October 14, 2008

MEMORANDUM AND NOTICE OF MEETING
To: Members of Graduate Education Council
From: Jane Alderdice, Secretary, Graduate Education Council

Welcome to a new academic year as a member of the Graduate Education Council! You will find the notice of meeting and agenda below. The meeting will take place in the Galbraith Council Chamber. If you have any questions or comments about this agenda, contact Ms. Sasmita Rajaratnam, Interim SGS Governance Officer, at 416-946-3427 or sgs.governanceofficer@utoronto.ca. If you would like to discuss any aspect of Council business, I would be pleased to hear from you at jane.alderdice@utoronto.ca.

ORIENTATION FOR NEW GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL MEMBERS
Tuesday, October 21, 2008
1:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
ALL MEMBERS ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND
(Agenda to be distributed at meeting)

Notice of Meeting
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, October 21, 2008
2:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. (Note meeting start time)

The Council Chamber
Room 202, Galbraith Building
35 St. George Street

AGENDA

1. Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of May 20, 2008
   (Documentation attached)

2. Business Arising from the Minutes

...2
3. Dean’s Remarks

4. Report of the Vice-Dean, Program Matters

5. Report of the Vice-Dean, Student Matters

6. Centre of Criminology: Proposal to Disestablish within SGS and re-establish as an extra-departmental unit A (EDU:A) within the Faculty of Arts and Science
   (Documentation attached)

7. Proposal for a Graduate Professional Skills Development Program
   (Documentation attached)

8. Program and Degree Name Change
   (Documentation attached)
   8.1. Information Studies Program – change to Information Program, and Master of Information Studies degree (MISt) – change to Master of Information degree (MI)

9. Program Requirement Changes
   (Documentation attached)
   9.1. Chemistry (Analytical Field only)(PhD)
   9.2. Museum Studies (MMSI)
   9.3. Planning (PhD)
   9.4. Political Science (PhD)

10. Other Business

11. For Information
    (Documentation attached)
    11.1. GEC Fall 2008 By-election Report
    11.2. Revised GEC Membership 2008-09
    11.3. Faculty of Information Studies name change to Faculty of Information
    11.4. Dalla Lana School of Public Health (EDU:A)

Regrets only to Ms. Sasmita Rajaratnam, Interim SGS Governance Officer, at 946-3427; e-mail: sgs.governanceofficer@utoronto.ca
The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. Dean Susan Pfeiffer welcomed Graduate Education Council members and visitors and thanked them for attending the meeting.

The Dean called for a motion to adjourn no later than 5:00 p.m.

**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**.

The Dean called for a motion to approve the agenda.

**MOTION** *(duly moved and seconded)*

**THAT** the agenda of the Graduate Education Council meeting of May 20, 2008 be approved.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

1. **Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of Tuesday, April 22, 2008**

   The minutes of the **Tuesday, April 22, 2008** meeting were circulated with the agenda.

   **MOTION** *(duly moved and seconded)*

   **THAT** the minutes of the **Tuesday, April 22, 2008** School of Graduate Education Council meeting be approved.

   The motion was **CARRIED**.

2. **Business Arising from the Minutes**

   **2.1 Subsequent action on GEC approved items**

   The following items are previously approved by this Council - I am reporting on subsequent progress towards final approval in two cases.

   - Master of (M.H.I.) degree program in Health Informatics
   - Master of Health Science (M.H.Sc.) degree program in Medical Radiation Sciences
Both programs were approved by Governing Council on March 4, 2008. Both are still under appraisal at OCGS.

3. **Dean’s Remarks**

1. **Doctoral Programs - Graduate Funding Information 2007-2008**
   There is a Financial Support Guide posted on the SGS website under Current Students – Financial Support. The guide lists minimum funding amounts for each doctoral program and includes an appendix of additional commentary on the administration of doctoral stream funding.

2. **International Visiting Graduate Student Protocol**
   As of September 2008, international visiting graduate students who are here to conduct research (not take courses) may be registered as “international visiting graduate research students”. The International Visiting Graduate Student Research Mobility Agreement sets out a protocol for recognition of international visiting graduate students. The Agreement exists to facilitate visits by international graduate students who do not fall under an approved exchange program to participate in short-term research activities and be recognized as legitimate visitors to the University of Toronto. An annual administration fee of $400.00 plus compulsory non-academic incidental fees and University Health Insurance Plan (UHIP) fees will be charged to international visiting graduate research students per application. This will enable international visiting graduate research services to access a range of University of Toronto support services including health care. SGS Student Services is pleased to provide further information as needed.

3. **For Information Items**
   Dean Pfeiffer said that she had comments on the “for information” items identified at the end of the agenda, but asked to hold discussion until the end of the agenda.

14.5 **Report of the Graduate Education Governance Processes Review Panel**
   Members of the panel are Professor Joan Cherry, Information Studies (chair); Professor William Robins, English and Medieval Studies; Professor Tarek Abdelrahman, Electrical and Computer Engineering; and Professor Helene Polatajko, Rehabilitation Science and Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy.

14.6 **Report of the Working Group on Interdisciplinarity in Graduate Education**
   The group focused on three areas: collaborative graduate programs, combined programs, and ad hoc interdisciplinarity.

The following items were announced without further comment:

14.1 **SGS Audit Report, 2007-08**

14.2 **Spring Graduate Council Election Report**
14.3 Annual Report on GAAB Appeals, 2007-08

14.4 Annual Report on Graduate House, 2007-08

4. Report of the Vice-Dean, Programs  
No report.

5. Report of the Vice-Dean, Students  
No report.

6. Program and Admission Requirement Change

6.1 Proposal for a Collaborative Master’s and Doctoral Program in Workplace Learning and Social Change, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Proposal was approved by the OISE Graduate Education Committee on March 14, 2008 and the Faculty Council of OISE on April 16, 2008. Professor Kiran Mirchandani was present to answer questions.

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

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

THAT SGS Council approve the proposal for a Collaborative Master’s and Doctoral Program in Workplace Learning and Social Change, effective September 2008. The new collaborative program is to be housed within Division II for administrative purposes. The lead Faculty will be the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Vice-Dean Cowper read comments sent in an e-mail from a member who was unable to attend the meeting:

The program requirements as stated in the proposal are confusing. That is, the total number of courses for the collaborative program seems to be no more than the total number for the regular degree program, but OCGS brief implies that more courses are required.

Vice-Dean Cowper said that the member hopes this information is clarified before the program is made available. Dr. Mirchandani responded that the requirements are exactly the same. Students in the collaborative program will take the same number of courses as in the regular degree program.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.
7. **Admission and Program Requirement Changes**

Dean Pfeiffer drew members’ attention to the large amount of information on the motion sheets for the items that follow, and commented that she assumes they have reviewed the information. She will therefore limit her comments to substantive items.

7.1.1 **Proposal to change admission requirements for the Elementary and Intermediate Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.), Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, OISE**

The proposal was approved by the OISE Graduate Education Committee on March 14, 2008 and the Faculty Council of OISE on April 16, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information. Professor Elizabeth Campbell was present to answer questions.

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

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, Elementary and Intermediate Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.), to change the admission requirements concerning prerequisites in teaching subjects from 2.0 full course equivalents to 3.0 full course equivalents, effective September 2008.

A student member asked what effect the motion would have on program requirements. Professor Campbell answered that the change relates to the prerequisite courses for admission.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

7.1.2 **Proposal to change program requirements for the Elementary and Intermediate Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.), Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, OISE**

These changes are proposed in association with the introduction of a new field to the program. The program currently is a single-field program – the field name is Human Development and Curriculum. A second field in “Secondary Education” is being proposed in a brief for the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. While the existing field is not being changed, its title is being revised to “Elementary Education”; this provides a level of consistency with the new second field name.

A new field does not require University governance approvals, but curriculum changes associated with the new field do. The program name is also being revised from “Elementary and Intermediate Education Program” to “Elementary and Secondary
Education Program" to reflect the introduction of a second field (see item #8 on agenda). The overall number of courses required is unchanged. The proposal was approved by the OISE Graduate Education Committee on March 14, 2008 and the Faculty Council of OISE on April 16, 2008.

SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information.

Professor Elizabeth Campbell was present to answer questions. The Dean called upon Vice-Dean Elizabeth Cowper to present the motion. Vice-Dean Cowper noted a correction to the motion – the word “designated” is eliminated and the words “core to the field” are added:

Revised MOTION

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, Elementary and Intermediate Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.), to change the program requirements from 14 core half-courses plus 2 half-course electives to 10 core half-courses plus 5 half-courses core to the field plus 1 elective half-course; in the area of Curriculum and Instruction, the elementary field will have 4 half courses to address major subject areas (language, mathematics, science, arts) and the secondary field will have 2 full courses representing the two teaching subjects that each candidate will take, effective September, 2008.

There was no discussion. The Chair called the question.

The revised motion was CARRIED.

7.2 Proposal to change program requirements for the M.A. and M.Sc. in the Geography Program, Geography Department, Faculty of Arts and Science

The proposal was approved by the Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on April 14, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. This item will be included in the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information. Professor Bill Gough was present to answer questions.

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

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Geography, Geography Program, M.A. and M.Sc., to change the program requirements for Geography students enrolled in the Collaborative Program in Environmental Studies from seven half-courses (3.5 FCEs) to five half courses (2.5 FCEs) effective September 2008; the program length for these students is thereby reduced from 16 months to 12 months.
A member asked whether the proposal would make the required number of courses similar to those at other universities. Professor Gough said he was not necessarily familiar with the requirements in other programs, adding the change is in line with the funding package which is a major issue with students.

A member asked how a reduction in the number of required courses would affect the quality of program. Will students have enough time to cover the material? Professor Gough explained that the key elements in this program are the internship and the research project. Those remain intact. The motion is a response to those students who feel there are too many courses.

Dean Pfeiffer asked for clarification on Professor Gough’s answer regarding the funding for students in the collaborative program. Professor Gough explained that students coming into the program have discovered that they are not funded for last four months. Dean Pfeiffer asked for clarification of requirements for regular degree program students compared to those also in the collaborative program. Professor Gough said that the regular program will be unchanged. Both the regular and collaborative program will be 12 months in duration.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

7.3 Proposal to change program requirements for the M.Sc. and Ph.D. in Geography Program, Physical Geography field, Geography Department, Faculty of Arts and Science

The proposal was approved by the Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on April 14, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information.

Professor Bill Gough was present to answer questions.

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

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Geography, Geography Program, M.Sc. and Ph.D., to change the program requirements for the Physical Geography field so as to require students to complete and pass “Physical Geography Core Course” (.5 FCE), effective September 2008; students in the physical geography field will substitute the required core course for one of their electives.

There was no discussion. The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.
7.4.1 Proposal to change admission requirements (background in philosophy) for Philosophy Program, Ph.D., direct entry, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts and Science

The proposal was approved by the Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on April 14, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information. Professor Philip Kremer was present to answer questions.

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

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Philosophy, Philosophy Program, Ph.D., direct entry, to change the admission requirements for students entering with a bachelor’s degree from a requirement of “at least six full courses (twelve half-courses) in philosophy. . .” to a requirement of “a strong background in philosophy (roughly equivalent to at least an undergraduate major) . . .”, effective September 2008.

A member asked Professor Kremer to give an example of a requirement that is “roughly equivalent” to an undergraduate major. Professor Kremer explained that the department receives applications from all over North America and that they consider applications from students with various backgrounds. He said that, in fact, the Department simply looks for a strong background, depending on what other courses the student has; for example, a student may have nine philosophy and political science courses.

The member asked if the motion is worded as it is in order to make requirements more broadly accessible. Another member commented the wording seemed imprecise. Professor Ainslie responded that the Department wanted a descriptor that would be broad in order to reduce the number of students who request feedback on the content of various courses they have completed.

Vice-Dean Smith noted that U of T’s definition of “major” is different than that of other institutions. In that sense, he suggested that the motion’s wording is not very descriptive and agreed that it seems imprecise. Professor Ainslie said that although people may interpret the word differently, “major” is the word that is most commonly used. The department accepts students with varied backgrounds.

Dean Pfeiffer asked if there was any lack of compatibility between the statement in the motion and the university’s policy regarding direct-entry admissions. Does it compromise the University’s basic requirements; for example, is it equivalent to a University of Toronto bachelor’s degree with appropriate standing?

Professor Ainslie said the requirements are compatible with U of T and SGS admissions standards.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.
7.4.2 Proposal to change admission requirements (GRE) for the Philosophy program, Ph.D. and direct entry option, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts and Science

The proposal was approved by the Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on April 14, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information.

Professor Philip Kremer was present to answer questions.

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

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Philosophy, Philosophy Program, Ph.D. and direct entry option, to change the admission requirements from encouraging students to submit the results of the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) to requiring the submission of the results of the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) taken within the preceding 18 months; if this requirement would impose an undue burden on an overseas applicant, it can be waived at the discretion of the Graduate Coordinator; changes are effective September 2008 for admissions in September 2009.

A member noted that it does not seem very economical to have all students complete a Graduate Record Exam (GRE) when it is useful only in borderline cases. Is there not a more effective way to assess borderline students since the GRE is not a common requirement across all Canadian universities? What about interviews?

Professor Ainslie answered it is not unusual for top Philosophy programs to require the GRE. The GRE itself is a way of identifying borderline students - the department cannot, of course, ask students to self-identify as borderline. Interviews are not a realistic option when the department must process 250 applications.

Dean Pfeiffer asked if the requirement is common to the top Philosophy programs in Canada. Professor Ainslie said the 18 top Philosophy programs are in other countries. University of Toronto is the top Philosophy program in Canada.

A member suggested that if the requirement becomes an undue burden to international students, the department may experience a loss of applicants; additionally, it may receive a large number of requests for waivers. Professor Kremer replied that students are also applying to competitor institutions. He envisioned that waivers will be requested rarely.

Dean Smith asked if there was evidence that GRE scores are a quality indicator for admissions. Professor Kremer said it is a good indicator in his mind.

Dean Pfeiffer asked if Professor Kremer anticipates that it will add value to the evaluation process. Professor Ainslie replied the GRE score will be taken as just another piece of information, which may be helpful if the student is from a university that is not well-known or has referees that are not well-known. The department is already getting scores from many students. This motion will allow all applicants to be assessed more equally.

A member asked if Canadians predominately are the students who are not submitting GRE scores. If so, might they be disadvantaged because they are not used to...
doing this type of exam? Will the requirement create a prejudice within the department against Canadian students? Professor Kremer replied he has not done a statistical analysis on this question.

A member asked if there are other departments outside the science disciplines that require a GRE. Is there a GRE specific for Philosophy? And what other non-science programs require the GRE? Dean Pfeiffer asked for a member from Student Services to respond. Ms. Vesna Makarowska said that the Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources, the Department of Economics, and the Department of Psychology require the GRE. Mr. Michael Godwin, another SGS Student Services Officer, answered that the Rotman School of Management requires submission of GMAT scores for all students. A member noted that some departments require the GRE only for international students and wondered about the fairness of the GRE’s use. A member announced he will support the motion, adding he has long wished that his own department would require the GRE as it helps enormously in evaluating applications. He said that if the motion passes, he will agitate in his own department to require the GRE.

A member asked if there was any evidence that a student performs better in the program if the application includes a GRE score. Is the motivation to be consistent with other institutions? Professor Kremer said that the motivation is to help evaluate files. Professor Ainslie noted that Philosophy students are good at these kinds of tests.

A member asked if the department would require the GRE for the regular program as well as the direct entry option. Professor Ainslie said that the requirement is for both. The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

7.4.3 Proposal to change program requirements (language requirement) for the Philosophy, Ph.D. and direct entry option, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts and Science

The proposal was approved by the Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on April 14, 2008.

SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information. Professor Philip Kremer was present to answer questions.

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

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Philosophy, Philosophy Program, Ph.D. and direct entry option, to change the program requirements from requiring students “to demonstrate a reading knowledge of French or, with the permission of the department, another language (other than English) as needed for the student’s research” to “A student must demonstrate competence in at least one research tool. A research tool may be one of the following: reading knowledge of a language other than English, familiarity with a discipline other than philosophy (e.g., linguistics, psychology, or mathematics), mastery of research methods not typical in philosophy (e.g.,
statistical methods), and so on. The research tool will be determined by the graduate coordinator in consultation with the student’s area committee.” Changes are effective September 2008.

A member asked why the ability to demonstrate a reading knowledge of French is being deleted from the requirements. Professor Ainslie replied the French requirement does not seem to be exactly what some students need for the research project. The proposed broad requirement is best. If a student needs German and French for example, then the requirements will be tailored to the individual student’s research needs.

The member asked if the language requirement was being reduced from two languages to just one. Professor Ainslie replied yes and, in fact, the requirement could go down from one non-English language to none. The member asked whether the requirement could include knowledge of French as core to the program plus one other option. Professor Ainslie said the department would rather direct the requirements to the student’s research needs. French may not be the right language in some cases.

Another member suggested that students should take what is needed for their programs. She asked what the requirement would be if the student did not need a language? Professor Kremer said this scenario is possible, but it would be extremely rare. The member asked for a response in consideration of such a rare case, for example. Professor Ainslie said that, for example, if a student wished to specialize in American Philosophy, then a history course would be a research tool. Courses with respect to metaphysics, or ethics, or law might also qualify as requirements.

The member asked whether the motion in essence enabled students to have the background they need to do their doctoral research. Professor Ainslie confirmed this was true.

A member asked what would happen if a student presents his/her research proposal in the third year – how are research tool requirements assessed in such cases? Professor Kremer said that students have two years of coursework, then eight months of research in their area, then an examination. Currently, if the requirement is for a language other than French, when the area was put together, the student would be told to learn German, for example, and that the requirement must be completed by end of third year.

The member asked if students needed a course in ethics, would the student have to complete it in the third year also while studying for comprehensive exams? Professor Kremer answered that if a background in mathematics was required for serious logicians, for example, then mathematics would be part of the study for area. The same would apply for study of a language other than English. The member asked whether an undergraduate degree in mathematics would fulfill the requirement for mathematics as a tool. Professor Kremer answered yes, just as if a student were fluent in German.

Dean Pfeiffer commented she saw a similar proposition from the Department of Anthropology. There was no question as to the way it would be implemented. Every doctoral student needed to identify a research tool that was a part of the requirements to achieve candidacy. She asked if the Department of Philosophy might waive the research tool element, adding she hoped they would view research tools as an achievement in context of a doctoral program. Professor Ainslie replied the Philosophy Department is viewing them that way. Professor Kremer said the tool is often a language.
A member noted that this seems a shift from the past when one would conceive of the discipline of Philosophy on a national level and students would be prepared to function on the national scene. Now there may be a shift to an international level which may alter the conceptualization of what makes a good philosopher in Canada. He asked if the department has paid any attention to this issue. Professor Ainslie said Department members have consulted with faculty from the top 11 programs in North America. Only the University of Toronto and McGill University have a language requirement at all. The elimination of a French requirement moves in that direction. A member commented that French does not seem like a research tool.

Another member commented the challenge lies in determining the definition of research tools. Languages are such a specific requirement, yet the department wants the requirement to be general. Why not eliminate the language requirement? Professor Ainslie said that is what often happens. The department went through several iterations and thought it was important that students develop extra research tools to enable research in philosophy. The distinction seemed important and the proposed requirements speak to the interdisciplinary projects in which students are engaged. He noted that the proposed requirements have the support of students in the Department.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

7.4.4 Proposal to change admission requirements for the Philosophy Program, M.A., Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts and Science

The proposal was approved by the Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on April 14, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information. Professor Philip Kremer was present to answer questions.

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

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Philosophy, Philosophy Program, M.A., to change the admission requirements from requiring “at least six full courses (12 half courses) in philosophy . . .” to “a strong background in philosophy (roughly equivalent to at least an undergraduate major)”, effective September 2008.

There was no discussion. The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

7.5 Proposal to change admission and program requirements for the Rehabilitation Science Program, M.Sc. and Ph.D., Department of Rehabilitation Science, Faculty of Medicine
Rehabilitation Science is proposing a new field. Admission requirements are being modified to target appropriately qualified applicants and new program requirements are being proposed for the new field. A new field proposal is being developed for submission to OCGS. The proposal was discussed at the Graduate Affairs and Appointments Committee of the Department of Rehabilitation Science. The proposal was approved by the Faculty of Medicine Graduate Curriculum Committee on May 8, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information. Professor Molly Verrier was present to answer questions.

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

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

**THAT** SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Rehabilitation Science, Rehabilitation Science program, M.Sc. and Ph.D., Practice Science field, for admission requirements in addition to existing requirements (as outlined in the attachment), and for program requirement changes for students in the Practice Science field in the M.Sc. and Ph.D. as follows:

**M.Sc.:** REH 1100H and REH 2001Y and a Research Methods half course continue to be required; the required half course in the field of study is replaced with three required half courses (see attached); the requirement for all students to complete a thesis is unchanged;

**Ph.D.:** The requirement to take REH 3001Y (Advanced Rehabilitation Presentations & Proceedings), REH3100H (if REH1100H has not been taken) and an advanced Research Methods half course continue to be required. Students in the Practice Science field will also be required to complete four additional, specific half courses (see attached); the requirement for all students to pass a comprehensive examination and write a thesis are unchanged.

Changes are effective January 2009.

Dean Pfeiffer asked Professor Verrier to give some background information regarding the new field. Professor Verrier explained there are five fields in the program and the current proposal is for a sixth field. The field focuses on practice for individuals so they have appropriate credentials to do practice. The additional requirements focus on determinants of practice, knowledge of translation of practice, and a practicum.

Seeing no discussion, the Chair called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED.**
7.6 Proposal to change program requirements for the following program:
School and Clinical Child Psychology Program, Ph.D.
Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology, OISE

The proposal was approved by the OISE Graduate Education Committee and the OISE Faculty Council on April 16, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be presented to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS annual report for information. Dean Pfeiffer noted that a revised motion sheet with a blue cover was distributed at the beginning of the meeting – changes to the motion wording are noted in bold text. The overall number of courses required for program completion remains at 10 half courses. Professor Michele Peterson-Badali was present to answer questions.

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

Rewtised MOTION
THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology, School and Clinical Child Psychology Program, Ph.D., to substitute the required course HDP 3222H with the required course HDP 3222Y; overall requirements are changed from three required courses (2.0 FCE) plus six half course electives (3.0 FCE) to three required courses (2.5 FCE) plus five half course electives (2.5 FCE); changes are effective September 2008.

A member asked whether the Full Course Equivalent was correct in the motion. Vice-Dean Cowper confirmed it was and Professor Peterson-Badali noted that the change is from a half course to a full course.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

8. Program Name Change

8.1 Proposal to change the name of the Elementary and Intermediate Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.) (current name) to:
Proposed name: Elementary and Secondary Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.), Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, OISE

The proposal to change the name of the program has arisen in association with the proposed introduction to the program of a new field in Secondary Education. The proposal for the new field is being presented to the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies for appraisal (without consultants). A new field does not require approval by University governance, although changes to admission and/or program requirements associated with the new field do. The proposal was approved by the OISE Graduate Education Committee and then by the Faculty Council of OISE at its meeting on April 16, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval constitutes final University approval of this item. It will be
reported to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS Annual Report for information. As noted, OCGS approval is also required. Professor Elizabeth Campbell was present to answer questions.

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

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning to change the name of the Elementary and Intermediate Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.) to “Elementary and Secondary Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.), effective September 2008.

Dean Pfeiffer asked if the word “intermediate” was still used in educational circles. Professor Campbell said the category is redundant now. There are four areas: primary, junior, intermediate, and senior. These are offered in pairs (primary/junior, junior/intermediate, intermediate/senior). The department is proposing to have a new field of study in secondary education in the intermediate/senior area. The proposed change in title recognizes that the department has all four divisions covered, so the word “intermediate” may be dropped from the program name and replaced with new language.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

9. Program Closures

9.1 Proposal to close the Ed.D. in the Developmental Psychology and Education program, Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology, OISE

In introducing the item, Dean Pfeiffer noted a minor correction to the motion sheet. Although the sheet indicates that a calendar entry is attached, in fact there is none. The proposal was approved by the OISE Graduate Education Committee and by the Faculty Council of OISE at its meeting on April 16, 2008. With SGS GEC approval, this item will be forwarded to Governing Council committees for final approval. OCGS will be advised of the closure. There were two full-time students enrolled in the Ed.D. in the Developmental Psychology and Education program, according to data collected November 1, 2007. Professor Michele Peterson-Badali was present to answer questions.

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

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology to cease admissions in the Ed.D. in the Developmental Psychology and Education program, effective immediately, and to close the Ed.D. in the program when there are no more students registered in it.
Dean Pfeiffer asked Professor Peterson-Badali to explain if students currently enrolled in the program will have access to what they need after the program closes. Professor Peterson-Badali replied they absolutely would. The students will continue in the program until they finish. The department has a flexible-time Ph.D. program option. The department concluded it cannot support both programs.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

9.2 Proposal to close the Combined M.B.A./M.A. in Eurasian, Russian and European Studies Program

Dean Pfeiffer noted a minor correction to the motion sheet in this item also. Similarly, although the sheet indicates that a calendar entry is attached, in fact there is none. The proposal was also approved by the Faculty Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee on April 14, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. It will be reported to the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of Governing Council in the SGS Annual Report for information, and it will be reported to OCGS for information. There is one student currently enrolled in the program. Professor Kopstein was available to answer questions.

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

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Rotman School of Management and the Centre for Eurasian, Russian and European Studies to cease admissions to the Combined M.B.A./M.A. in Eurasian, Russian and European Studies Program, effective immediately, and to close the combined program when there are no more students registered in it.

A member advised that in principle she approves of closures. However, she noted that the recent Report of the Working Group in Interdisciplinarity in Graduate Education suggests that the University wants more interdisciplinarity and points specifically at combined and collaborative programs. Although the numbers are small, the report is saying that the University could do better at promoting interdisciplinarity.

Dean Pfeiffer accepted the member’s comments as general and not specific to the motion. She said the University wants to promote interdisciplinarity in a way that is effective. An effective interdisciplinary program has interest from both student and administration sides, so that there is a confluence of energy around the topic. If a program is not recruiting well, and those responsible for the program do not see a solution that fits within their mandate, then continuing to offer such a program and keep it on the books seems like false advertising. It is reasonable to see a flow of programs starting and ending as the University naturally fine-tunes choices for our current life and times.

A member asked why the program is closing. Vice-Dean Cowper replied that only one student has graduated since the program’s inception in 1997. It is probably not worth the transaction costs to maintain the program. Dean Pfeiffer added that often the
requirement to produce an OCGS brief will lead to a request to close if enrolments are low.

   The Chair called the question.

   The motion was CARRIED.

   **9.3 Proposal to close the Collaborative Program in Integrated Manufacturing, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering (lead Faculty)**

   Once again, Dean Pfeiffer noted a minor correction to the motion sheet. Although the sheet indicates that a calendar entry is attached, in fact there is none. The Collaborative Program has had no students enrolled during the past three years. The proposal to close the program was put forward by the Director and approved by the Vice-Dean Graduate Studies, Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, on May 6, 2008. SGS Graduate Education Council approval is final for this item. The notice of closure will be reported to OCGS for information. Professor Pierre Sullivan was present to answer questions.

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

   **MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

   THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering to close the Collaborative Program in Integrated Manufacturing, effective September 2008.

   Dean Pfeiffer commented that some members may have noticed that this proposal for closure has not gone through the same steps as other closures. Decanal authority in the FASE deemed it appropriate to suggest closure. She, on her authority, accepted the proposition rather than let it proceed through committees in the fall. She suggested that this was expedient.

   Professor Sullivan advised that the program was created to work with a particular automotive parts manufacturer that has since gone bankrupt. As a result, internships are difficult to manage, so the department was unable to continue the program.

   The Chair called the question.

   The motion was CARRIED.

   **10. Graduate Academic Appeals Board, Approval of Membership for 2008-2009**

   The Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) is a standing committee of SGS Graduate Education Council (GEC). Appointment of the Chair of GAAB is approved by GEC upon the nomination of the Dean of SGS. Appointment of faculty members is approved by GEC upon the nomination of the Vice-Dean, Students and the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Student Matters. Appointment of student members is approved by GEC upon the nomination and election by the student members of GEC.

   The Dean called upon Vice-Dean Berry Smith to present the motion.
Revised MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the appointments of a Chair, five faculty and three student members to serve on the Graduate Academic Appeals Board for the 2008-2009 academic year:

Chair: Professor Emeritus Ralph Scane, Faculty of Law (renewed)
Faculty Members: Professor Chris Damaren, Dept. of Aerospace Science and Engineering (new)
(three-year term) Professor Sandy Welsh, Dept. of Sociology (new)
Professor Juvenal Ndayiragije, French Language and Literature (renewed)
Professor Greig Henderson, English (renewed)
Professor Lynne Howarth, Information Studies (renewed)
Student Members: Laura Stenberg, English (new)
(one-year term) Leah Burns, Adult Education and Community Development (new)
Sandra Newton, Human Development and Applied Psychology (renewed)

A member noted the name of one of the students was misspelled in the motion. He verified the spelling of the name Laura Stenberg.

The Chair called the question.

The revised motion was CARRIED.

11. Appointment of SGS Hearing Officer for the Code of Student Conduct

Item is withdrawn from agenda. See minutes of April 2008 meeting.


It is the responsibility of SGS Graduate Education Council to receive and approve proposed hood designs. If the motion is passed, Council’s approval is final. The approval will be forwarded to the Office of the Governing Council Secretariat for ordering.

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

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT Graduate Education Council approve a new hood for the Master of Science in Community Health Degree.

Dean Smith said he is disappointed that motions for new hoods continue to use Imperial measurements. Dean Pfeiffer noted Dean Smith’s disappointment.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.
13. **Other Business**

Dean Pfeiffer announced that a special reception to honour members of the Graduate Education Council and School of Graduate Studies would immediately follow the meeting at the Faculty Club.

14. **For Information**

14.1 **SGS Audit Report, 2007-08**

Dean Pfeiffer commented on the report. The School of Graduate Studies has been doing audits since 1999, which was a watershed year in which the official file of every graduate student was transferred to the departments. Once a year, our Student Services Officers review files for approximately 20 departments. There is a higher frequency of errors in those files than in previous years. The Dean invited members to comment on why they think there might be more errors arising in files of individual units regarding, for example, official transcripts of final degrees, documentation on who submitted marks for final courses, documentation on who recorded the admission of a student and on what criteria. She noted that this is relatively significant information. She asked how SGS can more fully support the departments in this very important set of responsibilities.

A member noted that the biggest percentage of errors is grades missing from forms. He asked if that was the number one most significant error. Vesna Makarovska, clarifying the question, responded that the most common error was a lack of signature on forms. She said that SGS requires two signatures on forms, one from the instructor and one from a person in authority in the department - either the Chair or the Graduate Coordinator. If one of those signatures is missing, then that is considered a significant error. The member asked why the graduate coordinator would have to sign everything. Ms. Makarovska said that her understanding is that someone has to take responsibility for grades overall in the department, either the Chair or the Graduate Coordinator. Vice-Dean Smith commented that University Grading Practices Policy states that instructors recommend grades and the department is required to sign off on the grades. There is supposed to be a review process, so signatures are required. The member suggested that it seems to be an overly complicated process in light of the fact that their grade submission is now electronic. He wondered about a requirement for someone to sign papers that are not retained for more than a year. He said he understands that the process is required, but he wondered if more powerful evidence would be the signed minutes of the review process instead.

Vice-Dean Smith said that blanket approval could be considered. The member suggested that such a process would reduce the number of significant errors in the report. Heather Kelly, Director of SGS Student Services, said that batch submission and batch processes are permitted via the grade sheet. One member said that in her department, there is a committee that reviews all grades and approves. Dean Pfeiffer said that not all departments have such a process. As we move towards more and more electronic procedures, the archiving of approvals and documentation can be challenging. She invited members to provide SGS with any thoughts on the audit or recommendations for changes to procedures.
A member commented that a lot of research has been conducted on record-keeping. The process fails when record keepers do not see the point of keeping records.

14.2 Spring Graduate Council Election Report
No discussion.

14.3 Annual Report on GAAB Appeals, 2007-08
No discussion.

14.4 Annual Report on Graduate House, 2007-08
No discussion.

14.5 Report of the Graduate Education Governance Processes Review Panel

Dean Pfeiffer recommended that members read the report if they have not done so. She said that she was very impressed with the amount of work that the Review Panel members did. Commentary about how things are working and how they might be made better will be very important for the Deans and Directors at SGS, as goals are assessed for the coming year.

She invited members to send their comments to her on how the Standing Committees are working and how the Graduate Education Committee functions. She reminded members to complete the year-end survey distributed with the meeting materials.

14.6 Report of the Working Group on Interdisciplinarity in Graduate Education
No discussion.

15. Adjournment
The next meeting will be held in October 2008. The Dean thanked all retiring members for their good service on Council. She said she looks forward to seeing returning members in the fall, and wished everyone a good summer.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.
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MOTION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, October 21, 2008

Item 6.

Centre of Criminology: proposal to disestablish within SGS, and re-establish as an EDU-A within the Faculty of Arts and Science

MOTION (     /    ) THAT the Graduate Education Council approve the proposal from the School of Graduate Studies that the Centre of Criminology be disestablished as an academic unit in the School of Graduate Studies and re-established as an extra-departmental unit (EDU:A) within the Faculty of Arts and Science, effective May 1, 2009, pending approval by the Faculty of Arts and Science.

See supporting documentation attached:
Letter from the Director of the Centre of Criminology

NOTE:
Graduate Education Council approval is final for the disestablishment of the Centre within SGS. The Faculty of Arts and Science, through its established governance processes has the authority to establish an EDU-A. The approval of the Planning and Budget Committee is required for re-establishment of the Centre in the Faculty of Arts and Science.
July 10, 2008

Dean Susan Pfeiffer
School of Graduate Studies
65 St. George Street
University of Toronto

Dear Dean Pfeiffer:

Further to our earlier discussions concerning the transfer of Criminology and other centres from the School of Graduate Studies, I am writing to confirm that the Centre of Criminology is happy to start the process of being moved to the Faculty of Arts and Science. Thank you for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Mariana Valverde
Professor and Director

c.c.  Meric Gertler, Interim Dean, FAS  
     David Klausner, Vice-Dean, Interdisciplinary Studies, FAS  
     Elizabeth Cowper, Vice-Dean, Programs, SGS
Item 7.

Proposal for a New Program in Graduate Professional Skills Development

MOTION (     ) THAT Graduate Education Council approve the Professional Skills Development Program proposal in principle, and approve the addition of the following transcript notation for students who successfully complete the Program while registered in a graduate degree program: "Completed the Professional Skills Development Program", effective May 2009.

See supporting documentation attached:
“A Graduate Professional Skills Development Program at the University of Toronto: A Proposal”

NOTE:

Background: SGS is establishing a “Graduate Professional Skills Development Program” (PSDP). The “program” will consist of a number of offerings, such as, short courses, workshops, placements, seminars, etc. The program is entirely optional. Successful completion of the PSDP will require completion of a set number of credits and will result in a graduate transcript notation.

The addition of a notation to the graduate transcript requires approval of the SGS Graduate Education Council; final approval rests with the Academic Policy and Program Committee of Governing Council.
Graduate Professional Skills Development Program
School of Graduate Studies, October 2008

Increasingly, universities are recognising a need to develop programs to provide graduate students, especially in the doctoral research stream, with skills beyond those conventionally learned within their disciplinary program. PhD programs typically prepare students exceedingly well for a future in their chosen area of research, but may not have the time or resources to develop other skills critical to success in the wide range of careers students may enter. Such skills include communication, teaching, planning and time management, entrepreneurship, knowledge of ethics in research and intellectual property issues, working effectively in teams, and leadership. The University of Toronto has already a rich array of offerings in what is generally referred to as “professional development;" the School of Graduate Studies proposes to harness this existing strength to produce a Professional Skills Development Program for doctoral-stream graduate students. The goal is to create a framework for coordinating and publicizing existing and new offerings in the area of professional development, for establishing and implementing appropriate criteria to ensure academic standards, and for providing an institutional “seal of approval” to enhance their value to students.

Process
This proposal has been developed through several meetings of a Working Group, whose membership has included: Berry Smith, SGS (chair); Heather Kelly, SGS (co-chair); Jeff Richardson (SGS); Yvette Ali (Woodsworth); Megan Burnett (TATP); Nancy Dawe (GSU); Deanne Fisher (Student Affairs); Jane Freeman (ELWS); Peter Grav (ELWS); Pam Gravestock (OTA); Tim McTiernan/Linda Vranic (VP Research); Jenny Mendelsohn (Library); Joseph Mulongo (GSU); Yvonne Rodney (Career Centre); Ian Simmie (Student Affairs).

The proposal
1. The Professional Skills Development Program (PSDP), will comprise a number of variable weight “offerings” (short courses, workshops, placements, seminars, etc) that will provide a range of optional opportunities for skills development.
2. We anticipate that offerings will initially largely consist of those that already exist, though we hope that new offerings will be created as demand increases and resources are found.
3. Successful completion of the PSDP will require completion of a selection of offerings covering an appropriate range of skills and approximately equal in time commitment to a half graduate course, and will usually be spread over one to three years.
4. Successful completion of the PSDP will be indicated on the transcript. Component offerings may be listed in a separate “certificate”, but will not be listed on the transcript.
5. The PSDP will be completely optional, and cannot be required in any particular graduate program.
6. An SGS standing committee will be formed to oversee the Program. Its mandate will include approving proposed offerings for inclusion in the program. This committee will report annually via the Committee on Student Matters to the Graduate Education Council for information.

Implementation timelines
2. Discussions with offering sponsors, call for proposals: January, February 2009
4. Program launch, first student registrants: May 2009
5. First program completions: November Graduation 2009.

The program is described more fully at http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/resources/psdp_proposal.htm
Graduate Professional Skills Development Program

School of Graduate Studies, October 2008

Increasingly, universities are recognising a need to develop programs to provide graduate students, especially in the doctoral research stream, with skills beyond those conventionally learned within their disciplinary program. PhD programs typically prepare students exceedingly well for a future in their chosen area of research, but may not have the time or resources to develop other skills critical to success in the wide range of careers students may enter. Such skills include communication, teaching, planning and time management, entrepreneurship, knowledge of ethics in research and intellectual property issues, working effectively in teams, and leadership. The University of Toronto has already a rich array of offerings in what is generally referred to as “professional development”; the School of Graduate Studies proposes to harness this existing strength to produce a Professional Skills Development Program for doctoral-stream graduate students. The goal is to create a framework for coordinating and publicizing existing and new offerings in the area of professional development, for establishing and implementing appropriate criteria to ensure academic standards, and for providing an institutional “seal of approval” to enhance their value to students.

Process
This proposal has been developed through several meetings of a Working Group, whose membership has included: Berry Smith, SGS (chair); Heather Kelly, SGS (co-chair); Jeff Richardson (SGS); Yvette Ali (Woodsworth); Megan Burnett (TATP); Nancy Dawe (GSU); Deanne Fisher (Student Affairs); Jane Freeman (ELWS); Peter Grav (ELWS); Pam Gravestock (OTA); Tim McTiernan/Linda Vranic (VP Research); Jenny Mendelsohn (Library); Joseph Mulongo (GSU); Yvonne Rodney (Career Centre); Ian Simmie (Student Affairs).

The proposal
1. The Professional Skills Development Program (PSDP), will comprise a number of variable weight “offerings” (short courses, workshops, placements, seminars, etc) that will provide a range of optional opportunities for skills development.
2. We anticipate that offerings will initially largely consist of those that already exist, though we hope that new offerings will be created as demand increases and resources are found.
3. Successful completion of the PSDP will require completion of a selection of offerings covering an appropriate range of skills and approximately equal in time commitment to a half graduate course, and will usually be spread over one to three years.
4. Successful completion of the PSDP will be indicated on the transcript. Component offerings may be listed in a separate “certificate”, but will not be listed on the transcript.
5. The PSDP will be completely optional, and cannot be required in any particular graduate program.
6. An SGS standing committee will be formed to oversee the Program. Its mandate will include approving proposed offerings for inclusion in the program. This committee will report annually via the Committee on Student Matters to the Graduate Education Council for information.

Implementation timelines
2. Discussions with offering sponsors, call for proposals: January, February 2009
4. Program launch, first student registrants: May 2009
5. First program completions: November Graduation 2009.

The program is described more fully at http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/resources/psdp_proposal.htm
School of Graduate Studies

MOTION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, October 21, 2008

Item 8

Proposal to change the name of the program and the degree name:
Current name: Information Studies Program, Master of Information Studies degree (MISt)
Proposed name: Information Program, Master of Information degree (MI)
within the Faculty of Information

MOTION
THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of
Information to change the name of the Information Studies Program to Information
Program, and change the name of the degree from Master of Information Studies
(MISt) to Master of Information (MI), effective September 2009.

See attached documents:
• Governance Form

NOTE:
The Faculty of Information changed its name in the 2007-2008 academic year. The proposed
change brings the program name into line with the Faculty name. The Faculty of Information
Council approved the proposal at its meeting on October 3, 2008. The following is a summary of
the discussion at that meeting:
Questions:
- What similar programs at other Universities have been named the Master of
  Information?
- Would the renaming affect students' ability to get jobs?
- Would the renaming affect the program's status as an ALA- accredited program?
- Would students currently enrolled be able to decide whether they wanted an MISt. or an
  MI?
Responses:
- The Dean was not aware of other Universities that offered an MI, but noted that the
  iSchool movement in general (of which the U of T is the only Canadian member) was
  moving in this general direction. Other Universities offered degrees ranging from the
  MLS, MLIS, MSc. (Information), and many other variants.
- Because of the variation in degree names, it was anticipated that the removal of the word
  'Studies' would have no appreciable impact on employers.
- No, the ALA accreditation is given on the content of the program, not its degree name.
- Policies followed at the central level would determine whether graduating students could
  choose which degree name to accept. When the MLIS was changed to the MISt.,
  students had been offered that choice.

The name change and degree name proposal require final approval by the AP&P Committee of
Governing Council and Ontario Council on Graduate Studies approval is required for program
name changes.
Faculty Affiliation: Information

Name of Graduate Unit: Faculty of Information

Graduate Program/s involved in proposal, if any:
Master of Information Studies (MISt.)

Brief Summary of Proposed Change:
We propose to rename the Master of Information Studies (MISt.) to become the Master of Information (M.I.)

Rationale:
With the recent renaming of the Faculty to the Faculty of Information, it is appropriate to rename the degree. Information has emerged as a discipline in its own right, and the Faculty is a leader in the i-School movement that has led the establishment of the discipline.

Prior Approvals/Actions:
The Faculty of Information Council has already approved in principle a degree name change. A formal proposal will go forward to the Council in early October.

Proposed Effective Date:
September 2009

Financial and/or Planning Implications: Minimal

Contact name:
Jens-Erik Mai, Acting Dean, Faculty of Information

Submitted by:
Jens-Erik Mai, Acting Dean, Faculty of Information

Date:
September 12, 2008
Faculty Affiliation: Information

Name of Graduate Unit: Faculty of Information

Graduate Program/s involved in proposal, if any:
Master of Information Studies (MISt.)

Brief Summary of Proposed Change:
We propose to rename the Master of Information Studies (MISt.) to become the Master of Information (M.I.)

Rationale:
With the recent renaming of the Faculty to the Faculty of Information, it is appropriate to rename the degree. Information has emerged as a discipline in its own right, and the Faculty is a leader in the i-School movement that has led the establishment of the discipline.

Prior Approvals/Actions:
The Faculty of Information Council has already approved in principle a degree name change. A formal proposal will go forward to the Council in early October.

Proposed Effective Date:
September 2009

Financial and/or Planning Implications: Minimal

Contact name:
Jens-Erik Mai, Acting Dean, Faculty of Information

Submitted by:
Jens-Erik Mai, Acting Dean, Faculty of Information

Date:
September 12, 2008
Item 9.1

Proposal to change program requirements for the following program:
Chemistry, PhD, Analytical Field
Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Arts and Science

MOTION
THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Department of Chemistry, to remove the “cumulative examinations” from the Analytical Chemistry field requirements in the Ph.D. program, effective September 2009.

See attached documents:
- Governance Form
- Calendar Entry

NOTE:
See rationale in Governance Form.

The proposal was approved by the Faculty of Arts and Science Tri-Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on October 6, 2008:
- Questions and responses:
  - Who will develop the assignment questions? There will be one professor in charge of the seminar series per session who will likely be the person to develop the questions. The seminar speaker will also be asked to develop questions.
  - Does each stream have the same type of breadth? Each stream has a breadth but there are different ways in which they are implemented, e.g. research proposals, cumulative exams, seminars, etc.
  - There was a concern about replacing a written exam with an oral exam. The representative from the Department of Chemistry clarified that this is not an oral exam.
  - Is it possible to fail in other ways other than non-participation? Yes. Students are required to pass a certain number of seminars in order to graduate.
  - Why will answers be posted? Answers will only be posted after the first two seminars and only the ones that receive the most points will be posted. This is to show students what is expected.

The motion to approve the changes was approved conditional to a successful posting on the GWS; there was no feedback from the GWS during the feedback period.

SGS GEC approval is final for this proposal.
Governance Form A: General
2007-2008 (Version #1)

Faculty Affiliation:
Arts & Science

Name of Graduate Unit:
Chemistry

Graduate Program/s involved in proposal, if any:
Chemistry Ph.D. in the field of Analytical Chemistry

Brief Summary of Proposed Change:

We propose to remove the “Cumulative Exams” requirement for Ph.D. Candidates in the field of Analytical Chemistry. The field-specific program requirements for Analytical Chemistry will be as follows:

One half-course in each of the areas of Spectroscopy, Separation Science/Electrochemistry, and Advanced Instrumentation/Data Analysis, plus one other half-course to support the research program. Candidates must also participate in the Analytical Chemistry seminar program.

Rationale:

Background
Chemistry Ph.D. candidates in the field of Analytical Chemistry currently fulfill the "breadth" requirement through a series of graduate cumulative exams ("cumes"). Cumes are given eight times per year, in traditional exam format -- students gather in a classroom, receive a list of questions set by the faculty, and record their answers in exam booklets in a two-hour period. Generally there is no information regarding the topic of cume questions prior to their setting. The responses are marked pass/fail, and seven "passes" are required for graduation. The most motivated/talented students complete this requirement in their first year (passing seven of eight), but many students do not complete the requirement until their second year.

While cumes have served their purpose for many years, we have decided to improve upon them in this Major curriculum proposal. Modern 'analytical chemistry' covers a remarkably broad range of topics, ranging from spectroscopy to sample preparation, from gas-phase reactions to genome analysis. We have found that many students experience anxiety about which topics will be covered by cumes, and spend large amounts of time memorizing long lists of details without (necessarily) understanding core concepts. Our faculty believe this anxiety could be mitigated and time better spent by replacing cumes with a new program, called "Analytical Seminar Plus" (ASP). In contrast to cumes, the ASP system will be completed off-line -- students will answer questions about
presentations in the Analytical Seminar Series (CHM1190), which features talks by Ph.D. students in the field of Analytical Chemistry as well as outside speakers. ASP questions will be written to emphasize breadth -- e.g., a question might read, "The speaker presented interesting data collected using method A -- how might this compare to data collected on the same sample using method B [which was not presented]?” As a part of this process, students will be encouraged to discuss the seminar content with each other (and with their supervisors and other scientists), but will be reminded that the written response should represent their own ideas. The assignments will be modest in length (typically limited to less than a page of text) such that the requirement is not onerous, and students will be encouraged to polish their answers and include relevant citations to literature sources.

In short, the ASP assignments will cover cutting edge research topics, will cause less anxiety (no memorization required) relative to cumes, and will provide a new opportunity for students to practice important skills such as literature review and formal scientific writing. Additionally, the new system will foster interactions between students, faculty, and other scientists, which stands in stark contrast to the sterile vacuum of traditional cumes. In short, we propose that the ASP system will be a significant improvement for our graduate program.

**Proposal**

Beginning in 2009/10, all Ph.D. students in the field of Analytical Chemistry must accumulate 30 Analytical Seminar Plus (ASP) "points" as a condition for graduation. There are ~15 seminars/year in CHM1190, meaning that highly motivated students can complete this requirement in two years, but most students will complete it within three or four years. Continuing students who have not yet completed the requirement of seven (hand-written) cumes will receive credit for 1 cume pass = 4.3 ASP points. For example, a second-year student who has passed four cumes will begin with 17.2 ASP points, with only 13 left to accumulate.

At the completion of each seminar, the CHM1190 course director will post an assignment online. All participants will submit responses to the assignment electronically, copied to the CHM1190 director and to their graduate supervisor(s). Responses (each worth one “point”) will be due within one week of the seminar. Note that students will be reminded that they are ineligible to earn ASP points in response to their own seminars (this is a minor issue, as each student gives 2 seminars out of a total of ~60 during his/her four-year program).

At the end of the semester, the CHM1190 director, who scores each submission as 1 or 0, will submit a list of students/points to the graduate office, who will forward this information to the students.

Because this is a new program, we expect that in the beginning, students will have questions regarding expectations. Thus, the first two ASP assignments will be “open” – i.e., after marking, the seminar director will post all of the responses
on the website (sans student name, etc.), along with the scores (1 or 0), such that students will have concrete examples of the types of responses that are expected. We plan for evaluation of the responses to be generous, such that all sincere efforts will be rewarded. We hope that, in time, students will see ASP as less of a new “requirement,” and more of a natural extension of the highly popular seminar program, which will serve to enhance participation and magnify the benefits for students and presenters alike.

Prior Approvals/Actions:

September 2, 2008

Analytical PhD students representing their own analytical chemistry group (Several graduate students in the field of analytical chemistry were contacted to review the proposal and give their comments):

- Michael Watson
- Walter Russ Algar
- Hesam Shahravan
- Matthew Forbes
- Shilin Cheung

Graduate Studies Committee

- James Donaldson (Environmental Chemistry and Assoc. Chair)
- Vy Dong (Biological & Organic Chemistry)
- Patrick Gunning (Biological & Organic Chemistry)
- Rebecca Jockusch (Physical & Analytical Chemistry)
- Eugenia Kumacheva (Polymers & Materials Chemistry)
- Peter MacDonald (Physical Chemistry)
- Jennifer Murphy (Environmental Chemistry)
- Dvira Segal (Theoretical Chemistry)
- Datong Song (Inorganic Chemistry)
- Aaron Wheeler (Analytical Chemistry)

Proposed Effective Date:
September 2009

Financial and/or Planning Implications: None

Contact name:
Professor James Donaldson
Associate Chair, Graduate Studies

Submitted by:
Robert Baker
Vice Dean Graduate Education and Research, Faculty of Arts and Science

Date:
September 8, 2008
Modern facilities are available for research leading to the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees. The areas of interest cover a wide variety of topics in analytical, biological, environmental, inorganic, organic, materials, polymers, physical, and theoretical chemistry and their related interdisciplinary areas.

An average of at least B+ is required for admission to the graduate programs. An exceptional student with an appropriate B.Sc. degree may be admitted directly to the Ph.D. program. Alternatively, transfer to the Ph.D. program may be considered after a one-year M.Sc. residency period.

Degree of Master of Science
A student's program will normally include the submission of a thesis, the successful completion of one graduate full-course equivalent, and participation in a seminar program.

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
The main requirement for this degree is the execution of an original investigation that is presented in a thesis. Students select one of the following as a major field: Analytical Chemistry, Environmental Chemistry, Inorganic Chemistry, Organic Chemistry and **Biological Chemistry**, Experimental Physical Chemistry, Theoretical Physical Chemistry, or Polymer and Materials Chemistry. Combinations within these subdisciplines, or with other disciplines, are permitted under the category of an interdisciplinary program. With the exception of Theoretical Physical Chemistry, each program requires a minimum of two full-course equivalents from approved graduate courses offered in the School of Graduate Studies. Up to one full-course equivalent taken for credit in the master's program may be used to partially fulfill the Ph.D. requirements. Each program requires successful completion of an oral examination in the area of the major field, as well as participation in a seminar program.

Specific requirements for some of the major fields are as follows:
1. Analytical Chemistry

One half-course in each of the areas of Spectroscopy, Separation Science/Electrochemistry, and Advanced Instrumentation/Data Analysis, plus one other half-course to support the research program. Candidates must also participate in the Analytical Chemistry seminar program.

2. Environmental Chemistry

At least four half-courses to include CHM 1401H, at least one other course in environmental chemistry (ENV 1410H, CHM 1415H, CHM 1425H, CHM 1550H, and at least one CHM course to be chosen in consultation with the supervisor/ supervisory committee and confirmed by the field representative. The fourth course may be an approved course offered in a cognate department. Presentation of two seminars (normally in second and fourth years of study) and participation in the Environmental Chemistry seminar and colloquia program. A written research proposal, defended orally, on a topic other than the primary research topic delivered prior to the end of the second year of graduate study. Successful completion of an oral examination in the area of Environmental Chemistry, normally completed following course work and before the end of the second year of graduate study.

3. Inorganic Chemistry

Four half-courses including one core half-course (either CHM 1261H or CHM 1270H that are offered in alternating years) plus the presentation of one seminar each year (to a total of four) in the Inorganic Chemistry seminar program including one on an original research proposal.

4. Experimental Physical Chemistry

Four half-courses consisting of a combination of core and other courses. The number of core courses is determined by the research director and the student, while observing the principle that breadth of background preparation should be the major objective in course selection. Attendance and participation in the Physical Chemistry seminar program are mandatory.

5. Theoretical Physical Chemistry

Six half-course equivalents, including two core half-courses. Specifics are to be determined by the research director and the student. Attendance and participation in the Physical Chemistry seminar program are mandatory.

6. Organic Chemistry and Biological Chemistry

At least four half-courses to include at least two Organic Chemistry graduate courses selected from CHM 1040H to CHM 1068H (inclusive). Students may take graduate courses from other chemistry fields or cognate departments. All students are expected to be at the level of the fourth year undergraduate courses offered in physical organic, synthetic organic, and biological chemistry, and if necessary the cross-listed Arts and Science courses may be taken. Courses will be selected in consultation with the supervisor and confirmed by the Graduate Studies Committee field representative. Students must also pass seven cumulative exams and present two seminars as a
component of their participation in the Organic Chemistry seminar program (normally in the second and fourth years of study). Upon completion of course work and cumulative exams, students will take an oral exam in the area of Organic and Biological Chemistry.

7. Polymer and Materials Chemistry
Four half-courses, to include at least two of the three core courses. A list of other courses considered appropriate to the Polymer and Materials Chemistry research area is available from the department. Presentation of at least two seminars (the first will be an independent research proposal, the second a presentation on research) and participation in the Polymer and Materials Chemistry seminar program. Successful performance in an oral examination in the area of Polymer and Materials Chemistry following the completion of course work.

8. Interdisciplinary Ph.D. Program
Four half-courses, including one core half-course from the above subdisciplines, and participation in one of the subdiscipline seminar programs. Acceptance into this program requires a research topic of a truly interdisciplinary nature; a written request must be submitted to the graduate coordinator.

Depending upon the area of research, students may also be required to show an adequate ability to translate scientific text in one or two of the following languages: French, German, and Russian.
A student whose major subject is in another department may consult the Department of Chemistry regarding the selection of a minor in Chemistry.

Collaborative Programs
The Department of Chemistry participates in the following Collaborative Programs:
1. Biomolecular Structure (Ph.D.)
2. Environmental Studies (M.Sc., Ph.D.)
3. Optics (M.Sc.)
For details, consult the separate entries in this calendar.

Course Schedules
A schedule listing the times, room locations, and course descriptions is available from the Coordinator of Graduate Studies at the beginning of each session.

Research Courses
All M.Sc. and Ph.D. degree students engaged in research must register in the appropriate 2000 sequential series of research courses in one of the major fields. Students register in these courses each year, in sequence of the last digit.

Courses of Instruction
Not all courses are offered every year. Please consult the Department each session as to course availability.

Organic Chemistry
CHM 1003H Physical Organic Chemistry II (AS 443H) *
CHM 1004H Synthetic Organic Chemistry (AS 440H) *
CHM 1005H Applications of Spectroscopy in Organic Structure Determination (AS 441H) *
CHM 1006H Bioorganic Chemistry (AS 447H) *
CHM 1008H Biological Chemistry (AS 479H) *
CHM 1040H Modern Organic Synthesis
CHM 1045H Modern Physical Organic Chemistry
CHM 1054H Topics in Bioorganic Chemistry
CHM 1060H Advanced Topics in Synthetic Organic Chemistry
CHM 1068H Topics in Biological and Medicinal Chemistry
CHM 1090Y Organic Chemistry Seminar (Credit/No Credit)
CHM 2044H Research in Organic Chemistry
JRX 1124H Structured-Based Drug Design

Analytical Chemistry
CHM 1102H Developing Techniques in Analytical Chemistry (AS 414H) *
CHM 1103H Advanced Topics in Analytical Chemistry (CHM 414H) #
CHM 1104H Separation Science (AS 416H) *
CHM 1105H Separations, Chromatography, and Microfluidics
CHM 1106H Instrumentation for Chemists
CHM 1150H Advances in Electroanalytical Chemistry and Electrochemical Sensors
CHM 1152H Chemical Sensors
CHM 1157H Applications of Chemometrics
CHM 1190Y Analytical Chemistry Seminar (Credit/No Credit)
CHM 2014H Research in Analytical Chemistry
BME 1452H Signal Processing for Bioengineering
CHE 1144H Separation Processes
ENV 1410H Analytical Environmental Chemistry
PHY 1406H Microprocessor Interfacing Techniques

Inorganic Chemistry
CHM 1204H Organometallic Chemistry (AS 432H) *
CHM 1206H Solid State Chemistry: Structure-Property Relations (AS 434H) *
CHM 1209H Structural Methods in Inorganic Chemistry
CHM 1258H Reactions of Coordinated Ligands
CHM 1261H Topics in Inorganic Chemistry I §
CHM 1263H Bioinorganic Chemistry (AS 437H) *
CHM 1268H X-Ray Crystallography
CHM 1269H New Directions in Solid-State Chemistry: Materials Self-Assembly
CHM 1270H Frontiers in Inorganic Chemistry §
CHM 1290Y Inorganic Chemistry Seminar (Credit/No Credit)
CHM 2034H Research in Inorganic Chemistry

Polymer and Materials Chemistry
CHM 1301H Organic and Inorganic Polymer Synthesis §
CHM 1302H Physical Chemistry of Polymers §
CHM 1310H Polymer Chemistry (AS 426)*
CHM 1390Y Polymer and Materials Chemistry Seminar (Credit/No Credit)
CHM 2304H Research in Polymer and Materials Chemistry
JMY 1303H Solids as Advanced Polymer Materials

Physical and Theoretical Chemistry
CHM 1441H Mathematical Methods
CHM 1442H Current Directions in Experimental Physical Chemistry
CHM 1443H Intermediate Quantum Mechanics
CHM 1444H Statistical Mechanics of Condensed Phases
CHM 1445H Coherent Control of Molecular Processes
CHM 1446H Quantum Computation and Information Theory
CHM 1447H Biophysical Chemistry
CHM 1448H Modelling of Biochemical Systems
CHM 1455H NMR Spectroscopy I: Introduction to Theory and Application
CHM 1456H NMR Spectroscopy II: Advanced Theory and Application
CHM 1458H Topics in Reaction Kinetics I
CHM 1464H Topics in Statistical Mechanics
CHM 1476H Modern Topics in Statistical Mechanics
CHM 1478H Quantum Mechanics for Physical Chemists §
CHM 1479H Thermodynamics §
CHM 1480H Basic Statistical Mechanics § (AS 427H)*
CHM 1481H Reaction Kinetics and Dynamics § (AS 421H)*
CHM 1483H Group Theory and Quantum Mechanics
CHM 1485H Molecular Dynamics and Chemical Dynamics in Liquids
CHM 1486H Modern Molecular Spectroscopy
CHM 1487H Modern Topics in Colloid Chemistry
CHM 1490Y Physical Chemistry Seminar (Credit/No Credit)
CHM 2024H Research in Physical Chemistry

Environmental Chemistry
CHM 1401H Transport and Fate of Chemical Species in the Environment §
CHM 1404H Molecular Analysis of Natural Systems
CHM 1415H Atmospheric Chemistry
CHM 1420H Environmental Chemistry of Soil
CHM 1425H Modelling the Fate of Organic Chemicals in The Environment
CHM 1550H Topics in Environmental Chemistry
CHM 1590Y Environmental Chemistry Seminar (Credit/No Credit)
CHM 2534H Research in Environmental Chemistry
ENV 1410H Analytical Environmental Chemistry

All graduate courses for degree credit must be approved by the Department. Subject to departmental permission, degree students in Chemistry may take a limited number of graduate courses based on fourth-year Faculty of Arts and Science courses in Chemistry or a cognate discipline. Approvals of such fourth-year courses will be considered on an
individual basis. Third-year Arts and Science courses, or their essential equivalents, will not receive degree credit.

§Core course
*Listing in the calendar of the Faculty of Arts and Science
#University of Toronto at Mississauga listing

Graduate Faculty

Full Members
J. P. D. Abbatt, BSc, AM, PhD
C. J. Allen, BSc; PhD
R. A. Batey, BA, PhD
P. W. Brumer, BSc, PhD, FRSC, University Professor, Roel Buck Chair in Chemical Physics
J. B. Chin, BSc, PhD
A.-A. Dhirani, BSc, MSc, PhD
J. D. J. Donaldson, BSc, PhD
D. H. Farrar, BSc, MSc, PhD
U. Fekl, MSc, PhD
S. J. Fraser, BA, PhD
M. Georges, BSc, Phd
C. M. C. Goh, BSc, PhD
R. E. Kapral, BSc, PhD, FRSC
L. Kay, BSc, PhD, Canada Research Chair
R. H. Kluger, AB, AM, PhD, FRSC
L. P. Kotra, BPhm, PhD
U. J. Krull, BSc, MSc, PhD, AstraZeneca Professor of Biotechnology
E. Kumacheva, BS, MSc, PhD
M. Lautens, BSc, PhD, AstraZeneca Professor of Organic Synthesis
S. M. Mabury, BS, PhD (Chair)
P. Macdonald, BSc, MSc, PhD
R. A. McClelland, BSc, PhD, FRSC
D. McMillen, BSc, MSc, Phd
M. Menzinger, Dipl-Ing, MSc, PhD
D. R. Miller, BSc, PhD, FRSC, Canada Research Chair
C. A. Mims, BS, PhD
R. H. Morris, BSc, PhD
G. A. Ozin, BSc, DPhil, FRSC, University Professor, Canada Research Chair
J. C. Polanyi, BSc, MSc, PhD, DSc, FRS, FRSC, University Professor
J. Powell, BSc, PhD
S. Prosser, BSc, MSc, PhD
J. M. S. Schofield, BA, PhD
G. D. Scholes, BSc, PhD
B. Sherwood Lollar, BA, PhD
J. Shin, AB, PhD
M. S. Shoichet, BSc, MSc, PhD, Canada Research Chair
A. Simpson, BSc, PhD
M. Simpson, BSc, PhD
D. Song
M. Thompson, BSc, PhD, DSc, FRSC, FCIC
T. T. Tidwell, BS, AM, PhD
G. Walker (Associate Chair, Graduate Studies)
F. Wania, Dipl-Geook, PhD
S. G. Whittington, BA, PhD
M. A. Winnik, BA, PhD, FRSC, University Professor
A. G. A. Woolley, BSc, PhD
A. K. Yudin, BS, PhD
D. Zamble, BSc, PhD

Members Emeriti
M. Bersohn, BS, MA, PhD
A. G. Brook, BA, PhD, FRSC, University Professor Emeritus
I. G. Csizmadia, MSc, PhD
A. G. Harrison
B. J. B. Jones
A. J. Kresge, BA, PhD, FRSC
S. McLean, BSc, PhD
A. J. Poe, BA, BSc, MA, PhD, DIC, ScD
W. J. Reynolds, BSc, PhD
J. P. Valleau, BA, MA, PhD

Associate Members
T. F. Bidleman, BSc, PhD
V. Dong
R. Jockusch
D. Muir, BSc, MSc, PhD
M. Nitz
A. Wheeler
Item 9.2

Proposal to change program requirements for the following program:
Museum Studies, MMSt, Faculty of Information

MOTION
THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the
Faculty of Information to change the program requirements in the
Master of Museum Studies program so that the number of required
courses is reduced from 5.0 FCE to 2.0 FCE, with the overall number of
courses for the program remaining at 7.0 FCE, effective immediately.

See attached documents:
• Governance Form
• Calendar Entry

NOTE:
See rationale in attached governance form.

The Faculty of Information Council approved the proposal at its meeting on October 3,
2008.

There was no discussion on this item other than minor points of clarification
and on when the changes would take effect, that is, would the January date
of implementation allow for students currently enrolled to follow the new
format?

Acting Dean Jens-Erik Mai informed Council that all incoming members of
the MMSt program had chosen to do so.

January 2009 was originally proposed as the effective date. The effective date was altered
by SGS to immediately since it represents an easing of requirements and all students have
agreed to it in advance.

SGS GEC approval is final for this item.
Faculty Affiliation:
Faculty of Information

Name of Graduate Unit:
Faculty of Information

Graduate Program/s involved in proposal, if any:
Master of Museum Studies

Brief Summary of Proposed Change:
The Master of Museum Studies program consists of 7.0 FCEs, of which 5.5 FCEs are required courses. The remaining 1.5 FCEs are elective courses, of which at least 0.5 should be a Master of Museum Studies course. The proposal will keep the program at 7.0 FCEs, but lower the number of required courses to 2.0 FCEs.

The nature of the required courses will change at the same time, to reflect suggestions made in a recent OCGS review of the program, broaden the scope of the program to follow newer research in cultural heritage and revised conceptions of museums.

Rationale:
The proposed change will allow students greater flexibility in their studies and give them the opportunity to specialize in various aspects of Museum Studies, if they wish. This is a request that students have made repeatedly in the last few years. The growth in number of faculty members has allowed us to offer a fuller and richer program with more electives and possible paths for specialization.

Prior Approvals/Actions:
Museum Studies program committee, various meetings spring and summer 2008
Consultation with students through focus group interviews for OCGS review
Consultation with students through discussion with elected leaders

Proposed Effective Date:
January 2009

Financial and/or Planning Implications:
None.

Contact name:
Jens-Erik Mai, Acting Dean, Faculty of Information

Submitted by:
Jens-Erik Mai, Acting Dean, Faculty of Information

Date:
July 29, 2008
Master of Museum Studies

Minimum Admission Requirements

- Four-year BA or BSc with an overall average grade of at least B+, or equivalent from a recognized university.
- Applicants must satisfy the Museum Studies program that they are capable of independent research in museum studies at an advanced level. Demonstrated previous experience in museums or related cultural organizations will also be considered. Admission to this program is competitive.
- One official transcript of the applicant's academic record from each university attended, complete to the time of application.
- A letter of intent (maximum 500 words), indicating areas of interest and experience in museum studies, heritage agencies, or comparable institutions.
- A resume.
- Three letters of reference, written on institutional or work-related letterhead. Appropriate referees include university professors (preferred), museum professionals, or others relevant to the field of museology.
- Other relevant information considered by the applicant to strengthen his or her application.
- Applicants are admitted as students for the MMSt under the General Regulations of the School of Graduate Studies.

Program Requirements

- Minimum requirement is 7.0 full-course equivalents (FCE) also known as credits, including 2.0 FCE required courses and 5.0 elective courses, of which 3.0 FCE must be internal (Museum Studies) elective courses.
- Before the end of their program, students whose primary language is English will be required to demonstrate a reading knowledge of a second language (preferably French) by means of a written exam and achieve a minimum grade of 70%.

Courses

Not all courses are offered every year. Please consult the Museum Studies Web site for course availability. The minimum requirement for the MMSt degree is 7.0 full-course equivalents (FCE), also known as credits.

MMSt Required Courses

MSL 1150H Collection Management
MSL 1200H Fundamentals in Museum Planning and Management
MSL 2331H Exhibitions, Interpretation, Communication
MSL 2370H Museums and Cultural Heritage I: Context and Critical Issues
MMSt Elective Courses

MSL 1000H Museums and Public History
MSL 1100H Museology and Theory
MSL 1300H Contemporary Theories of Art and Culture
MSL 1350H Museums and their Publics
MSL 2000H Curatorial Practice
MSL 2100H Museum Environment
MSL 2200H The History of Museums in Canada
MSL 2225H Architecture and Museums
MSL 2250H Topics on Museums and Society in Canada
MSL 2325H Museums and New Media Practice
MSL 2330H Interpretation and Meaning-Making in Cultural Institutions
MSL 2340H Issues in Cultural Policy and Contemporary Culture
MSL 2350H Museum Planning and Management: Projects, Fundraising and Human Resources
MSL 2500H Museums and Information
MSL 2371H Museums and Cultural Heritage II: Society, Responsibility and Cultural Change
MSL 3000Y Internship
MSL 4000Y Exhibition Project
MSL 5000Y Research Methods
MSL 5050H Special Studies

External Elective Courses

Courses relevant to the Museum Studies program and student interests are available within the listings of other graduate units as found in this calendar.
Item 9.2

Proposal to change program requirements for the following program:
Museum Studies, MMSt, Faculty of Information

**MOTION**

**THAT** SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of Information to change the program requirements in the Master of Museum Studies program so that the number of required courses is reduced from 5.0 FCE to 2.0 FCE, with the overall number of courses for the program remaining at 7.0 FCE, effective immediately.

See attached documents:
- Governance Form
- Calendar Entry

**NOTE:**
See rationale in attached governance form.

The Faculty of Information Council approved the proposal at its meeting on October 3, 2008.

There was no discussion on this item other than minor points of clarification and on when the changes would take effect, that is, would the January date of implementation allow for students currently enrolled to follow the new format?

Acting Dean Jens-Erik Mai informed Council that all incoming members of the MMSt program had chosen to do so.

January 2009 was originally proposed as the effective date. The effective date was altered by SGS to immediately since it represents an easing of requirements and all students have agreed to it in advance.

SGS GEC approval is final for this item.
Governance Form A: General
2007-2008 (Version #1)

Faculty Affiliation: Arts and Science

Name of Graduate Unit: Geography and Planning

Graduate Program/s involved in proposal, if any: PhD Planning

Brief Summary of Proposed Change:

Core Courses for PhD Planning
JPG 1111H Advanced Research Design or a methods course in a related department subject to the approval of the supervisor
PLA 2000H Advanced Planning Theory
PLA 2001H Planning Colloquium (CR/NCR)

Rationale:
PhD students come into the Planning Program with widely different backgrounds and research requirements in methods. While the Planning Program wishes to continue to require a methods course of PhD students, we feel that introducing some flexibility into the requirement will most effectively suit the pedagogical needs and abilities of the students. The Program has contacted cognate departments—namely, adult education and community development, anthropology, political science, public health sciences, and sociology—to ensure that the possibility of one or two of our PhD students taking their methods courses in any given year will not cause undue burden.

Prior Approvals/Actions:
The Geography Department Graduate Planning Committee has approved the change. The committee has representation from four graduate students (two PhD and 2 Masters) who were all strongly in favour of the change, and in fact initiated action on this issue.

Proposed Effective Date:
Jan 2009

Financial and/or Planning Implications:
None. There are only 5-6 incoming Planning students every year, and several undoubtedly will take the Geography Graduate methods course, JPG 1111. Cognate departments have been contacted; Planning students will be offered space in their methods courses, subject to availability. The program change simply offers institutional support to a widespread practice of graduate students taking courses in cognate social science departments.

Contact name: Katharine Rankin, Director of Planning

Submitted by:
Robert Baker
Vice-Dean Graduate Education and Research, Faculty of Arts and Science

Date: 29 August 2008
Doctor of Philosophy

Minimum Admission Requirements

- Appropriate University of Toronto master’s degree in planning or a related field, or its equivalent from a recognized university, with a minimum A- average and demonstrated competence in analytical methods or successful completion of one of two methods courses in the current master’s program.
- Students whose primary language is not English must take the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). Minimum TOEFL scores required for admissibility:
  - Paper-based exam: 580 and 5 on the TWE
  - Computer-based exam: 237 and 5 on the essay rating component
  - Internet-based exam: 93/120 and 22/30 on each of the writing and speaking sections.

Program Requirements

- Successful completion of coursework, a comprehensive examination, a thesis proposal, and a thesis.
- Students with a master’s degree in planning comparable to the University of Toronto M.Sc. in Planning are required to take 3.0 full-course-equivalents (FCE) of which 1.5 FCE are core courses and 1.5 FCE are electives (at least 0.5 elective FCE must be outside the Planning program). Students who enter with a master’s degree in a related field may be required to take up to an additional 1.0 FCE depending on their background and experience.
- Normally the PhD program is completed within four years.
- Visit the Planning Web site www.geog.utoronto.ca for more details.

Courses

All courses are not given every year; some faculty members may be on research leave. Please consult the departmental graduate office for details.

Core Courses for MScPl

PLA 1101H Issues in Planning History, Thought, and Practice
PLA 1102H Urban and Regional Dynamics
PLA 1103H Legal Basis of Planning
PLA 1105H Planning Decision Methods
PLA 1106H Workshop in Planning Practice
PLA 1107Y Current Issues Paper

Core Courses for PhD Planning

- JPG111H Advanced Research Design or a methods course in a related department subject to the approval of the supervisor
- PLA 2000H Advanced Planning Theory
- PLA 2001H Planning Colloquium (CR/NCR)
School of Graduate Studies

MOTION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, October 21, 2008

Item 9.4

Proposal to change program requirements for the following program:
Political Science, PhD
Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Science

MOTION
THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Department of Political Science, to change the Political Science Ph.D. program requirements as follows:

a) Ph.D. students will declare two fields: Field 1 and Field 2.
b) Four fields are eligible for Field 1 designation: Canadian Politics, Comparative Politics, Political Theory and International Relations.
c) Six fields are eligible for Field 2 designation: Canadian Politics, Comparative Politics, Political Theory, International Relations, Public Policy, and Development Studies.
d) Students will be required to take 2 FCE in Field 1, one of which will include the core course.
e) Students are required to take 1.5 FCE in Field 2, one of which will be the core course. The Director of Graduate Studies has the discretion to waive Field 2 requirements for students in collaborative programs.
f) Students will be required to do a .5 FCE Doctoral Research Workshop during their second or third year; this requirement may not be waived.
g) Students who do not designate Political Theory as Field 1 are required to do .5 FCE in Quantitative Methods. This requirement may be waived on the basis of previous MA work.
h) Students are required to do a .5 FCE in Qualitative Methods. This requirement may be waived on the basis of previous MA work.”

Changes are effective September 2009.

See attached documents:
- Governance Form
- Calendar Entry

NOTE:
This proposal was approved by the Faculty of Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on October 6, 2008. The following discussion occurred:
o How do the students view the proposed changes? It was not seen as being much more onerous as some students will have already met some of these requirements while completing their MA (e.g. methods courses). There was some apprehension that the new requirements would increase completion time but the department had found some students were already writing two Qualifying Exams to help with their marketability.

- The motion to approve the changes was approved conditional to a successful posting on the GWS.

There was no feedback from the GWS.

Approval of this item by the SGS GEC is final.
Faculty Affiliation: 
Arts and Science

Name of Graduate Unit: 
Political Science

Graduate Program/s involved in proposal, if any: 
PhD in Political Science

Brief Summary of Proposed Change:

i) PhD students will declare two fields: Field 1 and Field 2.

This change replaces the current option to declare either a Major Core and Minor Core Field, or a Major Core Field and an Area of Specialization.

ii) Students will write two Qualifying Examinations, in each of Field 1 and Field 2.

This change replaces the current requirement to write one examination in only the major field of study.

iii) Four fields are eligible for Field 1 designation: Canadian Politics, Comparative Politics, Political Theory and International Relations.

This designation eliminates the current distinction between Comparative Industrial Politics and Comparative Developing Politics.

iv) Six fields are eligible for Field 2 designation: Canadian Politics, Comparative Politics, Political Theory, International Relations, Public Policy, and Development Studies.

This change eliminates four areas of specialization: Political Economy; Political Behaviour and Democratic Politics; Public Law and Federalism; and Women, Gender and Politics. It converts the fifth area of specialization, Public Policy, to a Field 2 option. Development Studies also becomes a Field 2 area of study.

v) Students are required to take 2 FCE in Field 1, one of which will include the core course. The current requirement is 2 FCE in the Major Field.

vi) Students are required to take 1.5 FCE in Field 2, one of which will be the core course. The Director of Graduate Studies has the discretion to waive Field 2 requirements for students in collaborative programs.

This change replaces the current requirement to do 2 FCE in the minor field or area of specialization.

vii) Students are required to do .5 FCE Doctoral Research Workshop during their second or third year. This requirement is non-waivable.

viii) Students who do not designate Political Theory as Field 1 are required to do .5 FCE in Quantitative Methods. This requirement will be waivable on the basis of previous MA work.
Students who designate Political Theory as Field 1 will substitute a non-waivable .5 FCE intensive reading course for the .5 FCE quantitative methods requirement.

ix) Students are required to do .5 FCE in Qualitative Methods. This requirement will be waivable on the basis of previous MA work.

Changes vii-ix replace the current requirement for all students, except those for whom Political Theory is their major field, to do .5 FCE in research design. The change requires Political Theory students to complete the .5 FCE Doctoral Research Workshop.

Rationale:

The rationale for the designation of two fields of study, Field 1 and Field 2, and the requirement to write 2 Qualifying Exams, is based on the belief that students should be trained in depth in two fields. This requirement encourages students to read broadly and think deeply about a field prior to becoming immersed in a necessarily narrower dissertation topic. It also enhances graduates' job opportunities by making them more versatile.

The designation of the areas of study within Fields 1 and 2, and the elimination of 'areas of specialization', are based on a number of considerations. First, the four areas of study in Field 1--Canadian Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations and Political Theory—are recognized in Canada and elsewhere as distinct areas of study with their own body of literature and concerns. Folding 'Developing' and 'Industrial' Comparative Politics into a single area of 'Comparative Politics' is a response both to the increasing overlap in the theoretical literature that addresses the politics of the industrial north and the developing south, as well as to the reality that a host of specific countries (for example, China, Eastern European countries that were formerly members of the Soviet Union, Turkey) display characteristics of both developing and developed/industrial countries. Second, the areas of study within Field 2—the four areas in Field 1 plus Public Policy and Development Studies—are consistent with recognized areas of study in the discipline as well as strengths of the Department's faculty. Although Development Studies is commonly considered as a specialization within Comparative Politics, it nonetheless has a large and rich literature of its own, and many universities offer Development Studies programs at the undergraduate, Masters, and even, occasionally the doctoral level. Public Policy, although often closely associated with Canadian Politics in Canadian universities, American Politics in American universities, and Comparative Politics elsewhere, is often also treated as an autonomous field of study. The Political Science Department has an active and growing group of faculty with research and teaching expertise in Public Policy. Designating Public Policy as an area of study within Field 2 recognizes the Department's strength in the area and ensures that students have access to it.

Development Studies and Public Policy differ from Comparative Politics, International Relations, Canadian Government, and Political Theory in being designated areas of study only within Field 2 and not both fields. Whereas students are required to take 2 FCE in Field 1, they are required to take 1.5 FCE in Field 2. The assumption is that at least some of the material covered in Field 1 study will be relevant to, and will inform, Field 2 study. While Development Studies and Public Policy do have their own concerns and approaches, many of the questions they address arise initially, if more abstractly, in another field. There is a strong consensus among the faculty who teach Development Studies and Public Policy that these areas are best described as Field 2 areas, rather than Field 1.

The elimination of 'areas of specialization' is based on experience over several years that has demonstrated the conceptual and operational difficulty of implementing this alternative to a second area of study (now 'field'). Conceptually, the listed areas of specialization proved to be arbitrarily specified. For example, Religion and Politics, Postcolonial Studies, and Political Methodology were not included. Some areas of specialization, like Public Law and Federalism, were an ill fit. Some permitted narrowness and redundancy. Political Theory students, for example, who opt to specialize in Public Law and Federalism, can fulfill their specialization
requirement by selecting courses taught exclusively by political theorists. Operationally, it has proven difficult for the Department to offer year after year a sufficient range of courses within each area of specialization to enable students to complete an Area of Specialization requirement. The collective judgement of the Department is that students can acquire not only the depth that the areas of specialization were intended to provide, but also the vital breadth they need as scholars and teachers, by replacing the areas of specialization with the requirement to acquire a second field.

The rationale for having students do 1.5 FCE in Field 2 (rather than the current 2 FCE in their minor/area of specialization) is based on the increasing synergies and syncretisms between fields of political science and the consequent assumption, noted above, that at least some of the material covered in Field 1 will be relevant to and inform Field 2 study. The .5 FCE savings will be used to help bolster other new requirements without unduly endangering time-to-completion goals.

The requirement for students to complete a .5 FCE Doctoral Research Workshop in the second and third year is designed to help them formulate and polish a dissertation proposal in a timely manner. By bring all doctoral students into cross-disciplinary conversation, the Doctoral Research Workshop also helps build community even while it familiarizes students with a broad range of styles of political science research.

The methods requirements--.5 FCE in qualitative methods and, except students who declare Political Theory as Field 1, .5 FCE in quantitative methods—are intended to promote the methodological literacy and diversity not satisfied by the current .5 FCE requirement in research design/methods (for all but Theory majors). The new requirements will allow students to become conversant with major methodological styles in the discipline and render them capable of reading any article in any major journal. The changes bring the Department’s PhD program in line with norms in PhD programs in Political Science elsewhere and increase students’ job prospects by overcoming the Department’s reputation as providing minimal or substandard training in methods. Both qualitative and quantitative methods requirements are waivable on the basis of MA work. The exemption of Political Theory students from the quantitative methods requirements is based on the rationale that theorists have no pressing need to acquire quantitative skills and can make better use of their time cultivating a skill particular to their field. The requirement of a .5 FCE intensive reading course for Political Theory students will allow these students to hone their textual analytical skills.

Prior Approvals/Actions:
In the spring of 2006, the Departmental external review (conducted in connection with the search for a new chair) identified a number of issues with the MA and PhD programs. The incoming chair appointed a Task Force to conduct a systematic examination of the graduate program requirements and to recommend changes where appropriate with an eye toward the forthcoming periodic review by the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies. The members of the Task Force included representatives of each area group (field of study) and an MA and PhD student. The Task Force encouraged feedback and received several written submissions from faculty and students. On the basis of this feedback, the Task Force proposed changes to the MA and PhD programs which secured Departmental approval via a meeting of the Priorities and Planning Committee, to which all members of the Department and graduate student representatives were invited. The changes were included in the brief the Department’ submitted to OCGS in 2007 for the periodic appraisal of the graduate programs in Political Science. The external consultants for OCGS described the proposed changes as ‘laudable and thoughtful.’

Proposed Effective Date:
September 2009
Financial and/or Planning Implications: None.

Contact name:
Grace Skogstad
Director of Graduate Studies

Submitted by:
Robert Baker
Vice-Dean Graduate Education and Research, Faculty of Arts and Science

Date:
September 12, 1008
## Political Science PhD – Summary of Proposed Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Field plus Minor Field or Area of Specialization</td>
<td>Field 1 and Field 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Major Field Exam</td>
<td>2 Qualifying Exams (Field 1 and Field 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FCE in Major Field</td>
<td>2 FCE in Field 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options are: Canadian Government and Politics, Political Theory, International</td>
<td>Options are: Canadian Government and Politics, Political Theory, International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations, Comparative Industrial Politics, Comparative Developing Politics</td>
<td>Relations, Comparative Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FCE in Designated Minor Field or Area of Specialization</td>
<td>1.5 FCE in Field 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor options: Canadian Government and Politics, Political Theory, International</td>
<td>Options are: Canadian Government and Politics, Political Theory, International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations, Comparative Industrial Politics, Comparative Developing Politics</td>
<td>Relations, Comparative Politics, Public Policy, and Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of specialization options: Political Economy; Political Behaviour and Democratic</td>
<td>Graduate Director has discretion to waive Field 2 requirements for students in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics; Public Law and Federalism; Women, Gender and Politics</td>
<td>collaborative programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 FCE in Research Design (Theory students exempt)</td>
<td>.5 FCE Doctoral Research Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.5 FCE in Qualitative Methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.5 FCE in Quantitative Methods; Field 1 Political Theory replace with .5 FCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intensive reading course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 FCE in Political Theory</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Requirement</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Political Science POL

Faculty Affiliation

Arts and Science

Degree Programs Offered

Political Science – MA, Combined JD/MA, Combined JD/PhD, PhD

Collaborative Programs Offered

Degree programs that participate in:

1. Asia-Pacific Studies,
   ● Political Science, MA

2. Dynamics of Global Change
   ● Political Science, MA

3. Environmental Studies
   ● Political Science, MA

4. Ethnic and Pluralism Studies
   ● Political Science, MA

5. International Relations
   ● Political Science, MA

6. Jewish Studies
   ● Political Science, MA

7. Sexual Diversity Studies
   ● Political Science, MA

8. South Asian Studies
   ● Political Science, MA

9. Women and Gender Studies
   ● Political Science, MA

Overview
The Master of Arts program is designed to satisfy the diverse interests of students who wish to pursue a year of graduate study in political science. Students admitted to the general or “departmental” MA program may choose from two specializations. The Political Theory stream is for students whose interests are primarily normative and philosophical. The Politics and Policy stream appeals to students with more practical interests. The department also offers a specialized MA program in the Political Economy of International Development.

The Combined Juris Doctor/Master of Arts program allows students to obtain an MA in International Relations as well as a JD degree in Law.

The Combined Juris Doctor/Doctor of Philosophy program enables students to acquire a PhD in Political Science as well as a JD in law.

Contact and Address

Web: www.chass.utoronto.ca/polsci/information/graduate/graduate_information.htm
E-mail: poligrad@artsci.utoronto.ca
Telephone: (416) 978-2017

Department of Political Science
Room 3025, 100 St. George Street
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario M5S 3G3
Canada

Degree Programs

Degree of Master of Arts

Departmental Master of Arts Program

Minimum Admission Requirements

- Cumulative grade average of B+ or better in a bachelor's program equivalent to a University of Toronto four-year bachelor's degree program. Preference will be given to applicants with outstanding academic records and a strong background in political science.
- Admission is competitive. Enrolment in the program is limited, and meeting minimum requirements does not guarantee admission. All applicants are considered on their individual merit by a departmental admissions committee. Applicants lacking an adequate background in political science may be required to complete additional undergraduate courses before being considered for admission. Such work should be undertaken in consultation with the MA supervisor.
Applicants must submit a complete application according to instructions on the Website
(//www.chass.utoronto.ca/polsci/information/graduate/application_procedures.htm).

Program Requirements

- Minimum of 4.0. full-course equivalents (FCE)
- Programs are normally completed in two sessions, except in environmental studies, which includes an internship, or in other programs where additional requirements or prerequisites must be met.
- A thesis may replace 1.0 political science FCE with the approval of the department.
- The equivalent of 1.0 FCE may be taken in a cognate discipline with the approval of the department.
- For students intending to proceed to a PhD at the University of Toronto, there are advantages to planning the MA program with a view to eventually meeting PhD requirements.
- The departmental MA comprises two streams:
  - Political Theory
  - Politics and Policy

Students are admitted to one stream and may switch streams once in the program only with permission of the MA Supervisor.

Political Theory Stream

- This stream is intended primarily for students who wish to concentrate their studies in the theory area.
- Students in this stream will normally take 3.0 FCE in the political theory subfield and at least 1.0 FCE in an area outside political theory. All courses should be chosen in consultation with the MA Supervisor.

Politics and Policy Stream

- This stream is aimed at students with more empirical interests in political science. It is particularly designed to serve those who wish to apply their political science skills in the public service or in the private sector, as well those contemplating further academic study or research.
  - Courses must include at least 0.5 FCE in political theory, which can be either the 0.5 FCE offered by the department specifically for this purpose (POL 2040H) or any other theory course. Also required is at least 0.5 FCE in statistics or research design. POL 2502Y, POL 2503H, and POL 2504H are among the courses currently offered by the department which meet this requirement. The final requirement is a full-year seminar which emphasizes an independent research project. POL 2810Y and POL 2811Y are the two seminars currently offered which meet this requirement. Courses in this program should be chosen in consultation with the MA supervisor.
• **Specialist Program in Political Economy of International Development**

**Minimum Admission Requirements**

• Satisfactory background in political science and undergraduate prerequisites in microeconomics, macroeconomics, and statistics. A "satisfactory background in political science" means a minimum of five well distributed courses, including at least one relating to development. Those who lack any of these prerequisites must obtain them in addition to the required graduate courses. Therefore, this specialist program may take some entrants longer than one academic year to complete.

**Program Requirements**

• JPE 2408Y, complete the equivalent of 0.5 FCE in economics, normally ECO 2700H, selected from the economics course list (see listing in the Graduate Information Guide). One additional course must be chosen from the approved political science course list. The remaining course may be chosen from either the political science or political economy course lists.

**Combined Juris Doctor/Master of Arts, Law and Political Science (specialization in International Relations)**

The combined JD/MA in International Relations allows for the completion of both degrees in three years rather than the four that the separate degrees would take.

**Minimum Admission Requirements**

• Students must be admitted to both the Faculty of Law and the Collaborative Master of Arts Program in International Relations (MAIR).

**Program Requirements**

• Year 1 – complete the first year of law in the combined program
• Years 2 and 3 – complete credits toward both JD and MA (Collaborative International Relations) degrees. The MAIR requirements in year 2 and 3 are JHP 2231H, ECO 2302H, LAW 252H, 1.0 FCE from MAIR electives and 1.5 FCE from the political science timetable

**Combined Juris Doctor/Doctor of Philosophy**

The JD and PhD can be completed in at least one year less time than it would take to undertake the degrees separately.

**Minimum Admission Requirements**

Students must be admitted to both the Faculty of Law and the Doctor of Philosophy Program
Program Requirements

- Year 1 - complete the first year of law in the combined program
- Year 2 - complete a year in Political Science
- Years 3 and 4 - two years in Law
- Complete the requirements of the PhD program, including a thesis

Doctor of Philosophy

Minimum Admission Requirements

- Applicants may be admitted via one of three routes:
  - excellent students who have completed an MA degree in political science (or its equivalent) by the time of enrolment
  - excellent students who have completed the equivalent of a four-year B.A. with a concentration in political science by the time of enrolment. Students admitted to the PhD from a BA (or equivalent degree) who receive less than an A- average in their first four courses will be recommended to SGS for transfer to the MA program. If the transfer is approved, these students will graduate with a terminal MA, provided their grades meet the requirements for the MA degree.
  - In exceptional cases, on the initiative of the Director of Graduate Studies, MA students may be transferred PhD program. Such transfers will occur only where a full assessment of an applicant's BA record (or equivalent) was impossible and where that student's instructors concur that the student in question has excelled in the first half of the MA program.
  - Applicants from both levels are expected to have achieved grades averaging A- or better in their most recent degree. Applicants from the BA level will apply to the MA program but indicate on the MA application that they wish to be considered for direct entry to the PhD program.
  - Applicants must submit a complete application according to instructions on the Web site (www.chass.utoronto.ca/polsci/information/graduate/application_procedures.htm)

Program Requirements

- PhD students will declare two fields.
- **Field 1** will be one of Canadian Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations or Political Theory. The normal course requirement for Field 1 will be 2 FCE.
- **Field 2** will be one of Canadian Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, Political Theory, Development Studies, or Public Policy. The normal course requirement for Field 2 will be 1.5 FCE.
- The Director of Graduate Studies may exercise discretion to waive the Field 2 requirement for students enrolled in collaborative programs.
- All PhD students who do not designate Political Theory as Field 1 are required to complete 0.5 graduate-level FCE in political theory.
- All PhD students are required to complete 0.5 FCE in qualitative methods. This requirement may be waived on the basis of MA work.
- All PhD students who do not designate Political Theory as Field 1 are required to
complete .5 FCE in quantitative methods. This requirement may be waived on the basis of MA work. Students who designate Political Theory as Field 1 will substitute a non-waivable .5 FCE intensive reading requirement for the quantitative methods requirement.

- All PhD students are required to complete a Dissertation Research Workshop worth .5 FCE in their second or third year. This requirement is non-waivable.
- All PhD students are required to complete Qualifying Field Examinations in Field 1 and Field 2 by the end of Year 2.
- Thesis proposal, thesis committee, and thesis schedule. Students should assign a high priority to defining a thesis topic and choosing a thesis committee. The research and writing of the thesis will follow the acceptance of the thesis proposal.
- Language requirement. Students must demonstrate competence in the language that is appropriate to the nature of the graduate work in which they are engaged. Students whose Field 1 is Canadian Politics are strongly encouraged to demonstrate competence in French.
- University policy requires that students complete all their non-thesis requirements (that is course work, thesis proposal, major and minor field exams, and language requirements) by the end of Year 3.

Students with MA

- Students should aim to complete PhD requirements within five years.
- 2.0 to 5.0 FCE depending on student’s relevant background in the fields or area of choice. Graduate courses taken at the MA level at the University of Toronto or elsewhere may be counted, with the department’s permission, towards meeting some course requirements. Most students who enter from the MA will take the equivalent of 4.0 FCE to satisfy program requirements; all PhD students must take a minimum of 2.0 FCE with the department after entering the PhD program.
- Minimum of three sessions in residence.

Students with BA

- Students should aim to complete PhD requirements within six years.
- 6.0 FCE with at least an A- average in their first four courses in order to continue in the PhD program. In selecting courses, students should ensure that they satisfy the field requirements as described for those entering the PhD program with an MA.
- Minimum of six sessions in residence.

Courses

Some courses listed have an undergraduate component and begin the first week of the session. Not all courses are given every year. Consult the departmental timetable.

Political Theory

Deleted: ¶A major core field and a minor core field. Students who choose this option must fulfil the 1.0 core FCE requirement plus the equivalent of another 1.0 FCE in the major field, and the core course plus the 1.0 FCE in the minor field.
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Students with MA

- Students should aim to complete PhD requirements within five years.
- 2.0 to 5.0 FCE depending on student’s relevant background in the fields or area of choice. Graduate courses taken at the MA level at the University of Toronto or elsewhere may be counted, with the department’s permission, towards meeting some course requirements. Most students who enter from the MA will take the equivalent of 4.0 FCE to satisfy program requirements; all PhD students must take a minimum of 2.0 FCE with the department after entering the PhD program.
- Minimum of three sessions in residence.

Students with BA

- Students should aim to complete PhD requirements within six years.
- 6.0 FCE with at least an A- average in their first four courses in order to continue in the PhD program. In selecting courses, students should ensure that they satisfy the field requirements as described for those entering the PhD program with an MA.
- Minimum of six sessions in residence.

Courses

Some courses listed have an undergraduate component and begin the first week of the session. Not all courses are given every year. Consult the departmental timetable.
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Students with MA

- Students should aim to complete PhD requirements within five years.
- 2.0 to 5.0 FCE depending on student’s relevant background in the fields or area of choice. Graduate courses taken at the MA level at the University of Toronto or elsewhere may be counted, with the department’s permission, towards meeting some course requirements. Most students who enter from the MA will take the equivalent of 4.0 FCE to satisfy program requirements; all PhD students must take a minimum of 2.0 FCE with the department after entering the PhD program.
- Minimum of three sessions in residence.

Students with BA

- Students should aim to complete PhD requirements within six years.
- 6.0 FCE with at least an A- average in their first four courses in order to continue in the PhD program. In selecting courses, students should ensure that they satisfy the field requirements as described for those entering the PhD program with an MA.
- Minimum of six sessions in residence.

Courses

Some courses listed have an undergraduate component and begin the first week of the session. Not all courses are given every year. Consult the departmental timetable.

Political Theory
POL 2000Y Comparative Studies in the History of Political Thought (core course)

POL 2001Y Problems of Political Community
POL 2004Y Marxism
POL 2006H Studies in Modern Political Theory
POL 2007Y Twentieth-Century Political Thought
POL 2008Y The Political Theory of G. W. F. Hegel
POL 2010H Democratic Theory
POL 2011H Problems in the Political Thought of the Socratic School
POL 2014H The Problem of Natural Right
POL 2016H Topics in the Philosophy of Law
POL 2019Y The Political Philosophy of Political Economy
POL 2021H Comparative Studies in Jewish and Non-Jewish Political Thought
POL 2024H Feminist Theory: Challenges to Legal and Political Thought
POL 2025Y Enlightenment and Its Critics
POL 2026H Topics in Political Thought I
POL 2027H Topics in Political Thought II
JPJ 2028H Constitutional Theory
POL 2030Y Democratic Citizenship
POL 2032H Judgement in Law and Politics
JPJ 2036Y Comparative Constitutionalism: Rights and Judicial Review
POL 2037H Law, Religion and Public Discourse
JPD 2037Y Post-Modern and Contemporary Thought
POL 2038Y Pluralism, Justice and Equality
POL 2040H Horizons of Political Reflection
JPJ 2047H Comparative Constitutional Law and Politics
POL 2071H The Political Thought of George Grant
POL 2083H Cosmopolitanism
POL 2127Y Multiculturalism in Canada
PHL 2141H Political Philosophy
POL 2226H Ethics and International Relations
POL 2235H Development, International Relations, Globalization: Through the Lens of a Gender
POL 2423H Colonialism/Post-Colonialism: The Colonial State and its Forms of Power
POL 2801H Special Topics II
RLG 3622H Maimonides and His Modern Interpreters

**Canadian Government and Politics**

POL 2100Y Government of Canada (core course)

POL 2102H Topics in Canadian Politics I
POL 2103H Topics in Canadian Politics II
POL 2110H The Politics of Public Sector Budgeting
JPJ 2116H Constitutional Politics
JPJ 2120H Law and Public Policy
JPJ 2121H Federalism and Governance in Canada
POL 2125H Experiencing Public Policy Making
POL 2126H Canadian Public Sector Management
POL 2127Y Multiculturalism in Canada
POL 2139H The Canadian Welfare State in Comparative Perspective
POL 2190Y Topics in Canadian Politics I
POL 2191Y Topics in Canadian Politics II
JPJ 2220H Public Law, Social Regulation and Poverty
POL 2228H Dynamics of the Global Trade System
POL 2317H Politics and Policy Analysis
JPF 2430Y Cities
HAD 5011H Canada’s Health System and Health Policy
HAD 5765H Case Studies in Health Policy

**International Relations**

POL 2200Y International Politics *(core course)*

DGC 1000H Core Issues in the Dynamics of Global Change
DGC 2000H Special Topics in the Dynamics of Global Change
DGC 2001H Special Topics in the Dynamics of Global Change
DGC 2002H Special Topics in the Dynamics of Global Change
DGC 2003H Special Topics in the Dynamics of Global Change
JHP 1631H Intelligence and International Relations
JPJ 2031H Telecommunications and Internet Law
JPJ 2035H International Taxation
JPJ 2037H International Trade Regulation
JPJ 2039H European Community Law
JPJ 2042H Labour Policy
JPJ 2045H Institutionalizing Doubt: Modernity and the Challenge to Traditional Legal Traditions
JPJ 2046H Law, Institutions and Development
JPJ 2048H International Human Rights Law
JPJ 2049H International Women’s Rights Law
JPJ 2050H Legal Issues in Cyberspace
JPJ 2051H Foundations of the Law of the European Union
POL 2202H Advanced Topics in International Political Economy
POL 2205H Topics in International Politics I
POL 2206H Topics in International Politics II
POL 2207H Topics in International Politics III
POL 2208Y Third World Politics in International Affairs
POL 2210Y Elements of United States Foreign Policy
POL 2213H Global Environmental Politics
POL 2216Y The Military Instrument of Foreign Policy
POL 2217Y Politics of the International System
POL 2218H Political Economy of International Trade
POL 2225H Environmental Change
POL 2226H Ethics and International Relations
POL 2228H The Dynamics of the Global Trade System
POL 2229H G8 and Global Governance I
JBP 2230H Topics in International Politics
POL 2230H G8 and Global Governance II
JHP 2231H The History and Philosophy of International Relations Thought
JPD 2232H International Governance
POL 2233H Conflict and Conflict Management
POL 2234H Globalization, Internationalization, and Public Policy
POL 2235H Development, International Relations, Globalization: Through the Lens of a Gender
POL 2240H The Geopolitics of Information and Communication Technologies
POL 2260H Security Ontology
POL 2314H Political Economy of Eastern Asia
POL 2801H Special Topics

**Comparative Government**

POL 2300H Comparative Politics of Industrial Societies (*core course*)
POL 2700H Comparative Politics (*core course*)

JPV 1201H Politics, Bureaucracy, and the Environment
JHP 1289Y Twentieth-Century Ukraine
JPJ 2036Y Comparative Constitutionalism: Rights and Judicial Review
JPJ 2047H Comparative Constitutional Law and Politics
JPJ 2116H Constitutional Politics
JPJ 2121H Federalism and Governance in Canada
POL 2139H The Canadian Welfare State in Comparative Perspective
POL 2202H Advanced Topics in International Political Economy
POL 2234H Globalization, Internationalization, and Public Policy
POL 2302H Topics in United States Government and Politics
POL 2304Y Topics in Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics (exclusion to POL 2324H)
POL 2307H Political Economy of Technology: From the Auto-Industrial to the Information Age
POL 2308Y Politics and Governments of Eastern Europe
POL 2313Y Comparative Political Parties and Elections
POL 2314H Political Economy of Asia Pacific
POL 2316H Women and Politics
POL 2317H Politics and Policy Analysis
POL 2318H Comparative Public Policies: Selected Areas
POL 2321H Topics in Comparative Politics I
POL 2322H Topics in Comparative Politics II
POL 2322Y Topics in Comparative Politics II
POL 2323Y Multilevel Politics: The European Union in Comparative Perspective
POL 2324H Ethnonationalism and State-Building: The Communist and Post-Communist Experience (exclusion to POL 2304Y)
POL 2325Y The Politics of Post-Communism
POL 2338H Innovation and Governance
POL 2341H Nationalism, Myths and Identity: Ukraine and the CIS
POL 2344H Identity, Democracy and Autocracy in Ukraine
POL 2372H The Comparative Political Economy of Industrial Societies

Deleted: (Industrial Countries)
POL 2391H Topics in Comparative Politics III
POL 2392Y Topics in Comparative Politics IV
JPJ 2394H Innovation and Knowledge Transfer
POL 2411H Topics in Asian Politics
POL 2429Y Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, and Democracy
JPF 2430Y Cities

Development Studies

POL 2400H Theories and Issues - The Politics of Development *(core course)*

JPV 1201H Politics, Bureaucracy and the Environment
POL 2208Y Third World Politics in International Affairs
POL 2218H The Political Economy of International Trade

POL 2235H Development, International Relations, Globalization: Through the Lens of a Gender
POL 2314H Political Economy of Asia Pacific
POL 2322H Topics in Comparative Politics II
POL 2391H Topics in Comparative Politics II
POL 2392Y Topics in Comparative Politics IV
POL 2403H Topics in African Politics I
POL 2404H,Y Topics in African Politics II
POL 2405H Topics in Latin American Politics
JPE 2408Y Political Economy of International Development
POL 2409Y Politics and Planning in Third World Cities
POL 2411H Topics in Asian Politics
JPE 2415Y Research Essay: Political Economy of Development
POL 2416Y Politics and Society in Contemporary China
POL 2418H Topics in Middle East Politics
POL 2420H Globalization, Gender and Development
POL 2423H Colonialism/Post-Colonialism
POL 2429Y Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict, and Democracy
JPF 2430Y Cities
POL 2482H The Politics of Disease and Epidemic

Public Policy

POL 2318H Comparative Public Policy Theory *(Core Course)*

POL 2110H The Politics of Public Sector Budgeting

JPJ 2120H Law and Public Policy

POL 2125H Experiencing Public Policy Making
POL 2139H The Canadian Welfare State in Comparative Perspective

POL 2234H Globalization, Internationalization, and Public Policy

POL 2317H Politics and Policy Analysis

HAD 5011H Canada's Health System and Health Policy
HAD 5765H Case Studies in Health Policy

JPJ 2042H Labour Policy

JPV 1201H Politics, Bureaucracy and the Environment

POL 2409Y Politics and Planning in Third World Cities

Miscellaneous

POL 2501Y Doctoral Research Workshop
POL 2502Y Quantitative Methods and Data Analysis
POL 2503H Thinking Through Research Design
POL 2504H Statistics for Political Scientists
POL 2505H Qualitative Methods in Political Research
POL 2800H Intensive Course
POL 2810Y MA Research Seminar I
POL 2811Y MA Research Seminar II
POL 2904Y Reading course in an approved special field
POL 2905H Reading course in an approved special field
POL 2906Y Reading course in an approved special field

Graduate Faculty

Full Members

Emanuel Adler - BA, MA, PhD, Andrea and Charles Bronfman Chair in Israeli Studies
Robert Andersen - BA, MA, PhD
Sylvia Bashevkin - BA, MA, PhD
Harald Bathelt - MA, Diplom, PhD, Habilitation(Post Doc), CRC
Ronald Beiner - BA, DPhil
Jacques Bertrand - BA, MSc, MA, PhD
Aurel Braun - BA, MA, PhD
Alan S Brudner - BA, MA, LLB, PhD
David Cameron - MSc, BA, PhD (Chair)
Joseph Carens - AB, MPhil (Theol), MPhil, PhD
Simone Chambers - BA, MA, MPhil, PhD (Coordinator of Graduate Studies)
David Cook - BA, MA, PhD
Frank Cunningham - BA, MA, PhD, FRSC
Richard Day - BA, MA, Dip REES, PhD
Raisa Deber - SB, SM, PhD
Ronald Deibert - BA, MA, PhD
Dickson Eyoh - BA, MA, PhD
Victor Falkenheim - BA, MA, PhD
Joseph Fletcher - BA, MA, PhD
Donald Forbes - BA, MA, PhD
Rodney Haddow - BA, MScEcon, PhD
Randall Hansen - BA, MPhil, DPhil, Canada Research Chair
Ran Hirschl - BA, LLB, MA, MPhil, PhD, Canada Research Chair
Thomas Homer-Dixon - BA, PhD
Paul Kingston - BA, MA, MPhil, DPhil
John Kirton - BA, MA, PhD
Nancy Kokaz - BA, BA, MA, PhD
Jeffrey Kopstein - BA, MA, PhD
Lawrence LeDuc - BA, MA, PhD
Paul Magocsi - AB, MA, MA, PhD, FRSC
Patricia McCarney - BA, MCP, PhD
Jennifer R Nedelsky - BA, MA, PhD
Neil Nevitte - BA, MA, PhD
Clifford Orwin - AB, MA, PhD
Louis Pauly - BA, MA, MSc, MA, PhD, Canada Research Chair, Director
David Rayside - BA, AM, PhD
Kent Roach - BA, LLB, LLM
Arthur Rubinoff - BA, MA, PhD
Richard Sandbrook - BA, MA, DPhil, FRSC
Edward Schatz - PhD
David Schneiderman - BA, LLB, LLM
Donald Schwartz - BA, MA, PhD
Richard Simeon - BA, MA, PhD
Grace Skogstad - BA, MA, PhD
Peter Solomon - BA, MA, CertRussInst, PhD
Susan Solomon - BA, MA, CertRussInst, PhD
Janice Stein - BA, MA, PhD, FRSC, University Professor, Belzberg Professor of Conflict Management and Negotiation
Judith Ann Teichman - BA, MA, PhD
Carolyn Tuohy - BA, MA, PhD, Senior Fellow School of Public Policy and Governance
Robert Vipond - BA, AM, MA, PhD
Lorraine Weinrib - BA, LLB, LLM
David Welch - BA, AM, PhD, Ignatieff Chair
Graham White - BA, MA, PhD
Linda White - BA, MA, PhD
Melissa Williams - AB, AM, PhD
Nelson Wiseman - BA, MA, PhD
David Wolfe - BA, MA, PhD
Joseph Wong - BA, MA, PhD, Canada Research Chair

Members Emeriti

Edward Andrew - BA, PhD
Stephen Clarkson - BA, MA, D de Rech
Michael Donnelly - BS, Institute Certificate, MA, PhD
Richard Gregor - BA, MA, PhD
Franklyn J. Griffiths - BA, MIA, PhD
Gad Horowitz - BA, MA, PhD
Alkis Kontos - Barrister at Law, MA, PhD
Ronald Manzer - BA, BEd, MA, PhD
Robert Matthews - BA, MIA, PhD
R Cranford Pratt - BA, MPhil
Abraham Rotstein - BA, PhD
Paul Russell - BA, BA, LLD, FRSC, OC, University Professor Emeritus
Richard Stren - BA, MA, PhD
Melville Watkins - Bach Commerce

Associate Members

Nida Alahmad
Ana Maria Bejarano - BA, MA, PhD
Solomon Benjamin - BAarch, MSArchS, PhD
Steven Bernstein - BA, MA, PhD
Sandford Borins - BA, MPP, PhD
Sujit Choudhry - BSc, BA, LLB, LLM
Lilach Gilady - MA, BA, MPhil, PhD
Antoinette Handley - BA, MPhil, PhD
Ailsa Henderson - PhD
Matthew Hoffmann - BS, PhD
Gustavo Indart - BA, MA, PhD
Rebecca Kingston - BA, MA, PhD, CEP
Margaret Kohn - BA, MA, PhD
Renan Levine - BA, PhD
Wambui Mwangi - BA, MA, PhD
Carla Norrlof - BA, MA, DES, PhD
David Pond - PhD
Ayelet Shachar - BA, MA, LLB, LLM, JSD
Andrew Stark - BA, MSc, MA, PhD
Phil (Triadafilos) Triadafilopoulos - BA, MA, PhD
Lucan Alan Way - BA, MA, PhD

Back to previous page
POL 2501Y is a general research design course, the research component of which depends on the student's declared area of specialization. Thus, half of the credit for this course may be counted for credit in the major field, though not in political theory.
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Item 11.1  GEC Fall 2008 By-election Report
Report to the Graduate Education Council
Fall By-Election Results
October 2008

There were seven seats on the Graduate Education Council remaining open after the spring election of 2008. A call for nominations was made in September. Balloting closed on October 2, 2008. Three seats were filled by acclamation. The two vacant student seats in the Social Sciences (Division II) were filled by secret ballot, conducted this year for the first time by electronic balloting via the Internet. The Election Committee met on October 9, 2008 and determined the results. One seat remains vacant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Vacant Seats as of July 1, 2008</th>
<th>Election Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Division I Humanities | 1 graduate faculty (chair) 1 graduate student | Acclaimed Faculty:  
  - Prof. Stephen Rupp, Department of Spanish & Portuguese  
  Acclaimed Student:  
  - Adele Wilson, Department of English |
| Division II Social Sciences | 1 graduate faculty 2 graduate students | 1 faculty seat remains VACANT  
Elected Students:  
  - Christine McKenzie, OISE  
  - Katherine Parizeau, Department of Geography |
| Division III Physical Sciences | 2 graduate students | Acclaimed Students:  
  - Lisa Roach, Department of Physics  
  - Marcus Brubaker, Department of Computer Science |

Election Committee:
The Election Committee consisted of Professor Elizabeth Cowper, Ms. Xin Zhou, Mr. David Lock (SGS Curriculum Review Officer), and Ms. Jane Alderdice (Secretary of Graduate Education Council and Chief Returning Officer for the election).

A total of approximately 5,500 graduate students in Division II were eligible to vote. A total of 416 ballots were received. Of these, 413 were valid.

Jane Alderdice  
Secretary to Graduate Education Council  
October 10, 2008

65 St. George Street, Toronto, ON M5S 2Z9 Canada  
Tel: +1 416-946-3102 • Fax: +1 416-978-1649, jane.alderdice@utoronto.ca • www.sgs.utoronto.ca
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Item 11.2 Revised GEC Membership 2008-2009
# GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP 2008-2009

**President:** David Naylor  
**Dean:** Susan Pfeiffer  
**Vice-Dean, Programs:** Elizabeth Cowper  
**Vice-Dean, Students:** Berry Smith  
**Chief Librarian:** Carole Moore  
**GSU President:** Joseph Mulongo

## Division I - Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Rupp (Chair)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Cozea</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Duff</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Elliot</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Johnston</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Members:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Galloway</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Radmacher</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele Wilson</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Division II - Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Stabile (Chair)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jens Erik-Mai</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Kooy</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Tannock</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Members:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xia Zhou</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Parizeau</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine McKenzie</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Division III - Physical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Martin (Chair)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Graham</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeme Frist</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Julian</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Liu</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Members:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Grenier</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Roach</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Brubaker</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Division IV - Life Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daphne Goring (Chair)</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Abrams</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bondy</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Davis</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Williams</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Members:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Choi</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Klinger</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harince Sureandra</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Administrative Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term ends</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vesna Makarovska</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliana Szmania bok</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Weedmark</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Graduate Education Council 2008-2009 schedule of meetings

- October 21, 2008  
- November 18, 2008  
- January 20, 2009  
- February 17, 2009  
- March 17, 2009

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS:**

- Academic Board Reps: C. Anderson (Divisions I & II), C. Damaren (Divisions III & IV)
- U of T Administration: P. Young (Vice-President, Research and Associate Provost), E. Hillan (Vice-Provost, Academic), S. Zaky (Vice-Provost, Planning and Budget)
- Faculties & OISE: C. Damaren (Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies / Aerospace Science & Engineering), R. Baker (Acting Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Research / Arts & Science), P. Pauly (Associate Dean, Curriculum/ Rotman School of Management), L. Girolometto (Medicine), N. Labrie (Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies / OISE)
- Mississauga Campus: J. Sidnell (Vice-Dean, Graduate)
- Scarborough Campus: R. Bucherweitz (Dean)
- Massey College: J. Fraser (Master)
Item 11.3 Faculty of Information Studies name change to Faculty of Information

NOTE:
The name change was approved by the Academic Board at its meeting on June 3, 2008 and affirmed by the Executive Committee at its meeting on June 16, 2008. The change is effective June 30, 2008.

The following is extracted from the documentation accompanying the motion:

Founded in 1928 as the Library School, the Faculty’s name has changed several times—in 1972, to the Faculty of Library Science; in 1982, to the Faculty of Library and Information Science. Governing Council approved the name Faculty of Information Studies in 1994.

Each of the name changes that the Faculty has undergone in the last 80 years have reflected—and responded to—changes in the profession within which the Faculty operates, and, more importantly, the ongoing expansion of topics covered by the Information field. While the Faculty maintains its reputation as a professional school of choice for Librarians and Archivists, it has developed as the only Canadian member of the Information Schools (“i-schools”) movement. In so doing, the Faculty has expanded its academic offerings to include new fields of study such as Museum Studies, information policy, and inclusive design. Information itself, qua phenomenon, is an increasingly valid subject of academic study.

The new name will signify the Faculty’s membership in the emerging community of Information Schools (“i-schools”). There is a movement within this group to adopt such simple names as Information School, School of Information, etc., in order to establish Information Schools as a type, i.e., a cohesive and recognizable unit for granting agencies, patterns of allegiance, rating systems, public discussions, etc. The University of Michigan calls their i-school The School of Information, as does the University of Texas. The University of Washington has The Information School. In 2006 University of California Berkeley changed its name from the “School of Information Management and Systems” to the School of Information. Of the 19 Universities forming the Information School Caucus, just 4 others continue to have ‘studies’ in their names and several of these are contemplating name changes to the “Information School” or “School of Information.”

At this time, the proposed name change will have no direct impact on the names of Faculty’s programs or degrees. In the future—perhaps in conjunction with the on-going curriculum review—the Faculty may consider proposing changing the name of the Master of Information Studies (MISt) degree to Master of Information.

The proposal to change to the Faculty of Information has been considered carefully, having first been discussed in the Faculty’s 2004–10 Academic Plan. As the proposed change is important to the Faculty’s internal self-conception and to external image and reputation, the Faculty engaged in a broad consultation process with stakeholders. Meetings were held with the Presidents of each of the three student societies and with the Faculty’s Alumni Council. A ‘Town Hall’ meeting was held on March 18, 2008 to further discuss the proposal. The proposal has received broad support at all of the meetings and consultations. The proposed name was approved at the Faculty of Information Studies Council on March 25, 2008.
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Item 11.4  Dalla Lana School of Public Health (EDU:A)

NOTE:
The creation of the Dalla Lana School of Public Health (EDU:A), effective immediately, was approved by the Governing Council at its April 2008 meeting.

According to the minutes of that meeting, the School will support academic public health activity at the University, coordinated across several units. As an EDU:A, the School has its own budget, authority to administer research grants, offer academic programs, enroll students, and make primary faculty appointments. The existing Department of Public Health Sciences is providing the core faculty membership, education, research programs, and administrative structure. The Director of the School reports to the Vice-President and Provost or designate. The inaugural Director is Professor Jack Mandel. All revenues and costs associated with the School would be included in the budget of the Faculty of Medicine, and all administrative staff matters would be dealt with through the Faculty’s human resources functions.
A Report on Activities and Priorities, 2004 to 2008

Susan Pfeiffer
Dean and Vice-Provost
September 1, 2008
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The School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto

A report on Activities and Priorities, 2004 to 2008

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The School of Graduate Studies (SGS) was established in 1922, to serve a constituency of 300 students. It now serves over 13,000 students who participate in about 170 programs. The SGS provides a framework for excellence in advanced education that encompasses all academic units of the institution, thereby providing connection and community. Following the recommendations of the Task Force on Graduate Education (June 2005), the SGS Dean has undertaken a Vice-Provostial role, graduate governance functions have been changed to assure alignment of academic and budgetary considerations, and stronger linkages have been established among those engaged in graduate administrative functions. Several initiatives have improved aspects of the graduate student experience. Improvements to the Final Oral Examination, establishment of electronic thesis submission procedures, a strong recruitment initiative and the creation of The Grad Room are examples, with others provided herein.

Consultation and communication have been crucial not just for fulfilling the directives of the Task Force, but also for responding to new challenges and opportunities, like the province’s Reaching Higher graduate expansion and the Council of Ontario Universities’ decision to harmonize quality assurance of undergraduate and graduate programs. Consultation and communication have facilitated the expansion of services to graduate students, especially the monitoring of student experience and the provision of professional non-academic skills. They have also been important to the strengthening of our procedures supporting post-doctoral fellows.

The School of Graduate Studies can be powerful and effective only insofar as the U of T community wishes it so. With the support of the community, SGS can provide support and leadership in the provision of superb graduate education.

---

The role of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-Provost, Graduate Education is unique, insofar as the position’s power comes through designated responsibilities, rather than through budgetary controls. The power of the graduate dean is the power to convene, and thus to influence planning and opinion. At University of Toronto, the graduate dean also holds statutory responsibilities associated with quality assessment, governance and registration duties. As we contemplate a future in which the campuses of U of T may have greater autonomy, it is fortunate that U of T has established and maintained non-budgetary faculty appointments to the School of Graduate Studies. That School, SGS, is a functioning demonstration of our pan-institutional commitment to scholarly connectivity and to the provision of high quality graduate education.

In his request for an end of term report (02/21/08), Provost Goel asked that I assess the School’s success in meeting the recommendations set out in the Final Report of the Task Force on Graduate Education (2005), and address the issues raised as a result of the Council of Ontario Universities review of Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) in the context of the impact on U of T. I have attempted to comply, while at the same time providing a balanced perspective on the important functions of the School. Since the Task Force recommendations were tabled only three years ago, some responses to them are still being implemented. Nevertheless, there is much to report.

**DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND**

The number of graduate students increases each year, as is consistent with our institutional mandate. The registration count on February 1, 2008, indicates 13,130 graduate students registered. Women outnumber men in most degree categories, and fewer than 15% of the students are registered as international students. Almost 5000 new students joined us in 2007-08, chosen through a complex process that is based on about 22,000 applications. During the calendar year 2006, 3190 master’s degrees and 644 doctoral degrees were awarded. Graduation numbers, too, increase each year.

As demonstrated in Table 1, the number of graduate programs is also expanding. Proposals for new graduate programs come most frequently in newly identified areas of professional master’s education (see Figure 1). This trend is seen at institutions across Canada, and more widely. The increase in the number of collaborative\(^2\) graduate programs suggests that this venue for supporting interdisciplinary linkages is quite successful. Each new program represents a sustained commitment by faculty and staff to the provision of innovative education for which there is demonstrated demand. As noted below, each one represents extensive consultation, documentation, deliberation and preparation of submissions to U of T governance, OCGS and the provincial Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU).

\(^2\) Interdisciplinary, non-admitting thematic programs that link participating degree programs; fulfillment of requirements leads to notation on the transcript, thus supplementing the degree program.
Table 1: Graduate Program growth during the past decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Programs in Operation 1997-98</th>
<th>Programs in Operation 2003-04</th>
<th>Programs in Operation 2006-07</th>
<th>Programs in Operation 2007-08</th>
<th>Programs in Operation 2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjoint</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closures (all types – see governance section for details)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total programs in operation</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The category of “conjoint” (Th.M. and Th.D. degrees with TST – considered one program) was added to the total # of programs in 2003-04.

Figure 1: Growth in the number of graduate professional degree designations at the University of Toronto, from 18 to 35 during the past decade. This group includes large cohorts, such as the M.B.A., M.Ed., and M.Eng., as well as many others.

Source: SGS Academic Calendars, 1997-98 to 2008-09.
STRUCTURE OF THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Concomitant with expansion in graduate enrolment, the staff complement of SGS has expanded slightly, from about 42 Full Time Equivalents (FTE) in 2003 to 45.5 FTE today (see Appendix 1, the SGS and Graduate House organizational charts). All positions have been managed in a way that assures budgetary responsiveness, as needed.

In the context of the recommendations of the *Discussion Paper on Administrative Functions and Governance Arrangements for Graduate Education*, prepared by the Task Force on Graduate Education, 2005, the previous SGS decanal structure was modified in 2005-06. Previously, there had been four associate deans at 0.5 FTE each and one vice-dean at 0.8 FTE. The latter managed the SGS Centres & Institutes, among other tasks. This structure was replaced by that of two vice-deans at 0.8 FTE each, namely the Vice-Dean Programs and the Vice-Dean Students. Some staffing reorganization accompanied this change, with decanal support positions shifted toward governance, communication and student experience areas.

The integration of decanal functions across the four divisions facilitates the establishment of greater consistency of institutional standards. Areas that were previously managed in four different ways include the approval of arrangements for Final Oral Examinations (FOE), new program and curriculum proposals, fellowship and award adjudication, and student issues. The new structure has worked well, thanks to superb leadership by the vice-deans and good will within the community. Within this structure, we have initiated and maintained activities that are categorized for the sake of reportage, but are actually of a single piece, namely that of supporting quality graduate education.

A FOCUS ON GRADUATE STUDENTS: RECRUITMENT AND STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Considerable attention has been directed toward the enhancement of the student experience at U of T. Within SGS, we have focused on identifying what aspects of the graduate education process are most important to our students, then enhancing those aspects. Tools like the 2002 HEDS (Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium) survey, followed by the GPSS and CGPSS (Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey) in 2005 and 2007, provided valuable input on the former. This document will focus on some of our action items.

Recruitment

Until 2005, our institutional approach to graduate recruitment was almost entirely decentralized. Because communication between the faculty members in a program and the potential graduate students is crucial, it was thought that graduate units should have

---

3 One for each Division: Division I, Humanities; Division II, Social Sciences; Division III, Physical Sciences and Engineering; Division IV, Life Sciences.
autonomy in recruitment. With the announcement of Ontario’s Reaching Higher plan for graduate expansion, it was time to think of ways to help the units. The provincial plan for expansion followed a “short and sharp” curve, so in the fall of 2005, staff at SGS rose to the challenge. With the assistance of other U of T experts, we developed print advertising, produced a recruitment video, attended many, many Canadian recruitment fairs, developed “conversion” tools, and implemented a post-recruitment survey to evaluate these approaches. In subsequent years we have continued those elements of the package that were judged to be most helpful. We have also shifted the locus of responsibility from staff who have other primary responsibilities to new, contractual staff who can specialize in these activities. It represents a new area of expertise at SGS, and it links with the communication activities described later.

The Grad Room

Graduate House (discussed below) was designed to include a commercial restaurant operation, with the lease revenue going toward the mortgage. By 2004, it was clear that the restaurant was not a commercial success, and occupants of Graduate House were unhappy with the noise, vermin and disruptions arising from it. The Graduate House Council proposed that this space be taken over by SGS, for student programming. A plan was developed through which the needed renovations to the vacated space could be financed through the Student Experience Fund, and the operating expenses financed through Graduate House income.

While the renovations took longer than planned and therefore programming was hindered, The Grad Room is now a reality. On the lower level is a technologically supported “multi-purpose space” that can seat up to 50 people in various configurations for meetings and formal programming such as English Language Writing Support (ELWS) classes, and can also easily be cleared for events such as receptions. On the upper level is an informal “drop-in” space that will have food and beverages available, and will be supervised by graduate-student part-time staff. This space, at the busy corner of Spadina and Harbord Streets, provides a welcoming environment in which graduate students on the St. George campus can meet, mingle and learn. We acknowledge that many more such spaces are warranted, since graduate students are dispersed across many locales. Nevertheless, it is a start. This portfolio has been managed by the Vice-Dean, Students, with significant input from the Director of Student Services and the Assistant Dean, Graduate House.

Financial Supports

Improvements have been made to the ways in which SGS provides financial support and rewards to graduate students. Concomitant with some adjustments to staffing, the name of the SGS office has been changed from “Financial Aid” to “Graduate Awards.” We developed and maintain a document on our website that describes the funding commitment made by each doctoral program to its students.
In the management of scholarships and awards, endowed scholarships have been positioned within the units that are best positioned to distribute them. External scholarships and internal interdisciplinary awards that are held centrally are ranked and adjudicated by a multi-divisional SGS awards committee, components of which are convened as appropriate.

With regard to grants and bursaries, the emergency bursary (now emergency grant) program has been re-designed to make it compliant with provincial freedom of information and privacy protection legislation (FIPPA) and consistent with other forms of support, like the Ontario Student Assistance Program. The delivery of first instalments of funds to new graduate students has become more streamlined, replacing an unwieldy system of cheque issuance. New forms of payment are now accepted for application fees and special services.

Electronic Thesis Submission

We had been aware for some time that peer institutions were moving toward the electronic submission of theses. As is so frequent at U of T, the diversity of our programs, the diversity of our educational environments and the breadth of consultation required had slowed our ability to take this on. During the 2007-08 year, following extensive consultation planning through a working group led by the Vice-Dean Students and the Director of Student Services, plus a year of testing in selected units from each division, the Electronic Theses and Dissertation (ETD) project was launched. Doctoral and masters students now have the option of submitting to SGS electronic rather than paper copies of their theses. In September 2009, this will become the only acceptable format. ETDs can contain non-text elements such as multimedia, sound, video, as well as text and hypertext links. Ensuring world-wide free access, ETDs are housed in T-Space, the U of T digital library repository designed to capture, store, index, preserve, and redistribute scholarly research material in digital formats.

English Language Writing Support

The English Language Writing Support (ELWS) program has been in place since 2000. It assists graduate students at U of T in improving their academic writing and speaking skills by offering free non-credit courses, workshops, and individual writing consultations to both native and non-native speakers of English from most disciplines. Its core complement comprises three lecturer positions, supplemented by contractual instructors and teaching assistants. One of the lecturers now holds the rank of Senior Lecturer, and a second will become eligible for consideration for promotion soon. The third lecturer position will be maintained as a non-renewable contract of no more than three years, in order to ensure flexibility in the organizational structure. In 2007-8 nearly 4,000 graduate students participated in ELWS programs. Many of its courses have waiting lists. We continue to look for ways that the highly valued content of ELWS programs can be made available to a wider array of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.
Candidacy

The completion of a doctoral degree can take a long time, and milestones of achievement can be few. Some doctoral students become discouraged or disinterested, and fail to complete. From 2003 to 2005, governance bodies debated and ultimately approved the creation of an in-program degree for PhD students who had achieved all milestones, save for the thesis. They were to receive a Masters of Philosophy (M.Phil). In association with its implementation, challenges were discovered that made further action unwise. One important consideration was that we had no assurance from MTCU that the awarding of a master’s degree to numerous doctoral students would not trigger a reconsideration of the level of provincial funding generated by those students, to that point. This turn of events was disappointing to many advocates of the proposal.

As a partial solution to the absence of the M.Phil, in 2005-06 the Graduate Education Council approved a proposal that the notation “Achieved Candidacy” will be entered on the transcript when a unit reports that a doctoral student has completed all program requirements, save for the thesis. This acknowledgement of a significant milestone has been well received, to the extent that units are aware of it and use it.

Final Oral Examinations

The most memorable academic experience for each doctoral student is the final oral examination. This experience, still known as the “Senate Exam” in some quarters, is a University examination. The rigor and consistency of the examination is central to the credibility of the resulting doctoral credential. To encourage all doctoral programs to use the examination space available for them at SGS, the rooms were extensively refurbished. All three were equipped with new audio-visual and media equipment in 2007.

The Vice-Dean Programs has developed and implemented a web-based approval system through which the credentials of the proposed external examiner are vetted, as well as the composition of the examination committee. While the policy on appropriate examiners is relatively clear, there remains a need for scrutiny, focusing on the status of the examiner (Do they have the experience to know the standard of judgement?) and conflict of interest (Are they at arm’s length from the supervisor?). Thanks to funding from the Academic Initiatives Fund in 2006, SGS provides remuneration of $500 to units for each external examiner who attends an FOE in person. In the 2007-08 year, 733 FOEs were held, with external examiners in the room 70% of the time. Examiners came from Ontario institutions (38%), the rest of Canada (24%), the USA (32%) and the rest of the world (6%). These visits benefit not just our doctoral candidates, but also the academic communities who meet and host the examiners.
POST-DOCTORAL FELLOWS

Communication with our community of post-doctoral fellows is a responsibility that SGS shares with the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic. Changes to the procedures associated with our institutional policy (12/08) direct the SGS PDF office to institute mandatory registration for postdoctoral fellows whose traineeships are paid through the University of Toronto, and to enrol them in a mandatory benefits plan. Being implemented in summer, 2008, are a registration fee, an orientation, and a list of available professional skills programs. The PDF office also provides the communication link between the U of T and the newly-formed postdoctoral fellows association (PDA). All these activities are directed toward providing better and more clearly defined support to our postdoctoral fellows, and clarifying the type of training they receive during their time with us.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND GOVERNANCE

Governance Changes

In September 2006, significant changes to graduate governance procedures at the University of Toronto were put into effect. The changes were made to better align responsibilities and accountability with respect to governance matters within Faculties. As a result, graduate governance processes are now shared between Faculties across the University and the School of Graduate Studies.

These changes came about through a process that began with the review of the School of Graduate Studies, concluding in April 2004. Following from a recommendation of the review report, the Provost struck a Graduate Education Task Force in October 2004. The Final Report of the Task Force on Graduate Education: Administrative Functions and Governance Arrangements for Graduate Education at the University of Toronto was released in June 2005.

Several actions resulted from recommendations of the Task Force’s report. The position of Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, was created and the role of the Dean of SGS was expanded to include that title. An ad hoc Graduate Education Coordinating Committee was created in the 2005-2006 academic year. It was responsible for oversight of two working groups, one of which was the Governance Working Group. The mandate of the Governance Working Group was simply stated: “. . . to align governance functions to appropriately reflect Faculty and Graduate School responsibilities”. In a document entitled “Proposal for Changes to Governance Routing with Respect to Graduate Programs”, February 2006, the new graduate governance framework was presented.

Despite the scale of changes required, implementation occurred very quickly during the spring of 2006. The Graduate Web posting System (GWS), an Internet database, was developed. A new staff position in SGS, Curriculum Review Officer (CRO), was created and filled by August that year. The CRO is responsible for the GWS and, reporting to the Director of Quality Assessment and Governance, works closely with the SGS.
Governance Officer. Together they serve as important resources and provide support to graduate offices in the Faculties. Governance forms and revised procedures were made available on a revamped graduate governance website. Each Faculty established a Graduate Affairs Office in preparation for its significant role in the process. In the large multi-department Faculties (Arts & Science, Medicine, OISE/UT, Applied Science & Engineering), a Vice-Dean (or Associate Dean) was appointed with responsibilities for graduate matters within the Faculty, if that position did not already exist. A graduate administrator was also appointed in each Faculty Graduate Affairs office. This completed the administrative network across the University.

The SGS constitution was changed to accommodate new governance structures. Six by-laws were adopted. Three by-laws represent long-standing practices of the Council, and three by-laws are truly new. The continuing structures are the Rules of Council, the Admissions and Programs Standing Committee, and the Graduate Academic Appeals Board. The three new by-laws establish the committee to consider governance matters within the SGS Centres and Institutes, the Standing Committee on Student Matters and the Standing Committee on Program Matters. Constitutions in each of seventeen Faculties across the University were revised to ensure that Faculty Councils also had the appropriate responsibilities and membership to handle graduate governance matters.

Other changes resulting from the restructuring include: renaming of the SGS Council to the “Graduate Education Council” and dissolution of the four SGS Divisional Executive Committees. The Council of Graduate Deans was created to ensure dialogue among SGS and Faculty Vice-Deans on graduate affairs; this group includes representation from the UTM and UTSC campuses.

Beginning in September 2006, graduate governance processes followed a significantly different route than in the past. Approval authority for minor graduate curriculum matters has been delegated from SGS to Faculty Deans. The approval of some major changes has been delegated from the Academic Policy and Programs committee of Academic Board to the Graduate Education Council (Council provides an annual report of activity). The approval route for major program changes and new program proposals now begins with Faculty Graduate Affairs Offices and includes broad consultation, primarily through initial posting on the GWS for information and feedback.

The GWS is acknowledged as a valuable information and tracking resource. Use of the GWS has increased markedly in the past year. In its first year, there were 5,362 unique hits on the GWS website compared to 12,540 unique hits in this past academic year. However, its limits as a tool for formal feedback are recognized. Face-to-face meetings are the best way to achieve focused attention and gain feedback on individual proposals. Governance bodies are best positioned to perform these functions. Some adjustments across the institution are being considered for best effect. Refinements to the procedures continue. Posting periods on the GWS are being shortened in the coming year so that all posting periods are fourteen days, for example.
There has been a great deal of activity flowing through the new structures in the past two years. Each of the eleven new programs commencing in September 2008, and each of the nine new programs commencing in September 2009 required governance review and approval through the new processes. While these twenty new programs were being scrutinized, five programs were closed. The SGS Graduate Education Council reviewed approximately 65 major proposals (including the new program proposals noted above) in each of the past two years. The Faculty Deans’ offices approved a total of 381 courses across the University in 2007-2008, and 310 courses in 2006-2007. Each course and each major proposal required posting on the GWS and approval at the level of the Faculty Council. Major changes, including other program proposals not noted in detail here, require approval of the SGS Graduate Education Council. For new program proposals, higher levels of University approval are also required.

Overall the new governance system is working very well and, with continuing good will and good communication, it should serve us well into the future.

Tri-Campus Matters

The *Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses* (2002) envisioned the establishment of professional master’s programs on the University of Toronto at Mississauga (UTM) and University of Toronto at Scarborough (UTSC) campuses, as well as their expanded presence in doctoral stream programs. The structures under which campus-based master’s programs could be established needed to be determined. The SGS Constitution and related policies specify the expectations for administrative structures, should a new graduate program be proposed. In October 2006, the SGS dean developed a proposed approach to graduate program structure, through which a campus dean (or designate) can function as the graduate chair for professional master’s programs. In March 2007, UTM received approval for its Professional Graduate Program Centre (an EDU-B, in the parlance of extra-departmental unit classification). This structure, under the UTM Vice-Dean, Graduate, is now the administrative home for two programs (Diploma in Forensic Accounting and Master of Management and Professional Accounting) and is poised to provide oversight to others. It is hoped that a similar structure will be established at UTSC soon.

Judicial Activities

Activity in judicial matters has increased, as would be expected when the numbers of students and programs are increasing. Allegations against graduate students under the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters are handled by the SGS Dean. In 2003, SGS Dean Marrus reported "the Dean of SGS hears on average about nine cases annually....[and] on average only about three appeals a year reach the level of a GAAB [Graduate Academic Appeals Board] hearing." For the past four years, those numbers have more than doubled, in both categories. Since 2006, we have also completed two investigations under the Framework to Address Allegations of Research Misconduct, as directed by the Office of the Vice-President, Research. The SGS Vice-Dean, Students, the skilled senior staff of SGS and the volunteer members of the GAAB all provide
excellent service in this area. Because the cases are both rare and complex, and because institutional consistency is important, it is most expedient for judicial matters involving graduate students to remain a responsibility of the School of Graduate Studies.

Ontario Council on Graduate Studies

A report on the activities of SGS would be incomplete without mention of the substantial amount of activity associated with compliance with Ontario Council for Graduate Studies (OCGS) appraisals. In addition to submissions for all new program proposals, our established programs are appraised on a seven year cycle, plus off-cycle reports in some instances. Since September, 2004, we have submitted 27 standard appraisal briefs (new program proposals), 68 periodic appraisal briefs, and numerous reports. There is considerable work directed toward the preparation of the required quantitative information for each program, the scheduling of consultants’ visits, the management of the documents, and working with OCGS on proposed adjustments to the system. As noted below, a major reconsideration of this system for quality assurance is underway, although periodic assessments of program quality will surely remain a component of U of T’s public accountability and it is “business as usual” with OCGS for at least the coming year.

INSTITUTION-WIDE CONSULTATION AND TRAINING IN GRADUATE MATTERS

The Task Force on Graduate Education placed emphasis on the question of where the responsibility for various aspects of graduate education should reside. That is, should the graduate department, the department’s budgetary Faculty, or SGS hold a particular responsibility? This question arose out of a sense that the locus of responsibility was not always clear. Indeed, a document on “who does what” that was prepared for the Task Force indicated that many aspects of graduate education rely on shared responsibilities.

Many of the non-governance graduate activities are stronger because they are shared responsibilities. Examples include enrolment planning, adjudication of awards and professional skills development. To be effective, a shared approach must be based on a shared sense of purpose and shared knowledge. The partners need to know one another. Therefore, SGS needs to maintain sustained engagement in training, educating and consulting among the U of T community. As noted in a previous section, changes to graduate governance shifted responsibilities, with the Faculties giving initial consideration to all major changes and undertaking new responsibilities for curriculum review.

For any topic that arises, there should be three phases to the development of something new or the modification of existing practice: consultation, recommendation and decision. To assure that there is appropriate consultation and discussion before key policy or program recommendations are presented to the Graduate Education Council and subsequent levels of governance, we established the new web posting system (GWS) for
program changes that are proposed by the Faculties. Experience with the webposting system reinforces the sense that face to face meetings remain the best way to establish engagement and to solicit views.

To that end, various committees and groups are hosted and coordinated by the School of Graduate Studies (Table 2). The “type” column indicates the role of each body in the development process: consultation/training, recommendation and/or decision. There are two standing committees of Graduate Education Council that are specifically charged with consultation and the development of formal recommendations for matters of graduate education policy and are each chaired by a Vice-Dean. Each is comprised of one quarter of the graduate coordinators, balanced across the four divisions, plus half of the graduate student members of the Graduate Education Council. Membership of faculty rotates after two years’ service. All graduate coordinators are thus exposed to some committee work within SGS, yet that work is not a permanent part of each coordinator’s responsibilities.

With this annual cycle as a basis, engagement with the community is likely to expand still further. SGS can provide a forum for discussion of issues of immediate interest, like graduate expansion, institutional planning, and the harmonization of graduate and undergraduate program quality assurance.
### Table 2: School of Graduate Studies Councils, Committees and Groups; “Type” refers to the role of each body relative to Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Freq. of meeting</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Education Council</td>
<td>GEC</td>
<td>8 mtgs/yr Elected faculty, students &amp; staff</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committees of GEC:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on SGS Centre and Institute Programs</td>
<td>CCIP</td>
<td>As needed See by-laws of GEC</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Programs</td>
<td>A&amp;P</td>
<td>As needed See by-laws of GEC</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Academic Appeals Board</td>
<td>GAAB</td>
<td>As needed See by-laws of GEC</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee on Program Matters</td>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>In cycle with GEC Grad coordinators &amp; Student members of GEC</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee on Student Matters</td>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>In cycle with GEC Grad coordinators &amp; Student members of GEC</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of SGS Deans &amp; Directors</td>
<td>CoD</td>
<td>Bi-weekly SGS deans &amp; directors</td>
<td>Consultation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Graduate Deans</td>
<td>CGD</td>
<td>Monthly CoD + decanal designates</td>
<td>Consultation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td>As needed Graduate coordinators</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>As needed Graduate faculty, graduate students</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Graduate Programs Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Directors and staff of Collaborative Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Consultation, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation for new graduate administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual New Graduate Chairs, Graduate Coordinators &amp; Grad admin staff</td>
<td>Consultation, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Administration Briefing session</td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual, more often as needed Graduate Chairs, Graduate Coordinators</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Administrative Staff Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each term Graduate Administrative staff</td>
<td>Consultation, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate IT Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each term Faculty IT managers</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Also management decisions.

Link to constitution and by-laws that describe the functions of GEC, CPM and CSM: [http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/current/governance/constitution/index.asp](http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/current/governance/constitution/index.asp)
OTHER SGS RESPONSIBILITIES

The SGS Centres & Institutes

At the time of the Stepping UP planning exercise (July, 2004), there were fifteen SGS extra-departmental units (EDUs). There had been discussion for at least twenty years about whether it was wise to have a subset of interdisciplinary EDUs administered by the graduate school. On the one hand, this arrangement could provide a supportive administrative space in which new initiatives could be incubated. On the other hand, this arrangement stood in opposition to principles articulated in the Stepping UP planning document, namely that interdisciplinarity should be an integral part of all our academic activities, and that undergraduate teaching, graduate teaching and research should all be linked. In 2004, some of the fifteen units were well along in their plans to move elsewhere, the SGS advancement office was losing staff for budget reasons, and discussions of a new budget model were attending to variables like the costs of space and units’ income generation potential. As I began my term in September, 2004, I established as a principle of my deanship that the budget associated with support of graduate education at U of T would not be used to shore up the budgets of the Centres and Institutes.

In this context, it promised to be increasingly difficult to provide each of the disparate units with the sort of high quality “back room” services and academic linkages that they need in order to thrive. For these reasons, I urged the directors of the units to begin serious consideration of alternate administrative arrangements. Several units moved in 2005, and others have followed each year (Table 3). The deliberations have normally occurred in the context of a review triggered by a director’s end of term. This approach appears to have been beneficial on all sides. Discussions are underway to identify new homes for three of the remaining units, and one unit is scheduled to undergo review during the coming year. These transitions have been skilfully managed by the Vice-Dean, Programs and the Director of Support Services. It is my hope that arrangements for new administrative homes for all SGS Centres and Institutes will have been made by spring, 2009.
**Table 3: School of Graduate Studies, Centres and Institutes**
Changes to management structures since 2004-05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>Collaborative Graduate Program</th>
<th>Moved to…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Institute</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific South Asian</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Science 05/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Science 07/01/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology (Centre of)</td>
<td>M.A Ph.D.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama (Centre for the Study of)</td>
<td>M.A. Ph.D.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies (Institute for)</td>
<td>Environmental Studies Environment and Health</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Science 07/01/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development, Life Course &amp; Aging (Institute for)</td>
<td>Aging &amp; the Life Course</td>
<td>Faculty of Medicine 07/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Relations (Centre for)</td>
<td>M.I.R.H.R. Ph.D.</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies (Centre for)</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Science 07/01/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Media Design Institute</td>
<td>Knowledge Media Design</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Finance Program</td>
<td>M.M.F.</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Science underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Studies Program</td>
<td>M.M.St.</td>
<td>Faculty of Information Studies 07/01/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis (Institute for)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rotman School of Management 07/01/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Institute (nascent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Removed from records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian and East European Studies (Centre for)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Arts and Science 07/01/05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Community Studies (Centre for)</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design 01/01/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*List taken from Stepping UP submission, July, 2004

**Discussions underway

***To be reviewed, 2008-09
Graduate House

Graduate House is a 437-bed, suite-type residence operated by the School of Graduate Studies. It opened in the year 2000, hosting students, of whom 60% are graduate students and 40% are from second-entry undergraduate programs (Dentistry, Law, Medicine, Nursing, OISE and Pharmacy). Thus, while the name implies that the building would be a locus of graduate activity, it actually houses only about 260 graduate students (0.02% of the graduate student population). Nevertheless, the residence is an effective recruitment tool. Every year graduate departments, centres, and institutes, along with the professional Faculties, use up to 60 percent of all Graduate House spaces to attract superb new students to the University of Toronto.

Graduate House is a well managed, financially sound operation. Demand for accommodation is strong: for 2007-8, in addition to the more than 200 students who were guaranteed spaces by departments, 725 direct applications were submitted. Summer occupancy levels are also quite good.

Institutional Adjudication

Through the policies of the University of Toronto, the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (or designate) is charged with membership on tenure committees and on searches for deans and chairs. Indeed, it is the graduate dean who nominates each candidate for the position of graduate chair to Academic Board. We have seen growth in the number of tenure-steam faculty and the number of academic units (including EDUs). Timeliness is important in all these undertakings. While these are all very important tasks that any dean undertakes willingly, the scheduling of meetings would become impossible if some responsibility was not delegated.

In past times, the mandated decanal role on tenure committees was played by the SGS dean and the four associate deans, each associate dean primarily serving one division. With about 100 tenure committees each year, this arrangement was becoming unworkable. With the reduction in the number of deans in 2005, a new approach was immediately needed. The two Vice-Deans and the Dean handle about 40% of the tenure files each year, and the Dean delegates the additional files to a small group of tenure assessors, each of whom agrees to serve on five to six committees each year for three years. Colleagues who serve as SGS decanal assessors are senior (but cannot be emeritus), very experienced (often former department chairs), and highly regarded colleagues. That they are willing to serve the University of Toronto in this way is a great boon to us all. With the support of the Dean’s executive assistant and the office of the Vice-Provost Academic, I think that this system is working well.

With respect to departmental chair searches, committee structures have been regularized. In searches for chairs of undergraduate departments at St. George, UTM and UTSC, the graduate chair of the same or a cognate discipline is delegated to serve as the SGS
decanal representative. For graduate department chair searches, the Vice-Deans and Dean normally serve, and once candidates are identified the office of the SGS Dean coordinates the nominations with the offices of the Faculty deans.

For the special case of the graduate chair of a multi-campus Arts & Science unit, the three Arts & Science Deans (UTM, UTSC and St. George) and the SGS Dean have developed an approach that is consistent with the Framework for a New Structure of Academic Administration for the Three Campuses (2002). When a graduate unit has substantial activity on more than one campus, the current approach sees the Dean of SGS convening a three-campus search committee at such time as all three undergraduate chair positions are filled, to search for a graduate chair. The graduate chair may be one of the undergraduate chairs, or may be a fourth administrator. To date, I have chaired seven such searches, and each one has been a learning experience. Ongoing conversations with the three campus deans and the Office of the Provost are directed toward possible adjustments to the process, but whatever the process, Arts & Science units are unquestionably in a period of discussion and reconsideration of what it means to be a graduate department, and what it means to be a graduate chair. In 2005, the Task Force on Graduate Education anticipated that SGS might be providing specialized support to the single department Faculties, but to date it has been the unique features of tri-campus Arts & Science that have required extra engagement.

THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS: HAS THE RESPONSE BEEN SALUTARY?

A central message of the Task Force on Graduate Education was that rebalancing was needed, with Faculties taking a clearer leadership position. Since the implementation of an institutional approach to doctoral stream funding in 2001, Faculties had been progressively more engaged in planning and managing their graduate programs, yet they were not in the flow of governance discussions, nor were they regularly consulted on important graduate matters. Changes to governance structures and the creation of groups for discussion of graduate matters have adjusted the balance.

Another message was that we should re-consider “who does what.” Relatively few changes have arisen from that recommendation. Recently SGS has undertaken the responsibility for entering graduate faculty appointments into the Human Resources Information System (HRIS), not so that the decisions taken by graduate chairs should be scrutinized, but to improve data integrity. We are also enhancing our staff expertise related to the assessment of applicants’ credentials. Such actions, like our expanded recruitment activity, are designed to support and assist departments and Faculties, not to limit their activities. The main outcome of this Task Force recommendation was a redoubling of SGS engagement, so that all the players feel more supported.

Following another Task Force recommendation, an information technology plan was developed. Subsequent to that plan, a Communication and Information Coordinator was

---

4 If someone from outside U of T is entrusted with the rights of a graduate faculty member, we must also ensure that they have agreed to comply with our policies and procedures.
added to a restructured Information Systems group within SGS. There has been significant progress toward a greater web presence for graduate education. Some aspects are obvious to all, like the online application form that now allows applicants and referees to post materials online, the website developed to aid in recruitment and the online graduate calendar. A summary of some of the SGS initiated milestones is provided in Table 4. We plan to use the portal for communication directly with graduate students during the coming year. Other important developments are internal to SGS. Chief among these is the development of an SGS database that will allow us to link accurate data from registrarial, programmatic and budgetary domains.

Table 4: A selection of milestones in the development of the School of Graduate Studies, 2004 to present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Conclusion of the six-dean structure, divisional executive committees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of U of T on-line graduate application system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate and Professional Students Survey (GPSS);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reorganization of the SGS Quality Assessment &amp; Governance unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Three-dean structure: Dean, Vice-Dean Students, Vice-Dean Programs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decanal tenure representatives recruited;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regularized tri-campus component to OCGS appraisals, where appropriate;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual reports of graduate program demographics to Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Reorganization of the SGS Information Systems unit;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full implementation of Graduate Web posting System;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reimbursement for FOE examiners’ attendance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edited and improved governance forms;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment initiative, including web page and video;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly updates on applications and offers to deans;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian Graduate and Professional Students Survey (CGPSS);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised web-based document, Intellectual Property Guidelines for Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students &amp; Supervisors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SGS convenes first search committee for a tri-campus graduate chair;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Room, Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Web-based Final Oral Examination approvals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structural consistency to Calendar, web-based;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic submission of letters of recommendation linked to grad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applications;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory registration and benefits for post-doctoral fellows;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HRIS entry of graduate faculty appointments done by SGS;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Room, Phase II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Has all this activity created the sea change that the Task Force sought? I believe that it has. In spring, 2008, I approached colleagues from each of the divisions, asking them to conduct a review of the new governance structures. I asked them to solicit input on the extent to which the new system meets the needs of the University of Toronto. Their full

---

5 Joan Cherry, Div II (chair); Will Robins, Div I; Tarek Abdelrahman, Div III; Helene Polatajko, Div. IV.
report is appended to this document (Appendix 2). Their conclusions are gratifyingly positive. They report that Faculties feel a greater sense of ownership; “the fact that decision-making is now more closely aligned with responsibilities is seen as a real benefit;” they remark on improved consistency of standards and enhanced communication. The report also provides suggestions for further adjustments, chiefly to the web-posting system and the standing committees’ mandate, and urges continued work toward a system in which lower governance levels have final authority for more items. While there is plenty to do, the direction is clear.

**FUTURE CHALLENGES**

A safe prediction is that the School of Graduate Studies will continue to be a busy place. Just as the province’s Reaching Higher plan for graduate expansion arrived while we were re-designing governance structures, so the future will bring externally generated challenges and opportunities while daily tasks continue. In the context of current policy and new ideas conveyed during the *Towards 2030* discussions, we must continue to explore how graduate activity can be expanded most appropriately at UTM and UTSC. We need to understand, collectively, what an upward shift in the proportion of graduate students would look and feel like, if we are to weigh our long term options realistically. We need to provide graduate students with an expanded range of appropriate, accessible professional skills development. These are some of the larger matters that will engage us in the immediate future.

The review of OCGS (2007-08) has led to a COU Quality Assurance Transition/Implementation Task Force, charged with harmonizing the quality assurance approaches of what are now UPRAC (Undergraduate Programs Review Appraisal Process) and OCGS. The Provosts of Ontario universities have identified program quality assurance as part of their mandate. The OCGS system of graduate appraisal in which processes belong to OCGS will be replaced by a system in which institutions own those processes. At the same time, there is interest in assuring a more meaningful periodic review of undergraduate programs, particularly new program proposals. The implementation date proposed by COU is September, 2010. Many aspects of this discussion remain unresolved, but it is clear that U of T will need to identify a locus of expertise and management, so that our myriad programs are assessed against measures of quality, following a cycle and a protocol that meet provincial ministry expectations.

Responsibility for quality assurance rests in theProvost’s office. Fortunately, the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies is also a Vice-Provost. Thanks to over forty years of work in the quality assessment domain, the School of Graduate Studies provides a locus of expertise for graduate programs. A first thought might be that this base could be expanded and modified appropriately (perhaps re-named) so that this office could provide oversight and service to all educational programs that undergo quality assurance processes. The Vice-Provost Graduate Education could be designated as the Vice-Provost for Quality Assurance\(^6\). That person, then, could be delegated to chair an internal review

\(^6\) Perhaps some less arcane title can be devised.
committee that would be advisory to the Office of the Vice-President & Provost, and would oversee the consistency of the program review process. That person would also need to be an assessor to AP&P, as that committee receives and assesses the reviews on a slip-year basis.

While relatively simple, this approach could compromise the breadth of responsibilities held by the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. Not only is the SGS Dean’s role central to many U of T policies, but also the leadership of the School is an important role, deserving pride of place and title. Support for graduate enrolment management, the graduate student experience and the establishment of more graduate activity on the UTM and UTSC campuses all require the sort of support that can come from the graduate Dean. The institutional adjudication function is also significant, and growing. Whatever adjustments may be made to the Vice-Provostial title, there needs to continue to be a Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. Someone in our large and diverse institution needs to be charged with monitoring global trends in the delivery of advanced education, and assuring that U of T is maintaining a leadership role in this domain.

The same can be said for quality assurance, namely that there are global trends, it is a rapidly developing field, and we will need expert guidance. These points could be seen as support for two coordinated but separate Vice-Provostial positions. A further consideration is that the assessment of academic program quality needs to be integrated at some level with the wide range of compliance functions that U of T manages, especially those that are directly related to research. Perhaps this integration can be achieved through membership of the office of the Vice-President Research on the internal review committee. Some thought might be given to transferring some compliance functions to a Vice-Provost Quality Assurance, if a separate position is established.

Institutionally based quality assurance is a complex topic and discussions are just beginning. It is addressed here at the Provost’s request. At this stage, it is clear that the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, is well positioned to facilitate discussions within U of T, and that SGS is well positioned to assist in the development of an approach to quality assurance that can benefit all our educational programs. SGS is also well positioned to provide our community with support and information in many other areas, as this report has noted. We stand ready to serve.
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1. INTRODUCTION

On March 17, 2008, Susan Pfeiffer, Dean of Graduate Studies and Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, convened an ad hoc committee to review the effectiveness of the current graduate education governance processes, and specifically of the changes that were implemented following the proposals of the Graduate Education Governance Working Group in 2006. Those proposals had arisen in response to the report of the Task Force on Graduate Education in 2005 which recommended that governance functions should be aligned so that they “appropriately reflect Faculty and Graduate School responsibilities.” The changes in graduate education governance that were implemented in response to the proposals of the Graduate Education Governance Working Group of 2006 centred on four areas:

1. Enhanced information to graduate units
2. Faculty level of oversight
3. Electronic posting of proposed changes for information and feedback
4. Delegation of final approval of some items

Dean Pfeiffer asked the Review Panel to review the 2006 proposal and to consider input from the community in order to assess the extent to which the new system, as it has been implemented, meets the needs of graduate education at the University of Toronto.

Members of the Graduate Education Governance Processes Review Panel are:

Prof. Joan Cherry, Information Studies (chair)
Prof. William Robins, English and Medieval Studies
Prof. Tarek Abdelrahman, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Prof. Helene Polatajko, Rehabilitation Science and Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy

2. THE REVIEW PROCESS

Dean Pfeiffer invited input from the community on March 24, 2008 in a memo distributed by email to:

• Graduate Chairs and Coordinators
• Council of Graduate Deans
• Graduate Administrative Staff
• Graduate Education Council
• Chair of Academic Policy & Programs Committee

Eight responses were received.

The Review Panel met on April 3, 2008, and decided to solicit comments directly from the community, posing the following questions:
1. What is working well?
2. What needs improvement?
3. What has been lost?
4. What has been gained?

The Review Panel held seven face-to-face meetings with members of the community between April 14th and April 23rd.

- Governance Officer; former Graduate Webposting System (GWS) staff member, Executive Assistant to SGS Vice-Deans
- Student members of the Graduate Education Council (GEC)
- SGS Vice-Deans and Director of Quality Assessment & Governance Office:
- Members of the Council of Graduate Deans (CGD)
- Members of the Graduate Students’ Union (GSU) Executive
- Deans of Single Department Faculties (DSDF) (2 meetings)

The Review Panel sent an email message to the following groups inviting members to submit input to the Panel:

- Members of the Awards Committee
- Members of the Committee on Program Matters (CPM)
- Members of the Committee on Student Matters (CSM)

We received 17 submissions.

The Review Panel reviewed the following documents:

- Changes to the Governance Routing with Respect to Graduate Programs (2006)

The Review Panel also reviewed:

- Site-traffic report for Graduate Webposting System (GWS) from 2006, 2007, and 2008 to date
- GWS report on all minor and major changes approved from July 1, 2006 to April 21, 2008
- All GWS feedback received from January 2007 to April 1, 2008
- Structure and by-laws of CSM, CPM
- Structure and recent reorganization of Awards Committee
- Structure and recent procedural changes to SGS Calendar
- Description of Faculty of Medicine’s internal re-categorization of major changes procedures.

The Review Panel met again on 24 April, 2008 to review findings and to formulate this report.

3. FINDINGS OF THE REVIEW PANEL

A. Overview

Nearly two years have elapsed since the changes proposed by the Graduate Education Governance Working Group in 2006 were implemented. In the course of those two years those proposals have been implemented thoroughly, carried through in both the letter and the spirit. The readiness and attentiveness with which the changes were implemented by SGS and by the many Faculties involved in graduate education suggest that the changes were something whose time had come. Every group from whom we received feedback spoke of the positive difference that the changes have made to the processes
of graduate governance; every group could pin-point specific benefits for their own role in graduate education.

The first year of the new system brought with it several sources of strain as administrators encountered new forms, new systems of routing for approval, and new structures of governance in SGS and the Faculties. Those “teething pains” have dwindled significantly or disappeared entirely as familiarity with the new arrangements has grown. In the meantime, a few new problems have emerged. For instance, providing feedback via the web-posting system has actually decreased; and the end of Divisional Executive Committee meetings has meant that graduate coordinators in some areas feel out of touch with their counterparts. The changes have brought greater clarity to many procedures, such that for nearly all technical matters most administrators and coordinators know to whom to turn with their questions or concerns; on questions of greater import, as in cases regarding concerns about policy, the lines of responsibility are not yet as clearly demarcated.

The overwhelming consensus among those providing feedback, whether by e-mail or in our face-to-face meetings, is that the changes have been implemented as well as anyone could have hoped, and that the current system offers significant improvements. Nobody we spoke with recommended going back to the previous system; rather, almost everyone desires to move forward.

B. Enhanced information to graduate units

The changes introduced in 2006 provided an occasion to improve the forms used for proposed changes, making them more consistent and bringing them in line with SGS regulations. They also provided a chance to add clarity to the advice and instructions given to graduate units, and to ease the flow of information between SGS and the various Faculties. These improvements have been welcomed by all groups. The staff at SGS has been helpful in communicating needed information.

The new forms are consistent, but they can also be cumbersome; several administrators felt there was room for improvement in the design of required forms. While the procedures for approving minor changes (especially new courses) are now much clearer, some of the procedures for major changes (such as new program proposals) remain opaque, at least with regard to questions about templates, time-frames, contact-persons, and lines of authority.

Further steps taken to clear up the governance processes for major changes, and also to explain lines of authority for related concerns (academic appeals, etc.), would be widely welcomed.

C. Faculty level of oversight

The main structural change in graduate governance introduced in 2006 involved shifting to the Faculties greater responsibility for approving proposed changes to courses and programs. All Faculty constitutions have had to be re-written as a consequence, and in general the new level of Faculty oversight is working well. Faculty representatives expressed their happiness with their greater responsibilities for oversight. The Faculties have designated staff to handle this increased responsibility—with the corresponding increase in workload—and these positions are functioning well.

Co-ordination of the timing of Faculty efforts with those of other levels of governance remains tricky; there is a widely shared sense that more work could be done to align Faculty oversight with the cycles of SGS and university governance. There is also considerable variation among Faculties in how they have chosen to deal with issues of oversight; some models seem to be working better than others. Each Faculty either has a Faculty council where graduate governance decisions are discussed, or else delegates that responsibility to a graduate curriculum committee. Those Faculties whose deliberative bodies are of a manageable size and meet at least once a month during term report greater satisfaction with the process of oversight.
Committees which are too big to be effective might benefit from creating smaller sub-committees where substantive discussion could take place; committees which meet only once or twice a term might benefit from more regular meetings. It has been suggested that SGS could identify best practices for oversight and communicate these through the Graduate Education Council, the Council of Graduate Deans, and other appropriate groups.

D. Electronic posting of proposed changes for information and feedback

Nearly two-years of using the Graduate Webposting System has given most persons involved with the system time to grow familiar with its operation and to “work out the kinks.” As a consequence, the electronic posting of proposed changes now seems to be functioning smoothly. Information about proposals is easily available, and SGS makes sure that graduate units are notified of proposals from related units. Administrators at SGS find that the system has streamlined many aspects of the approval process, and they note that the Graduate Webposting System doubles as an effective archive.

Nevertheless, the Graduate Webposting System has not lived up to expectations as a means of gathering feedback on proposed changes. Many units and Faculties have noted receiving no comments of any kind on any proposals through the webposting system, and have wondered why the posting period needs to be so long if no comment is received during the wait. Before 2006, feedback on proposed changes was often provided personally at meetings of the SGS Divisional Executive Committees, which no longer exist. The switch to an electronic forum has left a void with regard to the critical discussion of new proposals, a void which in some cases has been filled with effective mechanisms for critical discussion within the Faculties. Printed versions of proposed changes, and deliberative bodies of manageable size were mentioned as key ingredients for successfully generating useful discussion. (Related to this issue is the fact that many groups, especially graduate coordinators and graduate students, miss the face-to-face interaction that could come from meetings of small, inter-departmental and inter-Faculty groups.) Critical discussion of new proposals seems frequently to be absent from most post-departmental levels of the approval process.

It has been suggested that the length of the posting period ought to be reduced (given that comment via the Graduate Webposting System is minimal). It has also been suggested that the Graduate Webposting System, which currently transmits feedback only to the proposing unit, might become more active if feedback was posted as part of a blog or discussion board.

E. Delegation of final approval of some Items

Several kinds of proposals that previously required approval from the university’s AP&P committee are now delegated to the GEC for approval; these new procedures are working well. Several other kinds of proposals that previously required GEC approval are now delegated to the Faculties for final approval; in these cases, too, the change of procedures has met with success.

One cost of the new processes is that there has been some reduction of cross-divisional and cross-Faculty communication about graduate programs; establishing some avenues for the exchange of information (especially give the paucity of commentary through the Graduate Webposting System) would alleviate this concern.

Otherwise, the delegation of final approval is viewed almost universally as a success, so much so that there is a widespread sense among many groups that further delegation would now be advisable. In the case of items where numerous levels of vetting and approval are required, it would seem appropriate to ask if there is any redundancy that could be eliminated. In particular, there may be reason to designate more items as “minor changes,” thereby shifting responsibility for their final approval from the GEC to the Faculties.
F. SGS Governance arrangements

The new governance processes saw the introduction at SGS of the Graduate Education Council (GEC) (replacing the former SGS Council), the Committee on Program Matters (CPM) and Committee on Students Matters (CSM), and subsequently the establishment of an awards committee. There is also a Council of Graduate Deans (CGD) that brings together vice-deans from SGS and the deans or vice-deans/associate-deans of Faculties. These new arrangements seem to be appropriately structured, however, there is a sense that some of the new bodies are still working at finding the optimal way of contributing to graduate governance.

The GEC is an important approval stage for many items of business. For various reasons (the large size of the GEC, the members' felt lack of expertise in areas far from their own, etc.), it is not well-suited to offer rigorous scrutiny of proposed changes to graduate programs. This is not necessarily a problem, as long as the members of the GEC can be secure in knowing that the proposals have all been subject to adequate scrutiny at some prior stage of consideration. At the moment there is a concern that this cannot be taken for granted.

The Committee on Program Matters was established with a mandate to consider new university-wide matters of graduate education, especially matters of policy. The Review Panel recommends that the CPM return to this original mandate, as there is considerable interest among students and graduate coordinators in having a body to which general concerns about policy could be brought (for example, online admissions, language requirements, the possibility of an M.Phil. degree, etc.). At the moment, CPM has drifted into reviewing major proposals which are already being reviewed at the appropriate stages of routing for graduate governance; once the committee has no approval authority, its current work spent reviewing proposed changes is toothless, and takes it away from its original terms of reference.

The Committee on Student Matters seems to have a lack of business. Some participants have described its meetings as superfluous or even pointless. The Review Panel heard many expressions of interest from students and graduate coordinators about having a body to which to bring concerns regarding student experience (for example, questions about funding, appeals, etc.). It strikes us that CPM and CSM are well positioned to perform very important functions in graduate education arrangements, especially perhaps if their focus shifts towards initiating policy discussions and making recommendations to the SGS vice-deans. It is crucial that the members of these committees know that the work they put into these committees is going forward. We received clear signals that if these committees ask their constituent members to bring forward issues of pressing concern, there will be no lack of business.

The awards committees are doing well, with the understanding that there will continue to be constant tinkering to find what works best.

The Council of Graduate Deans provides a venue where the deans of SGS and the deans or vice-deans of the Faculties can meet on a regular basis and keep each other apprized of the issues they are confronting. The members all appreciate these meetings. The CGD strikes us as essential for the smooth functioning of the new graduate governance structure.

G. Other Issues

The relations between SGS and the Faculties are not limited to issues of graduate governance, and during the course of our review we heard feedback about several cognate issues. The ones that came up frequently in the feedback we received were:

- Online admissions (especially on-line submission of references)
- Appeals procedures
- Departmental interpretation of SGS regulations
This review of graduate governance processes does not seem the most suitable place to elaborate upon these issues. Perhaps in the near future there will be an appropriate time and place to consider them.

II. Losses and Gains

When the Review Panel solicited groups for their input, we asked about what has been lost and what has been gained in the change-over to the current structures of governance.

For those respondents who felt that something had been lost, almost all were concerned about a diminishment in the personal interactions appropriate for graduate education. With respect to the processes now in place for approving proposed changes, there is a concern in several quarters that there is not much critical discussion after a proposal has emerged from departmental deliberations. Less directly tied to actual procedures of governance, there is a widespread concern, especially among graduate coordinators in some faculties, that there are no longer the same opportunities for informal, face-to-face meetings, which can be of great help for learning how to navigate the complexities of the university (this is an aspect of the old Divisional Executive Committee meetings that some coordinators now miss). A related issue is a sense that in order for students, administrators, graduate coordinators, and deans to evaluate the quality of graduate education in a meaningful way, there should be some avenues, formal and informal, for education about the world of graduate governance. Members of single-department faculties in particular, but also representatives of other faculties, frequently mentioned the reduction of opportunities for information sharing across faculties. Sharing of information seems to take place regularly at the decanal level, thanks to GCD, and at the administrative level, thanks to training sessions put on by SGS. For graduate students and for graduate coordinators, faculties will have to lead the way in devising new forums—both within faculties and across faculties—that are appropriate for the new situation.

There was near unanimity among respondents that the gains of moving to the new structures far outweigh any losses. In the responses to the question, “What has been gained?”, several themes were consistently sounded. The fact that decision-making is now more closely aligned with actual responsibilities is seen as a real benefit. For the most part, it is felt that decisions about program matters are being made in the right places by the right oversight body (the exception being those who feel some major changes could be reclassified as minor changes). There is now greater consistency in the standards that are being applied, due in no small part to the improved consistency of forms and to enhanced communication of information among SGS, the faculties, and graduate units. The faculties are pleased with the increased autonomy that they now have over many graduate matters, and appreciate the support that SGS provides.

4. CONCLUSION

It is now the case that governance structures “appropriately reflect Faculty and Graduate School responsibilities.” The individual faculties have a greater sense of ownership of the graduate programs for which they have budgetary responsibility. SGS continues to advocate for graduate education, to provide essential support to the faculties and to the students, and to have oversight for the overall quality of graduate education at the University of Toronto. Nobody we spoke with recommended going back to the previous system; rather, almost everyone desires to move forward.

It is still less than two years since the introduction of many significant changes to graduate governance processes, and many of the persons and institutions involved in graduate education are still adjusting. Most of the technical issues were worked out during the first year of implementation, and the
second year has run much more as a matter of course. The changes have been effected with minimal
disruption and confusion, due largely to the good will shown on all sides. As the standing committees of
SGS (CPM and CSM) settle into their mandates, as the Faculties discover suitable ways to facilitate
formal and informal discussions, as SGS and the Faculties work together to clarify the steps for major
program changes, and as the co-ordination of the timing of different deliberative bodies becomes more
habitual, then not only will the changes proposed by the Graduate Education Governance Working Group
in 2006 have been implemented, but also the transition to the new structures of graduate governance will
have been well accomplished.
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