



**FOR INFORMATION**

**PUBLIC**

**OPEN SESSION**

**TO:** Academic Board

**SPONSOR:** Mr. Christopher Lang, Director, Appeals, Discipline and Faculty  
Grievances

**CONTACT INFO:** [christopher.lang@utoronto.ca](mailto:christopher.lang@utoronto.ca)

**PRESENTER:** See Sponsor

**CONTACT INFO:**

**DATE:** May 26, 2014 for June 2, 2014

**AGENDA ITEM:** 12g

**ITEM IDENTIFICATION: Academic Appeals Committee: Report of Review of  
Composition Changes**

**JURISDICTIONAL INFORMATION:**

Sections 3.2.2 (iv) and 3.2.4 (ii) of the *Terms of Reference* for the AAC describes the process for changing the *Terms of Reference* as follows:

**3.2.2** Policy meetings may be called in the following circumstances:

(iv) to consider or recommend changes to the Terms of Reference of the Academic Appeals Committee of Governing Council;

**3.2.4** At the conclusion of a policy meeting, the Committee shall report its advice and recommendations for consideration in the following manner:

(ii) For items considered under 3.2.2(iv), the Committee shall report to the Academic Board;

Section **3.2.3** of the *Terms of Reference* describes the vote, including quorum requirements as follows:

The quorum for policy meetings is 6, excluding the Chairs, at least 3 of whom must be teaching staff members and at least 1 of whom must be a student. Motions in such meetings will be carried by a simple majority. The Chairs each have a vote in such meetings.

**GOVERNANCE PATH:**

1. Academic Board [for information] (June 2, 2014)

**PREVIOUS ACTION TAKEN:**

The composition change was approved by the Academic Board on January 27, 2011

**HIGHLIGHTS:**

Part of the approval involved a review as per the following: “It is recommended that a review of the composition change of the AAC should be conducted by the ADFG by June 30, 2013. The outcome of that review would be reported to the members of the AAC who are members on that date, and then to the Academic Board and other governance bodies as appropriate.”

We did not report back in 2013, as there were not enough appeals cases to conduct a fulsome review. I am pleased to report that we are able to confirm that the time from filing an appeal to the date of hearing, has been cut in half, with a general average of between 4-5 months.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

There are no financial implications.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

For information.

---

**DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED:**

- Chart: Average Number of Months from Appeal Submission to Hearing

<b>Calendar Year</b>	<b>Average # of Months from Appeal Submission to Hearing</b>
2005	13.3
2006	11.7
2007	7.8
2008	7.9
2009	9.8
2010	9
2011	4.3*
2012	4
2013	4
2014	5.3

\* There were three (3) cases that were filed prior to the composition change, but were heard after the change was implemented. These cases were delayed for multiple reasons, including the fact they were filed before the composition change, and therefore they were removed from the calculation for 2011.