers reported that the summary overall matched the full report. The reviewers had raised two issues that had not been discussed in the administrative response. First, the review had recommended that the new Chair of the Department take an active role in improving the level of collaboration of the Department with other units in the University. Second, the review had raised questions concerning courses that were cross-listed in the calendars of the Faculty of Arts and Science and the School of Graduate Studies and available to both undergraduate and graduate students. While the reviewers did not regard that as a problem with language-instruction courses, they were concerned about the extent of cross-listed courses in “content” areas. That was a specific manifestation of a more general concern about cross-listed courses in the University.

Professor Klausner replied that a new Chair was now in place, who would provide leadership in dealing with the recommendations contained in the review. The new Chair

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)**

**(e) Faculty of Arts and Science (Cont'd)**

had also been asked to deal with the question of cross-listed courses. Subsequent to the meeting, Professor Klausner reported that the Chair of the Department had stated that while many language courses would continue to be cross-listed (and the Faculty thought that to be appropriate), the Department would carefully monitor the number of “content” courses that were available to both graduate and undergraduate students. Some of those courses were needed in order to allow entering graduate students the opportunity to acquire background in areas unavailable elsewhere (the Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations was the only department in Canada offering such instruction at the undergraduate level). The purpose of this monitoring would be to determine whether it would be advisable to restrict enrolment in such courses to M.A. students.

**(iv) Department of Political Science; the Ethics, Society and Law Program; and the Peace and Conflict Studies Program.** One of the lead readers said that the summary had been very well done, and the administrative response made it clear that the Chair of the Department of Political Science was working on all of the recommendations contained in the review. The review had included strong accolades for the Department, which was described as clearly the leading department in Canada and a highly reputable department internationally.

Professor Klausner noted that the review of the Department of Political Science had included reviews of two related programs: the Ethics, Society and Law Program; and the Peace and Conflict Studies Program. The reviewers and the Faculty of Arts and Science took the view that those reviews illustrated the challenges associated with combining reviews of smaller college-based programs with larger departmental reviews.

**(f) School of Graduate Studies: Museum Studies Program**

The Chair reported that, in response to a recommendation of the review of the program, the Museum Studies Program was now located in the Faculty of Information Studies. Therefore, the Vice-Dean of that Faculty had kindly agreed to attend the meeting to respond to members’ questions.

One of the Committee’s lead readers said that the review contained several recommendations, all of which were recorded in the summary. The review was conducted solely by members internal to the University, who were concerned with the appropriate administration of this highly regarded small program, which was offered by cross-appointed faculty with primary appointments elsewhere and by instructors from the museum community. The reviewers and the University had reached the conclusion that the

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)**

**(f) School of Graduate Studies: Museum Studies Program (Cont'd)**

program should be continued and located in the Faculty of Information Studies. The various other recommendations of the review had all been addressed in the administrative response, and all were either being implemented or considered.

**(g) Faculty of Medicine**

**(i) Department of Immunology.** One of the Committee's lead readers expressed concern that the administrative response did not deal with one of the key recommendations of the review: that the Department develop and maintain a critical mass of faculty members on the St. George Campus to balance the impressive groups at the research institutes located in the affiliated teaching hospitals.

Dean Whiteside said that the Department of Immunology was a relatively small basic science department within the Faculty of Medicine. The previous Chair had built up the strength of the department by means of collaboration with the hospital research institutes. The immunology group at the University Health Network had always been a strong one, and a very impressive group had been developed at Sunnybrook. The new Chair, Professor Ratcliffe, had been able to appoint a number of tenure-track immunologists on campus. Professor Whiteside had not responded to the recommendation simply because of the lack of resources at this time to add further tenure-track positions. While there might be improved resources in the future, there were none at this time. Dean Whiteside had encouraged the Department to prepare a strategic plan and to initiate fundraising efforts.

A member referred to the undergraduate collaborative program involving the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Arts and Science, sponsored by Trinity College. Dean Whiteside observed that the program should not be regarded as a collaborative one because its courses were offered solely by the Faculty of Medicine. It was, however, a very good program, with Trinity College providing advising services to students. Even the members of the faculty who were not located on campus had become very engaged in the program.

**(ii) Department of Ophthalmology and Vision Sciences.** One of the Committee's lead readers said that while the summary of the review did omit minor parts of the full review, the administrative response responded fully to all matters raised in the review.

**(iii) Department of Pharmacology.** One of the lead readers reported that the summary of the review was accurate and that the Dean and Chair were clearly aware of, and actively addressing, a number of issues identified in the review. Those issues included:



**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007****2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)****(g) Faculty of Medicine (Cont'd)**

the initiation of a process of strategic planning, the monitoring of changes to the pharmacology content of undergraduate medical curriculum and of changes made to the pharmacology graduate curriculum, the termination of the role of the Department in the Institute for Drug Research, and collaboration with other basic science and clinical units to develop research opportunities.

Dean Whiteside said that she had not yet addressed the issue of the Department's participation in the Institute for Drug Research. Discussions of the matter would proceed when the Dean of the Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy returned from research leave.

**(iv) Department of Physiology.** One of the lead readers reported that the review was a highly positive one, praising the Department's research success as measured by grant support and peer-reviewed publications, the excellence of the department's leadership, and its contributions to undergraduate teaching in Arts and Science and Medicine as well as its graduate program. The review reported certain challenges associated with its undergraduate teaching in Arts and Science, arising largely from enrolment increases, and those matters had been addressed.

**(v) Department of Radiation Oncology.** One of the lead readers reported that the review was a very positive one, which was well summarized in the compendium provided to the Committee. The administrative response had dealt with all of the recommendations contained in the review.

Dean Whiteside noted that the development of the Department into a highly successful clinical department, without the benefit of a substantial university budget, had been extraordinary. It had been the outcome of the Department's willingness to undertake the academic oversight of the large, second-entry undergraduate program in partnership with the Michener Institute of Applied Health Sciences. The outcome had been transformative funding for the Department and a strengthened linkage with the radiation therapy community.

**(vi) Department of Speech-Language Pathology.** One of the lead readers said that the review was a very positive one. The Department's research productivity was praised. The enrolment in the Master of Health Science program had more than doubled, bringing about some challenges in terms of resources, space, and access to clinical training sites. The Department was beginning to address those challenges.

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)**

**(h) Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto:  
Department of Adult Education and Counselling Psychology**

One of the lead readers said that the review was a very comprehensive one of a “large vibrant department with a committed, energetic and productive faculty, dedicated staff and incredibly enthusiastic students.” The challenges faced by the Department were outlined in the summary and acknowledged by the administrative response. One central challenge arose from the fact that two separate departments had been amalgamated in 1996, and the Chair was working to build bridges to bring about more integration of the work of the two groups. A second challenge was that the offering of two master’s degree programs – an M.A. and an M.Ed. – had been causing some confusion. The Department was working to differentiate the two degree programs more clearly.

**(j) University of Toronto at Mississauga**

**(i) Department of Political Science.** The reviewers found that the Department had “a strong faculty of nationally and internationally recognized scholars.” One of the lead readers said that the very comprehensive review was well outlined by the summary. He was, however, concerned that the administrative response could have been more thorough in dealing with a number of the issues raised. There was, for example, no response to the recommendation that there be a core course in methodology added to the curriculum and required for the specialist program. There was a concern about the lack an adequate number of 400-series courses and a proposal to pursue the possibility of collaborative courses with cognate departments and programs. There was no course in African government and politics, notwithstanding the recent engagement of a specialist in the area. A student group had requested that there be at least one Political Science course cross-listed with Women’s/Gender Studies. There was real concern about difficulties in securing teaching assistants for UTM courses in Political Science. There was clear need for an administrative response to the curricular recommendations. More generally, there was no response to the recommendation for planning sessions or retreats to work on a clear vision and planning for the Department.

Professor Jones reported that the new Chair of the Department was concerned about the curriculum questions raised by the review, and he was addressing them. The absence of a course in African politics had been a function of the illness of the new faculty member hired in the field. Mounting a course in the area was an important priority at UTM, which was developing a general thrust in the area of African and Asian studies. The difficulty in securing teaching assistants was a general concern, and the tri-campus Arts and Science Deans were working to coordinate teaching-assistant assignments across the three campuses, which should be of assistance to both the Mississauga and the Scarborough campuses.

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)**

**(j) University of Toronto at Mississauga (Cont'd)**

**(ii) Department of Psychology.** One of the lead readers said that the review of this “excellent department” was well done. It included an interesting background essay on the role of academic psychology in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. The summary reflected the review very well, and the administrative response addressed all of the recommendations.

**(k) University of Toronto at Scarborough**

**(i) Department of Life Sciences.** One of the lead readers said that there was one issue concerning the process of the review. The students who had met with the reviewers were a self-selected group, and the reviewers were not certain that they were representative of UTSC life science students in general. It would be appropriate for future reviews that students be from a broader pool. Apart from that methodological matter, the review was clearly a good and rigorous one and the administrative response dealt with all of the recommendations. The Department was clearly a good one, with a faculty actively involved in productive research, teaching, university service and professional activity. The reviewers had suggested that the Department be divided into two new Departments: Biological Sciences and Psychology, and that recommendation was being implemented. The reviewers had also recommended special attention to the excellent program in Neuroscience, which included faculty and students from both new departments. The reviewers were concerned that the program not be marginalized as a result of the split. The recommendation for special arrangements was also being heeded.

Dean Buchweitz said that the split into two departments had been approved and would be effective as of July 1, 2007. The need for additional administrative staff to support the growth in enrolment and faculty in the departments, and their separation, had also been addressed.

**(ii) Department of Management.** One of the lead readers reported that the summary reflected the full review. The administrative response, however, was very brief, simply stating that the Chair understood the challenges facing the department and that the Dean was working with the Chair on the Department’s strategic planning endeavours. The review included many positive factors. The program was attracting high-calibre students. The Co-operative program was doing particularly well. The quality of teaching was uniformly good.

Another of the lead readers observed that this review, like the review of the undergraduate Commerce program on the St. George Campus, raised the issue of the relationship with the Rotman School of Management.

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007****2. Reviews of Academic Units and Programs – Annual Report, 2006-07 (Cont'd)****(k) University of Toronto at Scarborough (Cont'd)**

Dean Buchweitz said that the Scarborough Campus program was a distinctive one and was the only program in the University to offer the Bachelor of Business Administration degree. It was a flagship program for UTSC. It was very popular and required the highest average for admission. With respect to the question of the relationship to the Rotman School, members of the UTSC faculty held graduate appointments in the Rotman School, but the School was not involved in any way in the management of the Department or the undergraduate program at UTSC.

**(m) Chair's Concluding Comments**

The Chair thanked members for their diligent work in participating in the Committee's discharge of this very important responsibility of monitoring the reviews of the academic units and programs. She also thanked the Office of the Vice-President and Provost for its work, under the direction of Edith Hillan, in preparing the excellent compendium that had enabled the Committee to discharge its responsibility effectively. Very special recognition and thanks were due to Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, the Director of Policy and Planning in the Office of the Vice-President and Provost, who had put many hours into this item of business – coordinating preparation of the compendium of reviews, inviting guests, and providing advice with respect to process.

The Chair invited members' comments on, and suggestions for improvements to, the Committee's process for considering the annual report on reviews. Members had no suggestions. Ms Lasthiotakis noted that the process had been refined over the years and, more recently, aligned with the Undergraduate Program Review Audit Committee (UPRAC) Guidelines. That Committee had completed its first audits of the University of Toronto undergraduate program review process in 2001. The next audit was scheduled for 2008.

A member asked whether the full reviews were posted on the web for members who wished to read them. Ms Lasthiotakis said that copies of all reviews were available to members in the Governing Council Office, but they were not posted on the Governing Council website or the Vice-President and Provost's website. The process would continue to be reviewed, and discussions were ongoing as to how to make more fully available the full reviews and the associated administrative responses.

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007****3. School of Graduate Studies: Graduate Academic Appeals Board – Revised Terms of Reference**

Professor Hillan said that the proposed amendment to the terms of reference of the Graduate Academic Appeals Board arose from the changes to the governance structure in the School of Graduate Studies. The faculty members of the Appeals Board had previously been nominated through the four divisional Executive Committees on the nomination of the Associate Deans of the divisions. Those Executive Committees no longer existed, and it was therefore proposed that the faculty nominations be brought forward to the Graduate Education Council by the Standing Committee on Student Matters, upon nomination of the Vice-Dean, Students.

On motion duly made and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The revised Terms of Reference of the School of Graduate Studies Graduate Academic Appeals Board, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “A”, effective immediately.

**4. Research Policies: Inventions Policy**

Professor Challis said that the proposed Inventions Policy was another revised policy to emerge from the overall review of research policies. The proposed policy had been reviewed by, among other groups, the Research Advisory Board and the Principals, Deans, Academic Directors and Chairs. There had also been consultation with the University of Toronto Faculty Association. The objectives of the revised policy were: to encourage invention disclosures from the University community; to recognize the importance of transferring University inventions for commercial use and to encourage such transfer; and to adapt the Policy to the disestablishment of the University of Toronto Innovations Foundation and the assumption of its functions by the technology-transfer group in the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost.

Dr. McTiernan outlined the key aspects of the Policy. First, with respect to the ownership of intellectual property developed by a University inventor, the arrangement of the past several years would be unchanged: the intellectual property would be jointly owned by the inventor and the University, unless and until either party acted to assign ownership to the other. Second, with respect to the management fee charged for commercialization services, the former Innovations Foundation, when it was asked by the inventor to handle the legal protection and commercialization of an invention, had charged a fee of 50% of net revenue. The management fee charged for such services by the Innovations Group (the successor to the Innovations Foundation), was a maximum of 20%

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007****4. Research Policies: Inventions Policy (Cont'd)**

of net revenue – a fee that would be enshrined in the proposed Policy. That represented a substantially more favourable arrangement for inventors. Third, with respect to revenue sharing, the current arrangement depended on whether the inventor decided to retain ownership and responsibility for development of the invention or decided to assign the invention to the University, which would assume ownership and responsibility for development. Where the inventor retained ownership and assumed responsibility, she/he would receive 75% of the net revenue and the University would receive 25%. Where the inventor assigned ownership to the University and the Innovations Foundation assumed responsibility for its commercialization, the inventor would receive 25% of net revenue after the management fee, with the University retaining the remaining 75%. Under the proposed policy, the distinction - and the disincentive to assign the invention to the University – was removed. No matter which party held the assignment of ownership and responsibility, the inventor would receive 75% of net revenue after any management fee and the University would receive 25% of net revenue after any management fee. Where the inventor assigned ownership and responsibility to the University, the University would receive the 20% management fee plus its 25% of the remaining 80% of revenue, for a total of 40%. The inventor would receive 75% of the remaining 80% of net revenue or a total of 60%. When the inventor retained ownership, she/he would also retain the option to commercialize it if she/he chose not to engage the commercialization management services provided by the University through the Innovations Group, in which case the management fee would not apply.

On motion duly made and seconded,

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the revised Inventions Policy, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “B”, be approved, replacing the Policy approved by the Governing Council on May 3, 1990 and amended on June 3, 2002.

**5. Reports of the Administrative Assessors**

Professor Hillan reported that the Committee’s other voting assessor, Professor David Farrar, had been appointed Vice-President, Academic and Provost at the University of British Columbia, effective September 1, 2007. He would be completing his service as Deputy Provost and Vice-Provost, Students at the University of Toronto on June 30, 2007. Professor Farrar’s departure would be a great loss to the University of Toronto and to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, but his new appointment represented a very exciting opportunity for him. He had given over twenty-five years of distinguished service to the University of Toronto as Professor of Chemistry, Chair of the Department of Chemistry, Vice-Provost, Students and Deputy Provost.

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**6. Interim Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair said that while the Governing Council meeting schedule was far from final, members who would be continuing on the Committee were asked to set aside time for an early start to the Committee's work next year, with the first meeting currently scheduled for **Monday, September 10, 2007 at 4:10 p.m.** The meeting schedule would be distributed to members over the summer.

**7. Other Business**

**(a) Degree Expectation Guidelines**

A member noted that, pursuant to a directive from the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities, the University would be expected to develop guidelines on expectations for graduates from first-entry degree programs. Those guidelines would presumably require the consideration and approval of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs some time before the June 30, 2008 deadline. When was it expected that the proposed guidelines would be required by the Committee?

Professor Hillan took the question under advisement. She anticipated that the matter would come before the Committee some time in the spring of 2008, perhaps in March, but she wished to consult with Professor Pekka Sinervo, the Chair of the Council of First-Entry Deans.

**(b) Chair's Concluding Remarks**

The Chair thanked all members for their service to the Committee over the past year: for their careful review of extensive agenda packages and for their business-like and efficient participation in the discussions. The work of the Committee had been carried out very expeditiously and very well this year. In large part, that was a credit to members. In part also it was a credit to careful planning. Members might or might not be aware that a planning meeting preceded each meeting of the Committee. Material was reviewed for completeness and effectiveness. The order of the agenda was established, and – as far as possible – members' needs for information were foreseen. The Vice-Chair had been a very active and important participant in that process, and special thanks were due to Professor Douglas McDougall for his service. The Committee's assessors not only prepared the material that came before the Committee. They also participated in the planning meetings. Their wisdom and experience had been essential components in making the Committee function well. The Chair offered thanks to Professor Edith Hillan,

**REPORT NUMBER 130 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS - MAY 25, 2007**

**7. Other Business (Cont'd)**

**(b) Chair's Concluding Remarks (Cont'd)**

Professor David Farrar, Professor John Challis, Dr. Tim McTiernan, Professor Susan Pfeiffer and Ms Karel Swift for their leadership. She also thanked members of the Governing Council Secretariat for their assistance, in particular, Mr. Neil Dobbs, whose support and seasoned guidance had been invaluable.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

August 8, 2007

39304v3