UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
School of Graduate Studies

GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
of
Tuesday, October 21, 2008
HELD IN THE GALBRAITH COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. Dean Susan Pfeiffer welcomed Graduate Education Council members and visitors with a special welcome to new members who won seats on the Graduate Education Council in the spring election and fall by-election.

The Dean called for a motion to adjourn no later than 4:00 p.m.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the meeting of the Graduate Education Council will adjourn no later than 4:00 p.m.

The motion was CARRIED.

Approval Agenda of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of October 21, 2008

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the agenda of the Graduate Education Council meeting of October 21, 2008 be approved.

The motion was CARRIED.

1. Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of May 20, 2008

The minutes of the May 20, 2008 meeting were circulated with the agenda.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the minutes of the May 20, 2008 School of Graduate Education Council meeting be approved.

The motion is CARRIED.

2. Business Arising from the Minutes

2.1 Follow-up on recent GEC decisions forwarded to Governing Council committees

a) The proposal for a Master of Health Informatics (M.H.I) degree program and for a Master of Health Science (M.H.Sc.) degree program in Medical Radiation Sciences was approved by: OCGS on June 20, 2008. This constitutes final approval and the programs are ready to admit students.

b) The proposal for a Collaborative Master’s and Doctoral Program in Workplace Learning and Social Change, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education was approved by: OCGS on June 20, 2008 and constitutes final approval.

c) The proposal to change the name of the program from Elementary and Intermediate Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.) to Elementary and Secondary Education Program, Master of Teaching (M.T.), Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning, OISE was approved: OCGS on July 24, 2008 and constitutes final approval.
3. **Dean’s Remarks**

3.1 **A report on Activities and Priorities 2004-2008**

The report is available on the SGS website under Governance and Policy, Council and Committees, GEC, Reference Materials for Members. Administrators hold their positions for a term of five years and are required to submit an end-of-term report. As this is Dean Pfeiffer’s final year as Dean of SGS, the report reflects activities and priorities since 2004. There have been many changes since 2004, including changes to the governance structure and decanal structure.

The Dean mentioned that since 2004, SGS has taken an initiative to find more appropriate administrative homes for SGS Centres and Institutes. For many decades, SGS was home of interdisciplinary centres and institutes and this was based on the assumption that these needed a separate base. During the Stepping Up planning exercise, it became clear that interdisciplinary centres and institutes were meant to pervade all activities & programs; they can now fit in with other disciplinary-oriented groups in ways that are more fruitful to their growth and development. In 2004, there were 15 C/Is, and currently there are four. Today, there is a motion to move one and there may be others as the year progresses. The rationale is in the end of term report.

The final section of the report discusses changes at OCGS. It is likely that the quality assurance auditing of programs will move from external bodies to within the Universities. This would mean that U of T would do its own periodic quality assessment of its programs, as would other universities. She will keep Council informed as plans unfold.

3.2 **Website Re-launch**

The new website was launched on Monday, September 29 and can be accessed from the ‘old’ URL: [www.sgs.utoronto.ca](http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca) although some pages may appear in new locations. This new site is the product of an extensive content review that was undertaken by the SGS Communications Office, plus a redesign that has been supported by the Ironpoint Content Management System (CMS) team from the Administrative Management Systems (AMS) group. Because the new site is a work in progress, the Dean requested that members advise the SGS Communications Office if they encounter any problems or cannot locate a resource in its new place.

3.3 **Activities this Term**

**Fall Orientation for New Graduate Students**

The Orientation was held on September 5th and, as always, was a highlight of the year; the University admits over 5000 new graduate students each year.

**Graduate Orientation for New Academic Administrators**

SGS Student Services hosted an orientation for Graduate Staff Administrators on October 21. This was the first attempt at an orientation for new chairs and graduate coordinators and other graduate administrators and demonstrates the commitment of SGS to helping orient those involved.

**Fall Graduate Briefing Session**

The briefing session for all graduate chairs, directors, coordinators and administrators (not just those who are new) was announced for Wednesday, November 19th at 2:00 p.m. in the Governing Council Chamber, Simcoe Hall. This session is held every fall and GEC members are very welcome to attend.

**Session for Graduate Staff Administrators**

The General Meeting was announced for Friday, October 24th at 2 p.m.

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

Vice Dean Cowper informed the Council that she works with: Jane Alderdice (Director of Quality Assessment and Governance) and other staff in that office on new programs, program changes, new courses; Deans and staff in Faculty Graduate Affairs Offices; Jane Alderdice and Scott Moore (Quality
Assessment Officer) on OCGS briefs and appraisals; and Angelique Plata (Executive Assistant to the Vice-Deans) to approve external examiners appointments to final oral examinations (FOE). She also oversees the implementation of Graduate Faculty appointments on the Human Resources Information System (HRIS), is the Faculty Dean for the four remaining SGS Centres and Institutes, and chairs the Standing Committee on Program Matters. Major items this year include:

1. Quality Assessment concomitantly with changes to OCGS.
2. Streamlining FOE process
3. Continuing to ensure that Graduate Faculty appointments are properly recorded and are in compliance with regulations
4. Moving SGS Centres and Institute to appropriate Faculty homes.

5. Report of the Vice-Dean, Students

Vice-Dean Smith informed the Council that he chairs the Standing Committee on Student Matters (SCSM) and provides consultative advice on disciplinary matters. The Committee does not approve matters but is a forum for discussion on concerns regarding students and regulations. He invited members to suggest items for discussion at SCSM. Recently, the committee has discussed such matters as the SGS Leave Policy, grading issues, etc. He is also the Chair of the Admissions and Programs Committee (A&P) which makes decisions on non-standard cases presented by graduate units involving admissions falling below standards, second extensions for leaves, extensions for student programs, and extensions beyond those permitted by departments, among other matters. Many cases are resolved outside Committee by the SGS Student Service Officer and the Vice-Dean, Students. Difficult cases are sent to the Committee for consideration. The Vice-Dean, Students oversees Graduate House, Grad Room, and the English Language and Writing Support office (ELWS). Vice-Dean Smith works closely with Heather Kelly and her team on awards, fellowships, bursaries, etc. and is about to launch into Tri-Council award adjudications with the Awards Committee which has the job of adjudicating internal awards.

Discussion: Dean Pfeiffer reminded new members that during the course of the academic year, SGS will report on graduate enrollment patterns and also report in the spring on the outcome of award competitions at the federal & provincial levels as “For Information” items presented to GEC. A member asked if the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS) devolution will entail yet another layer of reporting and review and wondered if it would lead to reviews that were additional to reviews already required. Dean Pfeiffer responded that OCGS is part of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU), a non-governmental voluntary association of Ontario universities. COU has a task force and its goal is to harmonize OCGS & UPRAC (undergraduate review) activities. At present, undergraduate reviews are integrated into unit reviews that are associated with the end of a Chair’s term. The idea will be to coordinate or combine as many quality assessment reviews as possible, to minimize the number. There continues to be an obligation to demonstrate periodic review of all programs. The University has to, and would want to, review how it is doing in order to ensure continuing improvement of programs. There probably always need to be self-study and the external assessment of consultants/reviewers. Within that framework, there are many ways to do the work. Minimizing costs is another operating principle.

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

The supporting documentation was circulated with the package. Graduate Education Council approval is final for the disestablishment of the Centre of Criminology 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. Professor Rob Baker was present to answer any questions.

The Dean called upon Vice-Dean Elizabeth Cowper to present the motion.
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MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
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.

A member asked how the move might affect interaction with other faculties outside Arts and Science, such as Law. Vice-Dean Cowper stated that Criminology has close relations with the Faculty of Law. The Faculty of Law has been consulted and is pleased with the proposed move.

In response to a question, Dean Pfeiffer added that the move is arising from a request from the Criminology Centre itself rather than through a periodic review.

Vice-Dean Cowper stated that the Faculty of Arts and Science is home to the undergraduate program in Criminology, which is run through Woodsworth College. There is no plan that they will amalgamate at this time, but the move puts it in the same Faculty as its undergraduate sister program.

A member asked if the motion wording relating to Faculty of Arts and Science approval was correct given that final approval rests with the Planning & Budget committee. Ms. Jane Alderdice informed the Council that this language is similar to that used in other recent Centre or Institute moves and is appropriate for a motion at the level of the SGS GEC. Professor Robert Baker, Acting Vice-Dean, Graduate Education and Research, stated that he had not heard of any problems and that it was largely an administrative move from one Faculty to another.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

7. Proposal for a Graduate Professional Skills Development Program

The supporting documentation was circulated with the Council package. 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 the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P).

The Dean called upon Vice-Dean Berry Smith to present the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded) 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.

A member asked how the content and quality of such a program was determined and how will it be assured. Vice-Dean Smith reported that a series of meetings were held and one recommendation was to establish a Standing Committee at SGS consisting of program providers, students and stakeholders. Establishing a set of criteria (as discussed in the longer document), could be used to assess proposals. He suggested that members think of the matter as a quasi-academic venture. SGS will be looking for program elements leading to completion of requirements that include active as well as passive components. SGS will also look at the qualifications of instructors, recognizing that these are not traditional academic courses, with a view to standardizing offerings. The program will be based largely on existing offerings. Development of a list of offerings will be an iterative process. Members
of the Working Group come from ELWS, Office of Teaching Advancement, Vice-President Research Office, the Library, Career Centre, Student Life, etc.

Dean Pfeiffer referred to North American data that suggest that forty to sixty percent of doctoral graduates go into non-academic careers. As such, there is a growing and focused expectation by students that they receive more than the academic content of programs, and that additional skills will help them prepare for a variety of outcomes. A member asked what kind of courses would be offered, expressing concern that some might be trivial. Vice-Dean Smith indicated that offerings can range from a few hours of passive involvement in workshops to completion of one-session courses in advanced writing practices, ethics, etc. Minimum and maximum levels of offerings (three to ten hours each) will be defined. He added that there may be diverse views about what is appropriate and that the students themselves will judge what will help them in future goals.

A member asked if the requirements should result in a notation on a transcript when any student from the University can be expected to have this type of skill. Vice-Dean Smith said that he had no confidence that this was true adding that he has attended three conferences and workshops recently where this kind of program was discussed as a significant item. Feedback from outside the University such as industry leaders employing U of T graduates suggests that these skills are significantly missing. Employers say communication skills are lacking, as mentioned at the 2008 Canadian Association of Graduate Schools conference. It is agreed that the notation should have meaning.

Another member commended the proposal adding that in his experience large numbers of students did not stay in academia, but do take business courses on the side, which demonstrates need. He also stated that the notation on the transcript was a good incentive to show the value of the program.

A member asked if other universities have a similar notation and if this will have the same flavour as a collaborative program designation. Vice-Dean Smith replied that other universities were beginning to do this; U of T would not be the first to have a recognized program like this. Dean Pfeiffer noted that Michigan State University has a similar program, for example. Vice-Dean Smith added that in the United Kingdom, the government mandates this kind of program in graduate education.

Vice-Dean said that the difference between academic programs and extra co-curricular elements needs to be clarified. Collaborative programs are academic programs whereas this program is co-curricular.

Another member commended the initiative noting that Life Science students receive foundation aspects of ethics training, intellectual property, and rights awareness. Dissemination of this kind of information to students is woefully lacking. He said that he expects the program will be remarkably popular and trainees will be highly encouraged to take it. He suggested the program may be overwhelmed with demand. He inquired about resource implications, fee structures, additional instructors, etc.

Vice-Dean Smith stated that these issues were discussed by the Working Group. There may be a waiting list. SGS cannot ask the Provost or make an application to the Student Experience Fund unless a need can be demonstrated. It is acknowledged that there may be problems in the short run with excessive demand.

A member asked if the note on the transcript would show a half graduate credit. Vice-Dean Smith explained that there will be no course credit on the transcript. The member asked how many seminars and workshops were required in the program. Vice-Dean Smith stated that it would be based on hours of exposure and work, and estimated it would equal the work involved in an average half graduate course (approximately 60 hours). He added that the program requirements should not overwhelm the student’s graduate academic program requirements and could be taken any year during a program. The Committee will decide. The same member stated that she supported the notation on the transcript as the skills that would be taught are vital life skills and the notation would give students the motivation to take it.

Another member asked if students who have already fulfilled the program requirements in previous years could receive the transcript notation. Vice-Dean Smith said this would depend on whether there
is a record of completion in each case. He added that he had no objections to any currently registered
student counting courses towards the program if there is a substantial match to what is being offered
but this will not be extended to those students no longer registered.

A member asked if students would need approval of the supervisor or graduate coordinator or if
they could enroll in the program on their own initiative. Vice-Dean Smith said he hoped that the
program would remain optional to students.

Another member asked if individual academic units were surveyed to see if they have seminars of
this kind in place now. Vice-Dean Smith said that not all graduate units were asked directly, but the
program proposal was discussed at the Committees on Student Matters and on Program Matters –
graduate coordinators are members of both committees. One criteria of the program is that the
offerings may not be restricted to a particular segment of the academic community. The member
clarified that he thought it might be interesting to see how departmental activities intersect with this
program; he suggested that departments should consider to avoid repetition of offerings. It could be
seen as a resource for departments and not as competition. Vice-Dean Smith said that he hoped people
will be inspired to do something for their own community or produce offerings for this broader
program. He agreed that it will be important to keep communication channels open and thereby reduce
redundancy. He added that with 13,500 graduate students, more offerings seems like a good idea.

Another member also expressed support for the idea and added that his department offers a number
of short courses already. He wondered why SGS would offer a special program that gets a special
notation on the transcript whereas similar programs offered in departments are not recognized on the
transcript. Dean Pfeiffer responded by saying that SGS sees itself as a vehicle for the institution,
broadly speaking - this is not SGS having its own program. Indeed, there was a skills program offered
at Woodsworth College that was once recognized on the transcript and has now been removed. SGS
wants to ensure that the program is available to skills development providers and that it is useful to
their goals.

A member asked if smaller departments which offer specialized courses of this nature could allow
these to count towards the annotation; writing courses, for example. Vice-Dean Smith said that he
could only answer in principle. Courses, tailored to a particular community would not be part of the
program. It is not the intention to interfere with what departments choose to offer. Dean Pfeiffer added
that the Committee will be informed by this discussion regarding the activities units are already
conducting toward the same purpose and this issue may be thought through further. Vice-Dean Smith
referred members to details in the larger document. He invited departments to make suggestions and
said he expects the program to evolve.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

8. Program and Degree Name Change

8.1 Information Studies Program – name change to Information Program, and Master of
Information Studies degree (MIST) – name change to Master of Information degree (MI)

The supporting documentation was circulated with the package. The Faculty of Information
changed its name in the 2007-2008 academic year. The proposed change brings the program and
degree names into line with the Faculty name. The Faculty of Information Council approved the
proposal at its meeting on October 3, 2008. The program name change will be reported to the
Committee on Academic Policy and Programs (AP&P) for information; Ontario Council on Graduate
Studies approval is required for program name changes. Professor Jens-Erik Mai was present to
answer any 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 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.

A member asked how “MI” or “FI” would be pronounced as an acronym. Professor Mai responded that people would just say “Faculty of Information” or “Information”. In response to a question, Professor Mai replied that the change will occur at the beginning of the next academic year.

A member suggested that the terminology seems to have a comical edge to it and asked how the Canadian Library Association views the name for its members. Professor Mai explained that, when the Faculty name change was proposed, there were consultations with alumni and others and those discussions involved the program and degree name changes. The Faculty is broadening its scope from a library school to a very broad Information School. A lot of other schools still offer the Master of Library Science, the Master of Information Studies, Master of Information Science, etc. The Faculty is suggesting that the program and degree simply be called “Information”. The member further suggested that everyone thinks he/she is a “master of information” in their own field – the Master of Information name seems less specific. Professor Mai said that he does not agree that Master of Information Studies is more specific than Master of Information – and it is just a matter of time before people are used to the change. This change has occurred at others schools and been accepted.

A member asked if employers will understand the meaning of the degree. Professor Mai stated that, as previously mentioned, there is no one standard. It had been Master of Information Studies since 1994, Master of Information Science before that, and Master of Library Science before that. Lots of degree programs are changing names. Employers said that the degree name change would not make any difference. Consultations have occurred with library directors who said they would still be able to recognize the credential.

Another member said that it sounds “faintly ridiculous” to call a degree Master of Information and asked for more background. Professor Mai said that Master of Information Studies does not sound particularly beautiful. He noted that, generally, students are very supportive of the change and spoke favourably about it at the last committee meeting. Another member, acknowledging that although a new member of GEC, he is an experienced administrator - he has been aware of a significant, interesting shift in what the Faculty does. This is reflected in the shift to the “Faculty of Information” name. That name change has taken place and this proposal aligns the degree designation with the Faculty name. There has been a change in how the Faculty sees its mission and treats its students. He suggested that the semantic sense of the word “information” in English is sufficiently large that it should permit this new program name in a Faculty that studies information. He further suggested that consideration of the German word “wissenschaft” might be useful in this context.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

9. Program Requirement Changes

9.1 Chemistry (Analytical Field only)(PhD)

The supporting documents were circulated with the agenda package. The proposal was approved by the Faculty of Arts and Science Tri-Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on October 6, 2008. The motion to approve the changes was approved conditional upon a successful posting on the Graduate Webposting System (GWS) - there was no feedback from the GWS during the feedback period. SGS GEC approval is final for this proposal. Professor Robert Baker 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 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.

A member commented that she battled not to lose comprehensives in the PhD structure some years ago as she thinks it is an assessment of fundamental skills. After a groundswell of opinion, the department decided to retain cumulative exams. Students do worry about writing comprehensives and it keeps them from doing other things; however, even if seminars are turned into a form of evaluation, students will worry about that too. A certain amount of anxiety is normal and to be expected and so should not be sufficient cause for removing a well-adjudicated exam. The opportunity to make evaluation blinded and objective for seminars is not as easy as it is for comprehensives.

The Dean asked Professor Robert Morris, who joined the meeting at that time, for his comments. She acknowledged that anything major milestone requirement could cause anxiety, but is this a reason for a potential substantial intellectual loss in cumulative examinations from the program. Professor Morris explained that the intent was to get students reading outside their own narrow area and get a broader idea of the field. There were different ways to achieve this. Chemistry has become so broad in some areas that it is extremely difficult to answer questions unexpectedly in all possible areas. It is much more valuable if students can focus on the topics at hand, especially important ones brought up at seminars and learn them in a bit more detail. Examinations with random questions gives an advantage to students who have done their undergraduate degree at U of T and know what will be asked – those from elsewhere are disadvantaged. It is better to encourage attendance at seminars. Students would have to read up on an area in general and prepare. This is more productive and students would not have to waste time on areas peripheral to their fields.

The Dean asked if students could fail the proposed new exercise. Professor Morris said yes, there is a pass/fail for each element. Another member expressed frustration that there has been a move to drop these exams over the last ten to twenty years. Although there is some broad-based learning, without the comprehensive examination, it is not the same as saying “I am a chemist” or “I am well-versed”. It is not possible to go back to the time when you “crammed” and gain the information you would have at that time. It is a shame that so many graduates have lost resilience. Even though students hate them, the “cumes” are good for them. Professor Morris responded that, nonetheless, faculty members thought it was a more constructive use of students’ time to not take comprehensive examinations.

A member asked f the thirty points that students need to accumulate is tied to their academic standing in the program. He wondered if the requirement can extend all the way to graduation? Professor Morris stated that the student would be in deep trouble if they do not finish while in the funded time period. Responding to a further question, Professor Morris said that this was an experiment and that the department would evaluate it.

Another member expressed support for the elimination of cumulative exams and said he knew of a student who was recently “decimated” as a result of them. He added that it could be quite demoralizing for even quite bright students who come from a distance. The diversity issues seems to be quite well addressed through topics courses. Professor Morris said that students still have to come up with answers to areas completely outside of their own but that at least they would learn something in depth and can be more sophisticated about it.

A visitor expressed support for the idea and asked what would have to be demonstrated for the seminar. Professor Morris replied that attendance is all that is required. A member asked if over the span of two years the range of topics would be comparable to what is covered in the cumulative exams. Professor Morris said that it would be broader as “cumes” come from faculty members. The member inquired about the rationale behind the thirty units. Professor Morris said that he was not present during all the deliberation at the Department, but that he had faith in his colleagues that this is reasonable.

The Chair called the question.
The motion was CARRIED.

9.2 Museum Studies (MMSt)
The supporting documents were circulated with the agenda package. The Faculty of Information Council approved the proposal at its meeting on October 3, 2008. SGS GEC approval is final for this item. Professor Jens-Erik Mai 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 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.

A member inquired about the rationale for the change. Professor Mai replied that the program has just gone through an OCGS review and the change is based on the recommendation of the external consultants. Students want opportunities to specialize more in the field. The department has hired new faculty and is able and wants to offer more specialization for students in the program.

Another member asked of the word “core” means “required”. Professor Mai said that there is no difference between core and required courses. There are five core/required courses that all students need to take and two electives.

Vice-Dean Cowper said she accepts this as a “friendly amendment”. The revised motion was read.

Revised MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
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 5.5 FCE to 2.0 FCE, with the overall number of courses required for the program remaining at 7.0 FCE, effective immediately.

The Chair called the question.

The revised motion was CARRIED.

9.3 Planning (PhD)
The supporting documents were circulated with the agenda package. The proposal was approved at the Faculty of Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on October 6, 2008. Professor Katherine Rankin 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 Arts and Science, Department of Geography to change the program requirements in the Ph.D. program so that the required core course JPG 1111H “Advanced Research Design” may be substituted with “a methods course in a related department subject to the approval of the graduate coordinator”, effective immediately.

A member suggested that “approval of the graduate coordinator” be changed to “approval of the Planning Program Director”. Professor Rankin agreed and Vice-Dean Cowper said she accepts the change as a “friendly amendment”. Professor Baker supported the amendment.
Revised MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

THAT SGS Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of Arts and Science, Department of Geography to change the program requirements in the Ph.D. program so that the required core course JPG 1111H “Advanced Research Design” may be substituted with “a methods course in a related department subject to the approval of the Planning Program Director”, effective immediately.

In response to a question, Professor Rankin said that the courses will not necessarily be comparable to those offered in the Geography Department; students from other departments regularly take Planning program courses.

The Chair called the question.

The revised motion was CARRIED.

9.4 Political Science (PhD)

The supporting documents were circulated with the agenda package. The proposal was approved by the Faculty of Arts and Science Three Campus Graduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting on October 6, 2008. The motion to approve the changes was approved conditional upon a successful posting on the GWS; there was no feedback from the GWS. Approval of this item by the SGS GEC is final. Professor Grace Skogstad 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 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.

The Chair asked Professor Skogstad to provide a summary of the changes. Professor Skogstad said that the major change was the requirement for students to write two exams in two fields. Up to now, students have had to do qualifying exams in one field. The second major change involves the methods requirements. Currently students have to complete a half course in methods or research design but would now be required to complete 1.5 courses. A member inquired about students’ perceptions of workload and value added to writing two qualifying exams, suggesting it seems a fairly onerous undertaking. The member asked if students were polled and how widely; if polled, what kind of feedback was received? Was there a student representative on the committee? Professor Skogstad
explained that all proposals came from a Task Force in the Department leading up to an OCGS review and that it included an MA and PhD student. There were lots of opportunities for faculty; at the final stages students were involved and present at the meetings. Change is now catching up with practice. Students were thinking that one field exam was a handicap and were opting for two. The proposed change formalizes an ad hoc practice on the part of some students.

A member asked if there was a plan to monitor outcomes of the change with regard to its impact on postgraduate life. She wondered what would happen if another set of students wants to return to a single field set of exams. Professor Skogstad said that monitoring outcomes is a good suggestion. However, she noted that it is a large department with only two officers and that there is a limit to what may be done. Dean Pfeiffer said that there is a certain amount of outcome monitoring already in place.

Another member asked whether “Direct Entry” students would be required to complete the quantitative/qualitative methods requirement or if it could be waived. Professor Skogstad replied that it could not be waived on the basis of undergraduate courses. Direct Entry students have to make up to the MA level work anyway so this would not change their requirements.

A question was asked about (d) in the motion: What does “core course” mean? Professor Skogstad replied that there are core courses in every area. She provided further explanation for each field.

Another member, referring to (e) in the motion, asked if the statement that field 2 requirements may be waived means that they may be replaced by collaborative program courses. Professor Skogstad confirmed that it did.

The Chair called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

10. **Other Business**

The Chair asked if anyone had any other business.

10.1 A member inquired about student membership on the Committee on Student Matters (CSM). Ms. Alderdice advised that student members of the CSM are drawn from elected student members of GEC. Previous vacancies are now full as a result of GEC by-election.

10.2 A member asked if supervision could be discussed at a CSM meeting. Vice-Dean Smith asked the member to send him an e-mail with the suggestion.

11. **For Information**

The Chair drew members’ attention to the following items reported for information.

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)

12. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at: 3:45 pm.
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