

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

REPORT NUMBER 189 OF THE AGENDA COMMITTEE

March 12, 2013

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Tuesday, March 12, 2013, at 3:05 p.m. in the Board Room, Simcoe Hall.

Present: Professor Ellen Hodnett (Chair)
Ms Katharine Ball
Dr. Avrum Gotlieb
Professor Hugh Gunz
Professor Alison Keith
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Mae-Yu Tan, Secretary

Regrets: Professor Doug McDougall
Professor Cheryl Misak
Ms Judith Poë

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

1. Approval by Electronic Ballot

The Chair noted that, following the previous meeting, the Committee had, at the request of the Faculty of Medicine, considered one academic administrative appointment by means of electronic ballot. She read the resolution of February 13, 2013 into the record.

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

the following academic administrative appointment:

FACULTY OF MEDICINE

Professor John Kingdom

Chair
Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology
July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2018

1. Approval by Electronic Ballot (cont'd)

A member commented that he understood the need for the Agenda Committee to consider time-sensitive recommendations for academic administrative appointments by electronic means outside of scheduled meetings. However, he had concerns about the security of e-mail ballots and suggested that the matter be considered further. During the Committee's discussion, members agreed that the issue of secure communication was a broad one with implications that extended beyond the Agenda Committee. In considering the Diligent Boardbooks portal used by members to access governance meeting documentation, it was suggested that the possibility for members to share written comments when using the web-based voting feature should be explored.

2. Approval Process for Divisional Constitutional Amendments

Referring to documentation that had been provided to members, the Chair outlined proposed guidelines for determining the appropriate governance path for Academic Board consideration of amendments to constitutions of Divisional Councils. Consistent with recommendations from the Task Force on Governance,¹ consent agendas could be used for routine or transactional matters to enhance efficiency at Academic Board meetings. Proposals for minor constitutional amendments could be placed on the consent agenda of the Academic Board and major amendments could be put on the regular agenda. The Agenda Committee would continue to serve its role in determining whether agenda items were major or minor. Any purely academic matters relating to examinations, awards, admissions, or curriculum, could receive final approval from the Academic Board and would not need to be forwarded to the Executive Committee for confirmation.

The Chair shared with the Committee comments that had been provided by a member who had been unable to attend the meeting. The member was of the view that material on consent agendas was considered unimportant by many members of the Academic Board and was unread, for the most part. The member expressed concern that constitutional changes that might be considered major by some Board members but that were considered minor by the Agenda Committee might go through unnoticed. For this reason, the member preferred that proposals for all constitutional amendments be placed on the regular agenda of the Academic Board. If they were truly minor, they would take up little time at the Board meeting.

The Chair responded to the member's comments, noting that it was important to build on the good work of the *Task Force on Governance* and make appropriate use of consent agendas, as directed by Governing Council. One could not presume that consent agenda item documentation was not read by Board members, and Board members would likely not appreciate having their time used to consider multiple minor changes. The Chair closed by stating that she believed that the Divisional Councils and the Agenda Committee would each do their jobs well when carefully considering proposals for constitutional amendments. Encouraging Board members to be well-prepared for meetings was a separate matter that the Committee could consider.

¹<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/AssetFactory.aspx?did=7246>

2. Approval Process for Divisional Constitutional Amendments (cont'd)

Dr. Harrison commented that, over the past few months, she and Ms Tan had provided guidance to various divisions contemplating minor amendments to their constitutions and by-laws. It was likely that the Academic Board would be asked to consider a number of small changes in the future as divisions further refined their processes. For this reason, the proposed guidelines would be helpful to the Agenda Committee in managing Board agendas and meeting time.

Members agreed unanimously to adopt the guidelines provided below.

- 1) Proposals for minor amendments to divisional constitutions should be placed on the consent agenda of Academic Board meetings. Minor amendments that address purely academic matters of examinations, awards, admissions, or curriculum should receive final approval from the Academic Board. It is not necessary to forward such proposals to the Executive Committee for confirmation. (Under Sections 2 (14) (g), (h), and (n) of the *University of Toronto Act, 1971*, the Board has final decision-making authority for such purely academic matters.)
- 2) Proposals for minor amendments to divisional constitutions that address matters other than examinations, awards, admissions, or curriculum should be placed on the consent agenda of Academic Board meetings and require Executive Committee confirmation following Academic Board approval.
- 3) Proposals for major amendments to divisional constitutions should be placed on the regular agenda of Academic Board meetings. Major amendments that address purely academic matters of examinations, awards, admissions, or curriculum, should receive final approval from the Academic Board. It is not necessary to forward such proposals to the Executive Committee for confirmation.
- 4) Proposals for major amendments to divisional constitutions that deal with matters that are not purely academic should be placed on the regular agenda of Academic Board meetings. Such proposals require Executive Committee confirmation following Academic Board approval.

3. Academic Board

a) Calendar of Business

Members reviewed the Academic Board Calendar of Business. Professor Regehr informed the Committee that amendments to the University's *Copyright Policy* would not be brought forward for consideration in this governance year; further consideration was needed before it could be finalized.

3. Academic Board (cont'd)

b) Review and Approval of Agenda – Thursday, March 21, 2013

Members reviewed the Academic Board agenda for the March 21st meeting. The Chair said that none of the agenda items from the recent meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) would be forwarded to the Academic Board for consideration. She then invited Professor Regehr to report on the February 26th meeting on behalf of the AP&P Chair. Professor Regehr said that the AP&P had approved a new graduate Collaborative Program in Musculoskeletal Sciences in the Faculty of Medicine and the closures of a number of undergraduate programs at the University of Toronto Scarborough and the Faculty of Arts and Science. The closures were an outcome of the regular review of program offerings conducted by the divisions. At the AP&P meeting, the Chair had permitted a member of the International Relations/Peace and Conflict Studies (IR/PCJ) student executive to address the AP&P on the topic of the proposed closure of the IR/PCJ Joint Specialist program, which was offered through the Munk School of Global Affairs and Trinity College. Following discussion, a Faculty of Arts and Science representative requested that the program closure proposal be removed from the AP&P agenda so that further consultation could take place within the Faculty. At the meeting, the AP&P also received for information reports on student awards and student financial support.

A member requested additional information about an item on the Quarterly Report on Donations (November 1, 2012 to January 31, 2013).

The Committee approved the March 21st agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

THAT the consent agenda be adopted.

4. Approval of the Report of the Previous Meeting: Report Number 188 – January 29, 2013

Report Number 188 of the meeting held on January 29, 2013 was approved.

5. Business Arising from the Report of the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from Report Number 188.

6. Date of Next Meeting – Tuesday, April 23, 2013, 3:00 – 4:00 p.m.

7. Other Business

There were no items of other business.

The Committee moved *in camera*.

8. Academic Administrative Appointments

On motion duly moved, seconded, and carried

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

the following academic administrative appointments.

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Professor Ryan Balot	Acting Chair and Graduate Chair Department of Political Science July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014 (while Chair is on approved leave)
Professor Alan Bewell	Chair, Department of English July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2016 [renewal] (includes one year approved leave)
Professor Christer Bruun	Chair and Graduate Chair, Department of Classics July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2019 (includes one year approved leave)
Professor Donald Jackson	Chair, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2019 (includes one year approved leave)
Professor James Stafford	Chair, Department of Statistical Sciences July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2017 [renewal] (includes one year approved leave)

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Professor Morris Moscovitch	Chair, Graduate Department of Psychology July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2018 [renewal] (included six months of approved leave)
-----------------------------	--

