

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
THE GOVERNING COUNCIL
REPORT NUMBER 124 OF THE COMMITTEE ON
ACADEMIC POLICY AND PROGRAMS

September 20, 2006

To the Academic Board,
University of Toronto.

Your Committee reports that it held a meeting on Wednesday, September 20, 2006 at 4:10 p.m. in the Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall, at which the following were present:

Professor Andrea Sass-Kortsak
(In the Chair)
Professor Douglas McDougall
(Vice-Chair)
Professor Edith Hillan, Vice-Provost,
Academic
Professor David Farrar, Deputy Provost
and Vice-Provost, Students
Professor Gage Averill
Professor Ragnar Buchweitz
Mr. Ryan Matthew Campbell
Mr. Tim Corson
Ms. Bonnie Goldberg
Mr. Billeh Hamud
Dr. Chris Koenig-Woodyard
Dr. Lesley Ann Lavack

Professor Louise Lemieux-Charles
Mr. Matto Mildenerger
Professor Cheryl Regehr
Professor J. J. Berry Smith
Miss Maureen Somerville
Ms. Johanna L. Weststar

Non-Voting Assessor:

Professor Susan Pfeiffer, Vice-Provost,
Graduate Education and Dean, School of
Graduate Studies

Secretariat:

Mr. Andrew Drummond, Secretary

Regrets:

Professor Derek Allen
Professor Luc De Nil
Professor Dickson Eyoh
Ms. Linda B. Gardner

Dr. Wajahat Khan
Dr. Siobhan Nelson
Professor Janet Paterson
Professor John Wedge

In Attendance:

Professor David N. Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs, Faculty of Arts and Science
Professor Peter Pauly, Vice-Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Rotman School of
Management
Professor Mark Stabile, Interim Director, School of Public Policy

Report Number 124 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – September 20, 2006

ITEMS 6 AND 7 CONTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ACADEMIC BOARD FOR GOVERNING COUNCIL APPROVAL. ALL OTHER ITEMS ARE REPORTED FOR INFORMATION.

1. Welcome and Orientation

The Chair welcomed all members to the first meeting of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs for the 2006-07 academic year. She invited all members to introduce themselves.

In particular, the Chair introduced members to Professor Hillan and Professor Farrar, who were the Committee's two voting assessors, and to Professor Pfeiffer, who, as Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, would be presenting many of the items brought to the Committee.

The Chair reminded members that the Committee's terms of reference, membership information, and a frequently asked questions (FAQ) document had been distributed; she hoped that these documents would assist members in understanding their role in the governance process.

The Chair then gave a brief presentation, in which she informed members of the Committee's status as a standing Committee of the Academic Board, the body charged with the carriage of all academically related governance matters. The Academic Board was, in turn, one of three Boards underneath the Governing Council, the ultimate governing authority of the University of Toronto. Other committees of the Academic Board included the Agenda Committee, the Planning and Budget Committee, and the Academic Appeals Committee.

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs, commonly known as 'AP&P', was an entry point for proposals. Committees, within the University's governance system, were charged with performing detailed analyses of proposals coming before them, and of making sure that all appropriate due diligence was completed. Some members had, in the past, stated that it appeared as though the Committee was a 'rubber stamp'; the Chair stated in response to that point that, while it was true that most proposals brought before the Committee were approved, the administration tended to bring forward proposals in the knowledge that the Committee would scrutinize them closely. The Chair reminded members, though, that if a proposal was insufficient, or needed more work, the Committee should exercise its authority to refer an item back.

The Chair briefly summarized the main mandates of the Committee, which included oversight and approval of policy on academic matters, including research; oversight and approval of program matters, such as the academic content of new programs, major changes to existing programs, and major changes to academic regulations; and monitoring ongoing issues of academic management, including and especially reviews of academic programs and units.

New program proposals, in particular, were an important element of the Committee's mandate. The Committee had the responsibility to consider a program's academic content, and assure itself that the program was a good one, that it was structured appropriately, with suitable curricular considerations, that it fit well within the institutional mission, etc. Meanwhile, the Planning and Budget Committee would consider the same program in light of questions about a program's costs, the budgetary implications of adopting the program, where it would fit within academic planning priorities, etc. Both Committees would then report their discussions, along with any recommendations, to the Academic Board, which in turn would recommend to the Executive Committee and to the Governing Council.

Because of this structure, the Chair reminded members that their role was not to question costs of program, or whether the program was appropriate within a unit's academic plan; rather, it was to consider the quality of the program and the academic issues related to offering it.

There were no questions.

Report Number 124 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – September 20, 2006

2. Calendar of Business

The Chair informed members that the Calendar of Business represented the work plan for the Committee for the upcoming year. Because the Committee was the entry-level body for many proposals, it would be kept up to date as information about new items came forward. The Calendar was available on line through the website of the Office of the Governing Council, at <http://www.utoronto.ca/govcncl>.

A member asked why there was apparently no meeting scheduled for cycle two. The Secretary responded that, at the time of printing, there were no agenda items scheduled for that governance cycle, but he anticipated that there would be, and, when confirmed, they would be entered into the Calendar.

3. Report of the Previous Meeting

Report Number 123 (May 31, 2006) was approved.

4. Business Arising from the Previous Meeting

There was no business arising from the previous meeting.

5. Report on Decisions Made under Summer Executive Authority

The Chair reported that, in 2006, no decisions taken under summer executive authority were made within the Committee's terms of reference.

6. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Finance (M.F.) to be offered through the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management

The Chair welcomed Professor Peter Pauly, Vice-Dean, Research and Academic Resources, Rotman School of Management, to the meeting. Professor Hillan informed the Committee that the proposed M.F. was part of the Rotman School's academic plan, and would allow experienced and qualified students to focus on finance. It differed significantly from an M.B.A. because of its focus. During its development, there had been extensive consultation, including with the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Mathematical Finance Program, and both were satisfied that the program was appropriate.

A member asked about the relationship of the M.F. with the existing Master's degree in Mathematical Finance, and what the chief differences were. Professor Pauly responded that the content was significantly different: the Mathematical Finance program was a mathematics program with finance included. There was minimal overlap with program content, and no overlap in students. The targeted cohort for the M.F. would be career financial officers in their 30s and 40s seeking to expand their professional knowledge.

A member asked if the term M.F. was standard for programs like the one proposed. Professor Pauly responded in the affirmative, noting that other degrees that offered some education in finance were typically degrees in another field. Professor Pauly then responded to an additional question stating that the M.B.A. in Finance was a very different program.

A member asked if the required minimum standard in skills, as set out in the proposal, would mean that otherwise qualified individuals would have to take additional courses, and, if so, who would supply them. Professor Pauly responded that, given the targeted cohort, the School was operating on the assumption that practically all applicants would have the necessary skills, but any pre-program training would be included in the fee. A member asked if the program would be full-time, and what would happen with possible 'drop-outs' who might be unable to attend all the

Report Number 124 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – September 20, 2006

6. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Finance (M.F.) to be offered through the Joseph L. Rotman School of Management (Cont'd)

classes. Professor Pauly responded that the program was full time, designed for evening and weekend work. It would be an elastic program to meet the needs of its students, and individual circumstances would likely allow students to make up deficits through individual assignments or through other means.

On motion duly moved and seconded,

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Master of Finance Program, leading to the degree of Master of Finance (M.F.) within the Rotman School of Management, commencing September, 2007, as set out in Appendix “A”, be approved.

7. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.)

The Chair welcomed Professor David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Affairs of the Faculty of Arts and Science, and Professor Mark Stabile, Interim Director, School of Public Policy, to the meeting.

Professor Hillan informed members that the current framework for academic planning, *Stepping UP*, had placed the development of a School of Public Policy as a significant institutional priority. As part of the development of that School, a new professional degree program was seen as a major element of the School's offerings. The School itself was planned to be established as an Extra-Departmental Unit (EDU) in the Faculty of Arts and Science, reporting to the Dean of that Faculty, who would chair a council of involved Deans tasked with the oversight of the School.

The program was designed with a 20-month format in mind, with an eight-month advanced-standing option. It was planned to begin in September 2007. Widespread consultation had occurred during the development of the M.P.P.

During discussion, a member asked about the proposed internship positions, and whether the program administrators were satisfied that all the students would be able to find appropriate internship spots. Professor Stabile responded that the internship, which was designed to take place between academic years, had been developed with partners at all levels of government, and that numerous positions were available through those means. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were another possible destination for interns; in addition, the School had begun talking to international agencies that might be appropriate destinations.

A member asked who would administer the internship element of the program, because of the amount of work involved in placing students. He asked if the Career Centre would be involved. Professor Stabile stated that the administration of the internships would be done by the faculty and staff at the School. He added that he did not think it would prove excessively onerous, because of the small size of the cohort (20 students) and because of the guarantee of spots from governmental sources.

A member asked how potential conflicts over existing spots would be managed, and how a priority assignment would occur. Professor Stabile responded that internships were application-based positions, and the decision was ultimately up to the employer; however, the School would attempt to match students and positions for a 'best fit'.

A member asked what the level of tuition would be. The Chair noted that the question, strictly speaking, was out of order for the Committee (but a valid one for the Planning and Budget Committee), but allowed the question. Tuition was anticipated to be \$15,000, or \$19,000 for the program with advanced standing.

Report Number 124 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – September 20, 2006**7. School of Graduate Studies: Proposal for a Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.) (Cont'd)**

A member cautioned the proposers on the use of cross-appointed faculty as the basis for the School's staffing. Such a model presented a risk, given that new cross-appointed hires, employed as they were by their 'home' Departments or Divisions, might not match the School's plans for what would be wanted or needed. Professor Klausner agreed, stating that there was some risk for a centre that did not have faculty-appointment rights. His office was attempting to mitigate that risk through extensive consultation with 'provider' units. Several cross-appointments were currently planned or underway, and consultation was evident in those processes. Professor Pfeiffer agreed, stating that flexibility on all participants' parts, along with routine communication, was key. Furthermore, the Director of the School would be interacting with the Board of the School, which consisted of representatives of contributing divisions.

A member asked if the internships would be paid. Professor Stabile said they would be, but that potential international opportunities might not be.

On motion duly moved and seconded

YOUR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

THAT the Master of Public Policy program leading to the degree of Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.), as set out in Appendix "B", be established within the Faculty of Arts and Science, commencing September 2007.

8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors

Professor Hillan reported that the reviews of academic programs and units were planned to go forward once again to the Committee in the spring of 2007. She noted that the new process for the governance accountability for these reviews had been positively received, and that several suggestions put forward by members would continue to improve the Committee's ability to provide oversight.

She then reported that a policy change regarding academic appeals, approved by governance in the previous year, was being carried through. A workshop for staff involved with academic appeals had been organized for September 28, 2006. Professor Hillan acknowledged in particular the work of Ms. Bonnie Goldberg, a member of the Committee and a Chair of the Academic Appeals Committee, in helping to ensure that the academic appeals processes at the University were clear.

Professor Hillan then informed the Committee that the Office of the Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost had struck a committee to review policies relating to personnel involved in research, to research ethics, and to research administration. There would be a number of revisions to policies proposed as a result of the committee's work, and the Committee could expect to see numerous policy proposals before it in the 2006-07 year.

Lastly, Professor Hillan noted that a task force on Extra-Departmental Units (EDUs) was nearing completion and the policy on those units would be undergoing revision.

Professor Pfeiffer reported on the effect of recent changes to the Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies, and specifically on how those changes affected the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs. In particular, the newly created Graduate Education Council (GEC), which replaced the former SGS Council, had been one element of a reorganization of the School that had been designed to provide a better governance alignment between academic goals and the administrative structures (and budgets) of the units offering graduate programs. Program proposals would be considered by the Faculty-based Council prior to consideration at the GEC, which retained its mandate for cross-institutional review. A new web-based posting system, currently in the trial phase, had been set up to assist relevant personnel in knowing about upcoming proposed changes to graduate programs.

Report Number 124 of the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs – September 20, 2006

8. Reports of the Administrative Assessors (Cont'd)

The Committee on Academic Policy and Programs had delegated some of its authority over approval of graduate programming to the GEC, but would remain a key element in an accountability framework. The Dean of the School of Graduate Studies would deliver an annual report detailing the changes made to graduate programs in the previous year.

A member asked if the Committee would consider reviews by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) during its annual review process. Professor Pfeiffer responded that the OCGS reports did not proceed to the Committee, since they were a separate element from the normal cycle of reviews of academic programs and units. Instead, those reports were delivered to the unit in question.

A member asked about the new web-based posting system for graduate changes, and how feedback could be received. Minor changes, Professor Pfeiffer explained, would require two weeks for comments, while major changes would allow four weeks.

Professor Pfeiffer then reported that three programs recommended for approval were moving forward as anticipated. These three, namely, the M.A. in Women's and Gender Studies, the Master's degree in Management and Innovation, and the Ph.D. in Planning, were all in process to admit students over the 2006-07 year for a launch of September 2007.

9. Date of Next Meeting

Members were reminded that the next regular meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 25, 2006.

10. Other Business

There was no other business.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Secretary

October 18, 2006

Chair