The Dean called the meeting to order and welcomed all members and visitors at 3:10 p.m.

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**
THAT the Graduate Education Council meeting of October 19, 2010 will adjourn no later than 5:00 p.m.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

**Approval of the Agenda of the Graduate Education Meeting of October 19, 2010**

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**
THAT the agenda of the Graduate Education Council meeting of October 19, 2010 be approved.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

1 **Minutes of the Graduate Education Council (GEC) Meeting of May 18, 2010**

The minutes of the May 18, 2010 meeting were distributed with the agenda.

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**
THAT the minutes of the Graduate Education Council meeting of May 18, 2010 be approved.

Seeing no discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

2 **Business Arising from the Minutes**

2.1 **Subsequent Considerations of GEC-approved items**

**Environmental Science, PhD (new degree program)**
The new Environmental Science PhD program received final approvals, and commenced September 2010. It is housed in the Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences at UTSC, which has now been established as a graduate unit. Professor William Gough was appointed as its graduate chair under Summer Executive Authority of the Agenda Committee of Academic Board.
Detailed approvals: GEC (January 19, 2010), AP&P (March 2, 2010), P&B (March 3, 2010),
Academic Board (March 23, 2010), Executive Committee of Governing Council (March 25, 2010); final
approvals from Governing Council (April 8, 2010) and OCGS (June 18, 2010).

**Law, Global Professional Master of Laws (GPLLM) (new degree program)**

Final approvals are pending for the Global Professional Master of Laws (GPLLM) program.
Detailed approvals: GEC (April 20, 2010); AP&P (May 11, 2010), P&B (May 5, 2010), Academic Board
(pending); final approvals from Governing Council (pending) and OCGS (pending).

### 2.2 Other Business Arising

There was no other business arising from the minutes.

### 3 Dean’s Remarks

#### 3.1 Introductions

The Dean introduced the following people to GEC:
Berry Smith, Vice-Dean Students
Liz Smyth, Vice-Dean Programs
Jane Alderdice, Director of Quality Assessment and Governance, and Secretary to Council
Rodney Branch (absent), Director of Information Systems
Jane Freeman (absent), Director of English Language and Writing Support
Heather Kelly, Director of Student Services
Christy Kim (absent), Director of Support Services
Anil Purandaré, Governance Officer and Assistant Secretary to Council

#### 3.2 Orientation for GEC Members

The Dean explained to members that this is a year of transition. Governance and quality assurance
processes are changing at the end of this calendar year. The Constitution and By-law amendments that
will be presented later in this meeting indicate the direction of these changes. For now, however, GEC
will continue with the current process, which he outlined to GEC.

New policies and regulations, changes to existing ones, and new program proposals of all kinds
require GEC approval before going to higher levels of governance. New guidelines, and changes to
existing ones, are brought to GEC for information/discussion only.

New program proposals are approved by the Faculty Councils before being presented here and
will proceed to the Academic Policies and Programs Committee (AP&P), often the Planning and Budget
Committee (P&B), Academic Board, and then Governing Council for final approval.

Admission and program regulation changes are proposed by graduate units; they must first be
approved by Faculty Council before being reviewed for final approval by GEC.

The Dean stressed the importance of scrutiny, especially where approval is final. Members should
expect clarity from documents being presented to GEC; it is important for members to question items
where documentation or the regulatory environment around a proposal is not clear. It is not helpful to
rewrite program decisions made at the Faculty level. Sending proposals back to the Faculty level,
however, is a possibility. The Dean asked members to use their own good judgment, and explained that
they are not representing a constituency even though they were elected by a constituency.

Jane Alderdice explained the types of documents that come before GEC for approval: policies,
new programs, program changes and OCGS briefs. For items requiring approval, there will be a motion
cover sheet. Aside from the motion itself, the motion sheet advises of previous governance action and
consultations, including a summary of discussion points that have occurred to date; it also identifies the approval route and the set of documents relevant for that item.

Routing and required approvals for all graduate governance items are found on the SGS website under the Governance and Policy tab, Governance Procedures drop-down. Any change requiring GEC approval, including any time of admission or program requirement change, is considered a “major” change – even if the change itself is considered “minor”.

Ms. Alderdice concluded by noting that more information, including the SGS Staff directory, is available on the SGS website, and that she, Anil Purandaré, and other SGS staff are available to answer questions that arise during the year.

There were no questions either for Ms. Alderdice or the Dean.

3.3 Quality Assurance Update
The Dean related to GEC that the University had been mandated to come up with a quality assurance plan (the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process – UTQAP); the plan requires approval of the provincial Quality Council (QC), which will fulfill the role previously played by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (OCGS). These changes are expected to improve the quality assurance process. The QC begins its work this term. It is reviewing the UTQAP, which should be in effect by January 1, 2011, marking the transition from the old University quality assurance process to the new one; these changes will have a significant impact on the University governance process. Final discussions are underway regarding what will require approval by the QC versus what simply needs to be reported for information.

Under the new governance process SGS will have a consultative, advisory, and review role; SGS will not have a formal approval role in governance regarding programs. SGS will circulate information on the various plans and protocols that outline the new process when they are available.

3.4 Degree Level Expectations
The Dean expressed satisfaction that the QC will focus its activities on programs rather than on degrees; the matter of reviewing degrees has been dropped from the QC agenda.

3.5 Graduate Transcript Option
A numbered decanal memorandum was published September 9, 2010, and sent to graduate chairs and directors (and also available on the SGS website), advising that the new graduate transcript option is now operational. Students will have a choice about whether the transcript that is produced shows the full record at U of T, including undergraduate, or whether it shows only the graduate record.

3.6 Offers of Admission Conditional Upon Satisfying the English Language Facility Requirement
A numbered decanal memorandum was published September 9, 2010, and sent to graduate chairs, directors, coordinators and administrators (and also available on the SGS website), advising that graduate units now have the option in their admission procedures to make conditional offers of admission to students who have yet to satisfy the English language requirement.

3.7 Campus Affiliation
In an effort to streamline the process of student campus affiliation, the Change of Campus Affiliation form has been revised. Previously, the form contained information pertaining to both campus affiliation (which determines incidental fee assessment) and course union fees. However, the dual purpose of the form was confusing. The form now only collects information for the purpose of changing campus
Students are automatically affiliated with a campus according to their program of study and campus affiliation is carried forward. The form is therefore to be completed only if a graduate student wishes to change campus affiliation. Students may choose a campus for affiliation for practical reasons, for example, in order to gain access to facilities on the campus where they spend most time.

Course union fees are the purview of the GSU and the GSU has been encouraged to use ROSI campus affiliation data for the purpose of allocating course union fees.

3.8 SGS Orientations

SGS held an orientation for new graduate chairs, directors and coordinators on October 5, 2010. SGS also held a general meeting for graduate administrators on October 6, 2010. Both orientations were well received, and SGS plans to continue them.

4 Report of the Vice-Dean, Programs

Vice-Dean Elizabeth Smyth reported on two projects in progress. The first is setting forth guidelines for the flexible-time PhD option. The second project deals with graduate faculty membership; guidelines and a more user-friendly process, similar to the Final Oral Exam online approval system, are being developed. Members can expect to hear more during the year; Vice-Dean Smyth invited members to direct questions and comments to her.

5 Report of the Vice-Dean, Students

Vice-Dean Berry Smith reported on a numbered decanal memo, dated and distributed October 18, 2010, (and available on the SGS website) regarding best practices concerning procedures for the termination of student registration. Over the past few years, SGS has seen a wide variation in practices in different parts of the University, no doubt due in part to the fact that terminations occur infrequently. The available advice seemed inadequate, so SGS has developed a revised website with clearer information. One point to be noted is that the process requires a letter to the Vice-Dean, Students; the revised website offers template letters. Feedback on the template letters is welcome.

Another numbered decanal memo published during summer (and available on the SGS website) outlined the replacement of the old Doctoral Completion Grant (DCG) with the new Doctoral Completion Award (DCA). The DCG was available upon application; the DCA is competitive. SGS recently received a student inquiry about how students are notified of new awards, policies, guidelines, etc. In addition to decanal memos, memos are also archived on the website from various SGS offices such as Student Services. Communications to students are different. In the past, SGS relied on departments to forward communication to students. SGS has now moved from individual announcements via e-mail to SGS E-News as the communication vehicle. It is not yet archived, but SGS is looking at doing so in the future.

A member asked whether the DCA is open to students who are still fully funded. The Vice-Dean responded that students had brought to the attention of SGS that there were some students still in the funded cohort receiving DCG, which was not the intent of the program. In this, the final year of the DCG program, SGS has restricted the DCG to those who are beyond the funded cohort only. The same restriction applies to the DCA. This year there is a committee reviewing DCG applications. It is not yet known how many DGAs will be awarded since the number will be based on the balance of funding left after the DCG students receive their funding this year. SGS will be looking at the general environment in which students are receiving funding. SGS is asking graduate units to rank their students who are applying for the DCA; the objective is to fund students of the DCA program who, usually through no fault of their own, must spend more time in the program than provided for by their funding package.
Another member asked whether there would be two application cycles per year for the DCA. Heather Kelly, SGS Director of Student Services replied that this was an unusual year since the award was being adjudicated in the fall. The plan will be fully implemented next year, and will see the award adjudicated once, in the spring, in order to catch students who will be registered in the fall. Vice-Dean Smith added that this was another change, as the DCG had allowed three windows of opportunity throughout the year in which to apply.

A member asked whether the DCA will be purely merit-based or whether there was a percentage of the awards set aside for international students. Vice-Dean Smith responded that there was no set percentage, but it was expected that meritorious international students will be able to make a good case in their applications.

Another member asked whether SGS E-News is sent to graduate units as well as students. Dr. Kelly replied that all graduate Chairs, Vice-Deans, Coordinators and administrators should be receiving a copy; if there are any oversights, graduate units should contact Yi Yang at SGS to be added to the distribution list. Vice-Dean Smith added that he hoped there would be a link to archived E-News issues on the SGS website soon.

In response to a question from a member who asked how much funding through the DCA was available for students leaving the funded cohort, what the demand was, and what would happen to students who did not receive funding, Vice-Dean Smith reported that the total funding pool is $4,000,000. He is uncertain if this amount will be the same in the future, as this is the amount that was allocated to the number of people who applied for the DCG and represents a snapshot in time. The average award is expected to be approximately $20,000; assuming a $4,000,000 pool, this works out to approximately 200 awards. The member asked how much need exists for the award; the Vice-Dean replied that the exact need was unknown but was certainly more than could be met. It was expected that better information on this would be available next year. The member explained that his graduate unit funds students in the year after they leave the funded cohort; the graduate unit sees it as protecting the investment already made in its students and their work. The Vice-Dean responded that no doubt many disciplines could justify funding students for an extra year, and that the adjudication committee deciding which students were to receive the awards faced an interesting and challenging task.

A member asked whether it would not be better to reduce the award amount, thus increasing the number of awards available. The Dean replied that this had been discussed last year. This funding is ultimately controlled by, and is a gift from, the Provost. It was the Provost’s intention that the funding be used in such a way that each award would be sufficient to allow a student to finish their program where academic need was demonstrated. The DCA had been designed to reflect that intention. There had been dissatisfaction expressed from students with the previous DCG system, which consisted of more numerous but smaller awards—awards so small they did not provide sufficient funds to live on. No matter how the number and size of awards is balanced, there will be winners and losers; no choice that would satisfy everyone is possible. The Dean added that the DCA can be seen as an experiment and may be modified in the future.

6 SGS Constitution and By-law Revision

6a) SGS Constitution

The Dean reminded members that GEC had been informed many times last year that the SGS Constitution was being amended. He was happy to inform members that the amendments were now before them for consideration. The cover sheet provided describes the prior discussion for this item; the proposal has had much of feedback and considerable revision. If given GEC approval, it will be sent to
the Academic Board for approval, and to the Executive Committee or to Governing Council for final approval. This is expected to start a series of related constitutional changes in the Faculties.

There are many amendments arising from changes that have occurred over the years: changes to Centres and Institutes, governance changes, and housekeeping changes. The desire was to be as thorough as possible. The amendments clarify many issues and provide a lot of clean up. The result of all this work is a more concise and reader-friendly document.

The Dean called on Vice-Dean Smith to present the motion on the Constitution.

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

**THAT** Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the School of Graduate Studies to recommend to Academic Board that the **Constitution of the School of Graduate Studies** be amended as attached, effective January 1, 2011.

A member asked what the rationale was for amending clauses 7.2 and 7.4. The proposed amendments to these clauses transfer authority from GEC to the Dean of SGS for determining the number of divisions of SGS and for placing graduate units within SGS divisions. The Dean answered that changes to SGS divisions and the location of graduate units within them is seen as an administrative matter rather than something tightly coupled with academic activity. Such changes would be undertaken only with consultation, particularly in the case of any transfers of graduate units from one division to another; it was noted that such changes normally arise from a graduate unit’s request. Vice-Dean Smith added that the SGS divisions held greater significance prior to the last SGS Constitutional review and amendment in 2006. Prior to 2006 each division was led by one of four Associate Deans and each division was governed by an Executive Committee – this is no longer the case.

A member asked what the role of SGS would be in the development and review of graduate units, noting a change to clause (old) 4.3.d. The Dean explained that SGS ceased involvement in approving new units in 2005. SGS will remain involved in the development of new graduate programs, but in a review capacity rather than in a formal approval role.

In response to a question, the Dean clarified that clause 8.1, which refers to a graduate unit’s responsibility to “to maintain and improve its standards of instruction, research and examination”, refers to graduate activities only.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was **CARRIED**.

6b) **SGS By-laws**

The By-law revisions have been discussed within SGS, and have been reviewed by the Office of the Governing Council. GEC approval is final for By-laws. The Dean called on Vice-Dean Smith to present the motion.

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

**THAT** Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the School of Graduate Studies to amend and in some cases repeal the By-laws of the School of Graduate Studies and Graduate Education Council as follows:

- Amend the **By-laws of SGS Graduate Education Council (General)**.
- Amend By-law #1, **Rules of the Graduate Education Council**, as attached.
• Repeal By-law #2, *Committee on Centre and Institute Programs (CCIP)*.

• Renumber By-law #5, *Admissions and Programs Committee (A&P)*, to By-law #2 and amend it as attached.

• Repeal By-law #3, *Standing Committee on Program Matters (CPM)*.

• Renumber By-law #6, *Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB)*, to By-law #3 and amend it as attached.

• Repeal By-law #4, *Standing Committee on Student Matters (CSM)*.

• These changes are effective January 1, 2011.

A member asked for an explanation for the proposed repeal of certain by-laws. The Dean explained that By-law #2 (CCIP) was being repealed since SGS no longer has any Centres or Institutes. The repeal of By-laws #3 (CPM) and #4 (CSM) reflects administrative streamlining. These two committees are, in fact, advisory committees to the two Vice-Deans. They do not have legislative functions. As such, unlike the A&P committee which must report to Council since it is doing work delegated by Council, the advisory committees do not need to be standing committees of GEC. Both Vice-Deans have found them very useful and do not anticipate any changes in future. But if there were changes needed, the Vice-Deans would not need to bring them to GEC for approval. Vice-Dean Smith added that the CSM, which he has chaired for four years, has evolved into a very useful committee, with excellent discussions and good attendance; the intent is to keep the committee going. Vice-Dean Smyth also added that as their portfolios evolve, the Vice-Deans have identified areas where student and program matters intersect. The CPM, is not currently used as another level of scrutiny of curriculum proposals, but is a forum for discussions on substantive program matters.

A typographical error was noted by the member in the *By-laws of SGS Graduate Education Council (General)*, clause e) under the heading “Standing Committees of Council—General”: “of the” should read, “The”. The Dean thanked the member for the correction.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

### 6.1 Admissions & Programs (A&P) Committee: 2010-11 Membership

A&P is a standing committee of Graduate Education Council. The Committee has the power to waive, or modify in individual students cases, the application of an SGS regulation concerning admissions, registration, or enrolment. It also considers petitions from graduate units on exemption from cases of non-standard admissions, leaves of absence, course extension deadlines, grading, program completion time limits, and posthumous degrees. The Committee is chaired by the Vice-Dean, Students, who is an *ex officio* member. The other members of A&P consists of the Vice-Dean, Programs (*ex officio*), one graduate faculty representative from each SGS division, one graduate student and one alternate, the Dean of SGS (*ex officio*), and the Director of SGS Student Services (*ex officio*).

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

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

**THAT** Graduate Education Council approve the following appointments of divisional members to the Admissions and Programs Committee:

**Division I:** Professor Pascal Michelucci, Department of French Language and Literature *(three year term effective Sept 1, 2010 to Aug. 31, 2013)*
Division II:  Professor Grace Skogstad, Department of Political Science (three year term effective Sept. 1, 2010 to Aug. 31, 2013)
Division III:  Professor Markus Bussmann, Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering (three year term effective Sept. 1, 2010 to Aug. 31, 2013)
Division IV:  Professor Linda Wilson-Pauwels, Institute of Medical Science (renewed for a one year term effective Sept. 1, 2010 to Aug. 31, 2011)

No discussion arose; the Dean therefore called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

7 Admission & Program Requirement Changes: Information, PhD

The proposal was approved by the Faculty of Information Council on September 17, 2010. The Dean called on Vice-Dean Smyth to present the motions; the motions were considered separately.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of Information to change the admission requirements of the PhD in the Information program as follows:
• Remove the requirement of a bachelor’s degree or equivalent.
• Increase the admission requirements from an average of at least B+ to an average of at least A- in a master’s degree or equivalent.
• Remove the admission requirement that previously required the major subject for doctoral study to be supported by relevant courses taken at the master’s level including appropriate courses in research methods and statistics.
• Add a statement of research interest as a requirement.
• These changes are effective September 2011.

Professor Lynne Howarth was present to speak to the item; she related that the Faculty had engaged in broad consultation.

A member asked how consulted students had responded to the proposal, given the doubling of FCE requirements—while much of the increase seems to formalize practices in place, there still appears to be about 1.0 FCE above previous practice. Professor Howarth replied that students had made it known that they themselves had initiated taking courses outside of their requirements in order to be able to build a portfolio of scholarship. Students were welcoming of the proposed change.

Another member asked whether there would be an increase in tuition fees. The Dean explained that students paid a flat program fee and that increasing the FCE requirement would not therefore result in a tuition fee increase.

A member requested clarification on the issue of removing the requirement of a bachelor’s degree. Professor Howarth explained that the required degree is a master’s degree. Ms. Alderdice added that the change corrected an anomaly, as what is usually required is the degree that is the basis of admission; in this case, the master’s degree.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.
MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

THAT Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of Information to change the program requirements of the PhD in the Information program as follows:

- Replace INF 3004Y: Advanced Topics in Information Studies with INF 3006Y: Thesis Proposal Preparation, as a required course.
- Add courses INF 3007Y: Colloquium I and INF 3008Y: Colloquium II as required courses. This replaces the currently unweighted requirement to participate in the Colloquium Series of the Faculty and other research events.
- Replace the requirement of 1.0 FCE in a minor subject with a requirement to complete 1.5 FCE elective courses.
- Replace the requirement of a Determination of Research Readiness (written and oral) with the requirement to pass a qualifying exam.
- Add a requirement to present and defend a thesis research proposal.
- Remove reading knowledge of a language other than English as a possible requirement.

As a result of the above changes, overall requirements increase from 3.0 FCE to 6.0 FCE.

These changes are effective September 2011.

In response to a request for clarification about removing the language requirement, Professor Howarth explained that this formalized current practice in the program. If a student needs to study another language for their program, this is something they may pursue, and there were cases where students in the program had done so, but the Faculty does not want to make this a formal requirement. She added that she was not aware of language requirements in comparable programs in Canada.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

8 Program Requirement Changes: Management, MBA (EMBA option)

The proposal was approved by the Rotman School of Management Faculty Council on February 10, 2010. All affected students were informed of and agreed to the proposed retroactive change.

The Dean called on Vice-Dean Smyth to present the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

THAT Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Rotman School of Management to change the program requirements of the MBA (Executive MBA option) in the Management program by replacing MGT 5010H, Industry Analysis Project, with MGT 5291, Foundations of Integrative Thinking, as a required course, effective September 2010.

Ms. Anna Hoy (General Manager of the EMBA) was present to speak to the item. She explained that participants in the program are working under the assumption that the proposed change will take
place. They were given this information at the beginning of the year. The Dean noted that while there was some slippage in the timing of the proposal, students had been properly informed.

A member noted that the Calendar entry attached to the proposal showed a change in program length from 18 to 13 months. Ms. Hoy explained that this was correcting a typographical error in the Calendar and that the program is, and always had been, 13 months in length.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

9 Other Business
There was no other business.

10 For Information:

10.1 GEC Fall 2010 By-election Report
The report was distributed on yellow paper at the start of the meeting.

10.2 Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) 2009-10 Annual Report
The report was distributed with the agenda. A member noted that the report said that there had been seven doctoral cases, but only six were listed in the chart. Ms. Alderdice will investigate and make any corrections necessary.

10.3 GEC 2009-10 Annual Report on Approvals under Delegated Authority
The report was distributed with the agenda.

10.4 GEC Membership List (Revised) and Meeting Schedule
The revised membership list was distributed on yellow paper at the start of the meeting; the meeting schedule was distributed with the agenda.

11 Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

[ORIGINAL SIGNED] _____________________  November 8, 2010
Jane Alderdice, Secretary  Date
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