UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
of
Tuesday, November 21, 2006

HELD IN THE GALBRAITH COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. Dean Susan Pfeiffer welcomed Graduate Education Council members and visitors.

Agenda Approval of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of November 21, 2006

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the meeting of the Graduate Education Council will adjourn no later than 5:00 p.m.

The motion was CARRIED.

1. Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of October 24, 2006

The minutes of the October 24, 2006 meeting were circulated with the agenda.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the minutes of the October 24, 2006 Graduate Education Council meeting be approved.

The motion is CARRIED.

2. Business Arising from the Minutes

Corrections to the Attendance List were suggested. The minutes will be revised accordingly.

The new program proposal from the Faculty of Music, which was on the agenda of the October meeting of Council, has been forwarded to the Provost’s Office. The proposal is on the agenda of the December 6, 2006 meeting of the Academic Policy and Programs Committee, and the December 5, 2006 meeting of Planning and Budget Committee. The proposal has also been sent to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) for appraisal.
A member asked for an update on student awards committees. Vice-Dean Smith noted that he would be speaking to the issue during his remarks.

3. **Dean’s Remarks**

   3.1 **Approach to Professional Graduate Program Structure**

   A memo titled “An Approach to Professional Graduate Program Structures” was distributed to Faculty and Campus Deans on October 30, 2006, and to Council members as part of their November agenda package. The item appears on the agenda for information. In 2003, a policy document regarding the governing structure of the three University of Toronto campuses was presented for consideration and assessed via the University governance process. It envisioned an approach that would allow professional master’s degree programs to operate and be managed on UTM and UTSC campuses. Accordingly, the administrative framework of professional master’s programs needs to be examined under SGS policies.

   There are graduate programs that are managed by a program director, as distinct from a graduate director or chair. Sometimes more than one program chair reports to a single graduate chair or director. The memo suggests that each campus Dean, or their designate, could operate as the graduate director, and thus all of the professional master’s programs would function under their supervision. Each program would also have a program director, who would report to the graduate director. Accordingly, professional master’s programs can develop in a coherent and structured way without the establishment of “department-like” units to support each program. This topic will be revisited later in the meeting.

   3.2 **Collaborative Programs: Changes to administrative procedures**

   Revisions to the Collaborative Program Guidelines are on the Council agenda for information, and will be discussed later in the meeting.

   The administrative structures for collaborative programs have been aligned with the new governance structures. Collaborative Programs often involve more than one Faculty, and the guidelines have been revised to acknowledge all participating Faculties within the same framework. A lead Faculty has been identified for each collaborative program. The revisions will provide collaborative program directors with the necessary vehicle to make adjustments to programs in accordance with new governance procedures, as necessary.
3.3 **Revisions to SGS Booklets**

The booklets on Graduate Supervision and Intellectual Property will be revised, and may be reprinted for distribution. Current booklet information is available online, but SGS will be updating the content and will inform the U of T community when revisions are complete.

3.4 **Graduate Professional Student Survey (GPSS)**

The Graduate Professional Student Survey (GPSS) will be administered in January 2007. The survey will be used as a tool to aid in aspects of graduate expansion, and thus, since the survey was last administered in 2005, the provincial government has come to expect the participation of all Ontario universities.

The administrative procedure of the survey will remain unchanged; however, its broader administration is likely to become more complicated with greater participation from many university communities.

3.5 **Winter by-election**

SGS is now accepting nominations to fill a Division I faculty position, and a Division IV Chair position on the Graduate Education Council. The deadline for receipt of nominations is November 29, 2006. Forms can be found on the SGS website.

The Dean asked Council members if there are any questions regarding her remarks. A member questioned if the issue of how the funding guarantee has changed the supervisory relationship will be addressed during the meeting. The Dean answered that she would consider the topic for a future meeting of Council, but since only approximately a third of graduate students are affected by the funding guarantee, the topic may not be appropriate for broad discussion by the Graduate Education Council.

4. **Report of the Vice-Dean, Programs**

Vice-Dean Cowper noted that there are several new programs in discussion.

Streamlining of Final Oral Exams (FOE) is currently underway, and a report will be provided to Council during a future Graduate Education Council meeting.
5. **Report of the Vice-Dean, Students**

5.1 **New Awards Committee**

Membership is pan-divisional, and consists of graduate coordinators who are not currently members of the Committee on Program Matters or the Committee on Student Matters, as well as a number of "permanent members" from units that traditionally submit many applications for Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) awards.

The Awards Committee has come to a consensus regarding the adjudication process. There will be four sub-committees: two sub-committees for SSHRC, and two sub-committees for NSERC. Meetings to discuss the distribution of NSERC awards are currently in progress. Sub-committees have had constructive and productive discussions.

The Awards Committee has identified the theme of consistency as of principle importance. All members will be provided with a package consisting of applications to be evaluated prior to the meetings; each application will be assessed by at least two members. At the meetings, anomalous scores will be discussed and final rankings or a list of nominees for awards will be decided, as relevant.

Vice-Dean Smith noted that students will not be included in the evaluation process of awards for the 2006-07 year. It can be difficult to find appropriate student members since there is a conflict of interest when students evaluate their peers.

A member noted that there should be student members on the Award Committees. Although there may exist a conflict of interest when students evaluate their peers for awards, the same conflict can exist for faculty members since professors may be evaluating students who represent their departments. The member suggested that the recruitment of student members from specific divisional committees might eliminate conflicts of interests. Vice-Dean Smith noted the member’s comments and explained that issues regarding student membership may be revisited in the future.

A member asked which awards are covered by the Awards Committee. Vice-Dean Smith explained that the Committee will consider any award that has to be centrally adjudicated, such as SSHRC and NSERC. Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR) awards will not be considered because they do not need to be adjudicated. There is a range of other awards that the University is required to rank and support, and the Vice-Dean will soon be calling meetings to discuss the specifics.

5.2 **Electronic Thesis Project**

Discussions are ongoing, and the electronic thesis project is proceeding well. There is a plan to have a proposal in the spring of 2007 which will introduce the possibility of
students submitting theses electronically. A period of transition will allow students to have the option of submitting their theses electronically or in hard copy.

5.3 The Grad Room

The project to create a facility for graduate students at the old SpaHa restaurant, situated in Graduate House, is proceeding. The new establishment will be named the Grad Room and anticipated opening is January 2007. The Grad Room will be staffed at all times that it is open. Considerations regarding furniture and food choices are being discussed.

A member noted that Council has previously discussed the possibility of restricting access to the Grad Room. Dean Pfeiffer said that SGS explored the idea of a card-entry system; however, the University has deemed restricted access to spaces as inappropriate for a publicly funded institution. However, SGS will encourage usage of the space by graduate students by displaying announcements related to graduate education. Vice-Dean Smith noted that the Graduate Students’ Union operate in a similar fashion.

A member commended the electronic thesis project. There are increasing numbers of students who want to submit a thesis electronically, but not all faculty members are supportive of the endeavour, since there are many associated challenges. Some departments have instituted guidelines for paper submissions. Vice-Dean Smith noted that the purpose of the electronic thesis project is not to create restrictions in how these are handled at the department level. The project only covers the “official submissions” to SGS and beyond. The Vice-Dean commented that electronic versions allow thesis to be more than printed material, including colours, graphics, animation, performances, and anything else that can be converted to a digital format. Depending on area of study, printed documents may be restrictive for some students, and may not provide them with the formats that they may require to explain their thesis.

A member asked if a budget will be available to aid units during the transition from hard copy to electronic thesis submissions. Vice-Dean Smith explained that the cost for transitioning is not yet known but will be considered during the pilot project.

6. Program Requirement Changes

6.1 Industrial Relations and Human Resources, M.I.R.H.R. Program

The supporting documents were circulated with the agenda package. The proposal was posted on the Graduated Webposting System (GWS) for 28 days. Feedback and suggestions as a result of the posting related to: (1) clarification of the documentation to reflect that the proposed 12-month program option is an alternative to the regular two-year program; (2) deletion of reference to “direct-entry”, since the term usually refers to admission into a Ph.D. program from a bachelor’s degree; (3) number of courses required
for the advanced standing option; and, (4) a request for clarification of time to completion of degree requirements for part-time students in the calendar entry.

The proposal was approved at the Committee on Centre and Institute Programs (CCIP) on November 10, 2006. Feedback from the GWS was addressed at the meeting: (1) supporting documentation would be revised and clarified to reflect the proposal as an alternative option, not an addition to the two-year program; (2) reference to “direct-entry” would be deleted from the supporting documentation; (3) requirements should be understood as “sessions”, instead of requirements or semesters – calendar entry will be revised accordingly; and, (4) references to part-time students, and time to completion of degree requirements, would be clarified.

At the CCIP meeting, members also discussed minor textual clarifications of the governance form and calendar entry. The agenda package for Graduate Education Council members contains revised supporting documentation.

The CCIP approved the revised proposal. With the Graduate Education Council’s approval, the proposal will be forwarded to the Academic Policy and Programs Committee for information in an annual summary report.

Ms. Deborah Campbell was present at Council to answer question should they arise.

The Dean called upon Vice-Dean Elizabeth Cowper to present the motion.

**MOTION (dually moved and seconded)**

**THAT** the Graduate Education Council approve the proposal from the Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources to change program requirements of the Master of Industrial Relations and Human Resources (MIRHR) program. As an alternative to the regular two-year program, a 12-month program option is proposed, effective September 2007.

A member asked if compressing the program from two years to one year will negatively affect the quality of education. Ms. Campbell explained that the proposed change is replacing the existing advanced standing option, during which some students were able to complete the two-year program in as few as eight months. Thus, the change eliminates the eight-month option. The 12-month option will be offered over 12 consecutive months. Thus, the proposed changes actually expand the requirements. In the past, students were able to receive advanced standing status, thus the changes do not propose replacing the two-year program, but provide an alternative option for students depending on their experience and background.

A member noted the rationale section of the governance form indicates that more optional courses will be offered during May through August. The member questioned the anticipated number of part-time students in the program, and if the Centre will have to offer more courses to accommodate the number of students. Ms. Campbell replied that, currently, the proposal details increasing the number of courses offered during summer
months from one to four. Final considerations for adding the courses will be confirmed. There are approximately 60 students enrolled in the program, and fewer than half are part-time students. In keeping with graduate expansion, the first phase of changes will be geared towards full-time students. Predicted enrolment in the program is anticipated to be similar to current enrolment statistics.

A member noted that the revised documentation is an improvement compared to the online version. Regarding the calendar entry, there appears to be a list of nine required courses, however the heading explains that there are ten required courses. A member explained that there are ten courses listed, but one course is indented and does not appear to be a part of the list. The list will be revised to clarify the course offerings.

A member suggested inserting a list of optional courses.

The Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED, unanimously.

6.2 Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, Ph.D. Program

The supporting documents were circulated with the agenda package. The proposal was posted on the GWS, and the proposal received positive and supportive feedback. No changes were made to the proposal as a result of the GWS posting. The proposal was approved unanimously by the Engineering Graduate Education Committee (EGEC) on November 2, 2006. Members discussed reasons for eliminating program requirements, and no changes were made to the proposal as a result of the EGEC meeting.

The Graduate Education Council’s approval is final. The proposal will be included in an annual report to the Academic Policy and Programs Committee for information.

Professor Pierre Sullivan was present at Council to answer question should they arise.

The Dean calls upon Vice-Dean Elizabeth Cowper to present the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

THAT the Graduate Education Council approve the proposal from the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering to change program requirements in the Mechanical and Industrial Engineering Ph.D. program. Students with appropriate backgrounds will no longer be required to complete two of their five half-course requirements from the list of specified core courses. Changes are effective September 1, 2007.
A member asked if OCGS approval is required. Dean Pfeiffer replied in the negative, but noted that the change will be recorded as part of the program in the next periodic appraisal.

The Dean called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED, unanimous**

### 6.3 Social Work, M.S.W. Program

The supporting documents were circulated with the agenda package. The proposal was posted on the GWS for 28 days. There was no feedback as a result of posting on the GWS. The proposal was approved unanimously by the Faculty Council for the Faculty of Social Work on October 17, 2006. Members supported changes to program requirement options. No changes were made to the proposal as a result of the Faculty Council meeting.

The Graduate Education Council’s approval is final. The proposal will be included in an annual report to the Academic Policy and Programs Committee for information.

Professor Cheryl Regehr was present at Council to answer question should they arise.

The Dean called upon Vice-Dean Elizabeth Cowper to present the motion.

**MOTION (dually moved and seconded)**

**THAT** the Graduate Education Council approve the proposal from the Faculty of Social Work to change program requirements in the Master of Social Work (M.S.W.) program. Students specializing in Mental Health and Health will have the option of completing SWK 4631H Advanced Social Work Practice in Mental Health and SWK 4632H Advanced Social Work Practice in Health as part of program requirements. Changes are effective September 1, 2007.

A member commented that the program requirement change will benefit students in the program. The member noted that there is a minor typographical error in the calendar entry. Professor Regehr noted that the calendar entry would be revised.

The Dean called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED, unanimous.**

### 7. Program Name Change: Russian and East European Studies, M.A. Program

The supporting documents were circulated with the agenda package. The proposal was posted on the GWS for 28 days. There has been no feedback thus far as a result of posting on the GWS. The Faculty of Arts and Science provided the following report:
On October 12, 2006, the Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee (3CGC) of the Faculty of Arts and Science met to approve changes in curriculum. Along with various minor course and program changes, the following major program change and program initiative were approved at the meeting.

Jeffrey Kopstein, Director of the Centre, explained at the 3CGC meeting that the Centre for European, Russian and Eurasian Studies (CERES) came together after a merger of European Studies and the Centre for Russian and East European Studies (CREES) two years ago. At the time the Centre was formed, external reviewers suggested the name change of the program from ‘Russian and European Studies’ to ‘European, Russian and Eurasian Studies’. This change is supported by the Centre and by the students, following a process of wide consultation.

Posting of this proposal on the Graduate Webposting System was not complete before the proposal was approved by the 3CGC. Thus it was approved at 3CGC on condition of successful completion of its posting on the GWS. At the time that the agenda package was distributed, no feedback had been received.

With Graduate Education Council’s approval the proposal will go to the Academic Policy and Programs Committee for information and to OCGS for approval.

Professor Jeffrey Kopstein was present at Council to answer question should they arise.

The Dean called upon Vice-Dean Elizabeth Cowper to present the motion.

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

THAT the Graduate Education Council approve the proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Science to change the name of the Russian and East European Studies Master of Arts (M.A.) program to the European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies Master of Arts (M.A.) program. Changes are effective September 1, 2007.

The Dean noted that the name change would provide a new acronym for the program, which is in line with the name change of the Centre. Professor Kopstein noted that the program acronym will change from REES to ERES.

The Dean called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED, unanimous.**
8. **Proposal from the Faculty of Arts and Science for a Master of Arts (MA) in Cinema Studies Program**

The supporting documentation was circulated with the agenda package. The proposal was posted on the Graduate Webposting System (GWS) for 28 days, and received positive feedback.

The Faculty of Arts and Science provided the following report:

On October 12, 2006, the Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee (3CGC) of the Faculty of Arts and Science met to approve changes in curriculum. Along with various minor course and program changes, the following major program change and program initiative were approved at the meeting.

**New graduate degree program – Master of Arts in Cinema Studies**

Currently, Cinema Studies is following a parallel approval process, in that the Cinema Studies Institute is also being established as an EDU. At the 3CGC meeting, a member asked if having the graduate program and the EDU being created at the same time is a problem, to which Vice-Dean Gertler replied that it is not uncommon. Susan Pfeiffer added that the approval of the program and the EDU will reach Simcoe Hall (AP&P) for approval at the same time.

The establishment of a Master of Arts in Cinema Studies was approved by the 3CGC conditional on successful completion of its posting on the Graduate Webposting System.

With Graduate Education Council’s approval this item will go to the Academic Policy and Programs Committee, the Planning and Budget Committee, and Academic Board and Governing Council for approval, and to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) for a standard appraisal with consultants.

Members received two proposal documents for approval. One is the U of T submission document – this document addresses all aspects of the proposal, from resource issues to academic matters. The second document is the OCGS appraisal brief, Volume I, which is forwarded to OCGS for final approval. The other proposal document will go through four more considerations at U of T.

OCGS requires the approval of the Graduate Education Council prior to submission of a proposal for appraisal.

Professors Janet Paterson, Kay Armatage, and Charlie Keil were present to speak to the item.

The Dean calls upon Vice-Dean Elizabeth Cowper to present the motion.

**MOTION (duely moved and seconded)**

**THAT** the Graduate Education Council approve the proposal from the Faculty of
Arts and Science for a Master of Arts (M.A.) in Cinema Studies program, effective September 1, 2007, pending the identification and approval of an appropriate administrative structure to house the program.

Vice-Dean Cowper invited Professor Keil to speak to the item. Dean Pfeiffer asked Professor Keil to explain the overall rationale for the creation of an M.A. program in Cinema Studies. Professor Keil replied that many universities across North America offer a Master of Arts program in Cinema Studies, and the University of Toronto has an undergraduate program that has been in operation for more than 30 years. Therefore, the creation of a graduate opportunity is a natural progression. There is also strong faculty support and student interest in the program.

Dean Pfeiffer asked how the program will be managed administratively. Professor Keil indicated that the program will operate out of the administrative structures of Innis College, but with a separate structure responsible for assessing issues related to the graduate program.

Dear Pfeiffer asked Professor Gertler who will be the Graduate Chair or Director. Professor Gertler replied that the Dean of Arts and Science will serve as the Graduate Chair and there will be a Program Director. This administrative structure will facilitate the creation of the new program and fulfill its academic aims while keeping the administrative structure relatively light. It was noted that if a Ph.D. is developed in this area in future, the administrative structures will be revisited.

A member wanted to know why the proposal for the extra departmental unit (EDU) was not being presented to Council along with the program proposal. Professor Keil replied that it is not within the terms of reference for the Graduate Education Council to review the proposal for an EDU within a Faculty; Council’s responsibility rests with the graduate program proposal.

A member requested information on qualities that distinguish the Cinema Studies M.A. program from the undergraduate program and the distinguishing features of graduate scholarship in the curriculum. Professor Keil explained that the M.A. program would build on knowledge obtained at the undergraduate level, thus, courses offered as part of the graduate program are more in-depth and sophisticated, and many credits can be obtained by completing special topic courses. Additionally, students enrolled in the M.A. program will have the options of completing a major research paper or completing an internship plus a research paper in order to fulfill requirements.

A member questioned the number of graduate courses in which undergraduate students will be registered. Professor Keil noted that a maximum of one or two students in the Cinema Studies courses will be from outside the Cinema Studies program, perhaps only one graduate or undergraduate student.
A member said that the references to “mainframe” within the UT document and the OCGS proposal are archaic. Professor Keil noted that the references will be updated.

A member questioned the possibility of long-term funding for students. Professor Keil replied that students will be covered by the Faculty of Arts and Science funding guarantee.

Dean Pfeiffer inquired how Cinema Studies fits the description of a discipline. Professor Keil explained that the usual “scholarly apparatus” considered for disciplines exists for Cinema Studies including international research centres, journals and university press series devoted to Cinema Studies. These activities provide appropriate external verification of the subject as a discipline. Cinema Studies is also composed of technological, aesthetic, economic, and social features that differentiate it from other associated areas of study such as visual and cultural studies. The features that qualify Cinema Studies as a unique entity drive scholarship from a distinctive disciplinary standpoint.

The Dean called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED, unanimous.**

9. **Other Business**

There was no other business.

10. **For Information: Closures**

10.1 **Collaborative Program Guidelines – Revised**

The supporting documentation was circulated with the agenda package. Guidelines required revision in the context of the new governance model and other changes over the past few years.

The summary of major changes are: identification of “lead” Faculty Dean’s Office responsibilities with respect to collaborative programs; removal of the requirement for three-year initial University reviews; removal of regular review requirements, including removal of review procedures; revision of the procedures for adding new graduate programs into existing collaborative programs; and, editorial changes for ease of reading, consistency, and accurate reflection of current structures.

Previous Guidelines were approved by SGS Council in March 2003, and can be accessed via the SGS website.
The revised guidelines are being distributed broadly and will be posted on the SGS website for reference under Policies and Guidelines.

A member asked if there will be any changes regarding budget structures for collaborative programs, since the programs tend to require more funding than is currently provided. Dean Pfeiffer noted that the University of Toronto offers 36 collaborative programs – some have budgets, some do not. Many of the programs operate on “good will”. A collaborative program’s budget can be dependent on contributions from admitting programs, thus, contributions can vary. As the University moves into the new budget model, it has become apparent that although collaborative program activities supplement the pursuits of home programs, they do not generate a great deal of income for participating units. Interested parties need to explore institution-wide solutions for aforementioned challenges.

A member commended the changes to the guidelines, and requested clarification regarding when the provision of reports to Faculties and to SGS would be necessary. Dean Pfeiffer replied that SGS may request reports regarding the number of students enrolled in each collaborative program. Ms. Heather Kelly, Director of Student Services at SGS noted that every year SGS circulates a list of student enrolments to collaborative programs for confirmation.

A member asked if the end of a collaborative program’s director’s term and the review of the collaborative program occur simultaneously. The Dean replied that the review and the end of the director’s term may or may not occur at the same time.

A member inquired about the role of staff in a collaborative program since there is no mention of administrative staff in the guidelines. The Dean said that all collaborative programs have a memorandum of agreement, which acknowledges roles and responsibilities of staff. However, since some collaborative programs do not employ regular staff, specific roles could not be listed as part of the guidelines.

Vice-Dean Smith noted that the guidelines do not clearly define a “lead Faculty” and a “lead Faculty Dean”. Dean Pfeiffer noted that the guidelines would be revised to include the aforementioned definitions.

A member asked if the closure of a collaborative program follows the same procedures as the closure of non-collaborative programs. Dean Pfeiffer noted that closures of all programs follow the same procedures. Collaborative programs often make closure decisions at the point of their OCGS appraisal since discussion arises related to the number of students registered in the program, and whether the future of the program is viable. At this point, the collaborative program may decide to continue or discontinue the program.

Associate Dean Liu noted that the guidelines suggest that the SGS Dean has the authority to request a review of a collaborative program, and that the lead Faculty Dean can also make a request to the SGS Dean for a review. Guidelines should delegate the authority
for a review request to one individual. Dean Pfeiffer explained that the individual who provides the resources for the collaborative program should have authority to request a review. The Dean noted Associate Dean Liu’s suggestion; however, she indicated that the guidelines, as proposed, allow flexibility for a review based on the assessment of scholarly content or to discuss concerns regarding resources.


The supporting documentation was circulated with the agenda package. The Dean approved the closure of this program on behalf of the Graduate Education Council.

The program is closing because the original rationale of facilitating entry to a Ph.D. program is no longer valid due to the revision of requirements within the Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Sciences. As well, the degree does not facilitate timely completion of licensing exams. The only student enrolled in the program will graduate in November 2006.

For information only: Program Closure – Physical Therapy and Rehabilitation Science Combined M.Sc.P.T. / M.Sc. Program

10.3 An Approach to Professional Graduate Program Structure

The supporting documentation was circulated with the agenda package.

There was some confusion regarding categories of graduate faculty members as described in the memorandum and its appendix. The Dean clarified that a graduate director is responsible for tracking faculty and administrative responsibilities for a program.

A member commented that at the October meeting of Council, the Dean spoke to approaches on UTM and UTSC campuses issues; however, many professional programs operate on St. George campus. The supporting documentation suggests that all programs will be governed by the same approach. Regarding the section that notes “the Dean [of the Faculty] would be identified as the Graduate Director…” the member remarked that, as a director of a graduate unit, he is responsible for obtaining approval of appointments from the Dean within the same Faculty as the faculty member that requires approval. The member requested clarification about how a conflict of interest can be avoided.

A member noted that the Faculty Dean may encounter a conflict of interest by approving proposals for resources from one graduate unit, while rejecting proposals from another. The Dean explained that on the St. George campus, it is unlikely that the proposed structure will be implemented, save for exceptional circumstances. If necessary, the Faculty Dean can designate the task to another individual, such as the Vice-Dean of Graduate Studies. Dean Pfeiffer indicated that she will consider a more complete
response to answer the member’s concerns. The Dean noted that the approach in question is being applied to the new Cinema Studies program, and although a Master of Arts is not a professional degree, the program likely will rely on instructors whose appointments need to obtain approval from the relevant authority. Conflicts may exist in theory, but are unlikely to exist in practice. Vice-Dean Smith added that many faculty members currently perform multiple functions that may result in conflicts of interests and no serious issues have arisen. However, the Vice-Dean agreed that the discussion could be revisited in the future, if problems arise.

A member asked if existing professional programs have the option of adopting the new model, or if they have to remain affiliated with their current graduate unit. Vice-Dean Cowper noted that, for some programs it is not practical to secede from the affiliated department. Although it is possible for the structure of an existing professional program to change, the approach is most applicable to new programs without an obvious affiliation.

A member asked why the item is not being presented to Council as a proposal to be approved. The Dean replied that the document in question is conceptual, and Council is asked to provide a response of agreement or disagreement since it is possible that a Faculty or campus may bring forward a relevant proposal, and Council will have to consider how it will function in the proposed context. It is important for all units to consider the approach, and thus including it on the Council agenda for information is a method of obtaining consideration by units. It is important for the Graduate Education Council to consider the approach because of members’ high degree of understanding of graduate programs.

The Dean welcomed feedback from members, and encouraged members to communicate concerns about the premise described in the memorandum.

11. **Meeting is Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
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