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MINUTES
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, March 15, 2016, 3:10 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
The Council Chamber, Room 202, Galbraith Building

The Dean and Vice-Principal, Graduate Research and Education (Graduate Education Council Chair, Professor Locke Rowe) called the meeting to order. He welcomed all members and visitors, and gave a special thank you to all members for their participation on Council throughout the year.

Approval of the Agenda of the Graduate Education Meeting of March 15, 2016

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the agenda of the Graduate Education Council meeting of March 15, 2016 be approved.

The motion was CARRIED.

1 For Approval: Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of November 17, 2015

The minutes of the November 17, 2015 meeting were distributed with the agenda. Professor Elizabeth (Liz) Smyth presents the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the minutes of the Graduate Education Council meeting of November 17, 2015 be approved.

The motion was CARRIED.

2 Business Arising from the Minutes

The Dean addressed an item arising from the minutes of the November 17, 2015 meeting regarding conference grants for students. The Dean noted that student members submitted a survey and requested at the GEC (November 2015) to increase the number of conferences travel bursaries a doctoral student may receive from one to two. In response, the Dean advised GEC that the funds for conference grants no longer exists, as it was leftover NSERC funding. However, SGS is thinking about if these conference grants should be overseen and provided by the graduate units, as SGS is not the best place to be making the decisions about who should receive them. The Dean further noted that UTM and UTSC have programs for additional conference funds, and that SGS will be discussing the matter with the Graduate Deans in the future. A faculty member asked how it would be ensured that students has access to the funding. The Dean responded that one option is to give the conference funding decisions to the Deans and Faculties, as they will have a better sense of how to handle things. A faculty
member noted that conference grants had just been discussed in the Faculty of Dentistry, and equity was based on the assumption that all students could still apply to SGS for funding separately. A faculty member noted that not all departments have equal funding capabilities to provide conference grants. The Dean replied that SGS will collect data across the campuses and then ask the question of how to handle things in a different way, with a transparent discussion between divisions and faculties.

3 Report of the Vice-Provost, Graduate Research and Education

3.1 Vivek Goel Faculty Citizenship Award
The Dean announced that the Vice-Dean, Elizabeth Smyth, recently won the Vivek Goel Faculty Citizenship Award for her lengthy and extraordinary contributions to the University, and invited the GEC to join him in wishing her congratulations.

3.2 SGS Building Renovations
The Dean provided an update on the renovations at 63 St. George. The project required further approvals, resulting in a delay, with the project completion time being moved to Fall 2016. 65 St. George will also receive upgrades, although there will be less work with a small disruption for a couple months.

3.3 Mental Health Initiatives
The Dean advised the GEC on a number of mental health initiatives at SGS done in collaboration with Student Life and the GSU. The Conflict Resolution Centre (CRC) is now open and offers peer-to-peer support for students, and the embedded counsellor at SGS who will be moving from 3 to 5 days per week. The embedded counsellor is also modifying some mental health workshops for graduate students and offering them at SGS. The Dean advised that SGS will be continuing to support student led workshops in the graduate units to help normalize issues students are facing and offer pathways to resolve mental health issues. The Dean advised that moving forward SGS will be doing workshops with faculty members as well. The Dean noted that all of these initiatives have been done in collaborate with the GSU, and welcomes any feedback.

3.4 Graduate Professional Development
The Dean noted that the Graduate Professional Development (GPD) program at SGS has seen an increased growth and diversity of its Graduate Professional Skills (GPS) offerings. The Dean advised the GEC on a new ‘10,000 PhDs’ project that aims to track the last 10,000 doctoral graduates and provide the data gathered to the graduate units. SGS is hopeful this information will help inform graduate programs. The Dean noted that his own department, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, has done a similar project and found the data very useful. The Dean noted the project will also provide the graduate units with a list of alumni that they can engage with. A faculty member asked how many years the project cover. The Dean replied approximately 10 years, with 1000 graduates a year. A faculty member asked how the graduate units can get involved with the project. The Dean replied that SGS will take the first pass on the project, and then go to the graduate units for help. This is to ensure the same methodology is used across different graduate units. A faculty member asked if the alumni will be contacted for advancement purposes. The Dean replied that generally recent graduates in the 5 - 7 year range are not good targets for advancement. A student member noted there is a similar
project called ‘Trace’ that is tracking graduates across Canada. The Dean replied that SGS is aware of it, but prefers to use its own methodology. A faculty member asked if the data can be integrated into other databases so it is not lost. The Dean replied that the hope is for graduate units to carry on the project. A faculty member asked if the professional doctoral Music (DMA) degree can be included. The Dean replied that it can. A student member asked what types of data will be collected. The Dean replied that simple information such as year graduated, current job, sector, and an active email address. The Dean noted that the criteria were set up in consultation with the Conference Board of Canada. A student member asked if this is a privacy issue. The Dean replied that the information gathered will be publicly available. A student member asked if incomplete PhDs will be included. The Dean replied that they will not. The Dean also advised the GEC that SGS is getting more involved with internships and experiential learning opportunities for students.

3.5 Internationalization
The Dean advised GEC that the President’s Office is working on an internationalization strategy. As part of this focus, SGS is looking at its current services and practices for graduate students, and comparing itself against other international universities to see where overlap is, and what areas may be missing. The Dean advised that SGS has ongoing consultations, and recently organized international student focus groups to receive feedback on ideas. The Dean noted often international students are learning about services from each other and not from the source, so SGS is building a central web portal to share all international student services in one place, and developing an international student newsletter similar to the digest in collaboration with the GSU. The Dean advised that SGS is also reviewing the International Visiting Graduate Student (IVGS) program, and is aware that people do no register due to the fees. The Dean advised there is a risk with this, and that SGS is looking to remove the obstacles in the program, such as lowering its fees, to attract more students and prevent unregistered visiting students.

3.6 Time to Completion (TTC) and Graduation Rates
The Dean advised that TTC was discussed at the last GEC, and since then SGS has developed a better understanding of the issues. SGS is building a strategy to address TTC, involving the UTOPP process so that program reviews will ask about TTC and efforts being made to improve it. The Dean advised that SGS is also working on revising the Supervision Guidelines, and to developing best practices which will be shared with the graduate community after further consultations. The Dean advised that SGS is looking to incentivize innovative projects that assist with TTC, is offering resources for projects, and is open to any ideas, projects, or workshops the community may have.

3.7 Graduate Funding and Transparency
The Dean advised that since the last GEC, SGS has published program funding data actuals on the SGS website, and completion rate data will soon be added as well. SGS is will soon be adding base funding information to the website, and is currently developing best practices for funding information. This includes language in admissions letters, funding letters and website language. SGS will be producing templates to encourage consistency. The Dean clarified the pathway of data requests from the graduate units, specifically that they may send requests to Laura Stathopoulos, Associate Director, Graduate Awards and Financial Aid. The Dean advised that Vice-Dean Luc De Nil produced a report with a set of recommendations following a task force in 2014 that looked at graduate student funding.
The report included a number of recommendations, and SGS is working with the GSU to address each of them. The Dean noted the limits on employment income, and the goal to keep reducing it, as well as increased transparency, and a new funding complaints process. The Dean noted the final recommendation is to address all the recommendations by June 2017, and that Professor Sandy Welsh, Vice-Provost, Students, has worked on this a great deal.

4 Updates from the School of Graduate Studies

4.1 Vice-Dean Liz Smyth: Flexible-time Guidelines
The Vice-Dean advised the GEC that Flexible-time PhD Guidelines would be posted online soon. They are currently under development and there is no new information in the document, however they will be centralized in one place for ease of use, including some user-friendly FAQs, as the information is currently scattered across the calendar regulations. These guidelines will be coming to the GEC for information in the fall. There has been consultation with the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, Planning and Budget, Government, Institutional and Community Relations, and with several other committees across the University.

4.2 Vice-Dean Liz Smyth: Reconvened Oral Examinations
The Vice-Dean advised that there are currently about 1000 Full Oral Exams (FOEs) per year, with approximately 2 – 5 of those reconvened. The FOE Guidelines have an inclusion to address when a new external appraiser is appointed for a reconvened FOE. Some clarity will be added to the guidelines, as the current practice is that when an FOE is reconvened it will be the same committee, however sometimes this is not possible, and SGS wants to set out best practices for this.

4.3 Vice-Dean Liz Smyth: Academic Integrity
The Vice-Dean advised that that SGS has been working with graduate units across the University on outreach, and that SGS is also involved with the Academic Integrity Council of Ontario and the International Centre for Academic Integrity, of which the incoming President is Governing Council’s Chris Lang. SGS is planning workshops regarding academic integrity in graduate studies, and any inquiries should be sent to the Vice-Dean’s Office, or to Emma Thacker, Associate Director, Graduate Affairs. The Vice-Dean advised that SGS is planning workshops in the graduate units on best practices when assembling misconduct case files, so that as people and staff change, SGS can to provide an opportunity and space for discussion.

4.2 Josie Lalonde: SGS Statistics
Josie Lalonde provided an overview of the SGS Statistics Report presentation that was included with the agenda package. She noted that this is the fall 2015 snapshot, and that admissions are up 3.1% with a 7.1% growth in international student registration. A faculty member noted that the government is trying to make it easier for international graduate students to study here, and this is good news.
For Approval: Regulations

5.1 Dual Degree Program Definition – Regulation 1.5.7
The Dean advised the GEC on the motion for approval. The University is making strides to become more internationalized, and one initiative is the introduction of the International Dual Degree model. This type of program is new and a brief definition needs to be added to the SGS Calendar. The Dean noted that Daniella Mallinick, Director, Academic Programs, Planning & Quality Assurance was in attendance from the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, should there be any questions. Vice-Dean Liz Smyth presented the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the School of Graduate Studies to add a definition of a Dual Degree to the Graduate Programs section (1.5) of the General Regulations, effective September 1, 2016 as follows.

1.5.7 Dual Degree Programs
A dual degree program is a program of study offered in partnership by the University of Toronto and an international peer university, or equivalent institution. In a dual degree program, a student’s successful completion of the program requirements of two existing degree programs is conferred with two degree documents or parchments. Dual degree programs build on a strong academic rationale between the programs in the combination and provide a distinctive academic benefit to students. Dual degree programs are governed by a memorandum of agreement.

The Vice-Dean opened the floor to discussion from GEC on the motion. A faculty member asked how the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) works. Daniella Mallinick replied that the model is the same as Combined Programs, where the respective Deans sign the MOA for the two divisions, and the Provost’s Office is developing a template. A faculty member asked if the initiative for such an MOA comes from the department or elsewhere. Daniella replied that generally the conversation usually starts with individual faculty members and grows on existing faculty collaborations, but the initiative is not top-down. Daniella noted that for the Provost’s Office an expeditious process is a priority, and that they are looking at how to clarify things surrounding the process. A faculty member asks if a single student can study under this model. Daniella replied that there are a suite of options for single students, such as the joint doctoral placement program. A faculty member asked if this was meant to exclude domestic initiatives, and if so, the rationale for this. Daniella replied there is a push for internationalization at the moment. A faculty member asked about the joint degree program. Daniella replied this is a single new program, and that the Ministry has a separate accreditation for that type of approval, and the University has not yet engaged in the process. A faculty member asked how many dual degrees are currently available. Daniella replied there is one proposal at the moment, and that it should go through governance in the spring.

Seeing as discussion was finished, the Dean called the question.
The motion is CARRIED with one abstention.

5.2 Late Registration Fee Revision
The Dean advised the GEC on the motion for approval. Currently SGS has a service charge to students who register after the deadline. The fee is $44 plus $5/day, up to maximum of $94 (or 10 days late). Determining this payment amount relies on human intervention to assess the appropriate fee. A flat fee will allow for payment online, which will streamline the process. To arrive at the revised fee, research was completed to compare rates across the U15 Canadian institutions. In addition, cost analysis was completed and it was determined that the revenue loss would be approximately neutral, while offering many students the ease of paying online. Vice-Dean Liz Smyth presented the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the School of Graduate Studies to revise the Late Registration Regulation, to remove the incremental fee of $5 dollars per day to a maximum of $94. The language “plus $5 for each day of delay to a maximum of $94”, that has been struck in the Motion, will be removed from the regulations. The late registration fee will be $44, effective September 1, 2016.

Late Registration
Any student registering after the deadline date specified in the academic calendar (sessional dates) is required to pay a late registration fee of $44, plus $5 for each day of delay to a maximum of $94.

Seeing no discussion, the Dean called the question.
The motion is CARRIED.

6 For Approval: Standing Committee Membership

6.1 Graduate Academic Appeals Board - Membership: 2016-2017
The Dean commented that the Graduate Academic Appeals Board is a standing committee of the Graduate Education Council and is governed by a by-law. The motion documentation provides details regarding appointments to GAAB. The GEC is the final approval level for this Board. Vice-Dean Liz Smyth presented the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the renewal appointment of three faculty and two student members, the new appointment of one alternate Chair, one faculty and one student member to serve on the Graduate Academic Appeals Board for the 2016-2017 academic year as follows:

Alternate Chair
Angela Fernandez (Renewal - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)
(Professor Fernandez is currently Acting GAAB Chair)
Graduate Faculty Members (Division 2)
Michele Peterson-Badali, Human Development & Applied Psychology (Renewal - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)
Heather MacNeil, Faculty of Information (New - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)

Graduate Faculty Members (Division 4)
Michael J. Wiley, Anatomy (Renewal – July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)
Rosemary Martino, Speech Language Pathology (Renewal - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)

Graduate Student Members
Michael Donnelly, English, Division I (Renewal - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017)
Rusty Souleymanov, Social Work, Division II (Renewal - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017)
Boaz Schuman, Medieval Studies, Division I (New - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017)

Seeing no discussion, the Dean called the question.
The motion is CARRIED.

6.2 Admissions & Programs Committee - Membership: 2016-2017

The Dean commented that the Admissions and Programs Committee is a standing committee of Graduate Education Council and is governed by a by-law. The motion documentation provides details of the committee responsibilities, powers, and membership composition. GEC is the final approval level for this committee. Vice-Dean Liz Smyth presented the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the renewal appointment of four faculty members and one graduate student to serve on the Admissions and Programs Committee for the 2016-2017 academic year as follows:

Faculty Member Renewals: (renewal for an additional one year term)
Division I Faculty Member:
Pascal Michelucci, French Language and Literature (September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017)

Division II Faculty Member:
Anna Korteweg, Sociology (September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017)

Division III Faculty Member:
Markus Bussmann, Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017)

Division IV Faculty Member:
Howard Mount, Institute of Medical Science (September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017)
Student Members:
Graduate Student Member:
Bogdan Smarandache, Medieval Studies, Division I (September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017)

Seeing no discussion, the Dean called the question.
The motion is CARRIED.

7 GEC Discussion and Consultation Topics

7.1 International Graduate Student Services
The Dean asked the GEC what role SGS should have in international student recruitment. The Dean commented that we see a role for talking about the city. A student member stated that SGS could have a role in the timeline for accepting funding offers. A faculty member asked a question about funding for domestic versus international students, as the funding programs are important for recruiting international students. The Dean replied that work is being done to increase the number of Connaught scholarships, and that the process is being used to identify students. The hope is to have a 50% increase. The Dean welcomed any ideas on this topic as development is being done.

7.2 Mental Health Initiatives
The Dean asked the GEC what more can be done regarding mental health initiatives. The Dean reviewed the efforts already underway at SGS, including a variety of workshops, counselling, developing support communications such as supervisory guidelines, thesis writing groups, and the Conflict Resolution Centre. The Dean welcomed any ideas on what more can be done in the upcoming year, and any suggestions for more efficient means to access to students and spread information. A student member suggested asking the GSU to pass on information to the individual presidents in the graduate units as students do not read the GSU digest. Another student member voiced agreement. A faculty member shared concerns that they were not sure if they were in a good position to speak on behalf of students for this topic. The Dean replied that this is why SGS is working so closely with the GSU, and noted that the GSU is aware of the disconnect with students who are not engaged with them. A student member shared the he had looked at the statistics surrounding mental health issues, and was wondering if there were discussions about preventing mental health issues. The Dean replied that these discussions are happening, one such place is the Conflict Resolution Centre.

7.3 Graduate Funding Transparency
The Dean asked the GEC what more can be done regarding funding transparency. The Dean reviewed the efforts already underway at SGS regarding posting funding actual data online, revising the funding letter templates, and encouraging graduate units to be transparent in their transactions with students. The Dean noted that the project would be nearing completion after publishing the funding templates. A faculty member asked if the goal is to drive inflation of deflation. The Dean responded that is neither, it is about transparency and understanding. A faculty member shared that many students do not understanding their base funding, or the heterogeneity of funding and how it differs between programs, and sometimes between students. The Dean commented that this kind of information is about how their package is composed, and how the University handles these transactions. The Dean noted that often students are paid inconsistent amounts spread throughout the year. The Dean noted
that often UTF funding does not have to be this way, and that making the funding payments regular would help the students. A faculty member shared that many faculty members also do not understand the funding situation, and that the process of dividing up the funds available at the unit level into offers is complicated, and they were unsure how to make things more transparent. The Dean replied that the Faculty of Arts & Science does have a guide coming out for this, and that moving more of the process to the departmental level will help. A faculty member commented that for international students they can offer them UTF, or try and get Trillium or Connaught funding, but it can be complicated. The Dean replied that there is a new guide from the Faculty of Arts & Science, and that Arts & Science is looking to move more down into the departments. The Dean noted this is a conversation that will be held with the chairs in the units. A faculty member shared that they were unsure how to breakdown the numbers in funding letters and how to state living expenses. The Dean replied that SGS is thinking about how to separate it and make it easy to understand. For instance, there can be a column that makes the different amounts clear. A student member shared concerns that institutional memory may be lost, as many discussions that were held during the strike have disappeared. Another student member shared concerns that students often do not consult with the GSU when going to the table to negotiate. The Dean replied that people are recognizing this, and that there is some discussion happening in Arts & Science to form a unit to respond to this.

8 Other Business

None.

9. For Information:

The Dean commented that there are several attachments for information.

9.1 GEC Election Report — Spring 2016
The annual report was distributed with the agenda. The report is for information only, and provides the council with a summary of the spring election new members and remaining vacant seats.

The annual report was distributed with the agenda. The report is based on a snapshot of PDF engagement in 2014-2015. The report focuses on campus affiliation, hospital and other statistics, divisional representation, unit and faculty association and other statistics such as citizenship, gender and stipends.

9.3 Admissions and Programs Committee — Annual Report 2014-2015
The annual report was distributed with the agenda. The report is for information only, and provides the council with a summary of the various non-standard requests that were submitted to SGS and if the request was approved.

9.4 New Awards Report
The SGS New Awards Annual report was distributed with the agenda and developed by the SGS Awards Office. It details the newly established graduate awards. A summary page provides a
breakdown by Faculty and also indicates the total amount from the last reporting year for comparison.

9.5 Name and/or Status Change to Graduate Units or Programs
The report is for information only, and provides the council with a summary of approved name and status changes for graduate units and graduate programs, since our last meeting. It provides basic details on the appeals heard at SGS, including the graduate department of the appellant, the basis for the appeal, and the outcome.

9.6 SGS Registration Statistics
This annual report was distributed with the agenda as a PowerPoint. Thanks to Corinne Pask-Aube, for her contributions in pulling the data.

Closing Remarks

The Dean announced that the next meeting will be scheduled for the fall 2016, and that there may be some new program convocation hood motions emailed out approval prior to that. The Dean advised that the GEC will receive a communication from SGS. The Dean welcomed any questions or feedback.

Seeing no further discussion or questions, the Dean moved to adjournment.

Adjournment

The Dean thanked the Council members for their participation, and extended a special thank you to members who terms are ending for their service on the GEC.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Emma Thacker, Secretary, GEC

Date: March 15, 2016
The Doctoral Dissertation – Purpose, Content, Structure, Assessment

This document was written by a working group of the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies* and is intended to promote and facilitate discussion on the doctoral dissertation of the 21st century among those responsible for or undertaking doctoral education. The outcome of these consultations will help inform the development of a series of recommendations by the working group.

We broadly invite institutions or disciplinary groups to hold consultation discussions on this subject. Please see a Toolkit for Consultation in Appendix C at the end of this document to help with these.

August 30, 2016

*Working group composition:
Susan Porter (co-chair), Dean and Vice Provost, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies; Clinical Professor, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of British Columbia
Lisa Young (co-chair), Dean and Vice-Provost, Graduate Studies; Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Calgary
Lonnie Aarsen, Professor, Biology Department, Queen’s University
Robert Gibbs, Director of Jackman Humanities Institute; Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Toronto
Raymond Klein, Professor, Department of Psychology, Dalhousie University
Anthony Paré, Professor and Head, Department of Language and Literacy Education, UBC
Anna Ryoo, PhD student, Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy, UBC
Paula Wood-Adams, Dean of Graduate Studies; Professor, Department of Mechanical & Industrial Engineering, Concordia University
Overview
Shifts in the academy and society over the last few decades have led to a world-wide conversation on rethinking educational approaches to the PhD, with a number of recent meetings, conversations, and papers focused on the future of the dissertation in particular (Council of Graduate Schools, 2016; Institute for the Public Life of Arts and Humanities, McGill University, 2013; Modern Language Association of America, 2014; Patton, 2013; Porter & Phelps, 2014; Smith, 2015). While the themes of increased flexibility with regard to format and content are gaining some traction and/or are being encouraged and implemented institutionally (e.g. UBC Public Scholars Initiative, HASTAC Futures Initiative and City University of New York) there has not been a broad attempt to examine the pedagogical or evaluative principles relevant to a potentially changing scope, or to create parameters or best practices that could guide both students and faculty. It is our intent to help fill that gap through this consultative process.

Background
Any conversation about the form of the doctoral dissertation must be situated in the context of a discussion of the purpose, or purposes, of the PhD. Doctoral education has traditionally been viewed as an apprenticeship with a faculty member towards membership in the ‘guild’ of the professoriate. Given, however, that a minority of current PhD graduates enter the increasingly sparse tenure-track academic job market, that original purpose is insufficient (and, arguably, morally problematic) unless enrolment is drastically reduced.

Graduates make substantial and essential contributions to society in innumerable ways, both within and outside the academy, and the purpose—from a societal perspective—has broadened. Accordingly, there has been an ongoing process of reconsidering the doctoral curriculum and experience to ensure it is relevant to the variety of work graduates will undertake. Several large projects on the subject of doctoral students’ preparation for diverse careers (e.g., Higher Education Commission, 2017; Kemp, 1999; Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 2005) have identified some common employer- and student-identified gaps, including limited skills, understanding, and attitudes relevant to non-academic contexts, and a narrowness of doctoral research. Much change has already taken place; most major universities now offer optional, non-credit professional development offerings relevant to non-academic skills, internships
in non-academic environments are more common, and industrial and practice-based PhDs are increasingly prevalent in some parts of the world. A broadening conception of the core of the PhD program – the research and the dissertation – is beginning to be seen, as is a reconsideration of the sole apprenticeship model.

Attributes important for students’ future scholarship are often developed in isolation from the major intellectual work of the student’s program, but increasingly, the value of integrating such development within the student’s field and/or research is seen as valuable. Integration can occur through coursework, the work leading to a comprehensive exam, experiential opportunities, and the dissertation itself. Only some of these approaches allow assessment of the rigour and effectiveness of the student’s work in the context of their scholarly development, however, and only some involve meaningful scholarship.

The dissertation associated with the traditional academic vocational view is inherently conservative; the apprentice’s mode of research should resemble that of the supervisor’s, and the dissertation should be similar in form and scope to that completed by the supervisor. In most (but not all) cases, it follows that the goal of the dissertation research is to discover or synthesize knowledge in a way that other academics may critique and build upon. It also follows that in some disciplines, the dissertation should take the form of a first draft of a scholarly monograph; in others, the dissertation may take the form of a series of related published or publishable academic journal articles. The primary audience for the dissertation, in this view, is the scholarly community, and the objective and the standard by which the dissertation is judged is that of the scholarly literature.

The work most PhD graduates undertake, whether in or out of the academy, is scholarly, in that word’s broadest definition (Walker et al, 2008). In contrast to expected student trajectories in the traditional view, however, graduates’ scholarship may differ substantially from that of their supervisor – it may be solely focused on teaching, or involve work that is interdisciplinary, collaborative, application-oriented and/or problem-driven. These forms of scholarship can be said to be encompassed within the same paradigms of scholarship advocated by Ernest Boyer and many others to be given equal value in the academy (see sidebar), as a means of ensuring the university’s vitality, worth, and relevance. They are therefore, arguably, legitimate approaches to dissertation research; that is, even in disciplines where these forms of scholarship may be somewhat foreign (or perhaps unrewarded), the dissertation could reflect the scholarship of application, engagement, and of teaching and learning, in addition to the traditional modes of discovery and integration. As the approaches, audiences, and

---

1 Categories and quotes from Boyer, 1990. Boyer’s original category of ‘teaching’ was extended in later years to ‘teaching and learning’, and also to ‘sharing knowledge’. The scholarship of engagement is often an additional category, although it can be viewed as any of the forms carried out in a reciprocal partnership between the university and society.

2 This view is reflected in the Council of Graduate School’s policy statement on the purpose of a PhD: ‘The Doctor of Philosophy program is designed to prepare a student to become a scholar: that is, to discover, integrate, and apply knowledge, as well as to communicate and disseminate it...’ (Council of Graduate Schools, 2005, p. 1)
collaborators may differ in the more applied or pedagogical forms of scholarship, so would the dissertation structure and content. In particular, the scholarly products produced through these diverse forms of scholarship may also extend beyond the typical ones associated with discovery research.

Apart from the doctoral career perspective, other arguments have also been made for a more capacious view of dissertation research. Students themselves have indicated a desire to connect their research to society's challenges (Cherwitz et al., 2003; Jaeger et al., 2014; Phelps, 2013; Walker et al., 2008); engaged or applied research can validate and improve the quality of new knowledge; and collaborative, engaged, and interdisciplinary work is necessary to address the world's most pressing problems. There may also be ethical imperatives in research involving partners (whether communities, institutions, or individual human participants) to disseminate and/or validate findings in modes that differ from the usual academic ones; students need to learn these skills and should arguably be assessed on their merit.

Any view of the purpose of the PhD encompasses the notion that doctoral study must prepare students to carry out rigorous research that makes a significant and original contribution to knowledge, to have a breadth and depth of understanding of their field(s), to have strong critical and analytical thinking abilities, to be able to communicate their research appropriately, and to be able to ask important research questions. The challenge for supervisors, examination committees, and all those involved in graduate education is to find ways to allow (or even encourage) the inclusion of diverse forms of scholarship and scholarly products in the dissertation, while ensuring the rigour of the research.

---

### Characteristics of Knowledge, Originality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New knowledge should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• contribute to the shared store of knowledge in a general sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o generating ‘culturally novel apprehensions that are not just novel to the creator or individual observers of an artifact’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o leading to understandings that are transferable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• be shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• be testable and/or amenable to criticism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Originality** (some suggested qualities):

- contributes to new understanding in topic, in method, in experimental design, in theoretic synthesis, or engagement with conceptual issues
- contains innovation, speculation, imaginative reconstruction, cognitive excitement

---

**The Current State**

**Content:** There are no current universally-accepted definitions of the content or scope of a PhD dissertation, although the following types of descriptors are commonly used: ‘product of substantial research and scholarship’ (University of Michigan); ‘should make an original contribution to knowledge’ (Yale University). Many, but not all, universities also indicate that the dissertation should have a unified focus: ‘it is expected that a dissertation will have a single topic, however broadly defined, and that all parts of the dissertation will be interrelated’ (Yale University); ‘All components must be integrated into a cohesive unit...providing a cohesive, unitary focus, documenting a single program of research’ (McGill University).

For traditional forms of scholarship (discovery in particular), faculty have fairly common views of what would be considered ‘original’, or what constitutes new, meaningful ‘knowledge’. For other forms of scholarship, some definitions or characteristics of these and related concepts have been developed (see sidebar).

---

3 See for example, Scrivener, 2002; Candy, 2006; and Winter et al, 2000
Form: The academic monograph form was the norm throughout much of the history of the modern PhD; it is now common in many disciplines, however, to allow published or draft academic manuscripts to comprise much of the dissertation, usually accompanied by a unified scholarly introduction and conclusion. In some fields, it is increasingly common to include other scholarly products, including digital material (e.g., videos, websites) or creative products (e.g., novels, artwork). Although not yet common, there have also been examples of dissertations composed wholly in non-traditional forms, e.g., as a comic-book (Mulhere, 2015) or novel (Williamson, 2016), or in the Indigenous oral tradition (Hutchinson, 2015).

See Appendix A for other examples of dissertations that are non-traditional either in content and/or form.

Assessment: The types of scholarship where non-traditional products are common, and central to the dissertation work, include practice-based or practice-led research, action research, and creative practice research. These fields have developed some guidelines around the scholarly analysis, or exegesis, that normally accompanies the products. Such analysis has been recommended to include a description of the intended audience, the situating of the product and its processes within a discipline or field, an explanation of its significance and originality, and a narrative of the intellectual processes that led to its creation (Candy, 2006; Winter et al., 2000; Elison and Eatman, 2008).

Since Boyer’s delineation of alternative forms of scholarship, and in those disciplines where these alternative forms are common, much work has gone into identifying common standards of rigour to which all forms of scholarship should be held accountable. Very broad conversations across the US in the 1990’s (Glassick, 1997) resulted in the set of criteria listed in the sidebar. They continue to be used (with some modification) in the assessment of scholarship for tenure and promotion processes in many institutions.

STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE FOR ALL FORMS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Clear goals
- The scholar states the purposes of the work clearly, defines objectives that are realistic and achievable, and identifies important questions.

Adequate Preparation
- The scholar demonstrates an understanding of the relevant existing scholarship, and brings the necessary skills and resources to the work.

Appropriate Methods
- The scholar uses methods appropriate to the goals, applies them effectively, and modifies procedures in response to changing circumstances.

Significant Results
- The scholar achieves the goals. The work adds consequentially to the field and opens up additional areas for further exploration.

Effective Presentation
- The scholar uses a suitable style and effective organization to present the work, and uses appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences. The message is presented with clarity and integrity.

Reflective Critique
- The scholar critically evaluates his/her own work, brings an appropriate breadth of evidence to the critique, and uses evaluation to improve the quality of future work.
Questions for Discussion

Section I: Dissertation Content
A. Must/should the dissertation represent a unified program of research, or is it acceptable to include loosely related but separate studies? How does the intellectual development stemming from an exploration of a single subject compare with that of several loosely related or unrelated subjects?
B. What are the acceptable forms of scholarship in a dissertation? E.g. Is it acceptable in the humanities or basic sciences to investigate the application of knowledge, or the identification of new knowledge in a non-academic setting? To engage the public around a text (humanities) or policy? Is it acceptable to focus on the scholarship of teaching and learning in a non-Education discipline?
C. How should the boundaries of acceptable scholarship be determined? Are there identifiable criteria for making the determination? If so, what are they?
D. Who should determine these boundaries? Is this the domain of a central university authority (Senate, Faculty of Graduate Studies), the disciplinary group offering the graduate program? The supervisory committee?

Section II: Dissertation Form
A. What, other than traditional scholarly text, can be included in a dissertation? Should/could creative works (art, film), lay communication materials, policy papers, websites, syllabi, museum curation material, consulting reports, business plans or other elements be included and assessed as integral parts of the dissertation?
B. When non-traditional elements are included, do they need to be placed within a scholarly context? Is a critical analysis and/or interpretation required?
C. How should the boundaries of what is acceptable for inclusion be determined? Are there identifiable criteria for making the determination? If so, what are they?
D. Who should determine these boundaries? Is this the domain of a central university authority (Senate, Faculty of Graduate Studies), the disciplinary group offering the graduate program? The supervisory committee?

Section III: Dissertation Evaluation
A. What policies or practices should be in place to ensure quality and rigor? Should all work be assessed by those with appropriate expertise, if that means including practitioners without a PhD, or scholars from other disciplines on the supervisory and/or examination committee?
B. What standards should be used to assess the quality and rigor of non-traditional forms of scholarship and associated elements of the dissertation? Do the Glassick criteria (p. 5) address the main aspects?
C. Who should determine the standards and policies? Is this the domain of a central university authority (Senate, Faculty of Graduate Studies), the disciplinary group offering the graduate program? The supervisory committee?

Section IV: Concerns, Barriers, Opportunities, and Recommendations
A. What are your primary concerns about increased flexibility in doctoral dissertations? (see Appendix B for frequently cited concerns)
B. If you are generally supportive of the trend towards increased flexibility, what do you feel are the major barriers to enabling that to happen? What means might you suggest to reduce those barriers; what are potential opportunities to help facilitate the trend? What recommendations in particular would you make?
References
Council of Graduate Schools (2016) Imagining the dissertation’s many futures. GradEdge 5:1-3
Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver
Appendices

A - Examples

Non-traditional format/style of a dissertation; novel methodology (Educational Studies):


Hilda Doolittle (1886-1961), the American poet known as H.D., was a key figure in and founding member of the Imagist Movement, along with poets Ezra Pound and Richard Aldington. She was a prolific poet, and wrote extensively about poetry, as well. Charlotte Hussey, a Montreal-based poet, wrote this dissertation about the process of composing poetry by using herself as the unit of analysis and by analyzing and interpreting that process in H.D.'s Imagist framework.

What makes the dissertation unusual is its structure as a set of letters between Hussey and H.D., whose letters were written by Hussey based on Doolittle’s theories about poetry and the poetic imagination. In her own letters, Hussey sent draft poems to H.D., explaining their origins in memory, dream, and imagination, and H.D.’s responses drew on her own poetry, her theories of poetics, and the work of Pound and other Imagists. Occasionally, Hussey introduces "Dear Reader" letters, which offer a form of meta-analysis of the whole project.

In a very real sense, the dissertation reports on an experiment that blends the analytic with the poetic, the rhetorical with the literary. Though based deeply in scholarly texts, it is also suffused with poetry, and the resulting text traces the creative process from seed to flower.

Charolotte is currently a poet, creativity coach, and college/university lecturer in writing and literature.

Applied scholarship in a field normally dominated by discovery research (Pathology):

Jennifer Won (2015) *Clinical performance of diagnostic, prognostic and predictive immunohistochemical biomarkers for hormone receptor-negative breast cancer*. UBC. This dissertation starts with the development of a set of biomarkers that are unique to an aggressive form of cancer that is currently poorly diagnosed (and therefore suboptimally treated). Rather than doing further studies on the biology of the cancer, Jennifer chose to conduct a study more aligned with her career goals: she partnered with a starting non-profit group to assess whether Canadian hospital labs were able to use these biomarkers correctly in real life settings. She found the laboratories were not able to use the original markers consistently, so she tried a simpler, second set which was more successful. She continued to work with the labs to to assist with technical problems, and generally to raise awareness about the issue.

Although the content was unusual in her disciplinary context, the format of Jennifer’s dissertation was traditional, as she described the applied work in a scholarly framework with relevant background and analysis. Scholarly products that were critical to her methodology and to the success of the project, but which were not incorporated into the dissertation or assessed directly, included correspondence with and reports to the labs, other communications and press releases (to raise awareness), as well as a business plan for the non-profit. Jennifer would have appreciated their inclusion in the dissertation, to have them acknowledged and to benefit from feedback on them.

While completing her degree, Jennifer was hired as the first scientific director of the organization.
The scholarship of teaching and learning in a field dominated by discovery research (Zoology): 
Laura Melissa Guzman’s dissertation research in Zoology (UBC) is primarily focused on the ecology of bromeliads. As part of her research, she has become very adept at statistical computing. As a TA in a 4th year Ecological Methodology course, Melissa noted along with the instructor several deficiencies in the way statistics was taught, and together they created and implemented a revised curriculum that took into account cognitive load theory and associated designs and procedures. Melissa will conduct an analysis of student learning of the revised curriculum, and based on the results, will design and assess a fuller curriculum for that and an additional course. The work should be transferrable to many subjects and contexts, and is planned to be written and published as a scholarly paper and included as a chapter in her dissertation.

Non-traditional format of dissertation; the scholarship of engagement in a field dominated by the scholarship of discovery and integration (English): 
Amanda Visconti (2015) "How can you love a work if you don’t know it?" Critical code and design toward participatory digital editions. University of Maryland. This digital humanities dissertation is focused on an interactive (participatory) website on James Joyce’s Ulysses called Infinite Ulysses. Amanda designed and coded the website, conducted user testing, and analyzed usage data. The fully online dissertation consists of the abstract; a link to the Infinite Ulysses website; a 123 page ‘whitepaper’ that describes and analyzes the work, and synthesizes and adds to scholarly thinking on the public humanities; a set of research blog posts, a public repository of design and code; a description of the methodology; and acknowledgements.
The dissertation won the University of Maryland’s Distinguished Dissertation Prize. Amanda is currently an Assistant Professor at Purdue University.

Non-traditional/creative format of dissertation (Visual Art and Education); 
Marta Madrid-Manrique. (2014). Creating audiovisual participatory narratives: A/r/tography and inclusivity. University of Granada, Spain. This dissertation research investigates the use of participatory art to address educational problems, and in particular to assess whether such engagement enhances a sense of inclusivity among those with diverse experiences including disabilities, different cultures and languages, and social difficulties.
The overall structure of the dissertation was traditional, and included an abstract, a theoretical framework, a description of the research methodology and results, and an interpretation and conclusion. The format was highly unusual, however: It was published online in three volumes similar to a graphic novel trilogy, it incorporated many forms of visual data (including photos and watercolour illustrations) and was in part presented in the forms of a comic book, graphic novel, and story book. These forms were in themselves a research experiment, to assess mechanisms to convey research findings in a manner that preserved anonymity and confidentiality and which enrich academic narratives with graphic allegories.
Marta is a graphic artist, and teaches in postsecondary institutions.
### B - Concerns and Responses to Diversifying Doctoral Scholarship and Dissertations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students won’t get academic jobs / academic jobs are what most students want / academic placement is a positive metric for program quality | - This is not for everyone; it’s about what’s acceptable for those who desire it – students should be fully aware of the purpose and potential risks of non-traditional scholarship  
- Many students don’t want academic jobs  
- The academy is changing in many fields, with non-traditional scholarship becoming more common  
- Non-traditional scholarship includes teaching – incorporation of teaching scholarship into the dissertation may make candidates more competitive in higher education  
- One has to start somewhere or it will never change  
- Non-academic careers are increasingly not viewed as second-class; quite the contrary for many outcomes |
| In some fields, the issue is really just political – we need more tenure-track faculty; the PhD should still be oriented to that end | - It’s unlikely a significant change will occur, at least not to the point where all PhD graduates would get tenure-track positions  
- PhD graduates do contribute meaningfully in the teaching or non-academic world |
| Faculty need the labour on discovery research projects; non-traditional scholarship potentially devalues and may reduce the prevalence of basic research | - Non-traditional or applied scholarship is not for everyone  
- Discovery research can be extended, improved, and validated through application or knowledge exchange  
- Granting agencies are increasingly interested in impact  
- It is arguably an ethical issue if students’ needs are not taken into account; the university is in the business of education |
| This is diluting the PhD - i.e., this does not represent rigorous ‘real’ research; the products are not suitable | - Each realm of scholarship can (and must be) rigorous, with standard criteria for assessment  
- Students’ intellectual development can be made significantly richer through employing different approaches, disciplinary lenses, etc |
| If they get an academic job, they won’t be able to transform their dissertation to a book (humanities) | - Academic publishing is in major shift – it is not a given that a monograph will translate to book |
| External examiners won’t approve non-traditional dissertations | - There is a need to change culture, and make a legitimate case |
| We should be encouraging the development of professional doctorates rather than applied | - That is relevant for some sectors, but not all  
- The varied forms of scholarship are worthy of |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhDs</th>
<th>highest degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty don’t know how to mentor alternative forms</td>
<td>- Should include external professionals/scholars as mentors, on committees, examiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied research ‘sells out’ to the world’s values</td>
<td>- Collaboration can influence the world’s values and elicit positive change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s not necessary to re-envision the dissertation - just provide professional skills training</td>
<td>- Those can be good and necessary, but: didactic training is often decontextualized, doesn’t necessary allow development of intellectual breadth, attitudes, insight, understanding relative to context and core intellectual development - Internships etc are often outside of intellectual area, and are not assessed or valued as part of degree - Rigorous, non-traditional scholarship can improve the quality of knowledge, and make an impact in the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We shouldn’t admit students who don’t want academic track</td>
<td>- That would exclude the majority in most disciplines - Incoming students don’t often know what they want as a career path - PhD graduates contribute substantially to society in many ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students won’t get scholarship funding if student’s research is non-traditional</td>
<td>- Funding agencies are very interested in impact; research still has to be rigorous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and tenure have not caught up - faculty don’t get credit for non-traditional scholarship</td>
<td>- It is changing (slowly), and should be addressed in parallel - It is important work of the university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C - Toolkit for Consultation**

This Consultation Document is intended to form the basis for conversations about the future of the dissertation at Canadian universities. Any organization or group, including Faculties/Schools of Graduate Studies, graduate programs, graduate students’ organizations or disciplinary associations, are invited to host conversations about the future of the dissertation, using the Consultation Document as a basis. If you are interested in leading a discussion, please let Sally Rutherford in CAGS know [], and if you are at the same university or general location as one of the task force members, please coordinate with them.

The task force has no set guidelines for the format or make-up of the consultation meetings. We believe that both disciplinary and multi-disciplinary meetings are helpful, and the presence of students is encouraged. There may also be benefit in holding student-only or faculty-only discussions. If there is an opportunity to collaborate with another institution in the same geographic area, that is encouraged.

When organizing the consultation, please consider the following:

- Please let Sally Rutherford ([phd-doctorat@cags.ca](mailto:phd-doctorat@cags.ca)) know in advance if you wish to lead a discussion.
- Consider who is to be invited to the consultation - Faculty? Students? Other interested parties?
• Please distribute the Consultation Paper to participants in advance. Is there any other material that is relevant for your group that should also be distributed?
• If the group is fairly large (more than 10-15), we recommend incorporating smaller break-out sessions, with the smaller groups reporting back to the larger group.
• Identify one individual to chair the session, and leads for each small group.
• Identify individuals to serve as note-takers for each small group, and one for the larger group.
• We recommend that you set aside at least 2 hours for the discussion

Holding the Consultation

• To start the conversation, it would be helpful to give a short presentation outlining the issues
• It may also be helpful to have a general discussion about the ideas before addressing the individual questions. As much as possible, however, we would appreciate that the specific questions be addressed during the consultation.
• Before any break-out sessions, consider asking participants to make notes on their perspective
• Be sure that note takers provide summaries of the discussions to the lead
• You are welcome to record the sessions, and to submit the recordings to Sally Rutherford (phd.doctorat@cags.ca) for transcription and/or summary.

Reporting Back

• Please submit your notes and/or recording to Sally Rutherford (phd-doctorat@cags.ca) with a description of the consultation group.

The report summarizing these findings with recommendations going forward will be made broadly available in 2017.
Best Practices for Doctoral Students

1. Take an Active Role in Your Supervision
2. Get Involved Early and Often in Research
3. Build Community within Your Program
4. Become Familiar with University Supports and Resources
5. Know the Details of Your Funding Package
6. Enhance Your Professional Skills

Have feedback?
The School of Graduate Studies welcomes your feedback and innovative ideas on how to support students in their programs and improve time to completion. Please contact sgs.vdeanstudents@utoronto.ca with suggestions.

Background
Completing your doctoral program requirements in a timely manner has far-reaching benefits. Rather than prolonging the mental and financial stresses of a demanding workload, you can focus on launching your career, whether you choose to remain in academia or pursue work elsewhere.

In 2015, the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) initiated a research project to better understand Time to Completion (TTC) and improve TTC and graduation rates for doctoral students at the University of Toronto. This project resulted in two research-informed and data-driven sets of Best Practices: one for Graduate Units and one for graduate students.
Best Practices for Doctoral Students

1. Take an Active Role in Your Supervision

If your supervision is frequent, consistent, supportive, and transparent, you'll be able to focus your research sooner and make better progress.

How can you make the most of supervision?

▶ If you didn't select a supervisor before applying to the program, ask your department for resources that will help you make an informed decision and connect you with potential supervisors.

▶ As early as possible, meet with your supervisor to establish a common understanding about program milestones, meeting frequency, evaluation style, form of communication, and feedback (consult the Best Practice Guidelines for Graduate Supervision, which include a Supervision Checklist for Students). Together, create an independent development plan that will provide you with a clear roadmap to graduation.

▶ As you continue in your program, meet regularly with your supervisor and at least once a year with your supervisory committee to monitor your progress.

▶ Address challenges as early as possible: if you encounter difficulties achieving program milestones, speak with your supervisor or Graduate Coordinator/Director/Administrator (as appropriate to your program).
2. Get Involved Early and Often in Research

You'll be better prepared to meet your dissertation requirements if you have early opportunities for research, supervision, and academic collaboration.

How can you prepare yourself for advanced research and writing?

- **Ask** your supervisor about potential opportunities for research and collaboration early in your program.
- **Present** at and/or attend conferences and professional meetings early in your program.
- **Consider** getting thesis writing support through dissertation writing groups organized by your Grad Unit, the [Office of English Language & Writing Support](#), and the [Academic Success Centre](#) on St. George campus.
- **Familiarize** yourself with research ethics and integrity requirements and resources.

3. Build Community within Your Program

Feeling part of a larger graduate community helps you maintain a positive attitude and stay motivated personally and academically.

How can you build community in your program?

- **Participate** in social events, forums, speaker series, retreats and workshops.
- **Use** dedicated common spaces at the University where you can meet with other graduate students and faculty both socially and academically.
- **Help** maintain community by organizing social events and other initiatives.
- **Seek** out collaborative ways to connect with faculty and other graduate students (blogs, newsletters, e-mail bulletins).
- **Make** community a priority for yourself and your fellow graduate students by promoting your program's common purpose and goals in addition to other opportunities (both academic and non-academic) after graduation.
4. Become Familiar with University Supports and Resources

Graduate school is a challenging environment. Before problems arise, create support systems and find out what resources are available to help you.

How can you ensure you'll find the right resources when you need them?

- **Attend** orientation sessions to learn about policies, procedures, resources, support initiatives, and timelines.
- **Read** your Graduate Unit/Program Student Handbook carefully and consult the [SGS website](#).
- **Look** for early opportunities to improve your time management skills so you can plan your work at all stages of your program (e.g., take a workshop or speak to a [Learning Strategist](#) at the [Academic Success Centre](#) on St. George campus).
- **Consider** taking a course to develop your proposal-writing skills before applying for grants or scholarships.
- **Familiarize** yourself with conflict resolution and counselling services offered through SGS and the University (e.g., the [Conflict Resolution Centre for Graduate Students](#), [SGS Counselling Services](#), [Healthy Grads, Grad Minds](#), the [Health & Wellness Centre](#) on St. George campus, the [Health & Counselling Centre](#) at UTM, [counselling services](#) at UTSC, and the [Academic Success Centre](#) on St. George campus).
- Early in your program, **get acquainted** with writing support services for graduate students, including courses and intensives offered by the [Office of English Language & Writing Support](#) at SGS.
5. Know the Details of Your Funding Package

Being well-informed about financial support will alleviate your stress, allowing you to feel more in control of your academic future and have a more positive experience of your program's culture.

How can you better understand the financial support available to you?

- **Read** your annual funding letter carefully and ensure you know details concerning the annual amount, source, and timing of the financial support you will be receiving.
- **Go online** to read your department's funding policy, and ask your department questions to clarify, as needed.
- **Share** with your department any feedback you have on funding structures and opportunities so that communications or processes can be refined.
- **Be aware** of additional resources that can help you, such as SGS emergency funding and bursaries and the dedicated financial counsellor at SGS.
- **Look** for awards opportunities regularly posted to Ulife and the SGS website, and check SGS Events for information sessions led by Graduate Awards staff.
6. Enhance Your Professional Skills

With professional skills, you'll be better equipped to find employment sooner, whether inside or outside of academia. You'll also be more motivated to complete your program requirements with these opportunities in view.

How can you develop your professional skills?

- **Seek** out professional development offerings and workshops, such as those offered by the [Graduate Professional Skills Program](#) at SGS.
- **Reach out** to potential mentors: alumni, faculty, and representatives of industries outside academia.
- **Attend** speaker sessions representing a wide range of industries.
- **Network** with other students to share ideas about potential professional opportunities beyond graduation.
- **Consider** experiential learning programs such as internships, service learning programs and industry placements.
- **Use** career services such as the [Career Centre](#) at Student Life.
Online Resources

Academic Support & Professional Development
- Career Centre: http://www.studentlife.utoronto.ca/cc
- Graduate Professional Development Programs: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Enhance-Your-Experience.aspx

Financial Support & Resources
- Base Funding: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/gradfunding/Pages/default.aspx
- Completion Grants & Emergency Funding: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Completion-Grants-Emergency-Funding.aspx
- Financial Aid & Counselling: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Financial-Aid-and-Counselling.aspx
- Scholarships & Awards: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Scholarships-and-Awards.aspx

Wellness Resources
- Accessibility Services: http://www.studentlife.utoronto.ca/as
- Conflict Resolution Centre (CRC) for Graduate Students: http://gradcrc.utoronto.ca/
- Graduate Counselling Services: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Graduate-Counselling-Services.aspx
- Grad Wellness: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/gradlife/Pages/Grad-Wellness.aspx

Supervision Resources for Students
Top 10 Best Practices for Graduate Units

1. Begin with Fit
2. Provide Clarity in Financial Support
3. Support Effective Supervision and Mentoring
4. Provide Access to and Build Awareness of University Resources
5. Build Community within Programs
6. Support Research Early and Often
7. Prioritize Student Well-Being
8. Monitor and Track Student Progress
9. Champion Professional Development for All Career Pathways
10. Consider and Communicate Time-to-Completion Data

Have feedback?
The School of Graduate Studies welcomes your feedback and innovative ideas on how to support students in their programs and improve Time to Completion. Please e-mail suggestions to kristen.stinchcombe@utoronto.ca.

Background
Giving students the support and resources they need to complete their doctoral programs in a timely manner has far-reaching benefits. For students, it can mean avoiding prolonged mental and financial stress, and improving professional opportunities upon graduation. For Graduate Units, it can mean both substantially reducing financial costs and enhancing a unit's culture and reputation.
Students who complete a doctoral program in a timely manner are also more likely to perceive their relationship with the University in a positive light. Such relationships not only help students build a professional network for the next stage of their careers, but also build the University's profile and level of support within the larger community.

In 2015, the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) initiated a research project to better understand Time to Completion (TTC) in order to improve TTC and graduation rates for doctoral students at the University of Toronto. This project resulted in two research-informed and data-driven sets of Best Practices: one for Graduate Units and one for graduate students.

TIME TO COMPLETION RESEARCH STUDIES
Council of Graduate Schools - PhD Completion Project Reports: http://www.phdcompletion.org/
- A Data-Driven Approach to Improving Doctoral Completion (2007)
- Baseline Program Data from the PhD Completion Project (2008)
- Exit Surveys of PhD Completers (2009)
- Policies and Practices to Promote Student Success (2010)

Peer Institution TTC Task Force Reports: Yale University, Duke University, University of Texas, University of Michigan, University of Alberta, University of Manitoba, Queen's University
Top Ten Best Practices for Graduate Units

1. Begin with Fit

Admitting the right student to the right program is a key factor for student success.

What can Graduate Units do to ensure that prospective students' abilities and interests align with program requirements and culture?

- **Ensure** applicants are aware of all program requirements and funding expectations.
- **Encourage** prospective students to meet with potential supervisor(s) before applying for the program.
- **Sponsor** campus visits and host recruitment events.
- **Expand** the base of the admissions process to build a more comprehensive picture of a student's academic interests and personal capacity. Consider conducting student interviews and gathering writing samples.
- **Encourage** both current students and faculty to participate in admissions procedures and activities.

2. Provide Clarity in Financial Support

Keeping students well-informed about financial support can alleviate their stress, helping them feel more in control of their academic futures, and improving program culture.
How can Graduate Units promote a better understanding of graduate student financial support?

- Provide complete funding information in admission letters.
- Provide annual August/September funding letters outlining the annual amount, source, and timing of financial support.
- Share the department's funding policy online and respond to student questions.
- Review funding structures and opportunities regularly, gathering feedback from both students and faculty.
- Align funding payments with tuition payment dates.
- Ensure students know there are additional resources to help them, such as SGS emergency funding and bursaries and the dedicated financial counsellor at SGS.
- Encourage students to consult the SGS website regarding Base Funding and Actual Incomes and funding award requirements and deadlines.

3. Support Effective Supervision and Mentoring

Students can focus their research earlier and make better progress when supervision is frequent, consistent, supportive, and transparent.

How can Graduate Units increase the effectiveness of supervision and mentoring?

- Assign each student an advisor upon admission to the program.
- Promote procedures for students to make informed decisions about selecting their supervisor and their topic of study (if these decisions were not made prior to admission).
- **Establish** structures that connect students to potential supervisors.
- **Ensure** procedures are in place to facilitate a change in supervisor in the event that this becomes necessary.
- **Require** frequent student meetings with supervisors and supervisory committees to review progress. A helpful guide is *Guidelines for Departmental Monitoring of Progress Through the PhD*.
- **Encourage** students and supervisors to use a *Supervision Checklist*, which documents a common understanding of program expectations, meeting frequency, evaluation style, form of communication, and feedback. See *Best Practice Guidelines* for Graduate Supervision for template checklists.
- **Encourage** supervisors and students to establish an Individual Development Plan early in their program. Such plans will serve as the students' personalized roadmaps to graduation.
- **Offer** training on supervision/mentoring to faculty and administrators to spread innovation and best practices in supervision. Reminder: SGS and CTSI host an annual Graduate Supervision Workshop.
- **Monitor** the ratio of students per supervisor to maintain reasonable supervisory expectations and workload.
- **Provide** mechanisms for resolving problems that may arise between graduate students, supervisors, and/or members of the supervisory committee. Reminder: the *Conflict Resolution Centre for Graduate Students*, offered through SGS and UTGSU, is a helpful resource.
- **Actively** follow up with students who are not making progress in the program. Consider providing a second supervisory committee meeting two to three months after an unsuccessful meeting. Suggest additional academic supports, if necessary.
4. Provide Access to and Build Awareness of University Resources

With the right resources and supports, students can deal effectively with challenges before they impede academic progress.

How can Graduate Units help students find resources when they need them?

- **Organize** timely orientation sessions to inform students about policies, procedures, resources, support initiatives and timelines.

- **Develop** a Graduate Unit/Program Student Handbook and ensure current hardbooks are up to date. Consider consulting with Student Life and SGS on draft Program Handbooks to ensure policy information and resources are up to date.

- **Provide** support systems as problems are detected (e.g., Accessibility Services, Health and Wellness, Writing Support) and inform graduate students about resources such as the Conflict Resolution Centre for Graduate Students, SGS Counselling Services, Healthy Grads, Grad Minds, and Academic Success Centre.

5. Build Community within Programs

Feeling part of a larger graduate community helps students maintain a positive attitude and stay motivated personally and academically.

How can Graduate Units build community among graduate students?

- **Organize** social events, forums, speaker series, retreats and workshops.

- **Create** a common place for students and faculty to gather and meet — socially and academically.
6. Support Research Early and Often

Students given early and frequent opportunities for research, supervision, and academic collaboration are better prepared to meet dissertation requirements later in their program.

How can Graduate Units prepare students for advanced research and writing?

- **Engage** students in opportunities for early research and support the challenges of advanced stage research.
- **Support** and encourage student presentations of their own work and frequent attendance at conferences and professional meetings.
- **Establish** research and writing requirements early in the program.
- **Provide** ongoing writing support beginning in the first year and for each stage of study. Reminder: A helpful resource is the [SGS Office of English Language & Writing Support](https://www.english.utoronto.ca/office-shaped-essays).
- **Offer** opportunities for thesis writing support such as [dissertation writing groups](https://www.english.utoronto.ca/office-shaped-essays) organized by the graduate unit, SGS and the Academic Success Centre.
- **Consider** alternative supervision models, such as the 'lab-based supervision model' outside of the sciences.
7. Prioritize Student Well-Being

Encouraging students to strike a healthy balance between academic work and personal life helps them gain perspective and stay motivated in their program. It can also help them cope more effectively with any life transitions, stressors, and changes in mental and/or physical health that they may encounter along the way.

How can Graduate Units support student well-being?

▶ **Promote** mental health resources tailored to meet the needs of graduate students (e.g. the SGS Wellness Counsellor, SGS Wellness Workshops, Grad Minds, and Healthy Grads).

▶ **Build** awareness of the broad spectrum of University-wide resources promoting a balanced lifestyle — from athletic facilities and multifaith centres to the Health & Wellness Centre on St. George campus, the Health & Counselling Centre at UTM, and counselling services at UTSC.

▶ **Inform** students about resources that can alleviate financial stress, such as financial counselling available through SGS and SGS emergency funding and bursaries.

8. Monitor and Track Student Progress

Getting an accurate understanding of student progress allows Graduate Units to provide more effective support when it is needed.

How can Graduate Units better monitor and support student progress?

▶ **Use** the SGS Progress Tracker, an online application (available in Fall 2016), to manage the program milestones and requirements.

▶ **Use** data from the SGS Progress Tracker to understand whether students are meeting program milestones. Address student and program issues when data indicates progress is not on track.

▶ **Survey** current students on a regular basis and upon graduation to evaluate student experience regarding resources, academic support and the supervisory relationship.

▶ **Use** data and student feedback (such as surveys) as a performance indicator in program reviews and as a basis for resource allocation and departmental decision-making.
9. Champion Professional Development for All Career Pathways

Students with professional skills are more equipped to find employment sooner, whether inside or outside of academia. Awareness of relevant and stimulating professional opportunities outside academia may decrease TTC.

How can Graduate Units champion professional development?

- **Promote** student participation in professional development offerings and workshops.
- **Reach** out to alumni and industry leaders to mentor and speak to a broad set of careers inside academia and beyond.
- **Identify** and support opportunities to develop student networking.
- **Consider** experiential learning programs such as internships, service learning programs and industry placements.
- **Encourage** the use of career services and professional development such as the Career Centre and [SGS Graduate Professional Development](#).

10. Consider and Communicate Time-to-Completion Data

Timely completion rates improve when programs are better aligned with student objectives and both students and faculty understand the implications of longer completion times.

How can Graduate Units make TTC data a key part of program design and delivery?

- **Post** times to completion, completion rates, and graduate outcomes on departmental websites and in supplementary materials (e.g. brochures, handbook, recruitment collateral).
- **Build** in a review of TTC rates when reviewing program objectives, learning outcomes and delivery methods.
Consider student goals, abilities, and interests when designing coursework, determining timing of departmental exams, and approving dissertation formats.

Ensure that supervisory workshops for faculty and administrators include TTC data and promote strategies for achieving timely completion.

Offer information sessions and/or workshops for prospective and current students to address expectations about program length, to contextualize student progress, and to engage with recent graduates.

Review program and candidacy extension requests carefully; occasionally these requests may indicate the need to terminate registration in the program.

TTC RESEARCH STUDIES AND TASK FORCE REPORTS

- Yale University: [http://gsas.yale.edu/sites/default/files/page-files/best_practices_in_yale_graduate_programs.pdf](http://gsas.yale.edu/sites/default/files/page-files/best_practices_in_yale_graduate_programs.pdf)
- The University of Texas at Austin: [https://gradschool.utexas.edu/advisers-and-coordinators/milestones-information](https://gradschool.utexas.edu/advisers-and-coordinators/milestones-information)
- Queen’s University: [http://www.queensu.ca/sgs/sites/webpublish.queensu.ca.sgswww/files/files/Faculty-degree%20completion/Report%20to%20GSEC%20from%20Time%20To%20Completion%20Task%20Force%20May%202014.pdf](http://www.queensu.ca/sgs/sites/webpublish.queensu.ca.sgswww/files/files/Faculty-degree%20completion/Report%20to%20GSEC%20from%20Time%20To%20Completion%20Task%20Force%20May%202014.pdf)
Academic Support & Professional Development

- Career Centre: http://www.studentlife.utoronto.ca/cc
- Graduate Professional Development Programs: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Enhance-Your-Experience.aspx

Financial Support & Resources

- Base Funding: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/gradfunding/Pages/default.aspx
- Completion Grants & Emergency Funding: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Completion-Grants-Emergency-Funding.aspx
- Financial Aid & Counselling: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Financial-Aid-and-Counselling.aspx
- Scholarships & Awards: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Scholarships-and-Awards.aspx

Wellness Resources

- Accessibility Services: http://www.studentlife.utoronto.ca/as
- Conflict Resolution Centre (CRC) for Graduate Students: http://gradcrc.utoronto.ca/
- Graduate Counselling Services: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/currentstudents/Pages/Graduate-Counselling-Services.aspx
- Grad Wellness: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/gradlife/Pages/Grad-Wellness.aspx

Resources for Faculty & Staff

- Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation (CTSI): http://teaching.utoronto.ca/
- Guidelines for Departmental Monitoring of Progress Through the PhD: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/facultyandstaff/Pages/Monitoring-Doctoral-Progress.aspx
- Termination of Registration Guidelines: http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/facultyandstaff/Pages/Termination-Guidelines.aspx
Looking for tips to improve your program completion time?

Consult this new SGS resource, also available at uoft.me/bestpractices

Supervision can have a significant impact on your academic progress and graduate experience. Learn best practices to help you optimize this unique relationship.
Supervisory Guidelines:
A Quick Reference

1. Find out as much as possible about your potential supervisor's work and supervision style.

2. Participate cooperatively and responsibly in the supervisory relationship. Understand that graduate supervision is a shared responsibility.

3. Develop with your supervisor a realistic timeline for your program, and review it often.

4. Have regular meetings with your supervisor, and at least one annual meeting with your supervisory committee.

5. Keep your supervisor informed of emerging issues that may affect your academic progress.

6. Be proactive by contacting Accessibility Services for disability and related barriers.

7. Seek counselling, if needed, to maintain your mental health and well-being.

8. Seek conflict resolution as early as possible. Contact the Conflict Resolution Centre, if needed.

9. Inform yourself about the spectrum of resources available to support you in completing your program.

10. Become familiar with program-specific and University-wide policies and regulations that may affect your program completion.

Find the complete Supervisory Guidelines – Student Edition (2016)
uoft.me/bestpractices

Are you a supervisor?
Find guidelines and resources at uoft.me/bestpractices
10,000 PhDs Project
Reinhart Reithmeier
Special Advisor to the Dean
University of Toronto

10,000 PhDs Project

- To determine the current employment status of the 10,886 individuals who graduated from U of T with a PhD from the year 2000–2015
- Using on-line searches of publically-available open sources
- 79%–86% capture rate
10,000 PhDs Project

Count of DEGREE_CONF_DT

YEAR_OF_GRAD

GENDER

F
M

10,000 PhDs Project

U of T PhD Graduates 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>901 (100%)</td>
<td>109 (12%)</td>
<td>307 (34%)</td>
<td>290 (32%)</td>
<td>195 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 10,000 PhDs Project

### Tenure-track Professors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PhDs</th>
<th>PSE</th>
<th>Tenure-track</th>
<th>Division*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>270 (55%)</td>
<td>194 (39%)</td>
<td>45% H, 34% LS, 37% PS, 42% SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>343 (54%)</td>
<td>231 (36%)</td>
<td>49% H, 31% LS, 31% PS, 39% SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>381 (51%)</td>
<td>183 (25%)</td>
<td>42% H, 16% LS, 19% PS, 38% SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>429 (48%)</td>
<td>76 (8%)</td>
<td>3% H, 5% LS, 4% PS, 12% SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210 (23%) PDFs</td>
<td></td>
<td>15% H, 28% LS, 25% PS, 16% SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 con't</td>
<td>145 (16%) Private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4% H, 15% LS, 30% PS, 4% SS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H, Humanities; LS, Life Sciences; PS, Physical Sciences; SS, Social Sciences
Addition to agenda – before Dean’s Remarks

Corey has asked this individual to give a very quick introduction for the Academic Toolbox Renewal Initiative. She has a PPT presentation.

**Janice Patterson**, MLS, MEd
Associate Director
Interim Coordinator, Service Learning and Outreach Program
Centre for Teaching and Learning
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO SCARBOROUGH

She wishes to engage the SGS community in hands-on testing of these systems that UofT might select.
Academic Toolbox Renewal

Oct 18, 2016

Context

Three Parts to the Academic Toolbox Renewal Initiative:

Common Criteria
Learning Management Engine
Integration
Major Project RFP Milestones

April 13: Post RFP on Minx
May 30: Receive and respond to Supplier questions
May 27: Receive RFP Responses
June 10: Determine Vendor shortlist
July 14: Provide instructions for participating in the community assessment
August: Community Assessment
September: First Supplier Evaluation

Community Engagement Process

Live Presentations
- 8 by each supplier (Aug and Nov)
- Registration required
- 90 min long (60 min presentation and 30 min QA)
- Evaluating survey for participants

First round: 230 unique participants

Hands on Testing
- Open during Fall
- Registration required to receive user ID/password
- Guidelines available for testing
- Drop in sessions
- Functionality specific evaluation survey
- Registrants to date: 400

Faculty/Departmental Reach Out
- Road show in different locations
- Attending town hall meeting per request
- Having additional presentations by vendors when requested
- Live Presentation videos available

Communication Plan and Outreach
What's Next ...

Drop in Sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week of</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTM: 9-11 (CCT 1160)</td>
<td>UFS: 10-12 (BV 304)</td>
<td>Downtown: 1-3 (RL 4034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Sep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTM: 2-4 (UTM Library Smart Classroom lower level)</td>
<td></td>
<td>UTSC: 2-4 (BV 304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-Sep</td>
<td>Downtown: 1-3 (RL 4034)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UFS: 10-12 (BV 304)</td>
<td>UTSC: 2-4 (BV 304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown: 3-5 (RL 4034)</td>
<td>UTM: 3-3 (CCT 2160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTSC: 10-12 (BV 466)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UTSC: 10-12 (BV 466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UTM Specific student Sessions: Oct 26, 27, 28, 2016

---

Our Website

General Website: uoft.me/toolbox

LME Project Organization: uoft.me/toolbox-renewal

---
The Portal is Changing!

Our current Learning Portal hasn’t changed much in the last decade. Feedback from the University community is that the web interface for the Portal is clunky and out of date, and it doesn’t flow the way people would like. It’s also hard for instructors to incorporate new tools into their teaching.

Instead of an all-inclusive single website with built-in tools, we hope that our future Learning Portal will be a web interface that feels much more like a smart phone. Like your smart phone, the new environment should have an “operating system” with some core functionality (the ‘Learning Management Engine’). And like your smart phone, the new environment should have an ‘app store’ with integrated teaching and learning apps, and a way for instructors and students to suggest or build new apps. And of course, the new environment needs a cleaner, more contemporary user interface.

That is the goal of the University’s Academic Toolbox Renewal Initiative.
Happening now: Group Testing Drop in Sessions


Members of the UofT community gather for communal testing of LME systems
### Division I—Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Rios (Chair)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihaela Prvulescu</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Magnusson</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midori Koga</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca Somiglio</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Members:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Dalrymple-Fraser</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boaz Schuman</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameron Wachowich</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division II—Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nina Bascia (Chair)</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus Dubber</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Mahrt-Smith</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Ratto</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siobhan Stevenson</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Members:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren McDermott</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Sazavalleva</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Akbar</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division III—Physical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre Simpson</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Strong</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Members:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anam Qudrat</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division IV—Life Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marius Locke (Chair)</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina Brooks</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Hu</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Quinonez</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Buck</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Members:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Markovic</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff Afarabawi</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Zhang</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative Staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Marquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelly Pierrtopalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmela Versace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secretariat:

Dianne Heximer (Secretary to Council)

### Schedule of Meetings:

- October 18, 2016
- November 15, 2017 (Reserve)
- April 10, 2017
- May 10, 2017 (Reserve)

Website: [https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/facultyandstaff/Pages/Graduate-Education-Council.aspx](https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/facultyandstaff/Pages/Graduate-Education-Council.aspx)
Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) Membership 2016-2017:

Chair: Hamish Stewart, Faculty of Law (July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2017)
Alternates: Jim Phillips, Faculty of Law (July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2017)
           Angela Fernandez, Faculty of Law (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)

**Division I Faculty Members**
Members: Greig Henderson, English (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017)
         Paul Thompson, History and Philosophy of Science & Technology (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017)
         Keren Rice, Linguistics (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017)

**Division II Faculty Members**
Members: Lynne Howarth, Information (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017)
         Michele Peterson-Badali, Human Development & Applied Psychology (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)
         Heather MacNeil, Faculty of Information, (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)

**Division III Faculty Members**
Members: Chris Damaren, Aerospace Studies (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017)
         Willy Wong, Electrical and Computer Engineering (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017)
         Jane Phillips, Chemical Engineering & Applied Chemistry (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017)

**Division IV Faculty Members**
Members: Rosamary Martino, Speech Language Pathology (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)
         Don Jackson, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2018)
         Michael J. Wiley, Anatomy (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019)

**Graduate Student Members**
Members: Rusty Souleymanov, Social Work, Division II (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017)
         Michael Donnelly, English, Division I (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017)
         Boaz Schuman, Medieval Studies, Division I (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017)

Effective July 1, 2016
FOR INFORMATION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, October 18, 2016

School of Graduate Studies
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY ANNUAL REPORT
July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016
Summary of Divisional Academic Discipline Cases

This report provides statistics on graduate student cases administered within the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) under the University of Toronto, Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters ("the Code"). The SGS Office of the Dean is responsible for these cases.

Table 1 below shows the number of Code offence cases, by offence type, where a sanction was imposed at the level of SGS. The table provides data by academic year for cases that were concluded during that year.

Table 2 below shows the length of time, i.e., ‘timeliness’, from the date when an allegation of offence was received by SGS to the date that either a sanction was imposed at the level of SGS or the case was referred to the Office of the Provost. The table provides data by academic year for cases that were concluded at the SGS level during that year. There are only four years of data for timeliness. 2010-11 was the first year this information was reported.

Table 1: Number of Offences Resolved at SGS by Type (does not include cases referred to the Provost’s Office) Code Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>B.i.1(a)</th>
<th>B.i.1(b)</th>
<th>B.i.1(c)</th>
<th>B.i.1(d)</th>
<th>B.i.1(e)</th>
<th>B.i.1(f)</th>
<th>B.i.3(a)</th>
<th>B.i.3(b)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(a) Forger (documents, not transcripts)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(b) Unauthorized aid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(c) Personation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(d) Plagiarism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(e) Re-submission of work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(f) Concealment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.3(a) Forger (academic records)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.3(b) Cheating for academic advantage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Timeliness (including cases referred to the Provost’s Office) Time between receipt of allegation and case resolved at SGS or sent to the Provost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University of Toronto External Award Report
Federal and Provincial Awards

Prepared by the Graduate Awards Office at the School of Graduate Studies for Graduate Education Council, November 2016

The University of Toronto is an active participant in both the Federal Tri-Agency Award (NSERC, SSHRC, CIHR, Vanier and Banting) and Provincial Award (OGS, QEII-GSST, OTS) competitions. This report will briefly explain the outreach, process and results of these competitions for the past five years.

Outreach and Workshops

- The Graduate Awards Office at SGS offers a number of information sessions for students and Graduate Administrators to prepare for the Tri-Agency and OGS application season on all three U of T campuses. Approximately 500 students regularly attend these sessions.

Process for Tri-Agency Doctoral Awards

- Tri-Agency doctoral awards (NSERC & SSHRC) are announced by SGS in early September.
- SGS establishes the deadlines for submission of Tri-Agency doctoral award applications from the graduate units to SGS.
- SGS establishes a graduate unit quota of doctoral applications for submission using a formula, in consultation with the Vice-Dean Students. The formula is based on each unit's success rate over the past three years and doctoral population data.
- The SGS Awards Committee adjudicates, on behalf of the University, external and internal awards. The Committee is comprised of Graduate Coordinators from units not currently serving on either of the Committees on Program and Student Matters. Each Tri-Agency Award has a subcommittee(s) with discipline-relevant faculty members drawn from across the University.
- Committee members pre-read applications and attend scheduled adjudication meetings to determine which applicants will be forwarded to Ottawa to fulfill the quota given to U of T by the respective Tri-Agency.

**NSERC Doctoral**

Award Overview

For 2016-17, three graduate-level scholarships are offered through NSERC for Master's and Doctoral students:

- Canadian Graduate Scholarships Masters (CGS M): $17,500 value, awarded for 12 months
- Post-Graduate Scholarships Doctoral (PGS D): $21,000 value, awarded for 24-36 months
- Canadian Graduate Scholarships Doctoral (CGS D): $35,000 value, awarded for 24-36 months

Process

- The total number of NSERC awards available decreased from high of 2520 in 2010-11 to 1367 in 2015-2016 due to the separation of the master's level awards from the NSERC competition.
- SGS received 255 doctoral applications for the 2016-17 competition.
- The University of Toronto submitted 199 applications to NSERC and received 84 awards in the 2016-17 competition, which is a competition success rate of 42.21%.
- The number of NSERC applications received nation-wide and the overall number of awards available has risen since last year however, the overall success rate has increase to 44.2%
- U of T's percent of total awards dropped remains very similar to the 11.1% in 2015-2016 to 11.2% in 2016-17
Highlights

- U of T remains the university with the largest share of NSERC awards held nation-wide
- The CGS-M award section will reflect the new harmonized award process for the 2016-17 master’s award competition.

### NSERC National Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total applications Canada-wide</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>3175</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1544</td>
<td>1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards Canada-wide</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>710*</td>
<td>662*</td>
<td>701*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success rate</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>44.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications reviewed at SGs</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>273*</td>
<td>266*</td>
<td>255*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications forwarded (= quota)</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>204*</td>
<td>190*</td>
<td>199*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - awards received</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>95*</td>
<td>74*</td>
<td>84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - Success rate of applications forwarded</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>42.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - % of total awards nation-wide</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Numbers provided for the 2014-16 award year are for doctoral awards only. Previously, Master’s and doctoral applications received a combined quota and were forwarded together to NSERC.

### NSERC Results by Award Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UoN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>UoN</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>UoN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGSM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGSD</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGSM</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGSD</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Totals</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NSERC Comparative Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>% of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>11.60%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SSHRC Doctoral**

**Award Overview**

Three graduate-level scholarships are offered through SSHRC for Master’s and Doctoral students:
- The Joseph-Armand Bombardier CGS Master’s Scholarships (CGS M): $17,500 value, awarded for 12 months
- SSHRC Doctoral Fellowships: $20,000 value per year, awarded for 12-48 months
- Joseph-Armand Bombardier CGS Doctoral Scholarships (CGS D): $35,000 value per year, awarded for 36 months

**Process**

- The number of SSHRC Doctoral applications received at SGS for the 2016-17 competition was **114** (lower than past years).
- The University of Toronto submitted **230** SSHRC Doctoral applications to the national competition and received **114** awards; a success rate of **49.6%**.
- National statistics for 2016-17 award year are not yet available. U of T’s percent of total awards for the 2015-16 award year is **13.0%** down from the 2014-15 (13.5%).
- The total number of Doctoral awards granted by SSHRC in 2015-16 (1005) has increased since 2012-13 (864).

**SSHRC Doctoral National Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total applications Canada Wide</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards Canada Wide</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success rate of applications forwarded</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications reviewed at SGS</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications submitted to national competition</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - awards received</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>131</td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - success rate of applications forwarded</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - % of total awards</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SSHRC Comparative Doctoral Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Awards Granted</td>
<td>% of National Awards</td>
<td>Total Awards Granted</td>
<td>% of National Awards</td>
<td>Total Awards Granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12.15%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>11.74%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.21%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.59%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SSHRC Results by Award Type – Doctoral

N/A= Information not available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UofT</td>
<td>Cdn</td>
<td>UofT</td>
<td>Cdn</td>
<td>UofT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS Award (35K)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC fellowships (20K)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UofT % of total awards</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CIHR

Award Overview

- The CIHR Master’s Award: Frederick Banting and Charles Best Canada Graduate Scholarships (CGSM): $17,500 value, awarded for 12 months

Process

- The CIHR Master’s Award was harmonized for the 2014-15 competition, full competition details can be found in the Canada Graduate Scholarship-Master’s level section
- National results prior to 2014-15 are not easily accessible for comparative purposes
- The Graduate Awards Office does not have statistics on the CIHR Doctoral competition as students submit their application directly to CIHR however, the office does send a memo to graduate units with internal U of T processes determined by Research and Innovation

Highlights

- Under the Tri-agencies harmonization process the CIHR Master’s level awards were significantly increased starting with the 2014-15 competition. U of T had the number of CIHR Master’s awards increased from an average of 20 per year to 60 awards per year starting in 2014-15 through to 2016-17.
Canada Graduate Scholarships – Master’s Program

Award Overview

For 2016-17 the Canada Graduate Scholarship – Master’s Program was awarded through a harmonized process for all Tri-agencies:

- CIHR Master’s Award: Frederick Banting and Charles Best Canada Graduate Scholarships (CGSM): $17,500 value, awarded for 12 months
- NSERC Master’s Award: Alexander Graham Bell Canada Graduate Scholarship (CGSM): $17,500 value, awarded for 12 months
- SSHRC Master’s Award – Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate Scholarship (CGSM): $17,500 value, awarded for 12 months

Process

- The 2013-14 competition year was the first year of the Tri-Council Harmonization process for the Canada Graduate Scholarships – Master’s program. The objective is to streamline the application and review processes for students and university administrators. The agencies now have common evaluation criteria, common review mechanisms, a common IT platform and common post-award policies and regulations. The harmonization process is expected to be applied to the doctoral awards however no specific timeline has been confirmed; final adjudication of the doctoral scholarships will remain with the Tri-Councils.
- Eligible Canadian universities received an allocation of awards, and administered the CGS M process internally.
- New for the 2013-14 competition, applicants had to apply online through the Tri-agency developed application platform, Research Portal. A common submission deadline of Dec. 1st was set by the Tri-Agencies for student applications.
- Graduate units were given a quota for the number of applications they were eligible to recommend to SGS based on
  - University’s allocation from the federal government
  - graduate unit’s 3-year success rate (i.e. percentage of awards held at the unit)
  - graduate unit’s master’s student population;

Highlights

- Graduate units submitted 469 applications to SGS according to their quota
- 295 scholarships (totaling $5,162,500) were awarded through five separate SGS Award Committee reviews
- Award allocations from the federal government remained the same starting in 2014 until 2016

CGS M Results by Award Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UofT</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>J of T’s Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSERC</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>9.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIHR</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>11.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2274</td>
<td>8.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CGS M Application Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>NSERC</td>
<td>SSHRC</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>NSERC</td>
<td>SSHRC</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>NSERC</td>
<td>SSHRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># received at U of T</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># reviewed at SGS</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation/# of awards</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VANIER CGS**

**Award Overview**

Vanier scholarships are awarded through all Tri-agencies: CHIR, NSERC, SSHRC.
- Vanier CGS (doctoral): $50,000 value, awarded for 36 months

**Process**

- The Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarships (Vanier CGS) program is designed to attract and retain world-class doctoral students by offering them a significant financial award to assist them during their studies at Canadian universities.
- Vanier applicants must apply through only one university and winners must hold their award at the institution that submitted their nomination.
- International students are eligible for the Vanier awards.
- U of T’s quota for submission of applications for the Tri Councils’ is 246, which is to be allocated over a 3-year time period (2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18).

**Highlights**

- Candidates who are nominated by a university where they have completed a previous degree are asked to provide a compelling rationale, in the “Special Circumstances” section, as to why they have chosen the same/nominated university to undertake their PhD. The university was also required to provide an explanation, in the nomination letter.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UofT</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>U of T’s Share</td>
<td>UofT</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>U of T’s Share</td>
<td>UofT</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>U of T’s Share</td>
<td>UofT</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>U of T’s Share</td>
<td>UofT</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier NSERC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20.75%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.26%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier SSHRC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanier CHIR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25.93%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23.64%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23.64%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>19.11%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>15.95%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>15.65%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>% of National Awards</td>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>% of National Awards</td>
<td>Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.75%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.95%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.46%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.56%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.92%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Banting Postdoctoral Fellowships**

_**Award Overview**_

- Banting Postdoctoral Fellowships: $70,000 value, renewable for two years

_**Process**_

- The purpose of the Banting Postdoctoral Fellowships Program is to build world-class research capacity by recruiting top-tier Canadian and international postdoctoral researchers at an internationally competitive level of funding.
- The fellowships are distributed equally across Canada's three federal granting agencies: CIHR, NSERC, SSHRC.
- 70 new two-year awards annually at the national level, with a total of up to 140 awards active at any one time.
- At the request of the Tri-Council, the number of nominations forwarded in the Banting competition was reduced by the Graduate Awards Office.
- At the University of Toronto, Faculty Research Offices were given a quota from SGS and asked to nominate their best Banting candidates starting with the 2012-13 competition.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of applications submitted by UofT</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results by agency</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>CIHR</th>
<th>NSERC</th>
<th>SSHRC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDFs at UHN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDFs at UofT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparative Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency totals</th>
<th>2013-2014</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results by agency</td>
<td>CHRI</td>
<td>NSERC</td>
<td>SSHRC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>CHRI</td>
<td>NSERC</td>
<td>SSHRC</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>CHRI</td>
<td>NSERC</td>
<td>SSHRC</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded to UoT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ontario Graduate Scholarship (OGS)

**Award Overview**

- 3000 Ontario Graduate Scholarships are awarded annually province-wide;
- Over 800 awards were allocated by the Province to be administered by U of T (the largest share of OGS awards held province-wide; allocation was based on graduate enrollment); this included 21 OGS awards for Visa students;
- Master’s and Doctoral students in all disciplines are eligible to apply;
- Maximum of $15,000 value per year ($5000 per term, to be awarded for a minimum of 2 terms).

**Process**

- As of 2013-14 award year, universities have been responsible for the administration of all OGS awards offered and held;
- Students must submit a separate OGS application to each university to which they are seeking admission;
- Current and prospective students applied through the centralized U of T online OGS application system developed by SGS;
- Graduate units were given an allocation based on:
  - University’s allocation from MTCU
  - Graduate unit’s 3-year average success rate (i.e. percentage of awards held at the unit)
  - Graduate unit’s population;
- Graduate units accessed and reviewed applications and nominated OGS recipients along with a reversion list: in accordance with their allocation;
- SGS received lists of nominees, completed final eligibility checks, and issued official award offers.
Highlights

- 4042 applications were submitted to U of T in 2016-17 (vs. 4113 in 2015-16).
- Each university must award all of their allocated OGS awards. Unused allocations are to be returned to the Ministry. As U of T has many more applications than allocated awards, the entire 822 awards were offered to students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of OGS applications接收province-wide for Ministry adjudication</td>
<td>12348</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of initial offer of OGS awards by the Ministry</td>
<td>3060*</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications forwarded to Ministry for provincial adjudication</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - awards received (as per initial successful list from MTCU)</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T's Share</td>
<td>30.42%</td>
<td>26.87%</td>
<td>26.73%</td>
<td>26.93%</td>
<td>27.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The target number of OGS awards given by the province is always 3000; however, prior to 2013-14, when adjudication was done at the provincial level, the province used to “over award” beyond the 3000 awards available with the expectation that a certain number of awards offered would be declined due to recipients receiving other awards (e.g., federal awards) or for other reasons. 2011-12 was an unusual year during which they over awarded too many and then subsequently didn’t over award enough awards in 2012-13; hence causing the large variation in the two numbers. Starting 2013-14, the 3000 awards have been given as fixed allocations to universities for administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Applicants</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversions</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>2221</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>3488</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4747</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provincial application results provided until 2012-13 - Starting 2013-14 – U of T internal application results are provided.

**Ontario Trillium Scholarship (OTS)**

Award Overview

- Ontario Trillium Scholarship (OTS): $40,000 value, renewable annually for a total of four years.

Process

- The Ontario Trillium Scholarships (OTS) provides significant financial support to attract the best qualified international students to Ontario for PhD studies.
- Starting in the 2011-12, the University of Toronto received 15 OTS awards.
- Each year, an additional 15 awards are provided to U of T, reaching a steady state of 60 awards.
- PhD admissions applicants are nominated by eligible graduate units.
- SGS holds a central competition and awards the top candidates an OTS.
Queen Elizabeth II Graduate Scholarship in Science & Technology (QEII-GSST)

Award Overview

- In 1998, the Ontario government introduced the QEII-GSST (originally named the OGSST), a merit-based scholarship program targeted specifically toward graduate students in science and technology. Eligible Ontario universities receive an allocation of awards each year based on graduate enrollment in the science and technology disciplines.
- The program is supported through funds provided by the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities and by funds raised by the University of Toronto from the private sector.
- In order to guarantee funds from the private sector each year to meet the matching requirement, the University of Toronto, through a massive fundraising campaign, created 174 endowments to match and cover 1/3rd of each of the 174 awards the MTCU had allocated to the university in 2001; therefore each year U of T continues to award 174 awards as per the award records for each endowment;
- For the past three years the Province has been allocating approx. 150 QEII-GSST awards to be administered by U of T (the largest share of QEII awards held province-wide);
- Master’s and Doctoral students in disciplines of science and technology are eligible to apply;
- Maximum of $15,000 value per year ($5000 per term, to be awarded for a minimum of 2 terms);

Process

- Universities are responsible for the administration of all QEII awards offered and held;
- Students must submit an OGS application to each university department to which they are seeking admission and would like to be considered for the QEII-GSST; the OGS application acts with a dual purpose of an OGS application and a QEII-GSST application if the applicant indicates he/she would like to also be considered for the QEII-GSST competition;
- Current and prospective students applied through the centralized U of T online OGS application system developed by SGS;
- Graduate units have a fixed allocation based on the number of endowment accounts the unit was able to create when the QEII-GSST program was first introduced by the MTCU;
- Graduate units accessed and reviewed applications and nominated QEII recipients along with a reversion lls: in accordance with their allocation;
- SGS received lists of nominees, completed final eligibility checks, and issued official award offers.
**Ontario Women’s Health Scholars Award**

**Award Overview**
- Three levels of this award: Master’s, Doctoral, and Postdoctoral;
- Value of Master’s level award: $25,000 plus $1,000 research allowance;
- Value of Doctoral level award: $35,000 plus $2,000 research allowance;
- Value of Postdoctoral level award: $50,000 plus $5,000 research allowance;
- The award recipients are determined by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU).

**Process**
- The purpose of the Ontario Women’s Health Scholars award is to foster the creation of new knowledge about women’s health and its translation into improved health for women, more effective health services and products for women, and strengthen the health care system;
- Applicants must first submit applications to their graduate units;
- Graduate units may submit to SGS one candidate for each of the three categories for the centralized SGS competition;
- U of T has a quota of two nominations for each award level to submit to COU; the top two candidates for each level are determined by an SGS Awards Committee;
- The Council of Ontario Universities reviews nominations submitted from all registered Ontario universities to determine the recipients;
- Due to the research stipend received by recipients, award payments are made through the Office of Research and Innovation and processed by individual faculties and departments.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Post Doc</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T -</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applications</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>SGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forwarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renewal</td>
<td>applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Provincial awards including Renewals</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of T's share (%) of total awards</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autism Scholars Award**

**Award Overview**
- Two levels of this award: Master's and Doctoral;
- Up to one award at the Master's level and the Doctoral level is given annually province wide;
- Value of Master's level award: $18,000;
- Value of Doctoral level award: $20,000;
- The award recipients are determined by the Council of Ontario Universities.

**Process**
- The purpose of the Autism Scholars Award is to attract and retain pre-eminent scholars in the creation of new knowledge concerning child autism and increase the province's capacity in diagnosis and assessment of autism and to strengthen the treatment system;
- Applicants submit directly to the Graduate Awards Office by December 1;
- All completed and eligible applications received by the deadline are forwarded to the Council of Ontario Universities for adjudication;
- Graduate Awards Office processes payment if a U of T applicant receives the award.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-2015</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications reviewed at SGS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications forward</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U of T awards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Provincial awards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T's share (%) of total awards</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Program was discontinued by the province due to insufficient funds in 2010, but was re-introduced for the 2014-15 award year.
John Charles Polanyi Prizes

Award Overview

- The John Charles Polanyi Prizes is a prestigious award honouring the achievement of John Charles Polanyi’s receipt of the 1986 Nobel Prize in Chemistry;
- 3 Polanyi Prizes are awarded each year, one in each of the categories (mimicking the Nobel categories): Physics, Chemistry, Physiology or Medicine, Literature, and Economics;
- The value of the prize is $20,000;
- Recipients must have a postdoctoral fellowship or new faculty appointment.

Process

- For the 2015 competition, applicants submitted directly to the Graduate Awards Office;
- Applications were reviewed for eligibility and completeness and all completed and eligible applications were forwarded to the COU;
- COU adjudicates and selects recipients;
- Award funds are distributed directly to recipients from COU.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications reviewed at SGS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications forward</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U of T awards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total national awards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T's share (%) of total awards</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative Polanyi Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurier</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>