

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO**  
**THE GOVERNING COUNCIL**

**REPORT 171 OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE**

**April 15, 2011**

To the Academic Board,  
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Friday, April 15, 2011, at 2:05 p.m. in the Forster Room, Room 229, Simcoe Hall.

Present:           Professor Ellen Hodnett (Chair)  
                  Dr. Avrum Gotlieb  
                  Ms Jemy Joseph  
                  Professor Cheryl Misak  
                  Ms Judith Poë  
                  Professor Cheryl Regehr  
                  Professor Yves Roberge  
                  Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak

                  Ms Mae-Yu Tan, Secretary

Regrets:           Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles

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

**1.     Report of the Previous Meeting**

Report Number 170 (March 8, 2011) was approved.

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

There was no business arising from the Report of the previous meeting.

**3. Review of Academic Programs and Units**  
**a) Semi-Annual Report, July – December, 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 the Semi-Annual Report containing the July to December, 2010 summary of the reviews and the administrative responses along with the March 1, 2011 Report of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P), which contained a detailed discussion of the Committee's review of the reviews.

Professor Sass-Kortsak said that the AP&P had considered three provostial and two departmental reviews. Once again, the most important outcome had been the clear recognition by the reviewers that the University of Toronto offered outstanding programs and was a top research institution. Having studied the five reviews, the AP&P had determined that it was not necessary to request any follow-up reports.

Professor Sass-Kortsak then provided an overview of some of the concerns and suggestions for improvement that had been identified by the reviewers. The Faculty of Law was in dire need of additional space. The Faculty of Medicine had been urged to improve co-ordination among researchers, who were dispersed on the campus and at the affiliated teaching hospitals and their research institutes. In expanding the enrolments in the MBA program, the reviewers noted the importance of strengthening the quality of admissions, in line with the very best schools, by expanding significantly the applicant pool and improving yields among the very best applicants. Faculty in the Management program at the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) were concerned about their opportunities for graduate supervision, about compensation of their Department for their graduate teaching, and they felt a need for greater autonomy for their Department. At the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM), Political Science students had less access to their professors than would be desirable, as faculty spent a substantial proportion of their time carrying out research and graduate teaching on the St. George Campus. Professor Sass-Kortsak reported that the AP&P had been satisfied with the administrative responses to the concerns. She also noted that questions about tri-campus relations had been raised in three of the five reviews and an AP&P member had strongly urged that the University give high-level attention to the preparation of a strategic tri-campus plan. The AP&P had thanked members of the Provost's Office – Professor Cheryl Regehr, Dr. Jane Harrison, and Mr. Scott Moore - for their excellent work on the review of the reviews and the quality-assurance process.

During the Agenda Committee's discussion, members suggested that, in the future, whenever possible, the number of reviews considered by the AP&P should be more evenly distributed between the fall and spring meetings. A member observed that issues regarding the impact of insufficient space on the ability of units to achieve their academic mission had been raised in some of the reviews. The Committee agreed that it would be valuable for a brief report of the reviews to be presented at the upcoming Academic Board meeting.

### **3. Review of Academic Programs and Units (cont'd)**

#### **(b) Follow-Up Report**

Professor Sass-Kortsak said that the AP&P had received its first follow-up report under the new quality-assurance process at its March meeting. UTSC had moved very quickly to deal with ongoing problems in the Department of Humanities, and two new Departments - English and Philosophy - had been established. The Department of Humanities as well as the new Departments were now functioning very well with high morale and with an active focus on academic planning for the future. Professor Sass-Kortsak also stated that UTSC had very quickly arranged a series of external reviews of programs offered by the Humanities Department and the two new Departments, as those programs had not received sufficient attention as part of the original reviews. Professor Regehr commented that two follow-up reports would likely be part of the next group of reviews received by the AP&P in Fall, 2011. Such reports afforded an excellent opportunity for units to update the AP&P on developments that had occurred since the time of previous reviews. In response to a question, Professor Regehr said that, following receipt of a follow-up report, the AP&P could request a further follow-up report or could direct the Provost's Office to follow-up with the unit if there was a concern that any issues raised in the original review had not yet been sufficiently addressed. The Committee decided that mention of the UTSC follow-up report should also be made at the Academic Board meeting on April 26<sup>th</sup>.

### **4. Academic Board Agenda – Thursday, April 26, 2011**

Members reviewed and approved the draft agenda for the April 26th Board meeting. Due to the number of agenda items, it was decided that the Board meeting time should be extended to 6:30 p.m. and presenters should be asked to shorten the length of their presentations to allow sufficient time for discussion of each of the items. During the discussion of Item 6, *Policy on the Student Evaluation of Teaching in Courses*, members questioned whether the title of the *Policy* adequately reflected its purpose, which was to evaluate both a course itself as well as an instructor's teaching in a course. Professor Regehr assured the Committee that discussion about the title had occurred and that there had been previous iterations of the title. With respect to the development of the core questions to be used for the evaluations, consultation on the content would continue. The questions themselves, however, would not require governance approval. A member suggested that more of the details on this matter should be included in the *Policy* rather than be relegated to the *Guidelines*. This was especially important, as the *Guidelines* were not intended to be brought through governance. The Chair observed that the role of the Academic Board was to consider the proposal for the *Policy*, but not the accompanying guidelines, which were provided for information only.

### **5. Date of Next Meeting**

The Chair asked members to continue to hold the reserve meeting date of Tuesday, May 3, 2011 from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. It seemed likely that there would be need for the Committee to consider some recommendations for academic administrative appointments prior to its next regular meeting, which was scheduled for Friday, May 20, 2011 from 2:00 to 3:00 p.m. in the Forster Room, Simcoe Hall.

**6. Other Business**

There were no items of other business.

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 D. Grant Allen                      Chair and Graduate Chair,  
Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry  
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2016

**FACULTY OF ARTS & SCIENCE**

Professor Michelle Murphy                      Acting Director, Women and Gender Studies Institute  
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012

Professor Rowan Sage                              Acting Chair and Acting Graduate Chair,  
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology  
July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011

**FACULTY OF DENTISTRY**

Professor Daniel Haas                              Associate Dean, Clinical Sciences  
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 [Extension]

**FACULTY OF FORESTRY**

Professor Sandy Smith                              Dean  
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 [Extension]

**FACULTY OF MEDICINE**

Professor Sarita Verma                              Acting Dean  
October 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011  
July 1, 2012 to September 30, 2012

**7. Academic Administrative Appointments (cont'd)**

**FACULTY OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH**

Professor Scott Thomas                      Associate Dean, Graduate Education and Research  
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2014 [Renewal]  
(includes one year administrative leave, July 1, 2011 to  
June 30, 2012)

Professor Marius Locke                      Acting Associate Dean, Graduate Education and Research  
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012

**UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO MISSISSAUGA**

Professor Ulli Krull                              Vice-Principal, Research  
July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2013 [Extension]

The Committee returned to closed session.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

---

Secretary  
April 15, 2011

---

Chair