

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 120 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

February 1, 2006

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, February 1, 2006 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor J. J. Berry Smith
(In the Chair)
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Derek Allen
Professor Gage Averill
Professor Luc De Nil
Dr. Raisa B. Deber
Ms Linda B. Gardner
Mr. Christopher Goode
Professor Wayne K. Hindmarsh
Professor Ronald H. Kluger
Professor Ian R. McDonald
Professor Douglas McDougall
Professor Janet Paterson

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
Professor John Scherk
Professor Anthony Sinclair
Miss Maureen Somerville

Non-Voting Assessors:

Professor John R. G. Challis, Vice-
President, Research and Associate
Provost
Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Vice-Provost,
Graduate Education and Dean, School of
Graduate Studies

Secretariat:

Mr. Henry Mulhall
Mr. Neil Dobbs

Regrets:

Professor Rona Abramovitch
Mr. Navine K. Aggarwal
Mr. Blake Chapman
Dr. Inez N. Elliston

Professor Linda McGillis Hall
Ms Vera Melnyk
Mr. Matto Mildenerger
Mr. Andrew Pinto

In Attendance:

Mr. George Altmeyer, Assistant Dean, Faculty Registrar and Secretary, Faculty of
Arts and Science
Professor Alan Bewell, Acting Vice-Dean, Academic, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Deborah Black, Co-ordinator of Undergraduate Studies, Department of
Philosophy
Professor François Casas, Associate Chair, Undergraduate Affairs, Department of
Economics
Principal David Cook, Victoria Cook

**Report Number 120 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -
February 1, 2006**

In Attendance (Cont'd)

Professor Max Friesen, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, Department of Anthropology
 Professor Sue Howson, Vice-Dean, Undergraduate Education and Teaching, Faculty of Arts and Science
 Professor John Kloppenborg, Associate Chair and Undergraduate Secretary, Department and Centre for the Study of Religion
 Ms Helen Lasthiotakis, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
 Ms Rosanne Lopers-Sweetman, Director, Special Projects, Office of the Vice-President and Provost
 Ms Lanor Mallon, Faculty Governance Assistant, Faculty of Arts and Science
 Professor Kenneth Mills, Latin American Studies Program
 Professor Nicholas Terpstra, Program Coordinator, Renaissance Studies Program, Victoria College

ALL ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

Chair's Remarks

The Chair noted that Professor Rona Abramovitch would be leaving the University effective June 30, 2006 to take up a new position at Ryerson University. The Committee wished to record its thanks for the valuable contribution she had made to the University, and to wish her well in her new position.

The Chair informed members that, there having been two meetings of the Committee during the current governance cycle, the Report of the meeting of January 18, 2006 was not yet completed. A draft report had been placed on the table, but official approval by the Committee would be put off until the next meeting on March 1, 2006. There was no business arising from the draft report of the previous meeting.

1. Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus: Calendar Changes, 2006-07

Professor Hillan reported that the Faculty of Arts and Science on the St. George Campus had proposed a total of eight new undergraduate programs and five program deletions for the calendar year 2006-07. Comprehensive documentation had been provided regarding the new programs which outlined their academic rationale, fit with the academic plan, and expected learning outcomes.

A member asked if the estimated program enrolments provided in the documentation referred to first-year intakes, or the total enrolment over all years of programs. After some discussion it was determined that the documentation was consistent in referring to annual intakes into programs, but that this should be made as clear as possible in future documentation.

A member asked if there were criteria, such as student enrolment levels, used to decide when to add or delete programs. Professor Bewell replied that a range of criteria were considered such as student interest and changes in academic disciplines. The member asked if quantitative criteria were considered; Professor Bewell responded that they were, but not exclusively, as other more philosophical factors such as the evolution of academic disciplines were also important. A member pointed out that the general context within

**Report Number 120 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -
February 1, 2006**

**1. Faculty of Arts and Science, St. George Campus: Calendar Changes, 2006-07
(cont'd)**

which such decisions were made was the Stepping UP academic plan, from which were developed faculty plans which included proposals for program additions and deletions. A member questioned whether an estimated enrolment of three students was evidence of sufficient student demand to justify the creation of a proposed new specialist program in Renaissance Studies. Professor Howson responded that in this case the program would not be totally new, as there already existed a Major program in Renaissance Studies, and the Specialist program was being created to allow students the option of pursuing graduate studies in this discipline. The resource implications of the new program would be minimal, as it would largely make use of existing courses, and so could be justified even with a small estimated enrolment.

A number of questions concerned the learning outcomes provided for new programs, including whether a standardized format should be used in the documentation, and whether they were sufficiently clear to allow the Committee to carry out its role of approving new programs. Professor Hillan reminded members that, as she had pointed out at the previous meeting, this was the first year that divisions and units had been required to submit proposed calendar changes following the new guidelines in the *Policy for Assessment and Review of Academic Programs*, and that her office would continue to assist them to ensure that future documentation was more thorough and appropriate. Professor Howson added that the documentation had also been requested from divisions and units on short notice. The Chair commented that the Committee needed to vote on these calendar changes, and that his suggestion was to be flexible in this first year of the new process and to take the information provided for what it was worth. Even if imperfect, it was considerably more information than had been provided to the Committee in previous years. Next year there would need to be greater clarity in the documentation. A member stated that it needed to be made clear that the Committee was approving the programs “with reservations”, and the Chair agreed that this should appear in the minutes.

There followed a discussion, which arose from the proposed Major Program in Latin American Studies, concerning whether a student was allowed to register twice in a course with the same course designator, even though its content (as in a “Topics in ...” Course) differed from year to year. The Chair closed the discussion by stating that this was a technical issue best resolved by the Faculty of Arts and Science, which need not affect the Committee’s ability to approve the program in question. A member stated that he was pleased that some of these new St. George campus programs would include courses taught at the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC). Another member asked how much travel between campuses would be required of students enrolled in the Financial Economics Specialist program which was to be jointly offered by the Department of Economics on the St. George and UTM campuses. Professor Casas responded that students would be required to take at most one half-course away from their home campus.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The new specialist, major and minor programs and program deletions, as described in the submission from the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective for the 2006-07 academic year.

**Report Number 120 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs -
February 1, 2006**

2. University of Toronto at Scarborough: Major Cooperative Program in Computer Science

Professor Hillan reported that the University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) had proposed a new Major (Cooperative) Program in Computer Science for the 2006-2007 academic year. The program description, rationale for the program, admission requirements, and learning outcomes were outlined in the documentation that had been distributed to members. The proposal had been approved by the UTSC Academic Committee and been reviewed by the Tri-Campus decanal committee.

A member asked if additional resources would be required to establish the program, given that cooperative programs had to bear the additional cost of arranging work placements for students. Professor Scherk responded that this would not be the case because UTSC already had a long-established Specialist Cooperative Program in Computer Science with sufficient administrative staff in place, and there were already more work placements available than students to fill them.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE APPROVED

The new Major Cooperative Program in Computer Science,
effective for the academic year 2006-2007.

3. Item for Information: School of Graduate Studies – Ph.D. Candidacy

The above-noted item was received for information. There was no discussion.

4. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

(a) School of Graduate Studies: Report on the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Graduate Education Task Force

Professor Pfeiffer reported further on the implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force on Graduate Education. The proposal to revise the routes for approval of new or changed graduate programs had been approved by the Council of the School of Graduate Studies at its January meeting. That Council would consider changes to the School of Graduate Studies Statute at its February meeting. A workshop had been held on January 19 for representatives of all Faculties to discuss the changes that would be required to their constitutions to take into account the Faculties' new responsibilities with respect to graduate programs. A great deal of work was now underway in the divisions, and proposed constitutional amendments would be brought to the Academic Board in the current term. Finally, Professor Pfeiffer had received permission to initiate searches for the two new Vice-Deans to be appointed in the School of Graduate Studies: the Vice-Dean for Program Matters and the Vice-Dean for Student Matters.

(b) Innovations Foundation

Professor Challis recalled that the University had, in November 2004, commissioned a report on the protection and transfer of the intellectual property developed at the University. That report had been prepared by a small working group chaired by the Honourable John Manley, the former Deputy Prime Minister. The proposed changes with

4. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)**(b) Innovations Foundation (cont'd)**

respect to the University of Toronto Innovations Foundation represented implementation of several recommendations of the Manley report. Over the past year, the Foundation had been managed by two Interim Executive Directors, including Professor Ronald D. Venter, who had provided superb leadership in maintaining the morale of the Foundation's outstanding staff during this period of transition, and in integrating the work of the Foundation with that of the new MaRS Centre, where the Foundation's offices were now located. There was a clear need to make changes in the University's management of intellectual property. The first need was for "one-stop shopping" for inventors. That would be achieved by integrating the operations of the Innovations Foundation and the technology-transfer group in the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost into a new integrated unit within the University to be called "Innovations at the University of Toronto" (I.U.T.) The integrated operations would be under the leadership of a single officer, combining the roles of Assistant Vice-President, Technology Transfer and Executive Director of the Innovations Foundation. A search was currently underway for the new leader. The second need was for a change in the culture surrounding the protection of intellectual property and its transfer to the private sector. Professor Challis envisioned the business development officers spending a great deal of time in the University's units, making faculty members aware of the opportunities and services available and encouraging the disclosure, protection and development of inventions and other forms of intellectual property. The third need was to expand the range of expertise beyond the life sciences, physical sciences and information technology to include the humanities and social sciences. The fourth need was for a change in the manner of funding the operation. The Innovations Foundation had been operating on the basis of a long-term line of credit from the University. It therefore had a financial incentive to focus on finding and developing "home run" inventions or "gushers" that would be the source of major streams of revenue, needed to enable the Foundation to pay off its loan. Unfortunately, notwithstanding some successes, adequate revenue sources had not been found. It had been necessary to ask the Business Board to grant an extension to the line of credit, which would now enable the Foundation to operate for a few more months while its operations were being brought into the University and the cost of its operations included in the University's operating budget. Professor Challis was optimistic that the change in culture – the active effort to offer services to all faculty – and the synergies with the growing activity at the MaRS Centre would provide great opportunities for favourable development of the Innovations Foundation's functions.

Professor Challis referred to an organizational flowchart, which had been placed on the table for the meeting. The document showed the integration of the now separate activities of the Office of the Vice-President and of the Innovations Foundation. All of the activities related to the protection and transfer of intellectual property would in the new structure report to an Executive Director of the Innovations Foundation and Assistant Vice-President, Research. That officer would be advised by two committees. The first was an Academic Operations Committee consisting largely of Principals and Deans and advising on internal operations. The members of that Committee would also serve as a conduit for advice from, and encouragement to, the academic units. The second committee was a Business Operations Committee consisting largely of highly qualified individuals from outside the University, advising on the assessment of intellectual property and perhaps on the financing of its development.

4. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)**(b) Innovations Foundation (cont'd)**

Professor Challis referred to an illustration of the MaRS environment in which the combined “Innovations at the University of Toronto” (I.U.T.) unit would operate. While the diagram illustrated the considerable complexity in the relationships in the MaRS environment, those relationships also offered great opportunity. For example, some hospitals had contracted with the current Innovations Foundation to perform intellectual-property management services. They included St. Michael’s and Sunnybrook, and Professor Challis hoped that other organizations would consider this possibility. The new Executive Director / Assistant Vice-President would require a remarkable skill set to handle interactions not only with the University and its academic units but also the hospitals, government agencies, and various businesses and business sectors.

Professor Challis reported that two key efforts were currently underway. The first was the search for the new Executive Director / Assistant Vice-President. Members could expect to see the position advertised early in the following week. The second was the work of a transition team. That team would deal with such matters as the transfer of the Innovation Foundation’s employees into the University and issues concerning such legal matters as contracts and licenses.

Among the matters that arose in discussion were the following.

(a) Academic Operations Committee. A member noted that the Vice-President, Research had at one time been advised by a Research Board that consisted not only, or even primarily, of principals and deans but rather faculty members with active and successful research programs. The Research Board had operated very successfully. It had been a remarkable body, with some of its members having gone on to assume key leadership roles in the academic administration of the University. The member commended the model and urged that Professor Challis seek advice from, and ensure communication with, not only principals and deans but also with members of the research community. Professor Challis noted that there was currently in place a broadly representative Research Advisory Board, which included in its membership the Vice-Deans responsible for research from the various faculties, campuses and hospitals. That said, the member’s suggestion was a helpful one, and Professor Challis would consider including individual faculty researchers on the Academic Operations Committee of the I.U.T.

(b) Research policies. A member observed that the major concern among researchers in the professional faculties was the University’s research policies. They were concerned that with the current policies in place, companies seeking university research partners would go to elsewhere. Professor Challis replied that a review of the University’s Inventions Policy had been a high-priority recommendation of the Manley Committee, and a working group from the Research Advisory Board had been struck to review the Inventions Policy. Professor Challis agreed that the review of the policy was necessary and it was underway. It was a separate process from the organizational restructuring.

(c) Expansion of focus. Two members commended efforts to expand the focus of work to encourage and assist faculty in protecting and transferring the intellectual property to include smaller scale intellectual property, especially in areas other than the sciences. However, the new I.U.T. would apparently have the resources to manage only about

4. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (cont'd)**(b) Innovations Foundation (cont'd)**

twenty files each year. In addition, it was working in a close relationship with the MaRS Centre, which focused on the medical and related sciences. Professor Challis referred to the organizational flow-chart, which showed the plan to appoint a new officer – the Director, Knowledge Translation, who would focus her/his efforts on intellectual property in disciplines other than the sciences and information technology. The association with MaRS would in no way limit the areas of I.U.T.'s focus to the medical sciences. The key factor would be the work of the business-development officers, who could be expected to spend as much as half of their time in the University's departments, proactively working with faculty members to encourage them to protect and develop their intellectual property. In the course of discussion, members praised the breadth of Professor Venter's consultations, which included smaller faculties and also divisions that had not hitherto been active in intellectual-property protection and development. A member also commended the move to the MaRS Centre, which would be of significant benefit.

5. Date of Next Meeting

The Chair reminded members that the next regular meeting of the Committee was scheduled for Wednesday, March 1, 2006 at 4:10 p.m.

6. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Acting Secretary

February 10, 2006

Chair