

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**  
**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE COMMITTEE ON**  
**ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**May 11, 2010**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it met on Tuesday, May 11, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, with the following present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak  
(Chair)  
Professor Douglas McDougall  
(Vice-Chair)  
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-  
Provost, Academic Programs  
Professor Brian Corman, Vice-  
Provost, Graduate Education and  
Dean, School of Graduate Studies  
Professor Gage Averill  
Professor Charles Deber  
Mr. Sybil J. Derrible  
Professor William Gough  
Ms Min Hee Margaret Kim  
Professor Christina E. Kramer  
Ms Lesley Ann Lavack  
Professor Hy Van Luong

Professor John R. Miron  
Professor Ito Peng  
Ms Judith Poë  
Ms Lynn Snowden  
Mr. John David Stewart  
Miss Sabrina Kun Tang

Professor R. Paul Young, Vice-  
President, Research  
Professor Peter Lewis, Associate  
Vice-President, Research  
Ms Karel Swift, University Registrar

Mr. Neil Dobbs, Secretariat  
Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Secretariat

Regrets:

Mr. Konstantin Anosov  
Professor Katherine Berg  
Mr. William Crothers  
Professor Alister Cumming  
Miss Netila Demneri

Professor Miriam Diamond  
Professor Robert Gibbs  
Mr. Matthew Purser  
Professor Suzanne Stevenson

In Attendance:

Professor Elizabeth M. Smyth, member, the Governing Council; Vice-Dean, Programs,  
School of Graduate Studies  
Professor Jutta Brunnée, Metcalf Chair in Environmental Law, Associate Dean Designate,  
Graduate Program, Faculty of Law  
Ms Jane Kidner, Assistant Dean, Professional Legal Education, Faculty of Law  
Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-  
President and Provost  
Mr. Scott Moore, Quality Assessment Officer, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – May 11, 2010**

ITEMS 3 AND 4 CONTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

**1. Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report 145 (April 7, 2010) was approved.

**2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting**

**Item 3 - Vice-President Research, Annual Report, 2008-09 –Connaught Fund: Annual Report**

Professor Young's written report on the Connaught Fund had been distributed to the Committee in follow-up to the oral report that he had provided at the Committee's previous meeting.

Professor Young informed the Committee that, because of the serious financial issues that had faced the Connaught Fund in 2008-09, a distribution from the endowment had not been available to make awards that year. However, the Connaught Committee had continued to work diligently, and the present report was intended to provide an update on the Committee's activities. The Committee had assessed all of the existing Connaught programs at the University to determine whether they were maximizing the benefits available from the Connaught Fund resources. The Committee's evaluations had resulted in a new lineup of programs which would be officially launched in the coming academic year and implemented as funds became available. One of the new programs, the Connaught Strategic Research Initiative, was a suite of programs that could be funded individually or together. The programs focused on issues of importance to global society, and they had been unanimously approved by the Connaught Committee.

In response to a question from a member about the level of funding that would be available through the Connaught programs, Professor Young stated that the specific amount was unknown at present. It was possible that some of the planned programs might need to be deferred until greater funding could be obtained. However, once the total Connaught funding became available, it was expected that the University would be able to access approximately \$4-million annually to support research.

**3. Faculty of Law and School of Graduate Studies: Global Professional Master of Laws Program**

Professor Regehr introduced the proposal, stating that the Committee was being asked to consider an innovative Global Professional Master of Laws Program. The program was directed at professionals with experience in representing clients, businesses, and institutions that were international in scope. Courses would be offered in the evenings or on the weekends in order to

**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – May 11, 2010**

**3. Faculty of Law and School of Graduate Studies: Global Professional Master of Laws Program (Cont'd)**

enable participants to work and simultaneously to upgrade their education. Consultation regarding the proposal had occurred both within the University and with stakeholders in the community.

During the discussion that followed, a member noted the two admission paths to the program. He asked how those applicants with no legal training would fare in comparison with their peers who had a previous law degree. Professor Brunnée responded that the former admission path had been designed for use only under exceptional circumstances. There would be cases where qualified individuals with a bachelor's degree and at least five years of relevant experience would benefit from the program. In fact, masters degree programs in law for such professionals already existed in the United States. However, Professor Brunnée did not envision that such an entry path to the program would be typical. During further discussion of the matter, members drew parallels between the proposed program and other professional degrees currently offered within the University.

A member asked about the response of the Faculty of Law student body to the proposal. How would other students be affected by the need to share resources and facilities with the students in the proposed program. Professor Brunnée said that, in general, the reaction had been positive. While many of the applicants to the program would likely be senior professionals, the Faculty anticipated that some of its current students in the Juris Doctor program would also be prospective applicants. With respect to student services, the administration had no concern about its ability to extend support to students of the proposed program. As well, because classes would be held outside of regular hours, there would not be a strain on Faculty space.

In response to a member's question about enrolment, Professor Brunnée explained that it was anticipated that enrolment would grow from 30 students in the first year of the program to a steady state of approximately 120 students by 2015-2016.

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the proposed Global Professional Master of Laws (G.P.L.L.M.) program, as described in the proposal from the Faculty of Law dated April 12, 2010, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix "A", be approved, with enrolment commencing in September, 2011.

**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – May 11, 2010****4. *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units and the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process***

The Chair said that the Committee would be asked to recommend approval of the proposed *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units*. However, members were also invited to discuss the draft University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) which was being presented to the Committee for information.

Professor Regehr recalled that an initial draft of the *Policy* had been presented to the Committee for discussion at its previous meeting. Based on feedback provided by the Committee as well as by other members of the University community, both the *Policy* and the UTQAP had been revised. Professor Regehr outlined the governance approval path for the *Policy*, noting that if it was recommended for approval by the Committee, it would then proceed to the Academic Board and subsequently to the Governing Council for final approval. A final version of the UTQAP would be submitted for approval to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the “Quality Council”) by the end of June, 2010. Once accepted, the UTQAP would be implemented by the University. Professor Regehr anticipated that some of the recommendations that had been made by the Quality Assurance Working Group would also be considered by the University’s Task Force on Governance. The report of that Task Force might well include recommendations for revisions to the terms of reference of the Academic Board and its committees to implement the proposed quality-assurance process. The Task Force report would be brought forward to the Governing Council in June 2010.

Among the matters that arose in questions and discussion were the following.

(i) **Scope of the *Policy***. A member commented that there did not appear to be any reference in Appendix A of the proposed *Policy* to the approval process for new programs. Professor Regehr replied that the table addressed only responsibilities related to the cyclical review of academic programs and units. The Chair added that all new programs would require governance approval, and such responsibilities were outlined in the terms of reference of each relevant body of the Governing Council. Following approval of the UTQAP, recommendations were expected that would amend those terms of reference accordingly.

Referring to Appendix A, another member stated that she had been surprised to read the responsibilities of the governance bodies that were listed in the table. She had thought that some of the duties that were ascribed to other bodies were actually carried out by the Committee on Academic Policies and Programs (AP&P). Professor Regehr stated that the Committee served a central role in the review of academic programs and units. She commented that the order of the table should perhaps be reversed so that the Governing Council appeared at the bottom, rather than at the top. Implementation of the *Policy* would result in a strengthening of AP&P’s role in the quality assurance process. The Committee would consider the reviews twice a year, rather than annually, allowing it to provide important feedback at an earlier stage in the process. It was

**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – May 11, 2010**

**4. *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units and the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process* (Cont'd)**

identified as the governance body with the main responsibility for the review of reviews, and its findings were forwarded to the Agenda Committee via its minutes as well as through a report provided by the AP&P's Chair. The Agenda Committee then determined whether or not particular matters arising from the reviews should be brought to the attention of the Academic Board, and the entire review package was then forwarded to the Executive Committee and the Governing Council.

A member observed that the proposed *Policy* appeared to be more of a statement of principle than a guide to the detailed processes to be followed. Professor Regehr explained that the University had been taking such an approach for some time. Policies were intended to outline broader principles, while accompanying administrative documents, which did not require the same process of governance approval, outlined the procedures. That approach allowed for greater flexibility to respond as procedural revisions were needed.

In response to a member's query, Professor Regehr stated that the reference to reviews of academic units had been added to the *Policy*, further to the Committee's discussion at its previous meeting. Ms Lasthiotakis explained that, as part of the quality assurance process, extra-departmental units A and B, which offered programs and had cross-appointing rights, would be included in the University's review process. At present, there were approximately 25 such units.

**(ii) Evolution of the Quality Council and Framework.** In response to a member's question about what had precipitated the change in the provincial program review process, Professor Regehr provided a brief summary of the events that had occurred. In response to concerns about the program review process, the Council of Ontario Universities (C.O.U.) had commissioned a review of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (O.C.G.S.) process by a Quality Task Force in 2006-07. That Task Force had worked for two years and had proposed a Quality Assurance Framework that had been accepted in the fall of 2009 by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV).

The main change contained in the Framework was that universities were now responsible for their own quality assurance processes at the graduate and undergraduate levels, and they would be audited periodically to ensure that they were in compliance with their processes. In the past, graduate programs had been reviewed by O.C.G.S. Under the new Framework, the process for a new program proposal would begin with the division, which would commission an external review following consultation with the Provost's Office. The results from that review would then be incorporated into the division's proposal, which would be considered by the appropriate bodies of the Governing Council. Upon approval by the University, the proposal would then be submitted to the Quality Council for approval.

**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – May 11, 2010****4. *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units and the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process* (Cont'd)**

Professor Regehr observed that Ontario had been the only province with an O.C.G.S.-type model of approval and review of graduate programs. That process had not been aligned with the provincial process for the review of undergraduate programs. The new approach would place greater responsibility on individual universities to ensure the quality of their programs. Professor Corman stated that, in his view, the ability to establish benchmarks that were appropriate for the University would improve the quality of assessment of its graduate programs. A member concurred with Professor Corman's statement.

A member asked what provisions would be put in place to allow for refinements to the quality approval process. Professor Regehr replied that there would be a mechanism for review of the province-wide process through OCAV, but it was evolving. The University was being proactive in its involvement in the process. It had developed a good working relationship with the C.O.U. staff and had submitted nominations for a seat on the Quality Council.

**(iii) UTQAP.** A member commented on the complexities of the University's programs and wondered whether its unique processes would be accommodated within the quality approval process. Professor Regehr replied that both the provincial Framework and the University's own processes had been integrated into the draft UTQAP. The administration would continue to work closely with the divisions over the coming months to develop a detailed manual of processes for the University.

Referring to Figure 4 (page 19) of the draft UTQAP, a member observed that the protocol for cyclical program reviews appeared to be quite linear. There seemed to be little opportunity to return to earlier steps in the process in order to incorporate feedback, if necessary, before moving forward. Professor Regehr responded that it was the responsibility of her office to follow up on suggestions made by the AP&P during its review of reviews. While the role of the AP&P was to oversee, rather than manage, the review process, it could request update reports on programs which it wanted to monitor. The Chair also noted that the response from the program and the Commissioning Officer allowed for a more dynamic process than was represented by the figure.

In answer to a question about the process for setting the tuition fee for a new graduate program, Professor Regehr explained that the existing process, which had always been separate from that of the O.C.G.S., would continue. Once a division had consulted with the Office of the Provost on a proposal for a new program, the Planning and Budget Office then considered the budgetary impact of the program, and the Government, Institutional and Community Relations Office consulted with the Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities to determine the latitude for program fees. Within the University, fees were subject to approval by the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Business Board.

**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – May 11, 2010**

**4. *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units and the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process* (Cont'd)**

On the recommendation of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs

**YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS**

THAT the proposed *Policy on Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units*, a copy of which is attached hereto as Appendix “B”, be approved, replacing the *Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs and Units*, approved by the Governing Council on February 21, 2005, with effect immediately upon ratification of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance. At that time, proposals for related governance Terms of Reference revisions will be brought forward to governance for consideration.

**5. *Student Awards: Annual Report on those Established, Amended and Withdrawn, July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009***

The Committee received for information the Annual Report on Student Awards Established, Amended and Withdrawn, July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009.

Ms Swift informed the Committee that authority was delegated to the University Registrar to approve new awards on the Committee’s behalf. While the number of such awards had been lower over the last few years than in previous times, the University had been fortunate in the recent economic circumstances to be supported by a significant number of donors.

A member asked why an award would be withdrawn. Ms Swift explained that while it was unusual for a donor to change his/her mind about funding an award, it did happen on occasion. She noted that the aggregate value of withdrawn awards was miniscule. Typically, endowed awards were not withdrawn.

**6. *Reports of the Administrative Assessors***

There were no reports from the administrative assessors.

**7. *Interim Date of Next Meeting***

The Chair said that the first regular meeting of the Committee of the 2010-11 academic year was tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, September 21, 2010 at 4:10 p.m. A complete schedule would be distributed to members over the summer.

**REPORT NUMBER 146 OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS – May 11, 2010**

**8. Other Business**

**Chair’s Concluding Remarks**

The Chair observed that this was the Committee’s final regular meeting of the year. She thanked all members for their service to the Committee over the past year, particularly for their careful review of agenda material and their thoughtful and efficient participation in the Committee’s business. The Committee had done its work very well. The Chair expressed her special thanks to the Vice-Chair, Professor Douglas MacDougall, for his wise advice in the agenda planning meetings that preceded each regular meeting. Professor Cheryl Regehr, the Committee’s senior assessor, had demonstrated excellent leadership to the Committee overall, particularly with respect to the quality assurance process. The Chair also thanked the Committee’s other assessors for their work: the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education Professor Brian Corman; University Registrar Ms Karel Swift; Vice-President, Research Professor Paul Young; and Associate Vice-President, Research Professor Peter Lewis. The Chair noted that Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, the Director of Academic Programs and Policy in the Provost’s Office, played a key role in the work of the Committee. She coordinated the flow of business, advised the divisions on what was needed in terms of governance consideration of their proposals, drafted the cover sheets for many items, and oversaw the preparation of the compendium of divisional reviews. Ms Lasthiotakis was very ably assisted by Mr. Scott Moore, the Quality Assessment Officer, and Ms Vanessa Laufer, the Special Projects Officer in the Provost’s Office. Finally, the Chair thanked the Secretary for his support of the Committee’s work over the past year.

A member thanked the student members who had participated with such care and dedication on the Committee, and she expressed her admiration for their ability to navigate through the complexities of University governance.

The meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

---

Secretary

---

Chair

May 25, 2010