

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.]

Current Provision	Proposed Provision
<p>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</p>	<p>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</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.