



TO: Members of the Academic Board

SPONSOR: Ellen Hodnett, Chair, Academic Board

CONTACT INFO: ellen.hodnett@utoronto.ca/416-946-8676

DATE: March 10, 2011 for April 26, 2011

AGENDA ITEM 5

**ITEM IDENTIFICATION:**

**Academic Board and Committees – Terms of Reference: Revisions Re Approval of Academic Programs**

**JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:**

Section 2(14) (e) of the *University of Toronto Act* empowers the Governing Council to “appoint committees and delegate thereto power and authority to act for the Governing Council . . . .” Such delegation of authority is limited to committees consisting of a majority of members of the Council, apart from the following areas: examinations, awards for academic achievement, admission standard, curricula and degree requirement. In other matters, the Academic Board must make recommendations to a higher level of governance – the Governing Council or its Executive Committee.

The Governing Council achieves the delegation of authority through its approval of Board and Committee terms of reference. Traditionally Boards make recommendations to the Governing Council for amendment of their own terms of reference.

**PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN**

On June 24, 2010, the Governing Council approved the revised Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs. It also received for information the detailed University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process, which has been submitted to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the “Quality Council”) for ratification.

On October 28, 2010, the Governing Council approved in principle the recommendations of its Task Force on Governance.

For several years, the University has been operating on the basis of a new budget model which provides greater transparency and divisional responsibility.

**HIGHLIGHTS:**

- **Approval of new programs.** The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs would consider, and when necessary, make academic program recommendations to the Academic Board for approval of programs in a number of specific categories:
  - programs leading to new degrees;
  - the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;
  - the renaming of degrees; and
  - programs that establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.

New programs in those categories would be approved by the Academic Board, subject to the confirmation of the Executive Committee of the Governing Council. There would no longer be need for such proposals to go forward to the Governing Council.

Except where proposed new programs would require additions to a division's approved budget, or where they would have significant effects outside of the division offering the program, the Planning and Budget Committee would not be asked to concur with a recommendation for program approval.

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs itself would consider and, where it deems it appropriate, approve new programs, as defined by the Quality Assurance Process, other than those in the categories above.

- **Approval of the closure of programs.** It has been established by precedent that approval of the closure of programs requires the same process for approval as their establishment. It is proposed that this be made specific in the terms of reference.
- **Divisional approval of modification of existing programs.** The strengthened process for the approval and review of academic programs, and the stronger governance role of the Governing Council with respect to that process, enables the delegation of authority to the Councils of the academic divisions to approve modifications of existing programs. This would be consistent with the approved recommendation of the Task Force on Governance for delegation of authority with respect to transactional matters to the lowest appropriate level of governance.

*Academic Board – Terms of Reference: Revisions concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs*

Those modifications defined as “major modifications” in the University’s Quality Assessment Process would be included in an annual report for information to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

- **Approval of the establishment and closing of diploma and certificate programs.** The definition of the types of diploma and certificate programs requiring approval would be established in a revised Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs, which Policy could be revised more readily than the terms of reference.

**FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS: N/A**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Be it Recommended

- (a) THAT the proposed amendments to sections 3, 4.4, and 4.9 of the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the proposed amendments to the section of the “Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval” dealing with Academic program proposals, be approved.
- (b) THAT the proposed amendment to the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee, as described in Attachment “B” hereto, be approved; and
- (c) THAT the proposed amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board, as described herein, be approved.

Memorandum to: Members of the Academic Board

From: Ellen Hodnett, Chair, Academic Board

Subject: **Academic Board and Committees – Terms of Reference:  
Revisions Re Approval of Academic Programs**

Date: March 10, 2011

---

There is need to consider changes to the terms of reference of the Academic Board, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and the Planning and Budget Committee as they concern the review and approval of academic programs. The need arises from three other changes:

- The Governing Council's approval, on October 28, 2010, of the Report of its Task Force on Governance,
- The Governing Council's approval, on June 24, 2010, of the revised Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and its receipt of the detailed University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (the U.T.QAP), and
- The adoption of the new budget model.

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs has been asked to consider recommendations to amend its terms of reference, as shown in Attachment "A". Because of the strengthened process for review of academic programs and units, and because of the strengthened governance oversight of that process, it is possible to delegate more authority for the approval of modifications to existing programs to the academic divisions offering those programs. Such action is also appropriate in the light of the recommendation of the Task Force on Governance for delegation of authority with respect to transactional matters to the lowest appropriate level of governance.

Similarly, the Planning and Budget Committee has been asked to consider recommendations to amend its terms of reference as shown in Attachment "B". The University's new budget model enables each academic division to allocate its own net revenue – the revenue it generates minus its share of University-wide expenses, its contribution to student aid, and its contribution to the University Fund. Therefore, proposals for most programs, which would require no allocation of additional resources to the division, and which would have no major effect on other divisions, would be considered solely on their academic merits by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. That again would be consistent with the recommendations of the Task Force on Governance, which sought to avoid duplication. The Planning and Budget Committee

would increase its focus on review and approval of divisional academic plans, which presumably would include plans for new academic programs, again facilitating appropriate delegation to divisional Councils to deal with new programs and their resource implications.

In addition to considering the amendments to their terms of reference proposed by the two Committees, it is recommended that the Academic Board consider certain recommendations to its own terms of reference. Section 5.3 of the Academic Board Terms of Reference classifies matters coming to the Board from its Committees into three categories: matters requiring Governing Council approval, matters requiring Executive Committee confirmation, and matters for information. It is proposed that amendments to this section be of two types.

First, Recommendation 15 of the Task Force on Governance states that there should be delegation of authority with respect to transactional matters to the lowest appropriate level of governance. It is proposed that responsibility for approval of certain new programs, program closures, and program renaming require the approval of the Academic Board, with the confirmation of the Executive Committee. They include

- (i) undergraduate programs leading to new degrees;
- (ii) graduate programs and degrees;
- (iii) the closure of existing degrees;
- (iv) the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;
- (v) the renaming of degrees; and
- (vi) programs that establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.

There would be no longer be need for consideration of such proposals by the full Governing Council. The Academic Board has sufficiently broad, expert and representative membership to act as the “appropriate level of governance” for approval of new academic programs. Confirmation by the Executive Committee is, however, appropriate to meet safely the provisions of the University of Toronto Act.\* Proposals for other new academic programs, as defined by the University’s Quality Assurance process, would be considered for approval by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

---

\* Section 2(14)(n) of the University of Toronto Act enables the Governing Council to delegate to a Committee, not consisting of a majority of its members, authority for determining and regulating “the contents and curricula of all programs and courses of study and the requirements for graduation.” Section 2(14) (j) requires action by the Council, or a committee consisting of a majority of members of the Council, to “provide for the granting of . . . degrees . . . .”

*Academic Board and Committees – Terms of Reference: Revisions Re Approval of Academic Programs*

It is proposed that the section 5.3. of the Terms of Reference of the Academic board be amended as follows.

<b>Current Provision</b>	<b>Proposed Provision</b>
<p><b>5.3.1. Matters requiring Governing Council approval:</b></p> <p>New degree programs</p>	

<b>Current Provision</b>	<b>Proposed Provision</b>
<p><b>5.3.2. Matters requiring Executive Committee approval:</b></p> <p>Extensively restructured and/or renamed degree, diploma and certificate programs</p>	<p><b>5.3.2. Matters requiring Executive Committee confirmation:</b></p> <p>(i) undergraduate programs leading to new degrees;                      (ii) graduate programs and degrees;                      (iii) the termination of existing degrees;                      (iv) the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;                      (v) the renaming of degrees; and                      (vi) programs that establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.</p>

**Recommendation**

It is recommended;

- (a) THAT the proposed amendments to sections 3, 4.4, and 4.9 of the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the proposed amendments to the section of the Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval dealing with Academic program proposals, be approved;
- (b) THAT the proposed amendments to the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee, as described in Attachment “B” hereto, be approved; and
- (c) THAT the proposed amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Academic Board, as described herein, be approved.

## Proposed Revisions

### ACADEMIC BOARD TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### 1. MEMBERSHIP

##### 1.1 Composition

	<u>Ex officio</u>	<u>Elected</u>	<u>Appointed</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Teaching Staff</u> <u>Group I</u>				
Arts and Science	1	14		
St. George				
Colleges	7			
Erindale	1	3		
Scarborough	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>		
Totals	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>		<u>30</u>
 <u>Group II</u>				
Medicine	1	11		
Dentistry	1	1		
Nursing	1	1		
Physical Ed. & Health	1	1		
Pharmacy	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>		
Totals	<u>5</u>	<u>15</u>		<u>20</u>
 <u>Group III</u>				
App.Sci.& Engineering	1	3		
OISE/UT	1	3		
Management	1	1		
Music	1	1		
Law	1	1		
Social Work	1	1		
Forestry	1	1		
Information Studies	1	1		
Architecture, Landscape, and Design	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>		
Totals	<u>9</u>	<u>13</u>		<u>22</u>
 <u>Group IV</u>				
Graduate Studies	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>		<u>3</u>
 <u>Sub-total Divisional</u> <u>Teaching Staff</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>50</u>		<u>75</u>

	<u>Ex officio</u>	<u>Elected</u>	<u>Appointed</u>	<u>Total</u> Governing
Council				
Teaching Staff		6		6
Vice-President and Provost	1			1
Director, School of Continuing Studies	1			1
Director, TYP	1			1
Librarians	1	2		3
Master, Massey College	<u>1</u>			<u>1</u>
<u>Sub-total</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>58</u>		<u>88</u>
Students				
Governing Council		4		
Non-Governing Council			12	<u>16</u>
Administrative Staff				
Governing Council		1		
Non-Governing Council			3	<u>4</u>
Alumni				
Governing Council		2		
Non-Governing Council			1	<u>3</u>
LGIC Appointees			3	<u>3</u>
Presidential Assessors			<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<u>30</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>117</u>

In addition to the *ex officio* members listed above, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Governing Council, the President and the Chancellor are *ex officio* voting members of the Academic Board. The Secretary of the Governing Council is an *ex officio* non-voting member of the Board.

The President may appoint annually University Officers as non-voting assessor members of the Board in addition to the four voting assessors.

## 1.2 Term

Terms begin on July 1 and continue to June 30.

The Governing Council members of the Academic Board are appointed annually by the Governing Council and may be re-appointed subject to their continued membership on the Governing Council. Elected teaching staff and librarians are normally elected for three-year terms and are eligible to be re-elected. The non-Governing Council student members are appointed annually by the Board and may be re-appointed. The non-Governing Council administrative staff and alumni members are appointed by the Board for one- to three-year terms, and may be re-appointed.



### **1.3 Chair and Vice-Chair**

The Governing Council shall appoint the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board from among the members of the Council on the Board.

## **2. QUORUM**

One-third of the voting members (normally 41).

## **3. COMMITTEES**

### **3.1 Standing Committees**

The Standing Committees of the Board are: Agenda Committee  
Academic Appeals Committee  
Committee on Academic Policy and Programs  
Planning and Budget Committee

### **3.2 Special Committees**

From time to time the Board may find it useful to establish Special Committees to consider particular issues. Special Committees are normally formed on the recommendation of the Agenda Committee, when, in the view of the Board, one or more of the following conditions exist:

- a) an issue cannot be accommodated easily within Standing Committee schedules - either intense scrutiny is required in a relatively short time or thorough examination of complex issues is necessary over a relatively long period of time;
- b) an issue does not fall readily under an existing Standing Committee - either because it is not clearly within any Standing Committee's terms of reference or because aspects of the issue cut across several bodies;
- c) there is a need for the participation of experts not represented on the relevant committee.

A recommendation from the Agenda Committee to establish a Special Committee shall include terms of reference, an outline of membership, the anticipated reporting date and the date of disestablishment.

### **3.3 Connaught Committee**

The Connaught Committee is a Standing Committee that reports annually through the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs to the Governing Council on matters concerning the Connaught Fund.

Proposals for use of Connaught monies that would have a major steering effect are handled in the same manner as other major research proposals.

Proposals to amend the terms of reference of the Connaught Fund are considered by the Academic Board and confirmation by the Executive Committee.

### **3.4 Striking Committee**

The Striking Committee, established by the Agenda Committee, shall recommend annually and as vacancies occur to the Academic Board on the non-Governing Council membership of the Board, the membership of its Committees and various other appointments (except teaching staff and librarians who are elected).<sup>1</sup>

## **4. FUNCTION**

The Academic Board is responsible for consideration of policy in the academic area and for monitoring matters within its area of responsibility. In general, the Board is concerned with matters affecting the teaching, learning and research functions of the University, the establishment of University objectives and priorities, the development of long-term and short-term plans and the effective use of resources in the course of these pursuits.

Except in purely academic matters (those specified in clauses 2(14)(g), (h), and (n)<sup>2</sup> of the *Act*), the Board does not have final decision-making authority. In most instances, recommendations of the Board are confirmed by the Executive Committee on behalf of Council. Matters having significant impact on the University as a whole, those having serious steering effects on the development of a particular division or those having a major impact on the relationships amongst divisions and relationships between the University and the community at large, will normally require the approval of the Governing Council.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appointment of non ex-officio members of the Committee for Honorary Degrees recommended to Governing Council; appointment of two members of the Academic Board to the Provost's Advisory Committee on the Library recommended to the Board; on the recommendation of the President, the appointment of the Council of Ontario Universities' colleague and alternate recommended to the Board.

<sup>2</sup> Clause 2(14)(g) refers to conducting examinations and appointing examiners, (h) refers to matters arising in connection with the award of fellowships, scholarships, medals, prizes and other awards for academic achievement, and (n) refers to the determination and regulation of standards for the admission of students to the University, the contents and curricula of all programs and courses of study and the requirements for graduation.

## **5. AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY**

### **5.1 The following areas are within the Board's responsibility:**

- Academic appeals
- Academic appointments policies and individual appointments
- Academic discipline
- Academic priorities for fundraising
- Academic services
- Admissions
- Awards
- Budget guidelines and budget plans
- Capital plans, projects and space policy
- Constitutions of divisional councils
- Continuing studies
- Curriculum and academic regulations
- Earned and posthumously awarded degrees, diplomas and certificates
- Endowed chairs, professorships and visiting lectureships
- Enrolment policy
- Establishment, termination or restructuring of academic units
- Examinations and grading practices
- Name changes of academic units
- Planning policy
- Research
- Submissions to and agreements with external bodies
- Teaching guidelines
- University objectives / mission statement

### **5.2 Matters proceeding directly to the Academic Board:**

#### **5.2.1 Academic appointments policy and appointment of individuals**

##### **a) Policies on academic appointments**

Policies on the nature of academic employment are assigned to the Academic Board. These encompass policies on the appointment, promotion, tenure, suspension and removal of teaching staff, as well as policies on the conduct of academic work, such as the policies on research leave and on academic freedom and responsibilities. In the case of extensive revision to a policy or revisions of major import, or the establishment or repeal of a key policy, the matter may be referred to a Special Committee. Minor amendments to policies may be referred directly to the Academic Board for consideration and confirmation by the Executive Committee.

## **5.2 Matters proceeding directly to the Academic Board:**

### **5.2.1 Academic appointments policy and appointment of individuals (cont'd)**

#### **b) Individual appointments**

The Academic Board considers a number of academic appointments.<sup>3</sup>

### **5.2.2 Constitutions of divisional councils**

New or amended divisional constitutions are forwarded by divisional councils to the Academic Board for consideration and confirmation by the Executive Committee. By-laws which may contain such matters as procedural rules and committee memberships and terms of reference are approved by the divisional councils.

### **5.2.3 Divisional seals**

Authority to approve the acquisition and design of divisional seals is delegated to the Vice-President and Provost and the Chair of the Academic Board. [A record of such seals and the purposes for which they are used shall be kept in the Office of the Governing Council.]

### **5.2.4 Degrees, diplomas and certificates**

Approval of the award of earned degrees, diplomas and certificates, including conjoint degrees, and the award of posthumous degrees, diplomas and certificates is delegated by the Governing Council to any two of the Vice-President and Provost, the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Academic Board on the recommendation of divisional councils.

The Academic Board receives annual reports on the number of degrees, diplomas and certificates awarded.

[Policy matters affecting earned and posthumously awarded degrees, diplomas and certificates, including their design, are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded to the Academic Board for consideration.]

---

<sup>3</sup> Appointment of academic administrators shall be approved by the Agenda Committee on behalf of the Academic Board, pursuant to the *Policy on Appointment of Academic Administrators*, and shall be confirmed by a committee consisting of the Chairman of the Governing Council, the President, and the Chair of the Academic Board. Appointment of the University Librarian and the Director of the School of Continuing Studies shall be approved by the Academic Board pursuant to the *Policy on Appointments and Remuneration* and confirmed by a committee consisting of the Chairman of Governing Council, the President, and the Chair of the Academic Board. Academic appointments with tenure shall be reported to the Board for information pursuant to the *Policy on Appointments and Remuneration*. Appointment of professors emeritus shall be reported to the Academic Board for information pursuant to the *Policy on Appointment of Professor Emeritus*. Appointment of University Professors shall be approved by the Academic Board pursuant to the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*. Individuals who are promoted shall be reported to the Academic Board for information pursuant to the *Policy and Procedures Governing Promotions*. The President shall report to the Academic Board for information the removal of any academic administrator from office pursuant to the *Policy on Appointment of Academic Administrators*. The Vice-President and Provost shall report the waiving of some or all of the procedures for academic appointments to the Academic Board for information pursuant to the *Policy and Procedures on Academic Appointments*.

### **5.2.5 Convocations**

The Academic Board has responsibility for policy matters with respect to convocation ceremonies.

#### **a) Ceremonial procedures**

Authority concerning decisions on procedures is delegated to a committee of the Chancellor, the President, the Chair of the Academic Board and the Secretary of the Governing Council.

#### **b) Academic regalia**

Authority for the approval of academic hoods, academic robes, robes of office and other regalia is delegated to the Chancellor, Chair and the Vice-Chair of the Academic Board.

### **5.2.6 Academic discipline**

#### **a) Policy and procedures**

Policy and procedures with respect to academic discipline are as described in the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*, as amended. Amendments to the *Code* will either be submitted directly to the Academic Board or will be considered first by a Special Committee. With the University Affairs Board, the Academic Board recommends amendments to the terms of reference of the Discipline Appeals Board<sup>4</sup>.

An annual University-wide report on academic discipline cases is forwarded to the Academic Board for information.

#### **b) Individual cases**

Individual cases are disposed of in accordance with the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*. Reports on the disposition of cases, without names, are received by the Academic Board for information.

#### **c) Appointments**

The Academic Board appoints the following:

- i the University discipline counsel and the assistant discipline counsel, on the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost
- ii the Secretary of the University Tribunal, on the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost
- iii The Academic Board appoints the following: iii the Senior Chair, Associate Chairs and co-chairs of the University Tribunal, and the Senior Chair and Chairs of the Academic Appeals Committee, on the recommendation of the Nominating Committee for the University Tribunal and Academic Appeals Committee.<sup>5</sup>
- iv six members of the Discipline Appeals Board, on the recommendation of the Striking Committee. [The University Affairs Board appoints the other 6 members.]

---

<sup>4</sup> The Discipline Appeals Board is the body that hears appeals arising from the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters* and the *Code of Student Conduct*.

<sup>5</sup> The Nominating Committee for the University Tribunal and Academic Appeals Committee is established annually by the Agenda Committee.

### **5.2.7 Name changes of academic units**

Name changes in academic divisions (excluding namings<sup>6</sup>) are considered by the Academic Board and confirmed by the Executive Committee. [Changes in name that are part of a proposal for establishing, restructuring and/or merging units would be recommended to the Academic Board by the Planning and Budget Committee.]

### **5.2.8 Agreements with certain affiliated or federated institutions**

New or substantially amended agreements with affiliated or federated institutions such as the Toronto School of Theology are recommended by the Academic Board to the Governing Council. Extension of the term of the agreements or minor amendment are approved by the Academic Board and confirmed by the Executive Committee.

### **5.2.9 Disruptions in academic programs**

The Academic Board or the Vice-President and Provost shall declare when a disruption of the academic program has occurred.<sup>7</sup> [The Vice-President and Provost shall report to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs on the implementation of the procedures and changes to the status of the academic programs.]

### **5.2.10 Report from the COU academic colleague**

The Academic Board will receive an annual report from the University's Council of Ontario Universities academic colleague.

### **5.2.11 Sessional dates**

[Authority is delegated to the divisions.]

## **5.3 Matters coming from the Academic Board's Committees:**

### **5.3.1 Matters requiring Governing Council approval:**

- New or repealed policies or extensive changes to existing ones
- Planning frameworks including enrolment frameworks
- University mission statement
- Capital projects, capital plans, and campus master plans
- Annual operating budget and long-range budget guidelines
- Priorities for fundraising
- Template agreements with external bodies
- Allocations from designated funds
- Establishment, disestablishment or restructuring of academic units
- ~~New degree programs~~
- Submissions to external bodies that do not conform to policy

---

<sup>6</sup> Academic units named under the Policy on Naming will be reported to the Academic Board for information.

<sup>7</sup> University Grading Practices Policy and the Graduate Grading Practices Policy

### 5.3.2 Matters requiring Executive Committee confirmation:

Extensively restructured and/or renamed degree, diploma or certificate programs  
Academic program proposals, as follows:

- (i) undergraduate programs leading to new degrees;
- (ii) graduate programs and degrees;
- (iii) the termination of existing degrees;
- (iv) the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;
- (v) the renaming of degrees; and
- (vi) programs that establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.

Design of degree, diplomas and certificates  
Agreements with external bodies that do not conform to the template  
Chair proposals that do not conform to policy  
Academic appeal procedures which contain significant changes in divisional procedures or those contrary to policy<sup>8</sup>  
New diploma or certificate programs with resource implications  
Name changes of academic units

### 5.3.3 Matters for information:

Reports of the Academic Appeals Committee (without names)  
Reports of the Agenda Committee

### 5.4. Accountability Reports:

*Access to Information and Protection of Privacy* - the Academic Board will receive a report from the President if he/she or an Officer makes a final determination not to accept the recommendation of the Commissioner with respect to students and faculty records.

*The Provost's Guidelines on Donations* - a quarterly report on donations of \$250,000 or over will be provided.

*Employment Equity Policy* - an annual report on employment equity initiatives concerning faculty and librarians will be provided.

## 6. PROCEDURES

The Academic Board will meet in open session; appointments and other matters of a personal nature will be dealt with *in camera* session, usually at the end of the meeting. Because of its size, the Board will use the procedures set out for the meetings of Governing Council.

*Revision approved June 24, 2010 by Governing Council*

*Revision approved February 9, 2006 by Governing Council*

---

<sup>8</sup> Guidelines for Academic Appeals within Divisions  
58840  
March 10, 2011



TO: Members of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

SPONSOR: Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Chair, Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

CONTACT INFO: a.sass@utoronto.ca / 416 946 7617

DATE: March 10, 2011 for April 5, 2011

AGENDA ITEM 4

**ITEM IDENTIFICATION:**

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – Terms of Reference: Revisions to Sections 3, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 and the Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval**

**JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:**

Section 2(14) (e) of the *University of Toronto Act* empowers the Governing Council to “appoint committees and delegate thereto power and authority to act for the Governing Council . . . .” Such delegation of authority is limited to committees consisting of a majority of members of the Council, apart from the following areas: examinations, awards for academic achievement, admission standards, curricula and degree requirements. In other matters, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs must make recommendations to the Academic Board, which must in turn make recommendations to a higher level of governance – the Governing Council or its Executive Committee.

The Governing Council achieves the delegation of authority through its approval of committee terms of reference. Traditionally, Committees recommend revisions to their own terms of reference to their parent Board, which in turn makes a recommendation to the Governing Council.

**PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN**

On June 24, 2010, the Governing Council approved the revised Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs. It also received for information the detailed University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process, which has been submitted to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the “Quality Council”) for ratification.

On October 28, 2010, the Governing Council approved the recommendations of its Task Force on Governance.



## **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – Terms of Reference: Revisions**

### **HIGHLIGHTS:**

- **Divisional approval of modification of existing programs.** The strengthened process for the approval and review of academic programs, and the stronger role of the Governing Council with respect to that process, enables the delegation of authority to the Councils of the academic divisions to approve modifications of existing programs. This would be consistent with the approved recommendation of the Task Force on Governance for delegation of authority with respect to transactional matters to the lowest appropriate level of governance.

One element of program modification concerns the requirements for admission to the program. Apart from new divisional policies and practices and amendments that affect the whole division, approval authority would be delegated to the divisional councils.

Those modifications defined as “major modifications” in the University’s Quality Assurance Process would be included in an annual report for information to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, as would reports on the establishment and termination of transcript notations within existing degree programs.

- **Approval of new programs.** The Committee would consider, and where it deems it appropriate, make academic program recommendations to the Academic Board in the following categories:
  - (i) undergraduate programs leading to new degrees;
  - (ii) graduate programs and degrees;
  - (iii) the termination of existing degrees;
  - (iv) the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;
  - (v) the renaming of degrees; and
  - (vi) programs that establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.

The Committee itself would consider and, where it deems it appropriate, itself approve new programs, as defined by the Quality Assurance Process, other than those in the categories above.

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – Terms of Reference:  
Revisions**

- **Approval of the closure of programs.** It has been established by precedent that approval of the termination of programs requires the same process for approval as their establishment. It is proposed that this be made specific in the terms of reference.
- **Approval of the establishment and closing of diploma and certificate programs.** The definition of the types of diploma and certificate programs requiring approval would be established in a revised Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs, which could be revised more readily than the terms of reference.

**FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS: N/A**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Be it Recommended to the Academic Board

THAT the proposed amendments to sections 3, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 to the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the proposed amendments to the sections of the “Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval” dealing with Admission policies and Academic program proposals, be approved.



March 24, 2011

Memorandum to: Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

From: Andrea Sass-Kortsak

Subject: **Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs**

---

The Governing Council, at its meeting of June 24, 2010, approved the revised Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs. The revisions reflected the new Ontario Quality Assurance Framework and the recommendations of the 2008 Undergraduate Program Review Audit. Under the provisions of the revised Policy and the Quality Assurance Framework, the Office of the Vice-President and Provost has established a detailed University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (the U.T.QAP), which has been submitted (a) to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, the Academic Board and the Governing Council for information, and (b) to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the “Quality Council”) for ratification.

The revised Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs requires the external appraisal of all proposals for new undergraduate and graduate programs as part of the development process. It also requires the cyclical review of all established programs and their units. Cyclical reviews include external evaluations carried out by a committee consisting wholly or partly of external reviewers. The new Policy sets a very high standard for the program review process. The previous reviews of graduate programs by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, as well as current accreditation reviews of professional programs, could be described as “threshold reviews” intended to ensure that “mutually agreed-upon threshold standards of quality are maintained.”<sup>1</sup> The revised Policy stipulates that the review process will “address the quality of programs, and how the programs and the units in which they reside compare to the best in their field among international peer institutions.”<sup>2</sup>

Under the revised Quality Assurance Process, Governing Council oversight of the process has been strengthened substantially. First, an external appraisal of all new program proposals will now occur prior to those proposals coming forward for governance approval, and the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) will see the appraisal reports. Second, in the case of the cyclical reviews, AP&P will see reviews of both graduate and undergraduate programs and units; previously reviews of

---

<sup>1</sup> Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and Units,” p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1.

## **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

graduate programs were prepared by and for the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. Third, review reports will be submitted to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs twice annually. This will allow more time for Committee discussion. Fourth, reviews had previously been submitted on a slip-year basis to enable Deans to complete their responses and to begin implementation of changes. Henceforward, reviews will generally be presented to the Committee within six months of their completion, enabling more timely consideration. Finally, the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs will be able henceforward to request follow-up reports on areas of concern, which reports would normally be provided in one year's time. AP&P will continue to forward its Report, along with a compendium of review reports, to the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board, which will identify any academic issues that require further consideration by the Academic Board. The compendium of reviews, including the report of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, will continue to be forwarded to the Academic Board, the Executive Committee of Governing Council, and the Governing Council.

The strengthened process for the approval and review of programs contained in the University's Quality Assurance Process enables the delegation of authority for approval of modifications of existing programs to the Councils of the academic divisions. The delegation is consistent with the Governing Council's approval, on October 28, 2010, of recommendation 15 of the Task Force on Governance, which calls for delegation of authority with respect to transactional matters to the lowest appropriate level of governance. The University's Quality Assurance Process stipulates that an annual report of major modifications to programs approved by the divisional Councils will be prepared by the Office of the Vice-President and Provost and submitted to the Quality Council. That report will also be provided to AP&P for information.

The purpose of this proposal is to recommend amendments to the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs to implement the new Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and the new Quality Assurance Process.

### **Section 3, Function**

Section 3 of the Terms of Reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs outlines the general functions of the Committee. The amendments proposed below deal solely with those Committee functions concerning academic programs and the review of academic programs and units. They:

- maintain the requirement for the Committee to consider the establishment of new academic programs and their content;

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

- make specific the requirement that the Committee also consider the disestablishment of academic programs;

The current terms of reference are silent with respect to the termination of academic programs, but the precedent has been firmly established that approval of the termination of programs follows the same path as approval of their establishment.

- leave flexible the definition of the “new academic programs” requiring approval;

The current terms of reference include a footnote providing some clarification of the definition: “Here, the term “programs” includes the curriculum within a particular degree. Examples include specialist, major and minor programs in Arts and Science, and changes in curriculum within a professional degree, such as revisions to degree requirements.” It is proposed that the terms-of-reference definition of those new academic programs requiring approval follow the definition used Province-wide, approved by the Provincial Quality Council, and stated in the University’s Quality Assurance Process (the U.T.QAP). This is proposed because (a) the definition is not at this time firmly established, and (b) it might well change over time. The current definition would be provided for information in a footnote, which could be changed as a matter of course without the requirement for Governing Council approval but with the expectation of a report for information to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

- leave flexible the definition of those diploma and certificate programs that would require approval for their establishment or termination, with the requirements for governance approval to be determined by the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs;

A recommendation for amendment of that Policy is likely to be forthcoming in the near future. Relying on the Policy definition would again allow some flexibility. There would be no requirement for the more complex process to change the terms of reference.

- omit reference to any requirement for the approval of changes within existing academic programs.

Responsibility for approval of such changes is proposed to be delegated to the councils of the academic divisions.

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

The specific changes recommended to section 3 of the terms of reference, "Function," follow.

<b>Current Provisions</b>	<b>Proposed Provisions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the academic content and requirements of all new degree programs</li> <li>• joint programs with external institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new academic programs* including joint programs with external institutions, and their academic content and requirements, and the closure of academic programs.</li>   <li>* The University's Quality Assurance Process, draft dated February 9, 2011, defines new programs as new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors (for which a similar specialist/major is not already approved), graduate programs and degrees, graduate diplomas, collaborative graduate programs, and new fields in an existing graduate program. That definition, and this note, are subject to change from time to time. Any change will be reported to the Committee for information.</li>   <li>• the termination of existing degrees</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all major changes within existing academic programs or in academic regulations;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• major changes in academic regulations</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• diploma and post-secondary certificate programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the establishment of new diploma and post-secondary certificate programs, with approval as required by the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs, and the closure of such diploma and post-secondary certificate programs</li> </ul>

**Section 4 - Areas of Responsibility**

Section 4 of the Terms of Reference deals with more specific areas of responsibility and sets out appropriate levels of approval for proposals of various sorts.

## **Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

### **Section 4.1 Areas of Responsibility: Admission Policies and Practices**

One element of program modification in the University's Quality Assurance Process concerns the requirements for admission to programs. They are deemed to be minor modifications, and authority to approve most changes would be delegated to divisional councils. The approval of proposals to change admission requirements to graduate programs, including approval of direct admission options to PhD programs, was delegated in 2006 to the Graduate Education Council. With the changes to the Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies, approved by the Governing Council in 2010, the Graduate Education Council no longer performs that function, which would again be delegated to the divisions. New divisional policies and practices and amendments that would affect the whole division, as well as University-wide policies would remain within the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

<b>Current Provisions</b>	<b>Proposed Provisions</b>
<p>Minor changes to individual programs or to divisional practices and policies are normally approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.</p> <p>Proposals from divisional councils to approve changes to admission requirements to graduate programs, and to approve the establishment of direct admission options for existing PhD programs, may be approved by the Graduate Education Council.</p> <p>New divisional policies and practices or amendments to existing ones which affect the whole division or amendments to University-wide policies are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded to the Academic Board for consideration.</p>	<p>New divisional policies and practices or amendments to existing ones which affect the whole division or amendments to University-wide policies are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded to the Academic Board for consideration.</p>

### **Section 4.4 Areas of Responsibility: Academic Program Proposals**

The revision proposed below again leaves some flexibility in the definitions of program changes requiring approval, by stating reliance on the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process and the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs. Doing so permits change in the definitions by action that is less complicated than changes to the Terms of Reference.

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

It should be noted that in cases of Committee recommendations to the Academic Board the final level of approval required (in this case confirmation by the Executive Committee) is specified in the terms of reference of the Academic Board.

<b>Current Provisions</b>	<b>Proposed Provisions</b>
<p>The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs considers academic program proposals forwarded from divisional councils. [The administration forwards proposals to the Planning and Budget Committee for a review of planning and resource implications.]</p> <p>All major changes within existing academic programs, and academic program proposals, including joint programs with external institutions and new degree program, which involve new academic directions or anticipated significant new directions for a Faculty are forwarded by the Committee to the Academic Board with its recommendations for approval. [The Planning and Budget Committee forwards to the Committee for its information proposals for the disestablishment of academic units]</p>	<p>The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs considers academic program proposals forwarded from divisional councils.</p> <p>Where it considers it appropriate:</p> <p>(a) The Committee recommends to the Academic Board approval of proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) undergraduate programs leading to new degrees;</li> <li>(ii) graduate programs and degrees;</li> <li>(iii) the closure of existing degrees;</li> <li>(iv) the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;</li> <li>(v) the renaming of degrees; and</li> <li>(vi) programs that establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.</li> </ul> <p>Note 1: Where a proposal in these categories will have substantial resource implications requiring an addition to a division's approved budget, the senior assessor to the Planning and Budget Committee (or designate) will bring to that Committee a proposal for review of the planning and resource implications of the proposal, for action with respect to the resource implications, and for concurrence with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for approval of the proposal.</p> <p>Note 2. Where a proposal for the</p>



**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

	<p>disestablishment of an academic unit is to be made to the Planning and Budget Committee, the senior assessor to that Committee (or designate) will forward that proposal to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for information.</p> <p>(b) The Committee approves proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) new undergraduate programs within an existing degree, as defined in the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process*, and other than those in (a) above;</li> <li>(ii) diploma programs, including graduate diploma programs, as required by the University's Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs;</li> <li>(iii) new collaborative graduate programs; and</li> <li>(iv) new fields within an existing graduate program.</li> </ul> <p>* The University's Quality Assurance Program, draft dated February 9, 2011, defines new programs as new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors (for which a similar specialist/major is not already approved), graduate programs and degrees, graduate diplomas, collaborative graduate programs, and new fields in an existing graduate program. That definition, and this note, are subject to change from time to time. Any change will be reported to the Committee for information.</p> <p>The Councils of the academic divisions have delegated authority to approve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) modifications to existing degree programs;</li> </ul>
--	---

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

	<p>The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs receives for information an annual report on modifications to existing programs that are defined in the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process as major modifications.*</p> <p>* The University's Quality Assurance Process, dated February 9, 2011, defines a major modification as follows. A major modification of a program is a restructuring of a program, a merger of existing programs or a refreshing of a program in order to keep it current with its academic discipline. Under the scope of 'Major Modification' is included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Requirements that differ substantially from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review;</li> <li>b) Significant changes to the learning outcomes;</li> <li>c) Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g., different campus, online delivery, inter-institutional collaboration).</li> </ul> <p>This definition, and this note, are subject to change from time to time. Any change will be reported to the Committee for information.</p> <p>(b) transcript notations within existing degree programs;</p> <p>The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs receives for information an annual report on the establishment and termination of transcript notations.</p> <p>(c) the establishment, termination and</p>
--	--

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

	<p>modification of diploma programs and certificate programs, where authority is delegated to the academic divisions in the University's Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs;</p> <p>The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs receives for information an annual report on such actions where reporting is required by the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs.</p>
--	--

**Section 4.9 Areas of Responsibility: Monitorial Responsibilities**

Section 4.9 of the Terms of Reference deals with monitorial responsibilities, including responsibility for governance oversight of the reviews of academic programs and units. It requires a small amendment to provide for semi-annual reports to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs on reviews of academic programs and units. It also requires amendments to provide for annual reports on: (a) approvals by divisional councils of major modifications to their programs, and (b) establishment and termination of transcript notations within existing degree programs.

<b>Current Provisions</b>	<b>Proposed Provisions</b>
<p>The Committee is responsible for monitoring academic matters as may be required by general policy, as specified herein or by resolution of the Academic Board, the Executive Committee or the Governing Council. The Committee receives annual reports on matters within its purview, including reports on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviews of Academic Units and Programs;</li> <li>• Connaught Committee activities;</li> <li>• Student Financial Support;</li> <li>• Research and international activities;</li> <li>• Student awards.</li> </ul>	<p>The Committee is responsible for monitoring academic matters as may be required by general policy, as specified herein or by resolution of the Academic Board, the Executive Committee or the Governing Council. The Committee receives annual reports, or such more frequent regular reports as it may determine, on matters within its purview, including reports on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviews of Academic Programs and Units;</li> <li>• Major modifications to programs, as approved by divisional Councils;</li> <li>• Establishment and termination of transcript notations within existing degree programs;</li> <li>• Connaught Committee activities;</li> </ul>

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Financial Support;</li> <li>• Research and international activities;</li> <li>• Student awards.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval**

The above amendments would require corresponding amendments to the table accompanying the terms of reference entitled “Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval,” pages 1, 2 and 3, which deal with Admission policies and academic program proposals. A footnote to the terms of reference states that “the table is meant as a general guide. Decisions are made by the Chair in consultation with the Senior Assessor and the Agenda Planning Group.” The provisions concerning level of approval are listed under four column headings. The fourth column lists changes which are recommended by the Committee on Policy and Programs to the Academic Board for approval. (A footnote states that for levels of approval beyond the Academic Board, the reader should see the Academic Board terms of reference.) The third column lists changes which may be approved by AP&P. The second column lists changes which are received by AP&P for information. The first column lists changes approved by the Divisional Council.

The following changes are proposed to each column. The proposed revisions to the terms of reference are reflected fully in this section of the table. In some cases, that full reflection represents the higher level of detail proposed in the terms of reference. In other cases, the reflection represents the lower level of detail in the terms reference implied by their reliance on the provisions of the University’s Quality Assurance Process and on its Policy on Diplomas and Certificates.

**Column 4, Recommended by AP&P to the Academic Board for approval:**

<b>Current Provisions</b>	<b>Proposed Provisions</b>
<p>Changes which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• establish a new degree program, or change an existing degree, diploma or post-secondary certificate programs with resulting resource implications; or</li> <li>• establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty; or</li> <li>• are anticipated to have significant impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.</li> <li>• Involve joint programs with external institutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undergraduate programs leading to new degrees;</li> <li>• new graduate programs and degrees;</li> <li>• the termination of existing degrees;</li> <li>• the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;</li> <li>• the renaming of degrees; and</li> <li>• programs that establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.</li> </ul>

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

**Column 3, Approved by AP&P: Admission policies**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor changes to individual programs or to divisional practices and policies.</li> </ul>	
---	--

**Column 3, Approved by AP&P: Academic program proposals**

<b>Current Provisions</b>	<b>Proposed Provisions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• changes to curriculum within established degree programs that can be accomplished with existing resources and are not major, e.g.:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ specialist, major and minor programs in arts and science</li> <li>○ changes in professional degree requirements</li> <li>○ addition or deletion of program streams within established degree programs;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new programs within an existing degree, as defined in the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process, other than those requiring approval by the Academic Board and confirmation by the Executive Committee.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diploma programs which:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• require completion of an undergraduate or graduate degree for admission;</li> <li>• comprise a coherent sequence of courses</li> <li>• provide for a mechanism of assessment of student performance</li> <li>• register students as University of Toronto students who receive diplomas at Convocation</li> <li>• may include courses offered for credit in a graduate degree program, for which credit may be transferred if the student enrolls in the degree program</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• diploma programs, including graduate diploma programs, and certificate programs, where governance approval is required by the University's Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-secondary certificate programs which:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• require completion of secondary school as a condition of admission</li> <li>• comprise a coherent sequence of courses</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide for a mechanism of assessment of student performance</li> <li>• registers students as University of Toronto students who receive diplomas at Convocation</li> <li>• may include courses offered for credit in an undergraduate degree program, for which credit may be transferred if the student enrolls in the degree program</li> </ul>	
---	--

**Column 2, Received by AP&P for Information: Admission Policies**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to admission requirements for graduate programs and approval of direct entry options to existing PhD programs, as approved by the Graduate Education Council, are included in an annual report of changes to graduate programs submitted to the Committee for information.</li> </ul>	
--	--

**Column 2, Received by AP&P for Information: Academic Program Proposals**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collaborative graduate programs, after approval by the Council of the School of Graduate Studies</li> <li>• flex-time options for PhD studies approved by SGS Council</li> <li>• combined programs where the requirements of the established component programs are not changed</li> <li>• Minor changes within degree programs</li> </ul> <p>Certificate programs in continuing education which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have open admission, but may be targeted to particular professional and quasi-professional areas</li> <li>• comprise a coherent sequence of courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An annual report on modifications to existing programs that are defined in the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process as major modifications.</li> <li>• An annual report on the establishment, termination and modification of diploma programs and certificate programs where reporting is required by the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs.</li> <li>• An annual report on the establishment and termination of transcript notations within existing degree programs.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Approval and Review of Academic Programs (Cont'd)**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• credit may not be transferred to degree programs</li> <li>• do not register students as University of Toronto students</li> </ul>	
--	--

**Column 1, Approved by Divisional Council under delegated authority; reported to the Provost's Office for information.**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minor calendar changes, such as the addition or deletion of a course, without significant implications for the nature of the program or the needs of students;</li> <li>• changes in the semester in which a course is offered;</li> <li>• minor adjustments in the course hours, without significant implications for the objectives of the program;</li> <li>• changes in titles and in course descriptions that reflect normal updating;</li> <li>• purely stylistic changes in calendar material; etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) modifications to existing degree programs;</li> <li>(b) the establishment, termination and modification of diploma programs and certificate programs, where authority is delegated to the academic divisions in the University's Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs;</li> <li>(c) transcript notations within existing degree programs.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Recommendation**

THAT the proposed amendments to sections 3, 4.1, 4.4, and 4.9 to the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, and the proposed amendments to the sections of the "Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval" dealing with Admission policies and Academic program proposals, be approved.

**COMMITTEE ON  
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS**

**1. MEMBERSHIP**

**1.1 Composition**

Total membership is approximately 31, of whom 6 are students. The membership is broadly representative of the academic divisions. Two assessors, selected by the President, are members *ex officio*.

The composition of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs is as follows:<sup>1</sup>

	<b>GOVERNING COUNCIL</b>	<b>NON-GOVERNING COUNCIL</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Administrative Staff	0-1	1-0	1
Alumni and	0-1	0-1	1
LGIC Appointees	0-1		1 <sup>2</sup>
Teaching Staff	0-2	16-14	16
Students	1	5	6
Presidential Assessors			2
<i>Ex Officio</i>			
Chancellor	1		1
Chairman	1		1
Vice-Chair	1		1
President	1		1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>31</b>

The Secretary of the Governing Council is a non-voting *ex officio* member of the Committee. The President may appoint annually University Officers as non-voting assessor members of the Committee.

**1.2 Term**

Terms are for one year, beginning July 1, and may be renewed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Governors may or may not be members of the Academic Board. Non-governors must be members of the Board. When sufficient governors are not available, the number of non-governor members is increased to the required total. The total size of the Committee may be varied slightly, up or down, with the approval of the Chair of Governing Council.

<sup>2</sup> If no LGIC Appointee wishes to serve, a second alumni member, from Governing Council or the Academic Board should be appointed.



### 1.3 Chair and Vice-Chair

The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be appointed by the Academic Board.

## 2. QUORUM

One-third of the voting members (normally 11).

## 3. FUNCTION

The Committee, which reports to the Academic Board, has general responsibility for policy on, and for monitoring, the quality of education and the research activities of the University.

In fulfilling this responsibility, the Committee oversees policy matters such as admissions, awards, academic regulations, grading practices, research and the products of research, and academic services. Some policy issues concern only one academic division. Others are matters of University-wide concern.

The Committee is responsible for reviewing and, at times, approving, changes to admission and program regulations, curriculum, degree requirements and academic regulations. Much of the Committee's work in those areas arises from proposals from the academic divisions, which have been approved by the relevant divisional councils. The Committee will not normally amend proposals forwarded by a divisional council unless the amendment(s) is/are deemed by the Chair or the senior Presidential assessor to be minor. Such proposals may be accepted, rejected, or referred back to the divisional council. If accepted by the Committee, the proposal may be received for information, approved by the Committee, or recommended to the Academic Board for approval, depending on the nature of the proposal.

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs approves or recommends to the Academic Board of the Governing Council for consideration the following:

- amendments to divisional academic policies or practices, or amendments to University-wide policy in academic matters;
- new academic programs<sup>3</sup> including joint programs with external institutions, and their academic content and requirements, and the closure of academic programs
- major changes in academic regulations;
- the establishment of new diploma and post-secondary certificate programs with approval as required by the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs, and the closure of such diploma and post-secondary certificate programs;
- the establishment, amendment or rescission of University-wide policy with respect to grading practices and examinations;
- policy on academic services (such as the Library, information and computing services);
- policy on research;
- policy on earned degrees, diplomas and certificates;

**Deleted:** <#>the academic content and requirements of all new degree programs; ¶ all

**Deleted:** within existing academic programs<sup>4</sup> or

<sup>3</sup> The University's Quality Assurance Process, draft dated February 9, 2011, defines new programs as new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors, graduate programs and degrees, graduate diplomas, collaborative graduate programs, and new fields in an existing graduate program. That definition, and this note, are subject to change from time to time. Any change will be reported to the Committee for information.

**Deleted:** (for which a similar specialist/major is not already approved)

<sup>5</sup> The table is meant as a general guide. Decisions are made by the Chair in consultation with the Senior Assessor and the Agenda Planning Group.

- policy on admissions and awards;
- joint programs with external institutions.

The determination of whether a proposal is major or minor is made by the Chair of the Committee, on the advice of the agenda planning group, based on documentation from the division.

#### 4. AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

The approval levels describe below are summarized in tabular form in Attachment “A”.<sup>5</sup>

##### 4.1 Admissions policies and practices

New divisional policies and practices or amendments to existing ones which affect the whole division or amendments to University-wide policies are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded to the Academic Board for consideration.

##### 4.2 Awards policies and practices

The establishment, termination or major amendment of policies on student awards are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded to the Academic Board for approval. Minor amendments may be approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.

##### 4.3 Academic regulations

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs has authority for approval of changes to academic regulations and other matters affecting divisional calendars, for example, but not limited to, appeal procedures and standards of professional behaviour.

##### 4.4 Academic program proposals

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs considers academic program proposals forwarded from divisional councils.

Where it considers it appropriate:

(a) The Committee recommends to the Academic Board approval of proposals for:

- (i) undergraduate programs leading to new degrees;
- (ii) graduate programs and degrees;
- (iii) the closure of existing degree programs;
- (iv) the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;
- (v) the renaming of degrees; and
- (vi) programs that establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.

Note 1: Where a proposal in these categories will have substantial resource implications requiring an addition to a division’s approved budget, the senior assessor to the Planning and Budget Committee (or designate) will bring to that Committee a proposal for review of the planning and resource implications of the proposal, for

**Deleted:** ¶  
Minor changes to individual programs or to divisional practices and policies are normally approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. ¶  
¶  
Proposals from divisional councils to approve changes to admission requirements to graduate programs, and to approve the establishment of direct admission options for existing PhD programs, may be approved by the Graduate Education Council. ¶

**Deleted:** [The administration forwards proposals to the Planning and Budget Committee for a review of planning and resource implications.]

**Deleted:** All major changes within existing academic programs, and academic program proposals, including joint programs with external institutions and new degree program, which involve new academic directions or anticipated significant new directions for a Faculty are forwarded by the Committee to the Academic Board with its recommendations for approval. [The Planning and Budget Committee forwards to the Committee for its information proposals for the disestablishment of academic units]

**Deleted:** ii

**Deleted:** i

action with respect to the resource implications, and for concurrence with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for approval of the proposal.

Note 2. Where a proposal for the disestablishment of an academic unit is to be made to the Planning and Budget Committee, the senior assessor to that Committee (or designate) will forward that proposal to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for information.

(b) The Committee approves proposals for:

- (i) new programs within an existing degree, as defined in the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process<sup>6</sup>, and other than those in (a) above; and
- (ii) diploma programs, including graduate diploma programs, as required by the University's Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs; and
- (iii) collaborative graduate programs and new fields in existing graduate programs.

Deleted: .

The Councils of the academic divisions have delegated authority to approve:

(a) modifications to existing degree programs;

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs receives for information an annual report on modifications to existing programs that are defined in the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process as major modifications.<sup>7</sup>

(b) transcript notations within existing degree programs;

<sup>6</sup> The University's Quality Assurance Process, draft dated February 9, 2011, defines new programs as new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors, graduate programs and degrees, graduate diplomas, collaborative graduate programs, and new fields in an existing graduate program. That definition, and this note, are subject to change from time to time. Any change will be reported to the Committee for information.

Deleted: May 4, 2010

Deleted: (for which a similar specialist/major is not already approved)

<sup>7</sup> The University's Quality Assurance Process, dated February 9, 2011, defines a major modification as follows. A major modification of a program is a restructuring of a program, a merger of existing programs or a refreshing of a program in order to keep it current with its academic discipline. Under the scope of 'Major Modification' is included:

Deleted: May 4, 2010

- a) Requirements that differ substantially from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review;
- b) Significant changes to the learning outcomes;
- c) Significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (e.g., different campus, online delivery, inter-institutional collaboration);

This definition, and this note, are subject to change from time to time. Any change will be reported to the Committee for information.

Deleted: d) A new undergraduate major or specialist where a similar specialist/major currently exists at the undergraduate level,<sup>7</sup> and¶  
e) A new undergraduate option or minor within an existing degree.¶

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs receives for information an annual report on the establishment and termination of transcript notations.

(c) the establishment, termination and modification of diploma programs and certificate programs, where authority is delegated to the academic divisions in the University's Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs;

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs receives for information an annual report on such actions where reporting is required by the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs.

#### **4.5 Examinations and Grading practices**

The establishment, amendment or repeal of University-wide policy with respect to grading practices and examinations is normally considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded by the Committee with its recommendation for approval to the Academic Board.

Major amendments to divisional practices and policies or amendments requiring an exception to University-wide policy are forwarded by the Committee with its recommendation for approval to the Academic Board.

Major amendments to divisional practices and policies which are consistent with the University-wide policy but have a major impact on the division will be approved by the Committee.

[Minor amendments to divisional practices consistent with the University's policy are approved by the divisional councils and reported to the Vice-President and Provost.]

#### **4.6 Policy on academic services**

Policy matters with respect to academic services (included but not limited to the Library, computing services, student record systems) fall within the terms of reference of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Such policies are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded with its recommendation for approval to the Academic Board.

#### **4.7 Earned degrees, diplomas and certificates**

Policy matters affecting earned degrees, diplomas and certificates, including their design and issuance of replacements, are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded with its recommendation for approval to the Academic Board.

#### **4.8 Research policy**

Policy on research is considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and forwarded with its recommendation for approval to the Academic Board. Research policies deal with such matters as the use of human and animal subjects, intellectual property, publication of research results, inventions and innovations. [The Planning and Budget Committee has responsibility for policy on planning including the strategic planning framework for research.]

#### 4.9 Monitorial responsibilities

The Committee is responsible for monitoring academic matters as may be required by general policy, as specified herein or by resolution of the Academic Board, the Executive Committee or the Governing Council. The Committee receives annual reports or such more frequent regular reports as it may determine, on matters within its purview, including reports on the following:

- Reviews of Academic Units and Programs;
- Major modifications to programs, as approved by divisional Councils;
- Establishment and termination of transcript notations within existing degree programs;
  - Connaught Committee activities;
  - Student Financial Support;
  - Research and international activities;
  - Student awards.

← - - - Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

#### 5. PROCEDURES

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs usually meets in open session.

In order to carry out its mandate, the Committee receives for its approval proposals from the academic divisions of the University which have been approved by the relevant divisional councils.<sup>8</sup>

In establishing agendas for meetings of the Committee, the Chair normally will be advised by a planning group that includes the Vice-Chair, and the voting and non-voting assessors. The proposed agenda for a meeting, together with background documentation, is reviewed at an agenda planning group meeting scheduled ten to fourteen days prior to the Committee meeting.

The Chair of the Committee, with the advice of the Committee's agenda planning group and subject to the duly established authority of the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board, the Academic Board, and the Executive Committee of Governing Council, has the authority to interpret the terms of reference of the Committee with respect to whether an item should be placed on the Committee's agenda (for approval or discussion) or should be circulated for information and/or comment apart from the Committee's agenda.

May 23, 2002

~~Draft Revisions, March 18, 2011~~

Deleted: ed

Deleted: May 1, 2006

59201

---

<sup>8</sup> Divisional proposals are reviewed by the Senior Assessor to the Committee. All proposals are submitted to the Committee through the Office of the Vice-President and Provost, which recommends items to the Committee through the Senior Assessor.

## Committee on Academic Policy and Programs: Guidelines Regarding Levels of Approval

The level of approval required for proposals relating to academic policy and programs under the authority of Governing Council depends upon the magnitude and significance of the proposed changes to existing policy. Policy and program changes specific to particular academic divisions are approved in the first instance by divisional councils. University-wide policy proposals are developed by the central administration. The point of entry for all academic policy and program proposals into University governance is the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P). The judgment as to the level of approval warranted for a given proposal is made by the Chair of the Committee on the advice of the agenda planning group. Examples of the types of proposals, by the level of approval warranted, are given in the table below:

Category of Proposal	Approved by Divisional Council under delegated authority; reported to the Provost's Office for information; no further governance action required	Received by AP&P for information	Approved by AP&P	Recommended by AP&P to Academic Board for approval*
Admission policies		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Changes to admission requirements for graduate programs and approval of direct entry options to existing PhD programs, as approved by the Graduate Education Council, are included in an annual report of changes to graduate programs submitted to the Committee for information</del></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Changes to admission requirements for graduate programs and approval of direct entry options to existing PhD programs, as approved by the Graduate Education Council, are included in an annual report of changes to graduate programs submitted to the Committee for information</del></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New divisional policies and practices or amendments to existing ones which affect the whole division or amendments to University-wide policies</li> </ul>
Awards policies and practices			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor amendments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establishment, termination or major amendment of policies on student awards</li> </ul>
Academic regulations			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>appeal procedures</li> <li>standards of professional behaviour</li> </ul>	
Academic program proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>minor calendar changes, such as the addition or deletion of a course, without significant implications for the nature of the program or the</del></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>collaborative graduate programs, after approval by the Council of the School of Graduate Studies</del></li> <li><del>flex time options for</del></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>changes to curriculum within established degree programs that can be accomplished with existing resources and are not major, e.g.:</del></li> </ul>	<p><del>Changes which:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>establish a new degree program, or change an existing degree, diploma or post-secondary certificate programs with</del></li> </ul>

**Deleted:** Changes to admission requirements for graduate programs and approval of direct entry options to existing PhD programs, as approved by the Graduate Education Council, are included in an annual report of changes to graduate programs submitted to the Committee for information

**Deleted:** Minor changes to individual programs or to divisional practices and policies

\* For levels of approval beyond Academic Board, see Academic Board Terms of Reference 58838

Category of Proposal	Approved by Divisional Council under delegated authority; reported to the Provost's Office for information; no further governance action required	Received by AP&P for information	Approved by AP&P	Recommended by AP&P to Academic Board for approval*
<p><b>Academic program proposals</b></p>	<p>needs of students;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>changes in the semester in which a course is offered;</del></li> <li>• <del>minor adjustments in the course hours, without significant implications for the objectives of the program;</del></li> <li>• <del>changes in titles and in course descriptions that reflect normal updating;</del></li> <li>• <del>purely stylistic changes in calendar material; etc.</del></li> </ul> <p>(a) modifications to existing degree programs;</p> <p>(b) the establishment, termination and modification of diploma programs and certificate programs, where authority is delegated to the academic divisions in the University's Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs;</p> <p>(c) transcript notations within existing degree programs.</p>	<p>PhD studies approved by SGS Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>combined programs where the requirements of the established component programs are not changed</del></li> <li>• <del>Minor changes within degree programs</del></li> </ul> <p>Certificate programs in continuing education which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Have open admission, but may be targeted to particular professional and quasi-professional areas</del></li> <li>• <del>comprise a coherent sequence of courses</del></li> <li>• <del>credit may not be transferred to degree programs</del></li> <li>• <del>do not register students as University of Toronto students</del></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <del>specialist, major and minor programs in arts and science</del></li> <li>○ <del>changes in professional degree requirements</del></li> <li>○ <del>addition or deletion of program streams within established degree programs;</del></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>new programs within an existing degree, as defined in the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process, other than those requiring approval by the Academic Board and confirmation by the Executive Committee.</del></li> </ul> <p>Diploma programs which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>require completion of an undergraduate or graduate degree for admission;</del></li> <li>• <del>comprise a coherent sequence of courses</del></li> <li>• <del>provide for a mechanism of assessment of student</del></li> </ul>	<p>resulting resource implications; or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>establish significant new academic directions for a Faculty; or</del></li> <li>• <del>are anticipated to have significant impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.</del></li> <li>• <del>Involve joint programs with external institutions.</del></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undergraduate programs leading to new degrees;</li> <li>• graduate programs and degrees;</li> <li>• the termination of existing degrees;</li> <li>• the addition and termination of joint degrees and programs with external institutions;</li> <li>• the renaming of degrees; and</li> <li>• programs that establish significant new academic directions for a</li> </ul>

\* For levels of approval beyond Academic Board, see Academic Board Terms of Reference

Category of Proposal	Approved by Divisional Council under delegated authority; reported to the Provost's Office for information; no further governance action required	Received by AP&P for information	Approved by AP&P	Recommended by AP&P to Academic Board for approval*
			<p>performance registers students as University of Toronto students who receive diplomas at Convocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may include courses offered for credit in a graduate degree program, for which credit may be transferred if the student enrolls in the degree program</li> <li>• diploma programs, including graduate diploma programs, and certificate programs, where governance approval is required by the University's Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs</li> <li>• collaborative graduate programs</li> <li>• fields within existing graduate programs</li> </ul> <p>Post-secondary certificate programs which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• require completion of</li> </ul>	<p>Faculty or are anticipated to have a substantial impact on relationships amongst divisions or with the public.</p>

\* For levels of approval beyond Academic Board, see Academic Board Terms of Reference



Category of Proposal	Approved by Divisional Council under delegated authority; reported to the Provost's Office for information; no further governance action required	Received by AP&P for information	Approved by AP&P	Recommended by AP&P to Academic Board for approval*
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• secondary school as a condition of admission</li> <li>• comprise a coherent sequence of courses</li> <li>• provide for a mechanism of assessment of student performance</li> <li>• registers students as University of Toronto students who receive diplomas at Convocation</li> <li>• may include courses offered for credit in an undergraduate degree program, for which credit may be transferred if the student enrolls in the degree program</li> </ul>	
<b>Examinations and Grading Policies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor amendments to divisional practices consistent with the University's policy</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major amendments to divisional practices and policies which are consistent with the University-wide policy but have a major impact on the division</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment, amendment or repeal of University-wide policy with respect to grading practices and examinations</li> <li>• Major amendments to divisional practices and policies or amendments requiring an exception to University-wide policy</li> </ul>

\* For levels of approval beyond Academic Board, see Academic Board Terms of Reference

Category of Proposal	Approved by Divisional Council under delegated authority; reported to the Provost's Office for information; no further governance action required	Received by AP&P for information	Approved by AP&P	Recommended by AP&P to Academic Board for approval*
Policy on academic services				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy matters with respect to academic services (included but not limited to the Library, computing services, student record systems)</li> </ul>
Earned degrees, diplomas and certificates				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy matters affecting earned degrees, diplomas and certificates, including their design and issuance of replacements.</li> </ul>
Research policy				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy on research dealing with such matters as the use of human and animal subjects, intellectual property, publication of research results, inventions and innovations</li> </ul>
Monitorial responsibilities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Report on Reviews of Academic Programs &amp; Units</li> <li>Vice-Provost, Students, Annual Report on Financial Support for Students</li> <li>Report on Student Awards, New Amended</li> </ul>		

\* For levels of approval beyond Academic Board, see Academic Board Terms of Reference

Category of Proposal	Approved by Divisional Council under delegated authority; reported to the Provost's Office for information; no further governance action required	Received by AP&P for information	Approved by AP&P	Recommended by AP&P to Academic Board for approval*
		& Withdrawn <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report of the Vice-President, Research and International Relations</li> <li>• Connaught Committee Annual Report</li> </ul>		
<b>Other</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• revised Divisional Guidelines for the Assessment of Teaching and/or Creative Professional Activity</li> </ul>	

58838

\* For levels of approval beyond Academic Board, see Academic Board Terms of Reference

May 23, 2002 (Proposed Revisions, February 8, 2011)



TO: Members of the Planning and Budget Committee

SPONSOR: Avrum I. Gotlieb, Chair, Planning and Budget Committee

CONTACT INFO: Anwar Kazimi ([anwar.kazimi@utoronto.ca](mailto:anwar.kazimi@utoronto.ca); (416) 978-8427)

DATE: March 10, 2011 for April 6, 2011

AGENDA ITEM 4

**ITEM IDENTIFICATION:**

**Planning and Budget Committee – Terms of Reference: Revisions to Section 4.4.2**

**JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:**

Section 2(14) (e) of the *University of Toronto Act* empowers the Governing Council to “appoint committees and delegate thereto power and authority to act for the Governing Council . . .” Such delegation of authority is limited to committees consisting of a majority of members of the Council, apart from certain purely academic matters. In other matters, the Planning and Budget Committee must make recommendations to the Academic Board, which must in turn make recommendations to a higher level of governance – the Governing Council or its Executive Committee.

The Governing Council achieves the delegation of authority through its approval of committee terms of reference. Traditionally, Committees recommend revisions to their own terms of reference to their parent Board, which in turn makes a recommendation to the Governing Council.

**PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN**

For some years, the University has been using its new budget model.

On October 28, 2010, the Governing Council approved the recommendations of its Task Force on Governance.

On June 24, 2010, the Governing Council approved the revised Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs. It also received for information the detailed University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process, which has been submitted to the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the “Quality Council”) for ratification.

## **HIGHLIGHTS:**

- **The new budget model** enables each academic division to allocate its own net revenue – the revenue it generates minus its share of University-wide expenses, its contribution to student aid and its contribution to the University Fund. If, therefore, a division wishes to allocate a portion of its net revenue to establish a new academic program, it is reasonable that it be permitted to do so without detailed governance scrutiny of the budget implications by a committee of the Governing Council. As a result, in all or almost all cases, the proposals for new academic programs that have been brought to the Planning and Budget Committee contain no implications for the University budget. It would therefore make sense that the Planning and Budget Committee consider the budget implications of proposals for new academic programs only in any cases where their establishment would require the allocation of additional resources to the division.
- **The Report of the Task Force on Governance** has urged the avoidance of duplication. It has also urged that the Planning and Budget Committee review and approve divisional plans at a high level. That would remove the need to look more specifically at the plans for individual programs. Avoiding duplication, the consideration of individual programs would be left to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. From a planning perspective, consideration of proposals by the Planning and Budget Committee would be necessary only where a plan for a new program would have effects outside of the division offering the plan – either on other University divisions or outside of the University.
- **The revised Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs and the detailed University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (the U.T.QAP)** set a very high standard for the program review process. The Policy stipulates that the review process will “address the quality of programs, and how the programs and the units in which they reside compare to the best in their field among international peer institutions.” It strengthens Governing Council oversight of the review process. Because governance would be vigilant with respect to the performance of programs, there would not be a need for proposals to be examined by both policy committees of the Academic Board.
- **P&B role.** Therefore, the Planning and Budget Committee would be called on to advise the Academic Board and to concur with the recommendation to approve a new program, only (a) when that program will have substantial resource implications requiring additions to a division’s approved budget, or (b) when there are significant effects outside of the division offering the program, and therefore significant planning implications.

The Planning and Budget Committee would continue to be the lead Committee in considering recommendations to establish or close academic units.

*Planning and Budget Committee – Terms of Reference: Revisions to Section 4.4.2*

**FINANCIAL AND/OR PLANNING IMPLICATIONS:** N/A

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Be it Recommended to the Academic Board

THAT the proposed amendment to section 4.4.2 of the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee be approved.

March 10, 2011

Memorandum to: Planning and Budget Committee

From: Avrum I. Gotleib, Chair, Planning and Budget Committee

Subject: **Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Concurrence with Proposals to Approve New Academic Programs**

---

Under its current terms of reference, the Planning and Budget Committee has been called upon (a) to consider the planning and budget implications of proposals to establish new academic programs, and (b) to concur with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs to establish them. Three factors make it timely to review that provision.

The first factor is the University's new budget model, which enables each academic division to allocate its own net revenue – the revenue it generates minus its share of University-wide expenses, its contribution to student aid and its contribution to the University Fund. If, therefore, a division wishes to allocate a portion of its net revenue to a establish a new academic program, it is reasonable that it be permitted to do so without central governance approval. As a result, in all or almost all cases, the proposals for new academic programs that have been brought to the Planning and Budget Committee have had no requirement for an additional allocation of funding to the academic division. The Committee has been advised that there are no implications for the University budget. It would, therefore, make sense that the Planning and Budget Committee consider proposals for new academic programs only in any cases where their establishment would require the allocation of additional resources to the division proposing the program. Proposals for most programs, which would require no allocation of resources to the division beyond its net revenue, would be considered solely on their academic merits by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. Those proposals would in appropriate cases be recommended for approval by the Academic Board with confirmation of that approval by the Executive Committee.

The second factor is the Report of the Task Force on Governance. That Task Force sought in its Report, among other things, to avoid duplication. Its Report, approved by the Governing Council on October 28, 2010, included recommendation 16, which urged “that the terms of reference of the Academic Board and its Planning and Budget Committee be revised to clarify their respective responsibilities for reviewing and approving divisional academic plans and to provide appropriate delegation and oversight to divisional Councils and to divisions.” The Planning and Budget Committee would review a division's plans – including its plans for new programs – at a high level, but

**Planning and Budget Committee: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Concurrence with Proposals to Establish New Academic Programs**  
(Cont'd)

would not need to look more specifically at the plans for individual programs. Avoiding duplication, that would be left to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, which would where appropriate make a recommendation to the Academic Board. From a planning perspective, consideration of proposals by the Planning and Budget Committee would be necessary only where a plan for a new program would have effects outside of the division offering the plan – either on other University divisions or outside of the University.

The third factor concerned the revised Policy for Approval and Review of Academic Programs (approved by the Governing Council on June 24, 2010) and the detailed University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (the U.T.QAP). The new Policy sets a very high standard for the program review process. It stipulates that the review process will “address the quality of programs, and how the programs and the units in which they reside compare to the best in their field among international peer institutions.” It strengthens Governing Council oversight of the review process. Because governance would be vigilant with respect to the performance of programs, there would be less need to scrutinize their initiation and change. There would not be need for proposals to be examined by both policy committees of the Academic Board, the Board itself and perhaps also the Executive Committee of the Governing Council.

The purpose of this proposal is to recommend amendments to section 4.2.2 of the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee to require that a divisions’ proposals for new academic programs be brought to the Committee only in cases where such proposals: (a) would require the allocation of additional resources, or (b) would have significant planning implications in terms of effects outside of the division proposing to offer the program. It should be stressed that the Committee would continue, pursuant to section 4.4.1 of its terms of reference to deal with “plans and proposals to establish, disestablish, or significantly restructure academic *units*.” [Emphasis added.]

<b>Current Provision</b>	<b>Proposed Provision</b>
<p><b>4.4.2</b> The Committee advises the Academic Board on the planning and resource implications of plans and proposals to establish, disestablish or significantly restructure academic programs. Those implications might include significant planning and budgetary changes within the division or significant effects on other divisions, the University as a whole and the public. [The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs has responsibility for</p>	<p><b>4.4.2</b> Where a proposal for a new program, as defined by the University’s Quality Assurance Process*, will have substantial resource implications requiring additions to a division’s approved budget, or where there are significant effects outside of the division offering the program, the Committee advises the Academic Board on the planning and resource implications of the proposal and, if it deems it appropriate (a) concurs with the recommendation of the Committee on</p>



**Planning and Budget Committee: Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference Concerning Concurrence with Proposals to Establish New Academic Programs**  
(Cont'd)

<p>considering the curricular aspects of academic program proposals.]</p> <p>[Changes within a degree program that do not meet the above definition and do not require the allocation of additional resources from sources outside the division are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and do not require the attention of the Committee. Examples of such changes would include the addition or deletion of a specialist, major or minor program in the Faculty of Arts and Science or changes within such programs where the change can be accommodated without additional budget appropriations, substantial reallocations among departments or significant effects outside of the department(s) offering the program.]</p>	<p>Academic Policy and Programs to the Academic Board that the proposed program be approved, and (b) where required, recommends the addition to the division's budget. [The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs has responsibility for considering the curricular aspects of academic program proposals.]</p> <p>[Proposed program changes that would not require the allocation of additional resources from sources outside the division, and would not have significant effects outside of the division offering the program, do not require the attention of the Committee.]</p> <p>* A "new program" is presently defined in the University's Quality Assurance Process, draft dated May 4, 2010, as new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors (for which a similar specialist/major is not already approved), graduate programs and diplomas, collaborative graduate programs, and new fields in a graduate program.</p> <p>This definition, and this note, are subject to change from time to time. Any change will be reported to the Committee for information.</p>
---	--

Recommendation

THAT the proposed amendments to sections 4.4.2 of the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee be approved.



**Proposed Revisions**

**PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE<sup>1</sup>**

**1. MEMBERSHIP**

**1.1 Composition**

Membership is about 26, including 2 lay members, 3 students, the Chair or Vice-Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (*ex officio*) or the designate of the Chair of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, 12 teaching staff, 1 administrative staff, and 3 assessors selected by the President.

The composition of Planning and Budget Committee is as follows:<sup>2</sup>

	<b>GOVERNING COUNCIL</b>	<b>NON-GOVERNING COUNCIL</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Administrative Staff	0-1	1-0	1
Alumni	} 2	0	} 2
LGIC Appointees		0	
Teaching Staff	1-2	11-10	12
Students	1-2	2-1	3
Presidential Assessors			3
<i>Ex Officio</i>			
Chancellor	1		1
Chairman	1		1
Vice-Chairman	1		1
President	1		1
Other (from AP&P)	0-1	1-0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>26</b>

The President may appoint annually University Officers as non-voting assessor members of the Committee.

<sup>1</sup> Also approved as part of the terms of reference of the Planning and Budget Committee (June 1994) was the following:  
"The proposal to merge the responsibilities of the present Budget and Planning and Priorities Committees is intended to eliminate existing overlaps in jurisdiction, which have resulted in a number of important issues being examined in an unnecessarily artificial manner in several forums. Equally important is the need to ensure that increasing demands for accountability can be responded to in an effective manner. To this end, the proposal entails additional delegation of authority with appropriate reporting to the Committee, streamlined approval processes and increased flexibility for the Chair of the Committee in agenda planning. Further opportunities in these areas should be identified as the new Committee begins to operate."

<sup>2</sup> Members of Governing Council may or may not be members of the Academic Board. Non-members of Governing Council must be members of the Academic Board.  
When sufficient governors are not available, the number of non-governor members is increased to the required total. The seats for 12 members of the teaching staff should be allocated between members elected to the Governing Council and/or the Academic Board and those who hold their seats *ex officio*, in the ratio of their seats on the Board: 8 elected teaching staff and 4 deans or principals.  
The total size of the Committee may be varied slightly, up or down, with the approval of the Chairman of Governing Council.

## **1.2 Term**

Terms are for one year, beginning July 1, and may be renewed.

## **1.3 Chair and Vice-Chair**

The Chair and Vice-Chair shall be appointed by the Academic Board.

## **2. QUORUM**

One-third of the voting members (normally 9).

## **3. FUNCTION**

The Committee, which reports to the Academic Board, is responsible for monitoring, reviewing and making recommendations concerning a broad range of planning issues and priorities and for the use of University resources (including, but not limited to: staff positions, funds, space and facilities, and campus lands). Many of the matters within the Committee's scope are matters that have an impact on relationships amongst divisions and relationships between the University and the community at large.

## **4. AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY**

### **4.1 Planning and Monitoring**

The Committee is responsible for policy on planning. The Committee reviews and makes recommendations on the University's general planning framework.<sup>3</sup> Specific areas in which recommendations are made to the Academic Board include:

- policy on the organization of planning;
- statements of the University's mission or general objectives;
- statements of multi-year University principles and objectives for academic planning;
- statements of general divisional objectives;
- enrolment plans and policies;
- long-range planning and/or (operating and capital) budget guidelines;
- strategic planning framework for research.

The Committee is responsible for monitoring planning activities and documents as may be required by general policy, as specified herein or by resolution of the Academic Board. The Committee receives periodic reports from the Vice-President and Provost on the implementation of academic plans.

---

<sup>3</sup> Individual academic plans are approved by the Vice-President and Provost .

The Committee reviews, on its own decision or on the recommendation of the Vice-President and Provost, the academic and budget plans of divisions in cases where a division is substantially altering its programs or having significant difficulty in implementing approved plans.

The Committee conducts periodic reviews of the budget plans of non-academic portfolios, to consider appropriateness of resources and effective and efficient use of resources in support of University plans and priorities. [Academic service areas, such as the Library, are the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs.]

## **4.2 Campus and facilities**

### **4.2.1 Policy**

Campus master plans and policy governing the approval of capital plans and projects are recommended to the Academic Board for consideration.

### **4.2.2 Capital guidelines and plans**

Plans are recommended to the Academic Board for consideration.

### **4.2.3 Individual plans and projects**

The Committee considers reports of project planning committees and recommends to the Academic Board approval in principle of projects (i.e. site, space plan, overall cost and sources of funds) with a capital cost as specified in the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects. [The Business Board is responsible for approving the establishment of appropriations for individual projects and authorizing their execution within the approved costs.] The level of approval required is dependent on the cost of the project.<sup>4</sup> Significant changes to a space program/approved project require the same level of approval as the original proposal.

---

<sup>4</sup>The current requirements, as defined in the Policy on Capital Planning and Capital Projects, are:

**(a) Capital Projects**

- Capital projects with a projected cost of more than \$2-million - Governing Council approval on the recommendation of the Academic Board and the Planning and Budget Committee.
- Capital projects with a total cost between \$50,000 and \$2-million - Accommodations and Facilities Directorate approval. All such projects shall be reported annually to the Governing Council through the Academic Board and the Planning and Budget Committee.
- Projects costing less than \$50,000, in total, and funded by a unit, approved by the unit and reported to the Accommodations and Facilities Directorate. For small projects costing less than \$3,000 the projects are, for reporting purposes, pooled and identified as small projects, with the total cost of such projects provided.

**(b) Infrastructure Renewal Projects**

- Infrastructure Renewal projects with a projected cost of more than \$2-million - Governing Council approval on the recommendation of the Academic Board and the Planning and Budget Committee.
- Infrastructure Renewal projects with a total cost between \$50,000 and \$2-million - Accommodations and Facilities Directorate approval.
- A listing of all Infrastructure Renewal projects requiring attention shall be forwarded annually for information to the Governing Council through the Academic Board and the Planning and Budget Committee.

### **4.3 Operating and designated funds**

#### **4.3.1 Budget guidelines**

The Committee recommends to the Academic Board for consideration guidelines for long-range planning and budgeting that are the basis for the development of the University's annual Operating Budget.

#### **4.3.2 Annual operating budget**

The Committee considers for inclusion in the proposed Operating Budget the major components of the Budget, such as changes to Policies and Procedures for Budget Preparation, Contractual Obligations and Policy Commitments, allocation of Funds, General University Expenses, and Facilities Renewal Funds.

The annual budget is considered by the Committee for recommendation to the Academic Board. [Once the budget is recommended by the Academic Board, the concurrence of the Business Board is sought in regard to fiscal soundness before it is forwarded to Council.]

The Committee receives regular reports on the status of long-range budget guidelines, projections, and the strategic budget model.

#### **4.3.3 Designated funds**

The Committee is responsible for recommending to the Academic Board for consideration the creation and allocation of general University Funds established in the Operating Budget, Capital Renewal Fund or elsewhere.

### **4.4. Academic units and programs**

**4.4.1** The Committee recommends to the Academic Board on plans and proposals to establish, disestablish, or significantly restructure academic units, here defined as "faculties, schools, colleges, departments, centres and institutes with teaching, or teaching and research functions, undergraduate degree programs, and graduate degree programs", regardless of the source of funds.

~~**4.4.2** The Committee advises the Academic Board on the planning and resource implications of plans and proposals to establish, disestablish or significantly restructure academic programs. Those implications might include significant planning and budgetary changes within the division or significant effects on other divisions, the University as a whole and the public. [The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs has responsibility for considering the curricular aspects of academic program proposals.]~~

~~[Changes within a degree program that do not meet the above definition and do not require the allocation of additional resources from sources outside the division are considered by the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and do not require the attention of the Committee. Examples of such changes would include the addition or deletion of a specialist, major or minor program in the Faculty of Arts and Science or changes within such programs where the change can be accommodated without additional budget appropriations, substantial reallocations among departments or significant effects outside of the department(s) offering the program.]~~

4.4.2 Where a proposal for a new program, as defined by the University's Quality Assurance Process\*, will have substantial resource implications requiring additions to a division's approved budget, or where there are significant effects outside of the division offering the program, the Committee advises the Academic Board on the planning and resource implications of the proposal and, if it deems it appropriate (a) concurs with the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs to the Academic Board that the proposed program be approved, and (b) where required, recommends the addition to the division's budget. [The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs has responsibility for considering the curricular aspects of academic program proposals.]

[Proposed program changes that would not require the allocation of additional resources from sources outside the division, and would not have significant effects outside of the division offering the program, do not require the attention of the Committee.]

\* A "new program" is presently defined in the University's Quality Assurance Process, draft dated May 4, 2010, as new undergraduate degrees, undergraduate specialists and majors (for which a similar specialist/major is not already approved), graduate programs and diplomas, collaborative graduate programs, and new fields in a graduate program.

This definition, and this note, are subject to change from time to time. Any change will be reported to the Committee for information.

#### **4.5 Policy submissions to and agreements with external bodies**

**4.5.1** Submissions that establish new policy positions will be reviewed first by either the Committee or by another Governing Council body approved by the Executive Committee. In the case of the latter, the Committee shall be informed of the nature of the submission.

Submissions to external agencies that summarize existing policies and practices are the responsibility of the President and should be submitted for information to the appropriate body of Governing Council.

**4.5.2** The Committee recommends to the Academic Board for consideration templates for agreements with external bodies. Individual agreements that do not conform to the template are reviewed by the Committee for recommendation to the Academic Board and confirmation by the Executive Committee. [Agreements that conform to the template are approved by the Vice-President and Provost.]

#### **4.6 Incorporation of associated organizations and research ancillaries**

The Committee recommends approval, in principle to the Academic Board. [The Business Board is responsible for matters concerning the arrangements for incorporation.]

#### **4.7 Chairs and professorships**

The Committee is responsible for making recommendations with respect to the *Policy on Endowed Chairs, Professorships, Lectureships and Programs*. Approval of the establishment of individual chairs, etc., which fully conform to the *Policy*, is delegated to the President, with annual reports to the Committee on approvals given. The Committee considers, for recommendation to the Academic Board, proposals that do not conform to the *Policy*.

#### **4.8 Priorities for fundraising**

The Committee recommends to the Academic Board, for concurrence with the Business Board, on the ranking of priorities for major fundraising campaigns. [Policy concerning University development and fundraising campaigns is within the authority of the Business Board. Plans for fundraising campaigns are approved by the Governing Council on the recommendation of the Business Board.]

### **5. PROCEDURES**

The Committee usually meets in open session but may, pursuant to section 33 of By-Law Number 2, meet in closed session or *in camera* when: (i) matters may be disclosed at the meeting of such a nature, having regard to the circumstances, that the desirability of avoiding open discussion thereof outweighs the desirability of adhering to the principle that meetings be open to the public; or (ii) intimate financial or personal matters of any person may be disclosed at the meeting or any part thereof.

In establishing agendas for meetings of the Committee, the Chair normally will be advised by a planning group that includes the Vice-Chair, two other members of the Committee, recommended by the Academic Board Striking Committee and approved by the Academic Board, and the voting and non-voting assessors. The proposed agenda for a meeting, together with background documentation, is reviewed at an agenda planning group meeting scheduled ten to fourteen days prior to the Committee meeting.

The Chair of the Committee, with the advice of the Committee's agenda planning group and subject to the duly established authority of the Agenda Committee of the Academic Board, the Academic Board, and the Executive Committee of Governing Council, has the authority to interpret the terms of reference of the Committee with respect to whether an item should be placed on the Committee's agenda (for approval or discussion) or should be circulated for information and/or comment apart from the Committee's agenda.

May 28, 2002