

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT 166 OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE

November 17, 2010

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, November 17, 2010, at 2:00 p.m. in the Forster Room, Room 229, Simcoe Hall.

Present: Professor Ellen Hodnett (Chair)
Dr. Avrum Gotlieb, Chair, Planning and Budget Committee
Ms Jemy Joseph
Ms Judith Poë
Professor Yves Roberge
Professor Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak, Chair, Committee on Academic Policy and Programs

Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Secretary

Regrets: Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Professor Cheryl Misak

In Attendance: Ms Sheree Drummond, Assistant Provost
Dr. Jane Harrison, Director, Academic Programs and Policy, Office of the Vice-President and Provost

Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting. She informed the Committee that, as a result of new academic administrative responsibilities, Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles had decided to step down as Chair of the Academic Board. As well, Professor Varouj Aivazian had decided to step down as Vice-Chair due to personal reasons. The Chair stated that Professor Lemieux-Charles had kindly agreed to continue to serve on the Board, and the Governing Council had approved her appointment as Vice-Chair. It had also approved the Chair's appointment, both as of October 29, 2010 to June 30, 2011.

Board Books Portal

Turning to the matter of meeting material, the Chair noted that this was the first time that the Secretariat had used the Board Books portal as the sole means of distributing documentation for an Agenda Committee meeting. Use of the portal for Academic Board meeting documentation would be implemented for the November 25th meeting; the portal had been used successfully for the most recent meetings of the Business Board and the University Affairs Board.

Chair's Remarks (cont'd)Board Books Portal (cont'd)

Invited by the Chair to provide their comments about the portal, members stated that they had found the speed for loading data to a page and preparing material to be printed to be somewhat slow. A member asked whether it was possible to print a Board Books file to a pdf file so that she could save it on her laptop. The Secretary confirmed that that feature was available and provided instructions. A member suggested that it would be useful to have the ability to print the pages within a sub-tab. At present, it seemed that only the page range for the entire tab was visible in Board Books. The Secretary said that she would inquire into the possibility of obtaining such a feature in the future.

1. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 165 of the meeting held on September 28, 2010 was approved.

2. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

Referring to Item 12, Academic Administrative Appointments, a member recalled that there had been some discussion about the process that had been followed for one of the appointments. She asked whether there was a record of that discussion, given that the Committee had been *in camera* at the time. The Secretary said that *in camera* minutes were not normally prepared for meetings of the Agenda Committee. Ms Drummond replied that the Office of the Provost had made note of the Agenda Committee's commitment to ensuring that due process was followed for each recommended academic administrative appointment prior to its submission to the Committee. If it appeared that the appropriate procedures had not been followed, a submission for a recommended appointment would be returned to the unit. Ms Drummond elaborated, stating that, on the direction of the Committee, a communication from the Office of the Provost had been sent in the past and would be sent in the future to any academic unit about which the Committee expressed concern with respect to its search process. The Committee agreed that the current discussion would be recorded in these minutes.

3. Review of Academic Programs and Units, Annual Report - Part I (January - June 2010)

The Chair stated that the Agenda Committee was responsible for identifying any general academic issues arising from the Review of Academic Programs and Units that warranted discussion by the Academic Board. Members had received Part I of the Annual Report containing the January to June 2010 summary of the reviews and the administrative responses¹.

Professor Sass-Kortsak said that the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) was responsible for the first step in governance oversight of the process of reviews of academic programs and units. To that end, the Committee had considered the recent reviews to satisfy itself that the necessary steps were being taken by the academic units to address any problems and achieve improvements, to satisfy itself that the process of reviews was being managed well, and to report to the Agenda Committee on the outcome.

¹ <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=7180>

3. Review of Academic Programs and Units, Annual Report - Part I (January - June 2010)
(cont'd)

Professor Sass-Kortsak reported that twelve reviews had been discussed at length at the AP&P meeting on September 21, 2010. The primary conclusion of that “review of reviews” had been that the University’s programs continued to be regarded as outstanding ones. For example, a distinguished panel of reviewers of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering had spoken of the leading-edge work of the faculty and of the excellent programs offered to very well-qualified students. As well, the reviewers of the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics had spoken of a Department that continued “to flourish in a culture of academic excellence that leads to world-class status” in the discipline.

Professor Sass-Kortsak then provided an overview of three programs and units from which the AP&P had requested a follow-up report - the Centre for Environment in the Faculty of Arts and Science, the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) Forensic Science Program, and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) Department of Physical and Environmental Science. The Centre for Environment review had proposed new organizational arrangements, preferably the establishment of a School of Environment, combined with a University-level commitment to the study of environment. The Faculty of Arts and Science response had spoken of pursuing efforts to strengthen the existing Centre, perhaps moving towards a separate School in the future. The Centre’s existing collaborative undergraduate and graduate programs had been growing rapidly, and any move to establish a new stand-alone graduate program within the Centre would most sensibly begin at the Master’s level. AP&P recognized that, as the Faculty of Arts and Science was currently involved in academic planning, it would be appropriate to request a follow-up report once the Faculty had concluded its planning exercise and was able to provide a more definitive plan of action for the Centre.

The AP&P had also requested a follow-up report on the UTM Forensic Science Program once plans for the program were complete. Faculty turnover had led to a situation in which most of the teaching in the program was carried out by part-time faculty who were full-time practitioners. There was currently only one full-time faculty member with a strong commitment to the program who was engaged in research in the area. The Interim Dean at UTM had halted new admissions to the program, and the future of the program – whether it would have to be rebuilt or terminated – was now being contemplated.

Lastly, the AP&P had requested a follow-up report on the UTSC Department of Physical and Environmental Science, as the review had raised a number of issues, which were being addressed vigorously. The Department had initiated moves to expand its faculty in Chemistry and in Physics, and it had updated the teaching and research laboratories for those disciplines. Additional faculty in Physics would enable the offering of additional courses, making it possible for students to complete full programs at UTSC. The Department was also working to improve its governance and its internal communications. A health and safety audit of the Department’s facilities had been completed, revealing only minor problems, which had now been remedied.

During the Agenda Committee’s discussion, members observed that the new quality assurance process, which was currently underway, appeared to be working. Professor Regehr explained that, under the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP), which had been presented to the Governing Council for information this past June, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs could

3. Review of Academic Programs and Units, Annual Report - Part I (January - June 2010) (cont'd)

request a follow-up one-year report from the relevant dean to bring forward to AP&P. Such reports were one means of demonstrating that positive change was under way. Where quality concerns were raised in the cyclical review, the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, would monitor the timely implementation of improvements. The Chair noted that the number of required external reviewers (two for an undergraduate program and three for a graduate program) had been made explicit in the UTQAP.

The Committee agreed that a broad overview of the review process would be presented at the Academic Board meeting of November 25, 2010, under the Agenda Committee Report agenda item. The Chair commended Professor Regehr and the staff of the Office of the Provost on having prepared such a fine report. She also expressed appreciation for the care with which the AP&P had carried out its duty with respect to oversight of the reviews.

4. Academic Board Agenda – Thursday, November 25, 2010

Members reviewed the draft agenda and approved the agenda items for the November 25th Academic Board meeting. During the discussion of the proposed School of Graduate Studies constitutional amendments, it was noted that the changes were consistent with principles outlined in the UTQAP and the Report of the Task Force on Governance. In aligning the approval and review process for undergraduate and graduate programs, the latter would no longer be approved by the Graduate Education Council. However, consultation with stakeholders such as the Council of Graduate Deans and graduate students would be maintained. While the Graduate Students' Union would no longer have a formal route for commenting on graduate programs proposals, student input on any program proposal would continue to be of great value. It was noted that graduate students served on a range of governance bodies and would have an opportunity to voice their perspectives during any discussion. Members agreed to make some editorial changes to Section 9.2.k. of the Constitution.

One of the agenda items considered by the Committee was the designation of the rank of Sessional Lecturer III as an academic rank for the purposes of the teaching staff definition. A member expressed disapproval of the creation of such a rank. She stated that, in her view, alternate steps should be taken by the University to provide suitable remuneration and benefits to individuals who met the criteria for the rank of Sessional Lecturer III, perhaps through the application of the *Policy and Procedures on Employment Conditions of Part-time Academic Staff*².

5. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair asked members to continue to hold the reserve meeting date of Tuesday, December 14, 2010 from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. in case there was need for the Committee to consider any recommendation for academic administrative appointments prior to the new year. The Secretary would inform members closer to the date as to whether or not a meeting would be needed.

² <http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppmar071994i.pdf>
57261

6. Other Business

Approvals by Electronic Ballot

The Chair noted that following the Committee's previous meeting, there had been need, because of time constraints, to consider two academic administrative appointments by means of electronic ballot. She read the resolutions into the record.

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

the following academic administrative appointments by means of an electronic ballot on November 3, 2010:

LESLIE DAN FACULTY OF PHARMACY

Professor Christine Allen Interim Associate Dean, Academic
January 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011

Professor Lalitha Raman-Wilms Interim Associate Dean, Professional Programs
January 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011

Information Sessions

The Chair noted that an information session on academic appeals and academic discipline would be presented at the upcoming Board meeting. The Committee then discussed possible topics for future information sessions.

The Committee moved *in camera*.

7. Academic Administrative Appointments

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

the following academic administrative appointments:

FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Professor Sanjeev Chandra Acting Vice-Dean, Undergraduate
January 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011

FACULTY OF LAW

Professor Mayo Moran Dean, Faculty of Law
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2016

7. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Professor Alison M.J. Buchan | Vice-Dean, Research and International Relations January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2015 |
| Professor Catharine Whiteside | Dean, Faculty of Medicine July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2014 (inclusive of two three-month administrative leaves) |
| Professor David Latter | Interim Chair, Department of Surgery January 1, 2011 to March 31, 2011 |
| Professor James T. Rutka | Chair, Department of Surgery April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2016 |

LESLIE DAN FACULTY OF PHARMACY

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Professor Reina Bendayan | Associate Dean, Graduate Studies January 1, 2011 to December 31, 2013 |
|--------------------------|--|

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Secretary
November 19, 2010

Chair