

Thursday, May 31, 2018

2:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

North Campus, ERC 3023

Toll-Free: 1-877-385-4099 Participant Passcode: 1028954#

Members: Karyn Brearley (Chair), Doug Allingham, Lisa Edgar, Andrew Elrick,
Francis Garwe, Jay Lefton, Steven Murphy

Staff: Robert Bailey, Jamie Bruno, Becky Dinwoodie, Craig Elliott, Cheryl Foy,
Doug Holdway, Susan McGovern

AGENDA

No.	Topic	Lead	Allocated Time	Suggested End Time
	PUBLIC SESSION			
1	Call to Order	Chair		
2	Agenda (M)	Chair		
3	Conflict of Interest Declaration	Chair		
4	Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of April 19, 2018* (M)	Chair		
5	Chair's Remarks	Chair		2:35 p.m.
6	President's Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executive Compensation Plan 	S. Murphy	5	2:40 p.m.
7	Governance			
7.1	By-law No. 2 Implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Council Governance Committee* (M) By-law Orientation 	C. Foy	10	2:50 p.m.
7.2	Annual Board Practices Assessment* (U)(P)	C. Foy	15	3:05 p.m.
7.3	Draft Board Schedule 2018-2019 (M)	Chair	10	3:15 p.m.
7.4	Policy:	C. Foy	15	3:30 p.m.
	(a) Policy Framework Review* (M)			
	(b) Review of Board of Governors Procedures for the Election of Faculty, Non-Academic Staff & Student Governors (U)			
8	Nominations			
8.1	2018 Election Nominations (U)	Chair	5	3:35 p.m.
8.2	External Board Recruitment – Process Update	C. Foy	10	3:45 p.m.
9	Other Business	Chair		
10	Adjournment (M)	Chair		3:50p.m.

No.	Topic	Lead	Allocated Time	Suggested End Time
	NON-PUBLIC SESSION (material not publicly available)			3:55 p.m.
11	Call to Order	Chair		
12	Conflict of Interest Declaration	Chair		
13	Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of April 19, 2018* (M)	Chair		4:00 p.m.
14	President's Remarks	S. Murphy	5	4:05 p.m.
15	Human Resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour Relations Update* (M) 	R. Bailey	20	4:25 p.m.
16	Governance			
16.1	Annual Board Practices Assessment – Confidential Comments (D)(P)	Chair	5	4:30 p.m.
16.2	Annual Debenture Governance Checklist* (U)	C. Foy	10	4:40 p.m.
17	Nominations			
17.1	External Board Member Nominations* (M)	Chair	5	4:45 p.m.
17.2	Board Leadership & Committee Composition 2018-2019* (M)	Chair/C. Foy	5	4:50 p.m.
18	Confidential Questions (if any) from Public Session	Chair	5	4:55 p.m.
19	Other Business	Chair		
20	<i>In Camera</i> Session (M)	Chair		
21	Termination (M)	Chair		5:00 p.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary



**BOARD OF GOVERNORS
Governance, Nominations and
Human Resources Committee (GNHR)**

**Public Session Minutes for the Meeting of April 19, 2018
10:00 – 11:25 a.m., ERC 3023**

Attendees: Karyn Brearley (Chair), Doug Allingham, Lisa Edgar, Andrew Elrick (*via teleconference*), Francis Garwe (*via teleconference*)

Staff: Robert Bailey, Jamie Bruno, Becky Dinwoodie, Cheryl Foy, Doug Holdway, Niall O'Halloran, Olivia Petrie

Guests: Mike Eklund and Kimberly Nugent (*UOIT FA*)

Regrets : Jay Lefton

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Agenda

Upon a motion duly, the Agenda was approved as presented.

3. Conflict of Interest Declaration

There were no conflict of interest declarations.

4. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of February 7, 2018

Upon a motion duly, the Minutes were approved as presented.

5. Chair's Remarks

The Chair welcomed the President to his first GNHR meeting. She kept her remarks brief to allow additional time for discussion.

6. President's Remarks:

Pilot Agenda Format

The President discussed the pilot agenda format that was recently introduced. The goals of combining the public and non-public items into one agenda are to reduce duplication, streamline material and promote transparency.

He provided an update on the Executive Compensation Plan. There remains some uncertainty as to whether the government will act on the plans prior to the election. Having an approved compensation plan would be helpful in the recruitment of the next Provost and Vice-President, Academic, and Vice-President Responsible for Research.

(A. Elrick joined at 10:05 a.m. and F. Garwe joined at 10:06 a.m.)

Board Recruitment

The President discussed the advisory board recruitment approach used at Ryerson, which was a successful recruiting strategy, as well as an effective method of engaging community members with the university. A member asked how the committee could assist with the recruitment strategy. The President advised that the university would need to retain a consultant to effect such a strategy.

Upon a motion duly made by L. Edgar and seconded by D. Allingham, the Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee supported the proposed approach to recruitment.

7. Governance

7.1 By-law No. 2 Implementation:

- **Academic Council Governance Committee**

C. Foy presented the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Academic Council Governance and Nominations Committee (GNC) for feedback. The ToR were presented to Academic Council for consultation on Tuesday and Council expressed support for them. C. Foy shared that a member of Council asked whether an election process to select members of the committee would be more appropriate. She explained that the rationale for recommending a selection process is to ensure the ability to appoint diverse members to the committee. C. Foy discussed the benchmarking process used to develop the ToR. The operation and structure would be very similar to GNHR. One of the first tasks for the new committee would be to review the terms of reference for all other Academic Council committees. She explained the rationale for the President being the Chair of the GNC, as he is a member of both governing bodies and can serve as an effective link between the two.

There was some discussion at the Academic Council Executive Committee about the quorum requirement. The Chair commented that she prefers a simple majority (50% + 1) to provide clarity.

GNHR had a discussion regarding the number of meetings per year. A suggestion was made to revise it to "shall meet between 6 and 8 times per year, or otherwise at its discretion."

C. Foy reviewed the approval path and the ToR will return to GNHR for recommendation in May.

7.2 Annual Board Practices Assessment

B. Dinwoodie summarized the report that was included in the meeting material. She highlighted the response rate using the different methods over the past few years. The committee supported completing the 2017-2018 assessment by e-mail again this year. They also encouraged following up with Board members to try to increase the response rate.

7.3 Policy:

(a) Policy Framework Review

C. Foy delivered a presentation providing an overview of the Policy Framework Review results to date. They have been receiving rave reviews on the new Appendix A. There has also been feedback that the updated Appendix provides more clarity.

She clarified the role of the University Administrative Council in the Policy Framework and how it is replacing the Senior Leadership Team in the Framework. There was a discussion regarding how a change is categorized as being editorial. A comment was made about some confusion regarding the two local approval authorities and N. O'Halloran explained the difference between the local authorities.

The committee agreed that the updated Appendix A makes things more clear. There was a discussion regarding the benefit of having faculty members' perspective on the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC). The committee also discussed the time required for appropriate consultation. C. Foy advised that they are considering making PAC agendas public to keep the community informed of the status of policies coming forward.

The committee reviewed the delegation of authority chart. There was some concern that it is too long. While it might not be helpful to the general public, it could serve as a good guide for PAC and policy developers. A member commented that the delegation of authority chart is part of a good risk management strategy and it is better to start with too much than not enough.

C. Foy explained the alignment of the Framework with the Board's duty to consult under the *UOIT Act*. External counsel was consulted to ensure the Policy Framework aligns with the *Act* and By-laws. The Framework amendments include mandatory online consultation with Council on administrative policies to keep Council's focus at a strategic level.

The committee members supported the proposed changes.

(b) Policy on Sexual Violence for Students and Procedures for Responding to Incidents of Sexual Violence – Annual Report

O. Petrie provided an overview of the report that was provided in the meeting material, including reviewing the university's legal reporting requirements. She explained that students prefer to see the university's counsellors and, as a result, they hired two additional counsellors. She also

discussed the prevention strategies used throughout the year. She reviewed the number of disclosures, formal complaints, and reports to the police, which includes historical incidents. O. Petrie advised that the university is providing support to students regardless of when the incident happened.

O. Petrie confirmed that an advisory committee has been established, which has taken on the review of the policy. Additional consultation on the policy is planned for the summer and fall. There was a discussion regarding the difficulty of comparing UOIT's numbers to those of other institutions. R. Bailey advised that since the Board will receive this report annually, comparing the reports could be helpful with assessing the impact of the procedures and support provided. O. Petrie added that there is communication among senior administrators across institutions about the issue. A question was raised about whether there has been an increase in reporting as a result of the #metoo movement. R. Bailey clarified that the report covers the same period.

8. Nominations

8.1 Board 2018-2019 Election Results & Update

C. Foy provided an overview of the 2018-2019 election results. She summarized the concerns raised related to the research leave eligibility requirements for the Faculty governor positions, which were also described in the relevant report. She explained the rationale for the eligibility requirement for faculty Board members. The recommendation was to proceed with the election results and implement any changes to the policy in the next election. The committee supported the direction taken with respect to the faculty governor research leave eligibility requirement.

Upon a motion duly made by L. Edgar and seconded by A. Elrick, pursuant to the 2018-2019 Board of Governors Election results, the Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee recommended the appointment of the following individuals to the Board of Governors for approval:

- *Liqun Cao and Ferdinand Jones as the Teaching Staff Governors for the term of September 1, 2018 until August 31, 2021;*
- *Mark Neville as the Administrative Staff Governor for the term of September 1, 2018 until August 31, 2021; and*
- *Jessica Nguyen as the Student Governor for the term of September 1, 2018 until August 31, 2019.*

9. Other Business

10. Adjournment

There being no other business, upon a motion duly made by D. Allingham and seconded by L. Edgar, the public session of the meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

Becky Dinwoodie, Secretary



COMMITTEE REPORT

SESSION:

Public
 Non-Public

ACTION REQUESTED:

Decision
 Discussion/Direction
 Information

TO: Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee

DATE: May 31, 2018

PRESENTED BY: Cheryl Foy, University Secretary & General Counsel

PREPARED BY: Becky Dinwoodie, Assistant University Secretary

SUBJECT: By-laws Implementation – Academic Council Governance Committee

COMMITTEE MANDATE:

- the Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee (GNHR) is responsible for advising the Board of Governors on its governance structure & processes in accordance with its Terms of Reference
- as set out in the By-laws Implementation Plan that was presented to GNHR on February 7, 2018, discussing the establishment of a governance committee/working group of Academic Council (AC) was identified as AC’s immediate priority
- with the support of Academic Council, we are seeking GNHR’s recommendation of the draft Governance & Nominations Committee Terms of Reference, as presented, for approval by the Board of Governors

BACKGROUND:

- updated By-law Nos. 1 and 2 were approved by the Board on October 26, 2017 & come into effect on September 1, 2018
- in preparation for the updated By-laws, GNHR reviewed & endorsed the proposed By-laws Implementation Plan at the committee meeting in February 2018
- the By-laws Implementation Plan, which includes a Parking Lot of items related to the implementation of By-law No. 2 (the By-law that governs the affairs of the Academic Council), will require a considerable amount of work

- as a result of discussions of the By-law Review Project Working Group & as part of the evolution of Academic Council, it has been recommended that AC establish a Governance & Nominations Committee (GNC)
- the GNC would take over several of the responsibilities that are currently delegated to the Academic Council Executive Committee
- in drafting the proposed Terms of Reference, we benchmarked the senate committee structure of 14 other Ontario universities

Name & Role of Committee:

- there is inconsistency across institutions as to which body is responsible for governance – varies from a By-laws Committee to the Executive Committee
- establishing a Governance & Nominations Committee for Academic Council would be consistent with the structure of the university's Board of Governors

Membership:

- we recommend the GNC be composed of current members of Academic Council to ensure the committee members are familiar with the role & responsibilities of Academic Council & have knowledge of how meetings are functioning
- having the President & Provost as members of the committee is consistent across institutions
- we recommend having an elected tenured/tenure track or teaching faculty member from every Faculty, as well as a student and staff member on the GNC
- as proposed, the committee would have a total of 12 voting members, 7 of whom would be elected faculty representatives
- we also recommend that the Academic Council Executive Committee nominate committee members for the GNC based on expressions of interest from Academic Council members
- nominations through an expression of interest will assist with ensuring diverse representation on the committee, including a balance of tenured/tenure track & teaching faculty members – it will also provide an opportunity to assess the governance background of nominees

Format:

- the format of the Terms of Reference has been changed to be consistent with Board committees – this will allow for easier transition between governing bodies

Responsibilities:

- elements of the Terms of Reference for the Board's Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee have been incorporated, as well as responsibilities identified during the benchmarking process
- the policy/procedure authority elements have been reviewed to ensure they are consistent with the Policy Framework

CONSULTATION:

GNHR:

- April 19, 2018 – for comment
- May 31, 2018 – for recommendation

- the feedback given by GNHR regarding the number of meetings and quorum were incorporated and are highlighted in the attached draft

Academic Council Executive Committee:

- April 3, 2018 – for comment

Academic Council:

- April 17, 2018 – for comment
- May 15, 2018 – for recommendation

Board of Governors:

- May 9, 2018 – for comment
- June 27, 2018 – for approval

NEXT STEPS:

1. Subject to GNHR's recommendation, the GNC Terms of Reference will be presented to the Board for approval at the meeting on June 27.
2. The Office of the University Secretary will assist the Academic Council Executive Committee with issuing a call for expressions of interest for the GNC committee members over the summer.
3. The GNC will be established by September 2018 and will continue working on the implementation of By-law No. 2.

SUPPORTING REFERENCE MATERIALS:

- Draft Governance & Nominating Committee Terms of Reference

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Governance & Nominations Committee

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Governance & Nominations Committee (“Committee”) is a standing committee of the UOIT Academic Council and is responsible for providing advice to Academic Council on its governance structure and processes, the nomination and election of new members, and Academic Council performance.

Specifically, the Committee will have the following responsibilities:

(a) Governance

- Advise Academic Council on operations, efficient and effective structures supporting good governance, and Academic Council’s relationship with other bodies at the university as established in the *UOIT Act* and By-Laws;
- Advise Academic Council on the establishment, terms of reference, composition, membership and retirement of its committees, including its own;
- Propose, oversee, and periodically review the governance policies of Academic Council and its committees and make recommendations to Academic Council for development and revision when appropriate;
- Establish, oversee, and periodically review the governance procedures, guidelines, and directives of Academic Council and revise when appropriate;
- Develop, implement and monitor procedures for assessing and/or improving the effectiveness of Academic Council and its committees; and
- Oversee the delivery of programs for the orientation and ongoing education of members of Academic Council and its committees on good governance practices.

(b) Nominations

- Review and monitor the membership needs of Academic Council and its committees;
- Oversee the process of recruitment, selection, and election of new members of Academic Council and its committees and recommend appointments for approval by Academic Council in accordance with the *UOIT Act* and By-laws. In doing so, the Committee shall strive to achieve a balance of skills, expertise, and knowledge among its membership, while reflecting the demographic and cultural diversity of the communities served by the university; and

- Oversee the nomination and selection of Academic Council's Vice-Chair from among the members of Academic Council.

2. MEETINGS

The Committee shall meet between six (6) and eight (8) times per year, **or otherwise at the Committee's discretion.** In accordance with the *UOIT Act* and By-laws, the Committee shall conduct two types of meetings as part of its regular administration: Public and Non-Public.

3. MEMBERSHIP

The Committee shall be composed of:

- One (1) elected Academic Council member, being a Teaching Faculty member or Tenured/Tenure Track member, from each Faculty
- One (1) Dean
- One (1) student member from Academic Council

Ex-officio

- President & Vice-Chancellor (Chair)
- Provost & Vice-President, Academic
- Staff member of Academic Council (since there is only 1)
- Secretary of Academic Council (non-voting)

4. NOMINATION

The Academic Council Executive Committee will nominate members through expressions of interest from Academic Council members. When nominating candidates, the Academic Council Executive Committee should ensure the Committee members represent the diverse perspectives of the different constituencies within the UOIT community, including a balanced representation of tenured/tenure-track faculty and teaching faculty.

5. QUORUM

Quorum requires that **a majority** of the Committee members entitled to vote be present.



COMMITTEE REPORT

SESSION:

Public
 Non-Public

ACTION REQUESTED:

Decision
 Discussion/Direction
 Information

TO: Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee

DATE: May 31, 2018

PRESENTED BY: Cheryl Foy, University Secretary & General Counsel

PREPARED BY: Becky Dinwoodie, Assistant University Secretary

SUBJECT: Board Practices Assessment 2017-2018

COMMITTEE MANDATE:

- in accordance with the Governance, Nominations & Human Resources Committee’s (GNHR) Terms of Reference, the committee is responsible for developing, implementing & monitoring procedures for assessing the effectiveness of the Board and its committees
- we are presenting a summary of the results of the 2017-2018 Board Practices Assessment (“Assessment”)

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT & RATIONALE:

- the response rate for the 2016-2017 Assessment was 20/24 governors (83%) versus response rates of 90% for 2014-2015 (conducted by online poll immediately prior to a Board meeting) & 46% for 2013-2014
- the 2015-2016 online poll assessment was not conducted due to timing constraints at meetings
- at the GNHR meeting on April 19, 2018, the committee supported conducting the Assessment via e-mail again this year
- at the Board meeting on May 9, the GNHR and Board Chairs gave the Board advance notice of the Assessment & encouraged all members to complete & return the form
- the Assessment was distributed to the Board on May 11 with a completion deadline of May 24

- the Office of the University Secretary is compiling the results & will be presenting a summary at the meeting

COMPLIANCE WITH POLICY/LEGISLATION:

- conducting the annual Board Practices Assessment supports the committee's fulfilment of its mandate under the Terms of Reference

NEXT STEPS:

- based on the Assessment results, the Office of the University Secretary will prepare draft 2018-2019 committee work plans

SUPPORTING REFERENCE MATERIALS:

- none



COMMITTEE REPORT

SESSION:

Public
 Non-Public

ACTION REQUESTED:

Decision
 Discussion/Direction
 Information

TO: Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee

DATE: May 22, 2018

PRESENTED BY: Cheryl Foy, University Secretary and General Counsel

SUBJECT: Policy Framework Amendments – Recommendation for Approval

COMMITTEE/BOARD MANDATE:

- Under the UOIT Act, section 9 (1), the Board has the power: “to establish academic, research, service and institutional policies and plans and to control the manner in which they are implemented”. The UOIT Policy Framework is a key institutional policy that delegates the Board’s power, establishing categories of policy instruments with distinct approval pathways.
- Under the Policy Framework, GNHR is the deliberative body for this policy. We submit this report and draft amendments to ask for your recommendation to the Board of Governors for approval of the UOIT Policy Framework.
- *Whereas Academic Council has recommended the amendments to the UOIT Policy Framework for approval, GNHR approves the Procedures for the Development, Approval and Review of Policy Instruments and Appendices D and E and recommends that the Board of Governors approve the amendments to the UOIT Policy Framework and Appendices A, B and C.*

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT & RATIONALE:

- The UOIT Policy Framework was approved by the Board November 28, 2014. Under the Framework, all policy instruments must be reviewed at least every three years. A review was conducted, involving extensive consultation and resulting in proposed amendments.
- Academic Council has recommended the amendments to the UOIT Policy Framework for approval at its May 15, 2018 meeting.

RESOURCES REQUIRED:

- N/A

IMPLICATIONS:

- N/A

ALIGNMENT WITH MISSION, VISION, VALUES & STRATEGIC PLAN:

- N/A

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

- N/A

CONSULTATION:

- Through Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and University Administrative Council, the USGC has solicited comments from policy leads or policy owners who have engaged in policy projects under the Policy Framework. Additionally, we have developed an online questionnaire targeted at Policy Framework users to collect comments. We have conducted a special meeting with Academic Council to obtain their views on the existing Policy Framework. To address comments from Academic Council, we engaged outside counsel to provide a perspective on the duty to consult and ensure that the Policy Framework is consistent with the UOIT Act. Those comments have informed the proposed amendments to the Policy Framework and Procedures.

List of Consultation Dates:

- Policy Advisory Committee (December 13, March 2, March 22, April 19, May 29)
- Academic Council (January 16, February 13, April 17)
- Online Consultation (community comments) (January 30 - February 28)
- University Administrative Council (February 13, April 10)
- Senior Leadership Team (February 26, April 9)
- Governance, Nominations and Human Resources Committee (February 7, April 19)
- Board of Governors (March 7, May 9)

Comments Received and Response:

- GNHR requested a document including category definitions and a list of policy instruments approved under the Policy Framework in each of the categories. **Response:** We have prepared a document, previous distributed.
- There has been discussion about the duty to consult Academic Council and ensuring that the Policy Framework is consistent with the UOIT Act. **Response:** Under the UOIT Act, section 10 (5) the Board has a “Duty to consult” with Academic Council before making a decision regarding the establishment of academic, research, service and institutional policies. Based on comments from Academic Council, we confirm that the intention is for Academic Council to be consulted on Legal Compliance and Governance and Administrative Policy Instruments. Mandatory Consultation steps have been added to the Policy Framework for added clarity.
- Delegation of approval authority for Academic Policy instruments should be done as part of a broader governance review in the context of By-law No. 2 implementation. **Response:** We support re-examining Academic approval authorities as part of By-law implementation. We note that changes to the Academic Council committee terms of reference may require further amendment to the Policy Framework.

- Many in the university community are not aware of the process involved in developing and consulting on policies at UOIT. **Response:** We revise our training presentation and increase our offerings of training to those involved in policy projects and interested parties.
- There is a desire to clarify and simplify the policy development, consultation and approval process. A key concern is that the process from policy idea to approval can be long. We wish to explore ways to clarify the process, making it easier to navigate without losing sight of the importance of consultation in the policy development process. **Response:** Under the Policy Framework, the Policy Owner is responsible for assigning a Policy Lead to conduct the consultation process, draft policies, and integrate or respond to stakeholder comments. Many factors, including limited resourcing to do policy work within the Policy Owner's unit and within the Secretariat. Given the limited resources, the Secretariat's focus is on education and facilitation. To that end we will continue to develop tools and training related to stakeholder consultation and support Policy Leads in developing consultation schedules. We plan to make Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) agendas available to faculty and staff for increased transparency. In our proposed amendments, we set out mandatory consultation steps that ensure that consultation remains a priority.
- Strengthen the role of PAC to provide its comments more weight, and to include a role in the approval of administrative procedures. Ensure PAC reviews all Administrative and Legal, Compliance and Governance policies and procedures. **Response:** Proposed amendments to the Policy Framework and Procedures have included PAC as a mandatory step for all Administrative and Legal, Compliance and Governance policy instruments. PAC's assessment will be reported during deliberation and approval. We are also recommending increasing faculty numbers on PAC from one to two.
- Implementation of policies does not always include follow-up to ensure successful implementation and adoption. **Response:** There is no audit function for policy compliance at this time as the focus continues to be on implementation and clean up. The Policy Framework places the responsibility for an implementation plan on the Policy Owner, but also requires the Policy Owner to evaluate the implementation and report on it to the Approval Authority within one year of implementation. This requirement must be emphasized in our training and communications around the Policy Framework.
- There has been discussion of the categorization and approval authority for the Administrative and LCG categories. Administrative policies do not come to the Board for approval. The intent is to ensure that the Board is focused on high-level strategic policies, and not overwhelmed by operational policies. The Board is kept informed through an annual report on policies. **Response:** We are looking at how we can bring more clarity to the categorization of policies and also increase accountability to the Board. We have developed a delegation of authority chart as an appendix to the Policy Framework, as well as a Local policy approval form to approve Local policy instruments.
- There has been a suggestion to increase the opportunities for faculty members to contribute to policy development. **Response:** We agree that faculty members have a valuable perspective in the development of policies. Proposed amendments to the PAC Terms of reference increase the Teaching Staff membership of PAC to two. Additionally, the amendments to the Policy Framework provide for a mandatory open comment period on new or revised policies and procedures. These measures provide an additional opportunity for faculty members to consider and comment on policies in development.
- There has been a request to provide more clarity on the determination of what constitutes a substantive vs. and editorial amendment. **Response:** Section 17 of the Procedure provides more detail on how the determination is made.

COMPLIANCE WITH POLICY/LEGISLATION:

- We have taken steps to ensure that the UOIT Policy Framework is consistent with the UOIT Act, the current By-law and the new By-laws No. 1 and 2 which are effective September 1, 2018. The UOIT Policy Framework delegates the Board's power "to establish academic, research, service and institutional policies and plans and to control the manner in which they are implemented" and preserves the Board's duty to consult Academic Council under the UOIT Act and By-law No. 2 before establishing policies.

NEXT STEPS:

- Board of Governors to consider amendments for approval. (June 27)

MOTION FOR CONSIDERATION:

- *Whereas Academic Council has recommended the amendments to the UOIT Policy Framework for approval, GNHR approves the Procedures for the Development, Approval and Review of Policy Instruments and Appendices D and E and recommends that the Board of Governors approve the amendments to the UOIT Policy Framework and Appendices A, B and C.*

SUPPORTING REFERENCE MATERIALS:

- UOIT Policy Framework
- Appendix A Guide to Approval Authorities and Mandatory Consultation
- Appendix B – Delegation of Authority Char
- Appendix C – Policy Advisory Committee Terms of Reference
- Procedures for the Development, Approval and Review of Policy Instruments
- Appendix D – Policy Instrument Templates
- Appendix E – Local Policy Approval Authority Form



<u>Classification</u>	<u>LCG 1100</u>
<u>Category</u>	<u>Legal, Compliance and Governance</u>
<u>Approval Authority</u>	<u>Board of Governors</u>
<u>Policy Owner</u>	<u>University Secretary</u>
<u>Approval Date</u>	<u>DRAFT FOR APPROVAL</u>
<u>Review Date</u>	<u>November 2017</u>
<u>Supersedes</u>	<u>N/A</u>

Formatted: Different first page header

UOIT POLICY FRAMEWORK

PURPOSE

1. This framework is intended to provide for effective and consistent practice in the development and administration of University policy instruments.

DEFINITIONS

2. For the purposes of this policy the following definitions apply:

“Approval Authority” means a body or position that has authority to approve, amend, review or revoke a Policy Instrument.

“Deliberative Body” means a University body or committee responsible for discussion and consideration that provides recommendations for Policy Instruments prior to submission for approval.

“Directive” means a set of mandatory instructions that specify actions to be taken to support the implementation of and compliance with a policy or procedure.

“Guideline” means a set of optional directions that provide guidance, advice or explanation to support the implementation of a policy or procedure.

“Policy” means a statement of principle intended to govern the operation of the University and which aligns with the legislative, regulatory and organizational requirements of the University.

“Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)” ~~means an advisory committee and deliberative body, established to conduct Policy Assessments and deliberate on Policy Instruments as set out in Appendix A, means a sub-committee of the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Integrated Planning (PACIP) that serves as the Deliberative Body for all Administrative Policy Instruments.~~

“Policy Assessment” ~~means a review of a draft Policy Instrument as described in the PAC Terms of Reference (Appendix C),~~

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

“Policy Instrument” means the different tools and documents that are ~~utilized~~used to provide direction in the governance and administration of the University. Policy instruments may have application within a single organizational unit (Local) or across more than one organizational unit (University-wide).

“Policy Library” means ~~the official~~ central repository for the coordination and communication of University-wide Policy Instruments.

“Policy Lead” means the individual(s) responsible for drafting, reviewing, or amending a Policy Instrument.

“**Policy Owner**” means the position responsible for overseeing the implementation, administration and interpretation of a Policy Instrument.

“**Procedure**” means a process, information or step-by-step instructions to implement a policy.

“**University Administrative Council (UAC)**” means a body chaired by the Provost and made up of the Senior Leadership Team (not including the President) and the Senior Academic Team.

“**Senior Leadership Team (SLT)**” means the President and other members of senior management selected to be on SLT by the President.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

3. This policy applies to all University Policy Instruments.
4. The University Secretary is delegated overall responsibility for the administration of the UOIT Policy Framework.
5. The UOIT Policy Library is the official central repository for all University-wide Policy Instruments and Procedures and is overseen and maintained by the University Secretary.

POLICY

The University is committed to developing and maintaining Policy Instruments that contribute to the achievement of its goals and priorities and that provide transparency, clarity and consistency in decision making related to the University’s academic, administrative, legal, compliance and governance requirements.

6. Policy Instruments

- 6.1. There are four main types of Policy Instruments:
- Policies
 - Procedures
 - Directives
 - Guidelines

7. Categories

- 7.1. There are five categories of Policy Instruments:
- **Board** Policy Instruments that relate to the governance and administration of the Board of Governors.
 - **Legal, Compliance and Governance** Policy Instruments that relate to: broader institutional planning and governance issues, management of institutional risk, accountability and legislative requirements, and academic governance matters outside those authorities explicitly delegated by the Board to Academic Council.
 - **Administrative** Policy Instruments that relate to the ongoing management and operations of the University and that have application across more than one organizational unit.
 - **Academic** Policy Instruments that relate to academic governance and administration within the delegated authority to Academic Council from the Board.

- **Local** Policy Instruments that relate solely to the ongoing management, work, and operation of the single organizational unit for which they were developed. Local ~~policy~~ ~~Policy instruments~~ ~~Instruments~~ may be Academic or Administrative in nature.

8. Application

8.1. There are two levels of application of Policy Instruments:

- **University-wide** Policy Instruments that have application across more than one organizational unit.
- **Local** Policy Instruments that have application to only the organizational unit for which they were developed. A Local Policy Instrument will not be considered to solely relate to a single organizational unit where:
 - a) Similar Policy Instruments exist within other organizational units, and/or;
 - b) The Policy Instrument purports to regulate the actions of other members of the University community.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 4 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1.2"

9. Hierarchy

9.1. All Policy Instruments will be subordinate to and interpreted consistent with the UOIT Act and By-laws.

Formatted: Font: Bold

9.2. Policy Instruments at the University will follow a hierarchy. The hierarchy of Policy Instruments is detailed in Appendix A to this Policy as follows:

Formatted: Font: Bold

a) Policies

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

b) Procedures

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

9.1.c) Guidelines / Directives

9.2.9.3. Where two Policy Instruments in the hierarchy conflict, the Policy Instrument higher in the hierarchy takes precedence.

- a) Local Policy Instruments may not contradict University-wide Policy Instruments. University-wide Policy Instruments take precedence where there is a conflict between a University-wide and Local Policy Instrument.
- b) Where there is a conflict between a Policy Instrument and an existing collective agreement between the University and one of its bargaining units, the collective agreement will prevail.

10. Development, Approval and Review

10.1. Policy Instruments will be developed, amended, approved and reviewed in accordance with the Procedures for the Development, Approval and Review of Policy Instruments.

10.2. Policy Instruments will be formatted and presented in a unified and consistent manner.

Formatted: Font: Bold

10.3. University-wide Policy Instruments will be subject to a Policy Assessment as set out in Appendix A before submitting for deliberation or approval.

~~10.2.~~

11. Approval and Administration

- 11.1. All Policy Instruments will have a designated Approval Authority. Approval Authorities are ~~detailed-set out~~ in Appendix ~~B-A~~ to this Policy.
- 11.2. Appendices to Policy Instruments form part of the document and are subject to the same approval, amendment, and review processes.
- 11.3. The Approval Authority for a Policy that is not clearly within a single policy category will be determined collaboratively between the President and the Chair of the Board of Governors, ~~upon the advice of in consultation with~~ the University Secretary ~~as needed~~.
- 11.4. Policy Instruments will be submitted to a designated Deliberative Body prior to submission to the Approval Authority. ~~Some categories of Policy Instruments may have more than one Deliberative Body in order to ensure the desired level of consultation and review prior to approval.~~
- 11.5. All Policy Instruments will have a designated Policy Owner responsible for the administration of the instrument.
- 11.6. ~~Each organizational unit will maintain a Local Administrative Policy Approval Authority Form (Procedures Appendix E) that sets out the designated deliberation and approval path for each type of Local Administrative Policy Instrument. This form is subject to approval as set out in Appendix B.~~
- 11.7. ~~Academic Council will set out deliberation and approval requirements for Local Academic Policy Instruments, consistent with the UOIT Act and By-laws.~~
- 11.8. ~~Local Policy Owners are responsible for reporting the approval of Local Policy Instruments to a reporting body as set out in Appendix B.~~
- ~~11.5. Each y~~

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Hanging: 0.3"

12. Consultation

- 12.1. Consultation throughout the policy development and review cycle is crucial to the effective administration of Policy Instruments and to improve respect for and compliance with the instruments. Consultation on Policy Instruments will:
 - Consider relevant stakeholders;
 - Provide a comprehensive mechanism to gather and consider feedback and options;
 - Demonstrate that stakeholders' views are being considered;
- 12.2. The University Secretariat will develop and maintain mechanisms to update the University community regarding Policy Instruments under development or review and provide a means for gathering feedback.

Formatted: Font: Bold

~~12.2,12.3.~~ Requirements for mandatory consultation are set out in Appendix A.

13. Classification and Publication

- 13.1. Policy Instruments will be organized and maintained according to a classification scheme that is a reflection of the content and application of the instrument.
- 13.2. ~~Policies and Procedures~~ University-wide Policy Instruments will be maintained in an official University Policy Library that is updated on an ongoing basis.

14. Review

14.1. All Policies will undergo a substantive review every three years.

15. Reporting

15.1. The University Secretary will report annually to the Board of Governors and Academic Council on Policies approved and reviewed during the year.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

16. The Policy Framework will be reviewed every three years. The Policy Advisory Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating this Framework and its associated Procedures.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

17. University of Ontario Institute of Technology Act, 2002, SO 2002, c 8, Sch O
By-Law Number 1 of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology, as amended
By-Law Number 2 of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (effective September 1, 2018)

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTS

18. Procedures for the Development, Approval and Review of Policy Instruments
Policy Instrument Checklist-Review and Submission-Planning Form
Policy Instrument Drafting Guidelines (To be developed)
Policy Instrument Templates ~~(To be developed)~~
Policy Development and Review Cycle
Policy Instrument Review and Evaluation Guidelines (To be developed)



Classification	LCG 1100.01
Framework Category	Legal, Compliance and Governance
Parent Policy	UOIT Policy Framework
Approval Authority	Board of Governors
Policy Owner	University Secretary
Approval Date	November 28, 2014 DRAFT FOR REVIEW
Review Date	November 2017
Supersedes	N/A

PROCEDURES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, APPROVAL AND REVIEW OF POLICY INSTRUMENTS

PURPOSE

1. These procedures are intended to ensure clarity and consistency in the administration of policy instruments across the University.

DEFINITIONS

2. For the purposes of these procedures the following definitions apply:

“Approval Authority” means a body or position that has authority to approve, amend, review and revoke a Policy Instrument.

“Deliberative Body” means a University body or committee responsible for discussion and consideration ~~and that~~ provides recommendations for Policy Instruments prior to submission for approval.

“~~Minor Editorial Amendment~~” means an amendment that is essentially editorial in nature or does not change the purpose, scope or substantive content of the Policy Instrument. An editorial amendment may clarify language, correct typos, update contact information or titles to reflect current organizational structure, or modify the formatting of a Policy Instrument.

“~~Major Amendment~~” means an amendment that substantially change the purpose, scope or content of the Policy Instrument.

“~~Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)~~” means an advisory committee and deliberative body, established to conduct Policy Assessments and deliberate on Policy Instruments as set out in Appendix A of the Policy Framework.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

“~~Policy Assessment~~” means a review of a draft Policy Instrument as described in the PAC Terms of Reference (Appendix C of the Policy Framework).“

“~~Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)~~” means a sub-committee of the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Integrated Planning (PACIP) that serves as the Deliberative Body for all Administrative Policy Instruments.

“Policy Category” means one of the defining categories of Policy Instruments as set out in the UOIT Policy Framework, as amended.

“Policy Framework” means the UOIT Policy Framework, as amended, which is the enacting Policy for these procedures.

Formatted: Left

“Policy Instrument” means the different tools and documents that are ~~utilized~~used to provide direction in the governance and administration of the University. Policy instruments may have application within a single organizational unit (Local) or across more than one organizational unit (University-wide).

“Policy Lead” means the individual(s) responsible for drafting, reviewing, or amending a Policy Instrument and for facilitating consultation throughout the development and approval process.

“Policy Owner” means the position responsible for overseeing the implementation, administration and interpretation of a Policy Instrument.

“Policy Sponsor” means the Vice-President or delegate who oversees the organizational unit proposing a new Policy Instrument.

“Substantive Amendment” means an amendment other than an Editorial Amendment. It changes the purpose, scope or substantive content of the Policy Instrument. An amendment may be minor in scope but still substantive in nature if it affects stakeholder groups (including students), reassigns organizational authority, or changes existing processes or responsibilities.

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

3. These procedures apply to the development, approval and review of all University Policy Instruments.
4. The University Secretary is responsible for strategic oversight and overall administration of the UOIT Policy Framework and its associated Procedures and for ensuring the Framework meets University compliance obligations and is aligned with the strategic goals of the University.
5. The University Secretary will assign a delegate who is responsible for supporting the administration of the UOIT Policy Framework and its associated Procedures. This position is responsible for:
 - Coordinating the development, approval, amendment, publication and review of ~~policies and procedures~~Policy Instruments in accordance with the UOIT Policy Framework and these Procedures;
 - Providing advice on amendments to existing ~~Policies and Procedures~~Policy Instruments to the Policy Owners for incorporation in subsequent updates;
 - Providing advice and guidance to policy developers and other staff across the University on ~~policy~~Policy Instrument development, consultation, communication, implementation and review processes;
 - Developing resources that support ~~policy~~Policy Instrument development, evaluation and review;
 - Ensuring that final drafts of new or amended ~~Policies and Procedures~~Policy Instruments are compliant with the UOIT Policy Framework;
 - Publishing and maintaining approved ~~Policies and Procedures~~Policy Instruments in the Policy Library;
 - Managing and coordinating a ~~policy~~Policy Instrument review schedule.

- Preparing an annual report on the development, amendment, revocation and review of University Policy Instruments.
6. The Policy Owner is responsible for overseeing the administration of Policy Instruments under his/her jurisdiction in accordance with the Policy Framework and these Procedures. For any given Policy Instrument, the Policy Owner may assign a Policy Lead to carry out the following responsibilities :
- Developing, preparing amendments to and consulting on Policy Instruments;
 - Facilitating and evaluating the communication and implementation of Policy Instruments;
 - Monitoring adoption and compliance with Policy Instruments that have been implemented;
 - Conducting a review of existing Policy Instruments according to established procedures.

PROCEDURES

7. Identifying Policy Needs

- 7.1. A policy need will arise from identifying:
- Gaps where no Policy Instrument currently exists and where development of an instrument is the appropriate mechanism for addressing the issue;
 - Amendments that are required to existing Policy Instruments for compliance or administrative reasons.
 - Where an existing Policy Instrument should be revoked.
- 7.2. The development of new Policy Instruments requires the approval of a Policy Sponsor.
- 7.3. The amendment or proposed revocation of an existing Policy Instrument requires the approval of the Policy Owner.
- 7.4. The Policy Sponsor or Policy Owner will consult with the University Secretary delegate prior to beginning the development, amendment or revocation of a Policy Instrument.
- 7.5. The University Secretary delegate will advise on the need for a Policy Instrument, the appropriate type of instrument, as well as provide guidance on the processes under the Policy Framework.
- 7.6. The Policy Sponsor or Policy Owner will assign an individual who will act as the Policy Lead.

8. Preliminary Stakeholder Consultation

- 8.1. The Policy Lead will identify key policy stakeholders paying particular attention to faculty, staff and students, and will conduct preliminary consultations with those key policy stakeholders. When applicable, the Policy Lead will give particular consideration to the policies of any and all strategic institutional partners with whom the University shares academic or administrative operations that may overlap or otherwise affect the proposed policy (e.g. Durham College).
- 8.2. Preliminary consultation should include the gathering of feedback on:
- Content of the Policy Instrument;

- Operational practicality;
- Potential impact and resources required for implementation and compliance;
- Planning and requirements for successful communication and implementation.

8.3. Information on preliminary consultations will be provided when instruments are submitted for deliberation and approval.

Formatted: Font: Bold

8.3.8.4. The Policy Advisory Committee is available as a resource to Policy Leads in the early stages of a policy project to aid in identifying stakeholders, consider consultation and implementation planning, and provide recommendations on whether a policy need can be achieved by modifying or clarifying existing Policy Instruments.

9. Drafting

- 9.1. The Policy Lead is responsible for the drafting of all Policy Instruments.
- 9.2. All Policy Instruments will be accompanied by a completed Policy Instrument ~~Checklist Review and Submission-Planning Form.~~
- 9.3. Policy Instruments will be prepared using the official University templates (Appendix D).
- 9.4. Sections of the templates may not be added or removed. Where a section is not required, the wording “This section intentionally left blank” will be used.
- 9.5. The Policy Lead will ensure Policy Instruments are coherent and are consistent with existing legislation, ~~Policies and Procedure~~ and Policy Instruments.
- 9.6. Where a Policy is being drafted or amended, any Procedures, Directives, Guidelines or other associated documents (e.g. templates, schedules) will also be drafted or amended at the same time in order to ensure consistency and compliance with the Policy.

10. Consultation on Drafts

- 10.1. The Policy Lead will facilitate broader consultation on draft Policy Instruments with key policy stakeholders.
- 10.2. Consultation will be done in all cases except where amendments to an existing Policy Instrument are essentially editorial in nature.
- 10.3. The Policy Lead will incorporate feedback, as appropriate, and advise the policy stakeholders of action taken related to the feedback provided.
- 10.4. When Policy Instruments are submitted for deliberation and approval they will specify:
 - The key stakeholders who were consulted with;
 - The mechanism used to gather feedback and opinions;
 - A description of how stakeholders’ views were incorporated into the draft of the instrument;
 - If consultation was not done an explanation of why it was not necessary.

11. Mandatory Consultation and Assessment

11.1. Before submitting a Policy Instrument for deliberation, mandatory consultation steps and a Policy Assessment must be completed, as set out in Appendix A of the Policy Framework.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Bold

11.2. Draft Policy Instruments will be shared with the University community on the University Secretariat’s website to solicit feedback.

Formatted: Font: Bold

11.3. Policy Instruments submitted to a committee or governing body for mandatory consultation or Policy Assessment will be accompanied by a document satisfying the requirements of section 10.4. Submissions will be made to the University Secretary delegate, who will ensure compliance with the Policy Framework before it is shared.

Formatted: Font: Bold

11.4. The required format of consultation is set out in Appendix A of the Policy Framework.

Formatted: Font: Bold

11.12. Deliberation

11.1.12.1. In order to ensure compliance with the Policy Framework, the Policy Lead will submit copies of all draft documents to the University Secretary delegate before submission to any Deliberative Body or Approval Authority.

11.2.12.2. Drafts and amendments of Policy Instruments will be submitted to a respective Deliberative Body for review prior to being submitted to the Approval Authority.

12.3. The Deliberative Body is based on the Policy Category of the Policy Instrument, as set out in Appendix B-A of the UOIT Policy Framework.

Formatted: Font: Bold

12.4. The Deliberative Body will provide feedback and recommendations on a draft. The Deliberative Body may recommend;

Formatted: Font: Bold

a) Approval of the Policy Instrument;

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.85"

b) Approval of the Policy Instrument with recommended changes; or

11.3.c) Further consultation and/or changes, followed by further deliberation.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

12.13. Approval

12.1.13.1. Once feedback and recommendations on draft Policy Instruments are provided by the Deliberative Body, the instruments will be forwarded to the appropriate Approval Authority along with the recommendations of the Deliberative Body.

12.2.13.2. Approval Authorities are set out in Appendix B-A of the UOIT Policy Framework.

12.3.13.3. Appendices to Policy Instruments form part of the instrument and are subject to the same approval, amendment, consultation and review processes as the instrument they are a part of.

13.14. Approved Policy Instruments

13.1.14.1. When approved, Policy Instruments will receive a final review by the University Secretariat prior to communication and implementation.

13.2.14.2. Within two weeks of the approval of a Policy Instrument by the Approval Authority the University Secretary delegate will:

- Notify the Policy Sponsor and Policy Owner of when the approved Policy Instrument is ready for publication;
- Provide a final draft of the Policy Instrument to the Policy Sponsor and Policy Owner including classification number, approval date and mandatory review date;
- Publish copies of the Policy Instrument to the Policy Library.

- Report on approved Policy Instruments to other Deliberative Bodies and Approval Authorities.

14-15. Implementation

14.1-15.1. Once notified by the University Secretary delegate that a Policy Instrument is ready for publication, the Policy Owner is responsible for ensuring information is communicated to policy stakeholders according to the communication and implementation plan.

14.2-15.2. The Policy Owner will evaluate the implementation of the Policy Instrument and report on the implementation to the Approval Authority within one year of implementation.

15-16. Review

15.1-16.1. Policy Instruments will be reviewed at least once every three years. Such reviews will include a review of the Policy Instrument text as well as an assessment of compliance with the practices governed by the text.

15.2-16.2. Where a Policy has specific legislative requirements for reporting it will be reviewed against the stated compliance needs.

15.3-16.3. Where a Policy has Procedures, Guidelines and Directives associated with it, they will be reviewed at the same time as the parent Policy.

15.4-16.4. The University Secretariat will provide tools and templates to facilitate documentation for Policy Instrument review.

15.5-16.5. Amendments to Policy Instruments may be done at any time prior to the stated review date.

- a) Where a Policy Instrument is amended prior to the stated review date, the review will still take place according to the original stated date.
- b) Informal reviews of existing Policy Instruments may be done at any time but will not replace a formal scheduled review.
- c) Where significant concerns related to the content, consistency or compliance with a Policy Instrument exist, a formal review may be undertaken prior to the stated date.
- d) Where it is determined that a Local Policy Instrument conflicts with a University Policy Instrument, the Local Policy Instrument will be reviewed and amended to align with University Policy.

15.6-16.6. Reviews of Policy Instruments will take into consideration:

- The extent to which Policy objectives are being achieved;
- An assessment of the adoption and use of the Policy Instrument;
- Whether the Policy Instrument complies and remains consistent with University strategic goals as well as existing legislation, Policies and Procedures and Policy Instruments;
- Any deleterious impacts resulting from the Policy Instrument; and

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Outline numbered + Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.85"

- Whether updates to format or classification are required.

~~15.7.16.7.~~ Review of Policy Instruments will result in recommendations for one or more of the following outcomes:

- No amendment;
- ~~Minor-Editorial~~ amendment;
- ~~Major-Substantive~~ Amendment;
- Revocation;
- Development of new or additional supporting Policy Instruments;
- Additional communication and education of policy stakeholders.

~~15.8.16.8.~~ Upon completion of the review the review outcomes will be reported to the designated Approval Authority.

~~16.9.~~ Further development or amendment of Policy Instruments as a result of review outcomes will be done in accordance with the Policy Framework and these Procedures.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted

17. Amendment

~~17.1.~~ Policy Instruments requiring amendments will be submitted to the University Secretary delegate with a Policy Instrument Review and Planning Form for review and a determination if the amendment is an Editorial Amendment or Substantive Amendment.

Formatted: Font: Bold

~~17.2.~~ Amendments are subject to the deliberation and approval path set out in Appendix A of the Policy Framework.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Hanging: 0.3"

Formatted: Font: Bold

~~15.9.~~

MONITORING AND REVIEW

~~16.18.~~ These Procedures will be reviewed every three years. The Policy Advisory Committee is responsible for reviewing and evaluating these Procedures.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

~~17.19.~~ [University of Ontario Institute of Technology Act, 2002, SO 2002, c 8, Sch O](#)

[By-Law Number 1 of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology, as amended](#)

[By-Law Number 2 of the University of Ontario Institute of Technology \(effective September 1, 2018\)](#)

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTS

~~18.20.~~ UOIT Policy Framework

Policy Instrument ~~Checklist-Review~~ and ~~Submission-Planning~~ Form

Policy Instrument Drafting Guidelines (To be developed)

Policy Instrument Templates (~~To be developed~~)

Policy Development and Review Cycle

Policy Instrument Review and Evaluation Guidelines (To be developed)

DRAFT

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL – MAY 17, 2018
Appendix A – UOIT Policy Framework

APPENDIX A – GUIDE TO APPROVAL PATH AND MANDATORY CONSULTATION STEPS

Category/Type	Policy Advisory Committee	Vice-President (or Policy Sponsor)	University Administrative Council	University Community	Academic Council	Academic Council Committees	President	Board Committee	Board of Governors
BRD Policy				MC2				D	A
BRD Procedure				MC2				D / A	
BRD Guideline				MC2				D / A	
BRD Directive				MC2				D / A	
LCG Policy	PA	*	MC1	MC2		MC1	MC2	D	A
LCG Procedure	PA	*	D	MC2		MC1	MC2	A	
LCG Directive	PA	*	D	MC2		MC2	A		
LCG Guideline	PA	*	D	MC2		MC2	A		
ADM Policy	PA	*	D	MC2		MC2	A		
ADM Procedure	D	*	A	MC2		MC2			
ADM Directive	D	A		MC2		MC2			
ADM Guideline	D	A		MC2		MC2			
ACD Policy		*	MC2	MC2	D	A			
ACD Procedure		*	MC2	MC2	D	A			
ACD Directive		*	MC2	MC2	D	A			
ACD Guideline		*	MC2	MC2	D	A			
Local ADM Approval Authority Form		A							
Local ACD Policy Instruments						A ¹			

Policy Instrument Categories: BRD – Board; LCG – Legal, Compliance and Governance; ADM – Administrative; ACD – Academic

PA – Policy Assessment D – Deliberation A – Approval * – Approval of editorial amendments

MC – Mandatory Consultation: MC1 – Face to Face MC2 – Written²

¹ As set out by Academic Council

² Written Consultation means posting a draft policy instrument on USGC website for community comments. Policy Lead may optionally consult face to face.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL – MAY 17, 2018

UOIT POLICY FRAMEWORK APPENDIX B – DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY CHART

	Individuals									Administrative Bodies		Academic Council			Board of Governors		
	Policy Office	University Secretary	Policy Lead	Policy Owner	Policy Sponsor	Manager	Director	AVP/Dean	VP	President	PAC	UAC	Faculty Council	AC Committees	Academic Council	Board Committee	Board

Policy Project Initiation, Drafting and Consultation

Policy Sponsor (approve projects to fill university-wide policy gaps)									X	X							
Policy Owner (identify policy gaps, assign Policy Leads)								X	X	X							
Policy Owner (Local Administrative Policies)						X	X	X									
Policy Owner (Local Academic Policy Instruments)								X									
Policy Lead (identify stakeholders, determine schedule and method of consultation and develop plan, benchmark, draft PI, submit for consultation, incorporate and/or respond to comments)			X														
Policy Lead (submit draft to Policy Office for deliberation with a report on consultation to the deliberative body)			X														
Provide general training and advice on framework processes, advise on consultation planning, manage consultation website & schedule	X																
Classify PI, determine if amendments are editorial or substantive, report on PI reviews and approvals to Board and Academic Council. ¹		X															
Determine Policy Owner and Sponsor. Resolve questions about the approval authority for a PI where it is unclear										X ²							
Required consultation for research, service & institutional policies ³															X		

¹ includes reporting on Local Policies submitted by Local Policy Owners
² In collaboration with the Board Chair under the advice of the University Secretary
³ Research-related PI should undergo consultation with Research Board and all applicable research ethics or compliance committees

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL – MAY 17, 2018

Individuals									Administrative Bodies		Academic Council			Board of Governors		
Policy Office	University Secretary	Policy Lead	Policy Owner	Policy Sponsor	Manager	Director	AVP/Dean	VP	President	PAC	UAC	Faculty Council	AC Committees	Academic Council	Board Committee	Board

Policy Assessment

Submit to Policy Office for Policy Assessment			X													
Policy Assessment of Legal, Compliance and Governance and Administrative PI										X						
Policy Assessment of Academic PI													X ⁴			
Policy Assessment of Board PI		X														
Amend Policy Advisory Committee terms of reference																X

Deliberation

Determine if Mandatory Consultation & Policy Assessment are complete. Review formatting of PI. Submit for deliberation	X															
Report on deliberations to approval authority			X													

Approvals (New or Substantive Amendments)

Submit PI for approval	X															
Training and communications to support implementation of PI. Assess adoption and compliance with new PI and report to the Approval Authority after one year of implementation			X	X	X											

Approvals (Editorial)

Approve editorial amendments to all PI Categories (except Local)					X											
Report editorial amendments to Approval Authority			X	X	X											

Policy Library

Notify Policy Office of new PI or amendment approvals			X	X												
Maintain official copy of university-wide PI & record of approvals & amendments. Review formatting of PI.	X															

⁴ Recommend that a committee of Academic Council fill this role

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL – MAY 17, 2018

	Individuals									Administrative Bodies		Academic Council			Board of Governors		
	Policy Office	University Secretary	Policy Lead	Policy Owner	Policy Sponsor	Manager	Director	AVP/Dean	VP	President	PAC	UAC	Faculty Council	AC Committees	Academic Council	Board Committee	Board
Determine related Policies, Procedures and Documents. Post to Policy Library																	
Policy Review																	
Determine Policy Review priorities and initiate a Policy Review ⁵																X	
Determine outcome of Policy Review ⁶										X					X		X
Maintain University-Wide Policy Review Schedule	X																
Approvals (New or Substantive Amendments)																	
Approve new BRD Policy or substantive amendment																	X
Approve new BRD Procedure or substantive amendment																X	
Approve new BRD Guidelines/ Directives or substantive amendment																X	
Approve new LCG Policy or substantive amendment																	X
Approve new LCG Procedure or substantive amendment																X	
Approve new LCG Guidelines/ Directives or substantive amendment										X							
Approve new ACD Policy or substantive amendment														X			
Approve new ACD Procedure or substantive amendment														X			
Approve new ACD Guidelines/ Directives or substantive amendment														X			
Approve new ADM Policy or substantive amendment										X							
Approve new ADM Procedure or substantive amendment												X					
Approve new ADM Guidelines/ Directives or substantive amendment									X								

⁵ Policy Reviews can be initiated by the policy sponsor, owner or approval authority of a Policy

⁶ Review outcome is determined by the approval authority of the Policy under review, with the recommendation of the Policy Sponsor or Owner

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL – MAY 17, 2018

	Policy Office	University Secretary	Policy Lead	Policy Owner	Policy Sponsor	Manager	Director	AVP/Dean	VP	President	PAC	UAC	Faculty Council	AC Committees	Academic Council	Board Committee	Board
Approvals (Local Administrative Policy)																	
Approve new Local Administrative Policy or amendment and report to reporting body for Local Administrative PI							X	X	X								
Approve Local Administrative Approval authority form									X								
Maintain the official copy and a record of approvals & amendments of Local Administrative PI over time	X																
Reporting body for Local Administrative PI											X						
Approvals (Academic Local Policy)																	
Set out approval and deliberation path for Local Academic PI															X		
Approve editorial amendments to Local Academic PI and report to Faculty Council and reporting body for Local Academic PI								X									
Maintain the official copy and a record of approvals & amendments of Local Academic PI over time	X																
Reporting body for Local Academic PI														X ⁷			

⁷ Reporting body is the applicable committee of Academic Council based on their terms of reference.



Item Classification	5.12 LCG 1100 (Appendix C)
Parent Policy	UOIT Policy Framework
Approval Authority	Board of Governors
Policy Owner	University Secretary
Approval Date	November 28, 2014 DRAFT FOR APPROVAL
Review Date	November 2017
Supersedes	

APPENDIX C – POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. Purpose

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) is ~~a subcommittee of the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Integrated Planning (PACIP). The PAC~~ an advisory committee and Deliberative Body that provides recommendations to ~~both PACIP~~ other Deliberative Bodies, Approval Authorities, Policy Sponsors and Policy Owners who have brought forward ~~Policies for approval~~ Policy Instruments under development.

~~It is expected that broader consultation on the development and drafting of policies~~ Policy Instruments has occurred prior to a ~~a~~ Policy Instrument reaching the PAC. The purpose of the ~~€~~Committee is not to act in place of appropriate consultative processes in the development of ~~p~~ Policies y Instruments.

2. Terms of Reference

~~The Committee shall review all policies under development, amendment or review that are related to the ongoing management and administration of University operation and services, in order to:~~

~~a) – Administrative Policies~~

~~The PAC has an advisory role in the development, amendment and review of Administrative Policy, but not a decision-making role. The Committee will conduct an assessment of Policy Instruments and act as a Deliberative Body as set out in Appendix A of the UOIT Policy Framework. When PAC deliberates on a Policy Instrument, the committee should also conduct a Policy Assessment of the instrument, if it has not previously done so.~~

~~It is expected that broader consultation on the development and drafting of policies has occurred prior to a policy reaching the PAC. The purpose of the committee is not to act in place of appropriate consultative processes in the development of policies.~~

~~a) Optional Early Consultation~~

~~The PAC will have~~ Committee can provide a consultation in the following responsibilities related ~~early stages of a policy project to Administrative Policies:~~

- ~~i. — Review and aid in identifying stakeholders, consider all Administrative Policy submissions prior to submission to PACIP.~~

~~Make~~ consultation and implementation planning, and provide recommendations on whether a ~~policy~~ need can be achieved by modifying or clarifying existing Policy Instruments.

b) Policy Assessment

When conducting a Policy Assessment, the Committee will:

- ii.i. ~~Assess whether and what type of new policy~~ Policy Instrument is needed or whether the ~~purpose~~ policy need can be achieved by modifying or clarifying existing ~~policies and procedures~~ Policy Instruments.
- ii.ii. Ensure that ~~policies~~ Policy Instruments are aligned as far as possible with operational practicalities and that potential operational gaps are identified.
- iv.iii. Assess the ~~policy~~ Policy Instrument for consistency or conflict with legislation, the Policy Framework and Procedures, as well as other existing ~~policies and procedures~~ Policy Instruments, regulations and collective agreements. —When applicable, the Committee will give particular consideration to the policies of any and all strategic institutional partners with whom the University shares academic or administrative operations that may overlap or otherwise affect the proposed ~~policy~~ Policy Instruments (e.g. Durham College).
- v.iv. Determine coherence and consistency with the established ~~policy~~ template and format.
- vi.v. Review the process and extent of consultation and advise the Policy Sponsor or Policy Owner on areas where additional consultation may be needed.
- vii.vi. Provide advice and guidance to the Policy Sponsor or Policy Owner on issues related to implementation and communication.
- viii.vii. Provide feedback ~~to PACIP~~ regarding the implications of proposed policies, including impact on students, faculty and staff, as well as potential risks, costs and operational requirements, and make recommendations ~~to PACIP~~ regarding possible areas for consideration or change.

b) — Legal, Compliance and Governance Policies

~~The PAC has a role in the communication of Legal, Compliance and Governance Policies. The PAC will have the following responsibilities related to Legal, Compliance and Governance Policies:~~

- ~~i. — Receive for information the Policies approved by the Board of Governors.~~
- ~~ii. — Serve in an advisory capacity where requested by the Deliberative Bodies for these Policies.~~
- ~~iii. — Provide feedback to the Deliberative Bodies, as required, regarding the implications of proposed policies, including potential risks, costs and operational requirements and make recommendations regarding possible areas for consideration or change.~~

c) Deliberation

When acting as a Deliberative Body, the Committee is responsible for discussion and consideration and provides recommendations for Policy Instruments prior to submission for approval. Committee members should consider the elements of a Policy Assessment when deliberating on a Policy Instrument.

d) Policy Priorities and Planning

The Committee will discuss and consider policy gaps and policy needs at the University to provide recommendations to and advise the University Administrative Council on priorities for policy

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

development and review. This includes receiving for information and discussion approved Local Policy Instruments. Local Administrative Policy Instruments will be considered in the planning and development of university-wide Policy Instruments.

3. Responsibilities

- a) The PAC Committee will be responsible ~~to undertake for the~~ periodic review of the UOIT Policy Framework and its associated Procedures and for making recommendations to improve the effectiveness and implementation of the Framework.
- b) Representatives to the PAC Committee will be responsible for disseminating information and updates regarding Administrative and Legal, Compliance and Governance Policies to their respective areas.

4. Membership

- University Secretary, or delegate (Chair)
- Policy ~~Analyst~~ and Compliance ~~Officer~~ Advisor (Secretary to the Committee)

One representative from each of the following Administrative areas:

- Provost
- Academic Affairs
- External Relations
- Research and International
- Finance
- Human Resources
- Office of Campus Infrastructure and Sustainability (OCIS)
- Student Life
- Graduate Studies
- Faculty Planning and Budget Officers Group
- ~~Teaching Staff (selected by the Provost after consultation with PACIP)~~
- Registrar
- IT Services

- Two representatives from the Teaching Staff with direct knowledge and interest in University policies and policy development. Teaching Staff Representatives will be selected by the Provost after consultation with Academic Council.

Formatted: Underline

Formatted: Underline

Administrative Representatives are appointed by the Vice-President or delegate for each organizational area. ~~Representatives are~~ Each representative is expected to be a person within each area who has either direct knowledge or responsibility for the administration and application of policy for their respective unit (i.e. a senior administrative staff member).



Classification Number	
Framework Category	
Approving Authority	
Policy Owner	
Approval Date	
Review Date	
Supersedes	

POLICY TITLE

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of this Policy is to

DEFINITIONS

2. For the purposes of this Policy the following definitions apply: [definitions listed in alphabetical order, and defined terms are capitalized throughout the document]

“A term” means

“B term” means

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

3. This Policy applies to
4. The [insert position title], or successor thereof, is the Policy Owner and is responsible for overseeing the implementation, administration and interpretation of this Policy.

POLICY

[Insert general Policy Statement]

5. Policy Sub-Heading

- 5.1. Statement or broad principle under the policy sub-heading.

- a) Use lower case letters for lists, examples, conditions or exceptions

6. Policy Sub-Heading

- 6.1.

7. Policy Sub-Heading

- 7.1.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

8. This Policy will be reviewed as necessary and at least every three years (unless another timeframe is required for compliance purposes). The [insert position/committee], or successor thereof, is responsible to monitor and review this Policy.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

9. Legislation 1

Legislation 2

Legislation 3

If no associated legislation use the text “This section intentionally left blank”.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTS

10. Associated Document 1

Associated Document 2

Associated Document 3



Classification Number	
Parent Policy	
Framework Category	
Approving Authority	
Policy Owner	
Approval Date	
Review Date	
Supersedes	

PROCEDURE TITLE

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of these Procedures is to

DEFINITIONS

2. For the purposes of these Procedures the following definitions apply: [definitions listed in alphabetical order, and defined terms are capitalized throughout the document]

“A term” means

“B term” means

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

3. These Procedures apply to
4. The [insert position title], or successor thereof, is the Policy Owner and is responsible for overseeing the implementation, administration and interpretation of these Procedures.

PROCEDURES

5. **Procedure Sub-Heading**
 - 5.1. General direction or instruction under the Procedure sub-heading.
 - a) Use letters for procedural steps
6. **Procedure Sub-Heading**
 - 6.1.
7. **Procedure Sub-Heading**
 - 7.1.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

8. These Procedures will be reviewed as necessary and at least every three years (unless another timeframe is required for compliance purposes). The [insert position/committee], or successor thereof, is responsible to monitor and review these Procedures.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

9. Legislation 1

Legislation 2

Legislation 3

If no associated legislation use the text "This section intentionally left blank".

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTS

10. Associated Document 1

Associated Document 2

Associated Document 3



Classification Number	<i>To be assigned by Policy Office</i>
Parent Policy	
Framework Category	
Approving Authority	
Policy Owner	
Approval Date	
Review Date	
Supersedes	

[GUIDELINES/DIRECTIVES] TITLE

PURPOSE

1. The purpose of these [Guidelines/Directives] is to

DEFINITIONS

2. For the purposes of these [Guidelines/Directives] the following definitions apply: **definitions should be listed in alphabetical order, and defined terms must be capitalized throughout the document]**

“A term” means

“B term” means

SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

3. These [Guidelines/Directives] apply to
4. The [insert position title], or successor thereof, is responsible for overseeing the implementation, administration and interpretation of these [Guidelines/Directives].

[GUIDELINES/DIRECTIVES]

5. **Sub-Heading**
 - 5.1. General direction or instruction under the sub-heading.
 - a) Use letters to denote specific steps
6. **Sub-Heading**
 - 6.1.
7. **Sub-Heading**
 - 7.1.

MONITORING AND REVIEW

8. These [Guidelines/Directives] will be reviewed as necessary and at least every three years **(unless another timeframe is required for compliance purposes)**. The [insert

position/committee], or successor thereof, is responsible to monitor and review these [Guidelines/Directive].

RELEVANT LEGISLATION

9. Legislation 1

Legislation 2

Legislation 3

If no associated legislation use the text “This section intentionally left blank”.

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES & DOCUMENTS

10. Associated Document 1

Associated Document 2

Associated Document 3

Appendix E – Procedures for the Development, Approval and Review of Policy Instruments

APPENDIX E – LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY APPROVAL AUTHORITY FORM**Local Administrative Approval Authorities**

Organizational Unit:	
Date:	
Approved by:	
Approval date:	

Category/Type	Deliberative Body	Approval Authority
Local ACD Policy		
Local ACD Procedure		
Local ACD Directive		
Local ACD Guideline		

Local Administrative approval authorities are subject to approval by the Vice-President responsible for the organizational area. Positions eligible to be assigned as approval authorities are set out in the Delegation of Authority Chart, Appendix B to the UOIT Policy Framework.