April 13, 2011

NOTICE OF MEETING
Graduate Education Council

To: Members of Graduate Education Council
From: Jane Alderdice, Secretary, Graduate Education Council

This is your notice of the Graduate Education Council meeting on Tuesday, April 19, 2011, in the Council Chamber of the Galbraith Building (Room 202, 35 St. George Street).

If you have any questions or comments about the attached agenda, or wish to send regrets, contact Mr. Anil Purandare, SGS Governance and Policy Coordinator, at 416 946-3427 or anil.purandare@sgs.utoronto.ca. If you would like to discuss any aspect of Council business, I would be pleased to hear from you at jane.alderdice@sgs.utoronto.ca.

We are expecting that this will be the final meeting of Council for this academic year. A small reception is planned after the meeting to celebrate the work done this year; we look forward to seeing you there! In the event of an urgent matter, please continue to reserve the May 17, 2011 meeting date.

[ORIGINAL SIGNED BY]
Jane Alderdice
AGENDA
Graduate Education Council

Tuesday, April 19, 2011
3:10 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
The Council Chamber, Galbraith Building
Room 202, 35 St. George Street

Beverages only during the meeting • A reception with refreshments will immediately follow

Regrets only to Anil Purandare, SGS Governance & Policy Coordinator: 416-946-3427 or anil.purandare@sgs.utoronto.ca

1 Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of February 15, 2011
   (Documentation attached)

2 Business Arising from the Minutes

3 Dean’s Remarks

4 Report of the Vice-Dean, Programs

5 Report of the Vice-Dean, Students

6 Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB): Terms of Reference Revision
   (Documentation attached)

7 Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB): Approval of 2011-2012 Membership
   (Documentation attached)

8 Appointment of Hearing Officer for Code of Student Conduct
   (Documentation attached)

9 Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey Presentation
   (Documentation attached)

10 Other Business

11 For Information:
   (Documentation attached)
   11.1 SGS Student Services Annual Audit of Graduate Units: Report
   11.2 SGS Graduate Education Council: Spring 2011 Election Report
   11.3 New SGS Awards Annual Report
   11.4 Draft Principles for Governance Review of Minor Modifications
   11.5 Collaborative Program Guidelines, revised
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 February 15, 2011 will adjourn no later than 5:00 p.m.

Seeing no discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

### Approval of the Agenda of the Graduate Education Meeting of February 15, 2011

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

**THAT** the agenda of the Graduate Education Council meeting of February 15, 2011 be approved.

Seeing no discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

### Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of November 16, 2010

The minutes of the **November 16, 2010** meeting were not distributed with the agenda package. They were distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and paper copies were made available at the beginning of the meeting. The Dean asked if there were any objections to taking a moment to review the minutes now; as there were no objections, Council took a moment to review the minutes.

**MOTION (duly moved and seconded)**

**THAT** the minutes of the Graduate Education Council meeting of November 16, 2010 be approved.

Seeing no discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

### Business Arising from the Minutes

There was no business arising from the minutes.
3 Subsequent Considerations of GEC-approved items

Law, Global Professional Master of Laws (GPLLM) (new degree program)
Final approvals are now in place for the Global Professional Master of Laws (GPLLM) program. The program’s effective session date is September 2011. Detailed approvals: GEC (April 20, 2010); the Academic Policy and Programs Committee (AP&P) (May 11, 2010), the Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) (May 5, 2010), Academic Board (June 2, 2010); final approvals from Governing Council (June 24, 2010) and OCGS (February 11, 2011).

School of Graduate Studies Constitution
Final approvals are in place for the amendments to the SGS Constitution. The amended constitution became effective on January 1, 2011. Detailed approvals: GEC (October 19, 2010); Academic Board (November 23, 2010); final approval from the Executive Committee of Governing Council or from Governing Council (December 6, 2010).
In response to a member’s question, the Dean advised that the final approved version is identical to that approved by this Council.

4 Dean’s Remarks

Quality Assurance (QA) Update and New Governance Processes
The Dean noted that approval by the Quality Council (QC) for the Institutional Quality Assurance Plans (IQAP) was originally expected within 45 days. The approval process is now in month eight; the QC is in the last stages of debating some aspects of what a new program is and is expected soon to begin approving (IQAPs). In the meantime, SGS has developed a transitional process for most approvals. Very few problems are emerging from the transition itself. SGS will keep members advised.

GEC Elections and Electronic Balloting
Elections are underway for seats becoming vacant July 2011. Nominations are open until 5:00 p.m. on Monday, February 28, 2011. Balloting is expected to run for two weeks in mid-March. Results will be reported to Council.
Student balloting has been electronic for several years. For the first time, faculty balloting will also be electronic. Electronic balloting will be implemented for staff constituencies as soon as it is possible to do so.

Joint Degree Programs and “Cotutelles”
The University and SGS are receiving an increasing number of requests for joint degree programs, referred to as “cotutelles” in France, for graduate students and doctoral students in particular. As there is currently no policy around this, SGS is developing a draft discussion paper. A report will be made to members when the process is further along. SGS also invites comments within the next month if members have particular views or concerns.

Collaborative Program Reviews – Role of SGS
As part of QA concerns, SGS will be revisiting the process of reviewing collaborative programs. SGS is trying to regularize the process without making reviews more complicated than they need to be; that is, these reviews should not be as complicated as those for degree programs. A tailored review is needed. The transition from director to director is important to ensure that it follows the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), that the MOA is renewed regularly, and to ensure the program is still serving a useful function and that there still exists sufficient commitment to continue to offer it.
As the Dean of SGS appoints directors and oversees MOAs, the current thinking is that the nominal responsibility for these reviews should reside with the SGS Dean. Further discussion will follow, based on the recognition of the range and diversity of these programs; for example, some collaborative programs align with EDUs, while some cut across Faculties. SGS is working on a set of protocols that will allow flexibility in how the review is conducted.

**Degree Level Expectations (DLEs)**
This has not been a focal point for graduate studies in the past. However, in the new QA process, DLEs are expected. SGS is working with the office of the Vice-Provost, Programs, to develop templates to be used in program and unit reviews. These templates should help graduate units articulate goals, expectations and outcomes. The current prototype seems quite helpful and useful in the long term because all units eventually will be required to define DLEs for their programs.

**Graduate Briefing Session**
The Graduate Briefing Session is directed particularly to Directors, Chairs and Coordinators, but all members of GEC are very much welcome to attend. It is scheduled for Tuesday, March 8, 2011 from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m., at Simcoe Hall. The focus will be on recent developments, and it will provide a forum for updates and questions about graduate education.

A member asked whether graduate students who are not members of GEC are welcome. The Dean answered that they were and requested that SGS be informed if a large number was expected.

**Calendar Steering Committee Recommendations for Reduction of Paper Version**
A dramatic reduction in paper consumption is expected when we no longer print Calendars for every student. It is understood that most students do not pick up their physical Calendar, but rather get information they need online. Next academic year, SGS will provide a bookmark with the URL for the electronic Calendar in the Essential Graduate Guide for all incoming students. The bookmark will point out that print copies of the Calendar will not be distributed routinely and that preferred access is online. Bookmarks will be provided for new and returning students in graduate units. There will be a limited print run for departmental administrators; others who want a print copy will need to visit SGS Student Services at 63 St. George St. to obtain it.

**Graduate Faculty Membership – Procedural Revision**
A procedural revision was implemented at the beginning of last January; a new checklist can be downloaded from the SGS website.

**Sessional dates 2011-2012**
Sessional dates will be somewhat different next year; a decanal memorandum with the dates was published February 3, 2011, and is available on the SGS website.

5 **Report of the Vice-Dean, Programs**
The Vice-Dean Elizabeth Smyth thanked graduate units for working with SGS during the transition to the new governance process. Valuable feedback has been received, and continues to be welcomed.
5.1 Report of the Vice-Dean, Students

Conference Grant

Vice-Dean Berry Smith reported that a notice had already been sent out about a new grant to assist students to attend their first academic conference. A full announcement will be made shortly. One exciting aspect is that it will be launched with a fully electronic application process. The Vice-Dean thanked Rodney Branch, Director of Information Systems, and those in his office working on this. The new grant should provide qualified students with sufficient funds to cover their registration fee, and some extra costs. In order to qualify, students cannot merely attend but must present research at a conference. A full announcement should be available in March. The competition will occur twice a year: once well in advance of summer and the other in early fall.

A member asked whether there were any eligibility restrictions for the grant, such as part-time status. The Vice-Dean replied that he saw no reason why any student in a doctoral stream program who is working on a thesis would not be eligible whether full-time or not. Heather Kelly, Director of Student Services further clarified that the grant’s first iteration was prioritizing full-time students. Providing the grant to part-time students would be taken into consideration. Another member asked whether flexible-time students would be eligible, and noted that they face disadvantages in many funding venues; the Vice-Dean replied that this would be taken under advisement.

In response to a question from another member, the Vice-Dean clarified that the grant is also available to doctoral-stream master’s students.

A member asked whether co-authorship with a faculty member of the paper to be presented would affect eligibility; the Vice-Dean replied that there was no problem with co-authorship; in fact, there is a space on the application to indicate it.

In response to a question from another member, the Vice-Dean asked that suggestions to the adjudication committee be sent to him directly, or to the Vice-Dean, Programs.

Doctoral Completion Award (DCA)

SGS is working on completing the first iteration of the DCA. The Vice-Dean reminded GEC that the first awards were partial. The majority of the funding had to be used for students “grandparented” under the Doctoral Completion Grant. A committee has been struck to formulate more transparent requirements and instructions. The committee has representatives from all four SGS divisions, including students, and SGS staff. It will begin meeting in early March. The criteria should be available in mid-March.

6 Changes to Regulations and other Sections in the SGS Calendar, 2011-12 Edition

For each of the following motions, members were directed to consult the motion sheet for previous discussion. GEC approval is final for each motion.

MOTION #1: General and Degree Regulation Changes, and Fees and Financial Support section changes (removal of “lapsed” status)

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

MOTION #1 (duly moved and seconded)

THAT the Graduate Education Council approve changes to the General and Degree Regulations and the Fees and Financial Support sections of the SGS Calendar, 2011–12 edition, as follows:
• Remove lapsed status for all students who are beyond the time limit for their degrees and replace with a revised extension schedule, and related adjustments to time limits, as outlined in attachments.

• Changes are effective September 2011.

The Dean noted that Council had removed lapsed status for PhD students during the last academic year. At the time, members were advised that SGS would follow with similar changes to other programs; this is the result.

A member asked about time limits for PhD or master’s programs introduced in section 7.6. Heather Kelly replied that changes had been made with respect to all full-time master’s programs; however, time limits for other programs (e.g. PhD, flexible-time PhD, or professional doctoral programs) had not changed. The motion is to indicate the time limits more clearly and have them all in one place. The member further asked what was meant by visiting the campus regularly, whether this could be accomplished by, for example, Skype, and why the arrangements to visit campus needed to be set in agreement with the supervisor. Ms. Kelly replied that students and supervisors in consultation with the relevant graduate unit should determine how often the student should visit campus. There is a form that a graduate student can complete in the rare cases where a student wishes to remain registered but be off-site. She also explained that geographic availability was a factor in students being engaged in their program. The Dean noted that campus residency requirements were part of the provincial definitions of full-time status, and that the University had to observe provincial requirements in order to maintain funding for students. The language has been kept flexible enough to allow compliance with provincial requirements while allowing for the diversity of student and supervisory needs.

Another member noted that when lapsed status was eliminated for PhD students, fees for students on extensions were lowered by fifty percent; the member asked whether this would have any effect on master’s students and master’s student fees. Vice-Dean Smith replied that if a master’s student’s application for an extension was accepted, the same fifty percent prorating of fees would apply. Based on current practices, very few extensions to master’s programs are expected and therefore little impact is expected.

A member asked why fees for part-time students were not being reduced; the member expressed concern that these students already often face funding issues since they are not eligible for most funding. Vice-Dean Smith replied that the part-time fee is currently one-third of the full-time fee; as the majority of part-time students finish in less than three times the normal length of the program for full-time students, they already have an advantage. As well, very few students are expected to exceed the time limit being suggested. Since it would affect few students, and those students already have a financial advantage, the motion does not propose extending the fee reduction for part-time students.

Another member asked for clarification on the status of flexible-time students. The member asked if they are considered full-time students by the University, and if there is any difference regarding their geographical availability requirements, and if they are eligible for tri-agency awards. Heather Kelly replied that flexible-time students must study full-time for the first four years of their program and can choose to study part-time after that. During the full-time portion of their program, all of the conditions that apply to full-time students apply to them.

In response to a member’s question, the Dean confirmed that currently-lapsed students have the option of registering and applying for extensions to their program under the new rules if they so desire. Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.
MOTION #2: General and Degree Regulation Changes (Good Academic Standing)
The Dean called on Vice-Dean Smith to present the motion.

MOTION #2 (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the Graduate Education Council approve changes to the General and Degree Regulations in the SGS Calendar in the following areas:
• Adjustments to language to bring all students under the requirements for Good Academic Standing, including Candidacy.
• Changes are effective September 2011.

Vice-Dean Smith noted that this is a substantive change. The notion of Candidacy has evolved relatively recently and has only been applied to PhD programs. The motion proposes that it apply to all doctoral programs. Candidacy essentially means completion of all requirements of the program excluding the thesis; these requirements, including courses and comprehensive exams, have time limits for completion. Vice-Dean Smyth added that the achievement of Candidacy by a student will be recognized with an annotation on the academic record.

A member asked whether there was a requirement of a minimum of four supervisory committee meetings in order to achieve Candidacy. Vice-Dean Smith replied that there is a general requirement of one per year in the program. The member further asked whether Candidacy also applied to master’s students, to which the Vice-Dean replied that it was only applicable to doctoral students including professional doctoral students and flexible-time doctoral students.

Heather Kelly proposed a friendly amendment to the motion to clarify that master’s students are not subject to Candidacy, but have requirements for Good Standing. The Dean asked for any objections to having Dr. Kelly finesse the language to address that point. There were no objections.

AMENDED MOTION #2 (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the Graduate Education Council approve changes to the General and Degree Regulations in the SGS Calendar in the following areas:
• Adjustments to language to bring all degree students under the requirements for Good Academic Standing, including Candidacy in the case of doctoral students.
• Changes are effective September 2011.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

MOTION #3: General and Degree Regulation Changes (various items including extending PhD regulations to all doctoral students)
The Dean called on Vice-Dean Smyth to present the motion. The Vice-Dean noted that the motion was erroneously labelled as Motion #2 in one place on the documentation for the meeting.

MOTION #3 (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the Graduate Education Council approve changes to the General and Degree Regulations in the SGS Calendar in the following areas:
• New language for flexible-time option PhD students in the areas of admission and program requirements
• Formalize SGS responsibility to archive inactive graduate courses
• Formalize grade reporting procedures language to clarify use of non-grade course reports of INC, WDR, and SDF
• Extend PhD regulations to apply to all doctoral students, including the SGS Final Oral Examination for all doctoral students
• Update language in the EdD degree regulations section
• Update language in Degree Regulations, EdD Degree, Admission Requirements and Program Requirements sections, and in General Regulations, Time Limit section.
• Changes are effective September 2011.

Vice-Dean Smyth explained that the motion would formalize the current role of SGS in archiving courses, clarify reporting practices around INC, WDR and SDF grades, and extend the PhD regulations to all doctoral students. The new language had been developed in consultation with graduate units that are involved with the affected programs.

A member asked what was meant by archiving of courses. Rodney Branch explained that this was not a change but simply an articulation of current practices around not allowing re-use of course numbers until five years after they had last been used. He explained that a report is sent by SGS to all graduate units each year listing such courses. Following that, unless a unit requests otherwise, the courses are archived on ROSI and each course number becomes available for use by a new course. If a unit wishes to offer a course again once it has been archived, it must be proposed as a new course.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

7 Other Business

A member asked when the Canadian Graduate and Professional Students Survey (CGPSS) would be ready. The Dean replied that the summary report should be released today, while individual unit reports will be sent to interested parties within the next few weeks. The Dean asked whether there was any interest in the report being presented to Council. The indications were that Council was interested; the Dean stated that he would be happy to do this at an upcoming meeting of Council.

Another member asked if there were any recent developments on graduate expansion funding, and how these developments were generally communicated. The Dean replied that negotiations with the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) occur at the level of the Provost’s office. Funding allocations are arranged between the Provost’s office and the Faculties. This means that the sources of graduate unit funding allocations are the deans of the Faculties. While GEC can discuss topics that are of interest to it, there is no clear role for it in this process. Another member reported having been told at a meeting of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) not to expect anything on this front until well after the next provincial election.

8 For Information:

8.1 Registration Statistics Annual Report

The Dean thanked Heather Kelly, who presented the report. Dr. Kelly explained that it represents a “snapshot” of data at November 1, 2010. Final data is still being refined, but the report is still useful for identifying trends.

A member asked what year Postdoctoral Fellows (PDF) data represented. Dr. Kelly replied that PDF data always lagged a year behind, so the PDF data in this report was from the year 2009-10.
A member noted that the number of applications seems to be increasing but the number of offer letters is decreasing, and asked whether this indicates a decreasing quality of applications. Dr. Kelly replied that increased selectivity of applicants and a swell in applications due to the economic downturn are other possible reasons. SGS does not have all the information necessary to determine the cause of this trend with certainty; colleagues at the graduate unit level might be in a better position to know this. Another member mentioned that his Faculty has more PhD students than there is funding available, and this affects the number of PhDs they can accept.

A member asked whether a more progressive way of reporting gender could be considered. Dr. Kelly responded that the report was constrained by the registration tools currently available, but there is hope that future systems will allow improvement. Rodney Branch added that the University is also bound to comply with legal requirements for the information that is reported to the MTCU and to Statistics Canada.

A member asked whether a lot of internal PDFs return to Canada. Dr. Kelly replied that approximately eleven percent of graduate students are international. The number of international PDFs is not available but is known to be significantly higher. This would be in keeping with the philosophy that it is beneficial to go abroad to do one’s PDF. Another member asked whether there were any shifts in international students in research programs compared to professional master’s programs. The Dean responded that there is currently no single greater concern in the graduate school community than the ability to attract more international students to doctoral stream programs. Funding is the major challenge. Some small moves are being made here, such as the new Connaught program and proposed Trillium program. These moves have been made despite poor response by the public, demonstrating the difficulties in making progress in this area. The consensus that this is a top priority is unusually strong across the University.

A member expressed his appreciation for the report and asked whether it was accessible to the community, and if so, whether the historical data was also available. Dr. Kelly replied that making historical data available is something that could be explored. SGS currently does track historical data through its Office of Graduate Education Research (OGER). Helen Chang from that office makes data available to graduate units; Dr. Kelly invited graduate units wanting data to contact her and Rodney Branch. Mr. Branch added that the data had been archived for many years, sourced from common University files. Vice-Dean Smith added that the reports are available on the SGS website in the meeting documentation for this meeting and previous years’ meetings where this report was presented. Jane Alderdice added that GEC meeting documentation on the website currently goes back to 2005-06, and that older documentation would be added in the future.

A member asked whether a distinction was made in the data between Canadian citizens versus landed immigrants. Mr. Branch replied that the data was a total number and did not include the conversion rate; it is known that approximately 70 to 110 people change status each year. Dr. Kelly added that SGS is happy to help those requiring further data.

### 8.2 Guidelines on Archiving Courses

The Dean invited those with questions about procedures on archiving courses to contact Rodney Branch.

### 8.3 Summary Report of EMBA and OMNIUM Audits

Heather Kelly remarked that the results of the EMBA and OMNIUM audits were very positive this year.
8.4 **Admission and Programs Committee (A&P) Annual Report 2009-10**

The report was not distributed with the agenda package, but was distributed electronically prior to the meeting, and paper copies were made available at the beginning of the meeting. Heather Kelly noted that those with Bologna-compliant degrees and community college degrees are now being tracked. Those with Bologna-compliant degrees seem very well prepared, in contrast to those with community college degrees. The report helps SGS track those students as non-standard and collect data over time for analysis.

8.5 **Adjournment**

The Dean noted that one more meeting of Council is expected this year, most likely in April. A member asked how the structure of Council had changed now that the new governance process was implemented. The Dean replied that the fundamental change could be seen at this meeting, as there were no curriculum proposals for Council to approve. The need for frequent meetings is therefore removed. There remains a need for some meetings to facilitate information sharing and allow for approval of regulatory matters. Some reports for information and for approval are still required to come before this Council according to the revised SGS Constitution and By-laws. The norm which may emerge may be two meetings per term with the possibility of one meeting being cancelled from time to time due to insufficient business. However, there will continue to be business that needs to be done.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

[ORIGINAL SIGNED BY] ________________________  April 13, 2011 __________

Jane Alderdice, Secretary  Date
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DRAFT MOTION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, April 19, 2011

ITEM 6
Proposal for by-law and policy amendments relating to academic appeals in the School of Graduate Studies
School of Graduate Studies

MOTION
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the School of Graduate Studies to amend the By-laws of the School of Graduate Studies and policies in the SGS Calendar as follows:

• Amend By-law #3, Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB), Terms of Reference
• Amend the Academic Appeals Policy in the General Regulations section of the Calendar
• The changes are effective September 2011.

See attached documents:
• Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) Terms of Reference amended
• 2011/12 SGS Calendar Extract

Prior Approvals and Discussion
By-law revisions have been discussed within SGS and have been reviewed by the Office of the Governing Council.

Further Governance
GEC approval is final.
Approved by the School of Graduate Studies Council: XXXX

BY-LAW #3: GRADUATE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD (GAAB)
GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL
School of Graduate Studies
University of Toronto
Page #1

DRAFT 5

BY-LAW #3

GRADUATE ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD (GAAB)

PREAMBLE
1. The Graduate Academic Appeals Board (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") is
a standing committee of the Graduate Education Council of the School of Graduate Studies
(hereinafter referred to as "the Council").

REPEAL
2. These Terms of Reference repeal and replace all former terms of reference.

JURISDICTION
3. a. The Board shall hear and determine appeals of students registered in the School
of Graduate Studies concerning grades in a course or in a component of a grade in
a course, or concerning any other decision with respect to the application of
academic regulations and requirements to a student. Except by leave of the Board
in exceptional circumstances, an appeal shall not be heard by the Board until all
prior levels of academic appeal established for students in the School of Graduate
Studies have been completed and determined. EXCEPTION: Appeals related to
failure of a final doctoral examination or related to termination of registration
in a program should be made directly to the SGS Graduate Academic Appeals
Board – Step 4(b) (see SGS Calendar entry on Academic Appeals). In some
cases, the Chair of GAAB may refer the appeal to the Graduate Department
Academic Appeals Committee for prior consideration. The GDAAC will not
have the right to overturn a failed doctoral examination result or a termination
of registration, but may recommend that such a decision be considered further
by GAAB.

b. The Board may vacate, reverse, or amend the decision appealed from, and in
the case of an appeal of a grade, may order a re-evaluation of the student in such
manner and on such terms and conditions as the Board considers appropriate. The
Board may recommend to the University that fees of a student be rebated or
cancelled in whole or in part, but shall not otherwise recommend or award any
monetary or other compensation. The Board shall not award costs of the appeal to
or against the University.

c. For the purposes of this section, "student" shall include a person who is no
longer enrolled as a student in the School of Graduate Studies, but who was so
enrolled at the time of the decision which is being appealed.
d. A decision of the Board shall take effect as if it were a decision of the Council.

COMPOSITION

4. The Board shall be composed of:
   a. The Chair who shall be a member or retired member of the teaching staff of the University, or a person with academic credentials, and who shall be appointed by the Council upon the recommendation of the SGS Dean. Normally the Chair shall be legally qualified.

   b. The Alternate Chairs who shall be members or retired members of the teaching staff of the University, or persons with academic credentials, and shall be appointed by the Council upon the recommendation of the SGS Dean. The Alternate Chairs may, but need not be, faculty members who are appointed to the Board to represent a division. Normally, Alternate Chairs shall be legally qualified.

   c. Twelve Graduate Faculty members, that is, three members from each of the four SGS Divisions, who shall be members or retired members of the teaching staff of the School of Graduate Studies. The members shall be appointed by the Graduate Education Council, upon the recommendation of the SGS Vice-Dean, Students. The Graduate Faculty members shall not be members of the same graduate unit.

   d. Three members, each of whom shall be registered as students within the School of Graduate Studies, who shall be appointed by the Council upon the recommendation of the student members of the Council. The student members shall not be registered as students in the same graduate unit.

5. The membership of the Board shall be reported to the Council annually, for information.

6. a. Where no Chair or Alternate Chair is available to hear and determine an appeal which has been filed, and it appears to the SGS Dean that there is no reasonable likelihood of such person becoming available or being permanently replaced without creating undue delay in the hearing of an appeal, the Dean may appoint ad hoc an appropriately-qualified person to act as Chair for the hearing of such appeal.

   b. Where no Graduate Faculty member from a division, or no student member is available to hear and determine an appeal which has been filed, and it appears to the SGS Dean that there is no reasonable likelihood of such person becoming available or being permanently replaced without creating undue delay in the hearing of the appeal, the Dean
may appoint ad hoc some person from the same constituency as the member who is unavailable, as a member of the Board for the purposes of determining that appeal.

TERM

7.a. The Chair and the Alternate Chairs may each hold office for a maximum of five years from the date of their respective appointments. An appointment may be renewed by the SGS Dean for further one-year periods indefinitely.

b. Graduate Faculty Members representing the teaching staff of the divisions shall each hold office for a maximum of three years from the date of the appointment. An appointment may be renewed for further three-year periods indefinitely.

c. Student members shall each hold office for a period of one year from the date of the appointment. An appointment may be renewed for further one year periods indefinitely.

d. Where, at the expiration of the term of a Chair, Alternate Chair, teaching staff member or student member, that person is a member of a Hearing Panel that has commenced the hearing of an appeal, that person may continue as a member of the Board for the purpose of hearing and determining that appeal, notwithstanding that the person's appointment is not otherwise renewed, and notwithstanding that the person may no longer be eligible to be a member of the Board except for this provision.

SECRETARY

8.a. The SGS Dean shall appoint a member of the administrative staff of the School of Graduate Studies to act as Secretary to the Board. The Secretary shall carry out such functions for the Board as the Chair, with the approval of the Dean, shall designate.

b. If the Secretary is unable to act, the SGS Dean may appoint an Acting Secretary.

INSTITUTION AND HEARING OF APPEALS

9. Except by leave of the Chair or Alternate Chair, a Notice of Appeal shall be filed by the student with the Board not later than eight weeks after the decision at the immediately prior level of appeal has been communicated to the student.

10.a. After the Notice of Appeal has been filed with the Board, the Secretary, under the direction of the Chair or an Alternate Chair, shall establish a Hearing Panel to hear and determine the appeal at the earliest possible date, normally within six to eight weeks from
the deadline given to the Student by the Secretary to submit all materials in support of the Notice of Appeal.

b. After the deadline for the Student to submit all materials, the Secretary shall provide a copy to the graduate unit chair or director with a request for a written Response normally within four weeks.

c. After the graduate unit’s Response is received, the Secretary shall provide a copy to the Student with a request for a written Reply normally within one week.

d. Subject to Paragraph 13, a Hearing Panel shall consist of:

i) a chair, who shall be the Chair or Alternate Chair or a person appointed ad hoc pursuant to Paragraph 6 to act as Chair;

ii) a teaching staff member who is a Graduate Faculty Member from each of the divisions of the School of Graduate Studies or a person appointed ad hoc pursuant to Paragraph 6 to act in place of a member and

iii) a student member or a student appointed ad hoc pursuant to Paragraph 6 to act in place of a student member.

e. A copy of the appeal package, including the Notice of Appeal and supporting materials, the graduate unit’s Response, and the Student’s Reply, if any, shall be provided to members of the Hearing Panel and the parties.

11. If, after a Hearing Panel has been constituted to hear and determine an appeal, but before the hearing has commenced, the Panel Chair becomes unable to act, another Panel Chair shall be appointed. The replacing Panel Chair shall be the Chair, an Alternate Chair or a person appointed ad hoc pursuant to Paragraph 6. If a teaching staff or student member of the Hearing Panel becomes unable to act, another member of the Board from the same constituency, or a person appointed ad hoc pursuant to Paragraph 6 shall be appointed.

12. After a Hearing Panel has commenced to hear an appeal, if the Panel Chair becomes unable to act, he or she shall cease to be a member of the panel and shall not take further part in the hearing or determination of the appeal. The other members of the Hearing Panel may either select one of themselves to act as Panel Chair until the appeal is determined, or may terminate the hearing and remit the appeal to be reheard by a reconstituted Hearing Panel.

13. After a Hearing Panel has commenced to hear an appeal, if a member of the Hearing Panel other than the Panel Chair becomes unable to act, he or she shall cease to be a member of that panel, and shall not take further part in the hearing or determination of the
appeal. The remaining members of the Hearing Panel shall continue to hear and determine the appeal, so long as at least four members, including the Panel Chair, are present. If there are fewer than four members, including the Panel Chair, able to act, the proceedings before that Hearing Panel shall terminate, and a new Hearing Panel shall be constituted to hear and determine the appeal.

14. The student who is appealing and representatives of the University may attend, present evidence, and submit argument at meetings of the Hearing Panel, except meetings or portions thereof when the panel is deliberating, and may be represented by counsel or other agent. "Entitled Persons", as defined by the Rules of the Board, may attend, present evidence and be represented by counsel or other agents, to the extent permitted by the Panel Chair.

15. The hearing of the appeal shall be open to the public, unless the Hearing Panel decides that the hearing shall be closed. A hearing shall be closed only in circumstances where a hearing to which the Ontario Statutory Powers Procedure Act applies may be closed.

16. Decisions of the Hearing Panel shall be made by a simple majority of the members. The Panel Chair shall not vote except in the case of a tie, but may take part in the deliberations of the Panel. Decisions normally shall be provided to the Secretary for distribution to the parties within four weeks from the date of the hearing. Decisions shall be submitted in writing with reasons.

17. A decision of a Hearing Panel shall take effect as a decision of the Board.

POWERS OF THE CHAIR

18. The Chair may determine:

a. that an appeal or some part thereof is outside the jurisdiction of the Board;

b. that an appeal to the Board has been filed prematurely without completion of all previous steps of the appeal process, if any, and may remit the appeal for determination at the appropriate stage;

c. that an appeal submitted late may be accepted if requested in writing; alternatively, the Chair may refer the written request to the Board;

d. that a request may be granted for extension of any operative deadline.
The decision of the Chair shall be final, and shall take effect as a decision of the Board.

19. The Chair shall determine issues of the law of Ontario or of Canada that may arise with respect to an appeal. Where the interpretation of an internal statute, regulation or rule of the University is required in order to determine an appeal, that issue shall be decided by the Hearing Panel.

20. The Chair may determine all interim or interlocutory matters which may arise concerning the hearing of the appeal, and the admissibility of evidence. If the Chair considers it proper, such matter, other than admissibility of evidence, may be referred to the Hearing Panel for determination.

21. The Chair may determine that certain persons are "Entitled Persons", as defined under the rules of the Board, and may direct the Secretary to give such persons notice of the proceedings in an appeal, and give directions as to copies of documents that shall be supplied to those persons and as to the manner and degree of participation of such persons in the hearing of the appeal.

22. Prior to the establishment of a Hearing Panel to hear and determine an appeal, the powers and duties of the Chair shall be exercised by the Chair, or, if the Chair is unavailable to act, or so requests, by an Alternate Chair.

23. After the establishment of a Hearing Panel to hear and determine an appeal, the powers and duties of the Chair with respect to that appeal shall be exercised by the Panel Chair.

RULES

24. The Board may make rules for the institution and conduct of appeals to the Board. Rules and procedures existing at the time this resolution comes into effect shall remain in force until repealed or amended by the Board.

ENTRY INTO FORCE

25. The Graduate Academic Appeals Board and its Terms of Reference enter into force when enacted by the Graduate Education Council of the School of Graduate Studies. Prior to its existence as the Graduate Academic Appeals Board, the GAAB was preceded by a committee named “The Applications and Memorials Committee.” The Board and its Terms of Reference were originally established by SGS Council at its meeting of May 22, 2001. The GAAB and its Terms of Reference were amended by the SGS Council on January 29, 2002.
This By-law of the Graduate Education Council was originally created on May 9, 2006 and approved by the Graduate Education Council on May 23, 2006.

This By-law (#3) was amended by the SGS Graduate Education Council on:

- October 19, 2010;
- April 19, 2011;

and is in effect immediately.
EXTRACT

2011/2012 SGS Calendar

Based on revisions approved by SGS Graduate Education Council meeting of February 15, 2011

General Regulations

Exemptions

The Graduate Education Council of the School of Graduate Studies has the power to waive the application of a regulation in individual cases. Such exemptions are granted only in exceptional circumstances and require the favourable recommendation of the graduate unit and of the School of Graduate Studies Admissions and Programs Committee.

[...]
failed final doctoral oral examination result or a termination of registration, but may recommend that such a decision be considered further by GAAB.

11.2 Informal Mediation

At any stage before filing and until the hearing of any appeal with the SGS Graduate Academic Appeals Board, a student may consult the relevant SGS Vice-Dean for advice and/or informal mediation. The Vice-Dean will serve as informal mediator, attempting to resolve the dispute or clarify issues. Timelines are not affected by mediation. Consultation with the Vice-Dean at an early stage is encouraged. In cases where the Vice-Dean has approved the termination of a student’s registration or in cases where perceived or actual conflict of interest is identified, the student will have access to an alternate informal mediator.

11.3 Steps

The overall graduate appeals process is set out in the table below. Students should note the timelines for each stage carefully.

11.3.1 Step 1 – Informal

In the case of dispute, students must first attempt to resolve the matter with the instructor or other person whose ruling is in question. Should the matter not be resolved with the instructor, and should the student wish to pursue the matter, the student must discuss the matter with the graduate coordinator/associate chair (hereafter referred to in this Policy as “graduate coordinator”) and/or chair of the department.

11.3.2 Step 2 – Department Appeal

Should such discussions fail to resolve the matter, the student may make a formal appeal in writing to the Graduate Department Academic Appeals Committee (GDAAC). The student must complete a Notice of Appeal to the GDAAC; a copy of this Notice is available from the graduate coordinator in every graduate department. This form must be completed and delivered to the chair of the graduate department or the chair of GDAAC within the specified timeline of eight (8) weeks from the date of the decision under appeal. The chair of the GDAAC will determine, at his or her sole discretion, whether the appeal will proceed by way of an oral hearing and/or written submissions. In either case, at the conclusion of the hearing and/or review of the written submissions, the GDAAC will make a recommendation to the chair of the department regarding the merits of the appeal. The department chair will then render the department-level appeal decision. Guidelines for department chairs are made available to all parties in an appeal.

11.3.3 Step 3 – Appeal to GAAB

1. The student may appeal from the decision of the chair of the department by filing a Notice of Appeal to the SGS Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) within eight (8) weeks of the decision of the chair of the department.

2. Filing a Notice of Appeal to GAAB is the first step for a student who is making an appeal regarding the failure of the final doctoral oral examination or termination of registration in a graduate program.
### 11.3.4 Step 4 – Governing Council Appeal

A decision of the [SGS Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB)](https://example.edu/sgs-appeals) may subsequently be appealed by a student to the Governing Council’s Academic Appeals Committee, in accordance with its guidelines and procedures. An appeal to this committee shall be commenced by filing a notice of appeal with its Secretary no later than ninety days after the date of the GAAB decision under appeal.

#### STEPS AND TIMELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR STUDENT ACTION AT EACH STAGE</th>
<th>STEP</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR DECISION/ACTION BY UNIVERSITY BODY AT EACH STAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Note A below</td>
<td>See Note B below</td>
<td>See Note C below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Informal**
   - a. Student to instructor
   - b. Student to graduate coordinator
   - 8 weeks from date of decision being appealed

2. **Department-level Appeal**
   - Notice of Appeal to GDAAC
   - Note: Appeals related to failure of the final doctoral oral examination or to termination of registration in a graduate program must be made directly to GAAB, see Step 3b below.
   - 8 weeks from filing of Notice of Appeal to GDAAC

3. **SGS Appeal**
   - a. Notice of Appeal to GAAB
   - b. Appeal begins here for students who wish to appeal failure of the final doctoral oral examination or termination of registration in a graduate program
   - Normally 12 weeks from filing of Notice of Appeal

4. **Governing Council Appeal**
   - Notice of Appeal to GCAAC
   - N/A

Note A: A student may apply, in writing and with reasons, for an extension of time. Such applications may be made to the Chair of GDAAC for department-level appeals or to the GAAB for SGS-level appeals. Any extension is within the discretion of the Chair of GDAAC or GAAB, as appropriate, where the view is that compelling reasons exist.

Note B: Informal mediation is available via the SGS Vice-Dean at any stage before filing or until the hearing of an appeal with the GAAB. Consultation with the SGS Vice-Dean at an early stage is encouraged. In cases where the Vice-Dean has approved the termination of a student’s registration or in cases where perceived or actual conflict of interest is identified, the student will have access to an alternate informal mediator.

Note C: The chair of the appeal body retains discretion to extend time limits applicable to its response at any stage where, in its view, compelling reasons exist.

---

1. Graduate Department Academic Appeals Committee
2. Graduate Academic Appeals Board
3. Governing Council Academic Appeals Committee
DRAFT MOTION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, April 19, 2011

**ITEM 7**
Proposal to approve appointments to the **Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB)** for the 2011-2012 academic year:

**MOTION**

**THAT** Graduate Education Council approve the appointments of a Chair, three Alternate Chairs, four faculty and three student members to serve on the Graduate Academic Appeals Board for the 2011-2012 academic year as follows:

**Chair:** Ralph Scane, Faculty of Law *(renewed)*

**Alternate Chair:** Edward Morgan, Faculty of Law *(renewed)*

*(five-year term)*

Kate Hilton, Faculty of Law *(new)*

Hamish Stewart, Faculty of Law *(new)*

**Faculty Members:**

*(three-year term)*

Paul Thompson, Division I *(new)*

Greig Henderson, Division I *(renewed)*

Lynne Howarth, Division II *(renewed)*

Sandy Welsh, Division II *(renewed)*

Chris Damaren, Division III *(renewed)*

Jane Phillips, Division III *(renewed)*

**Student Members:**

*(one-year term)*

Jason Grenier, Division III *(renewed)*

Behnam Nowrouzi-Kia, Division IV *(renewed)*

Kimberley Radmacher, Division I *(renewed)*

**About Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB):**
The Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) is a standing committee of 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 recommendation of the Vice-Dean, Students. Appointment of student members is approved by GEC upon the nomination and election by the student members of GEC; this occurred on March 21, 2011.
GAAB Membership 2011-2012:

With GEC approval, membership of GAAB for 2011-2012 will be as follows:

Chair: Ralph Scane, Faculty of Law (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012)

Alternates: Edward Morgan, Faculty of Law (July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2015)
Kate Hilton, Faculty of Law (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2016)
Hamish Stewart, Faculty of Law (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2016)

Division I Faculty Members
Members: Greig Henderson, English (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2014)
Russell Kazal, History (July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2012)
Paul Thompson, History and Philosophy of Science and Technology (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2014)

Division II Faculty Members
Members: Lynne Howarth, Information Studies (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2014)
Michele Peterson-Badali, Human Development & Applied Psychology (July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2013)
Sandy Welsh (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2014)

Division III Faculty Members
Members: Chris Damaren, Aerospace Science and Engineering (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2014)
Eric Hehner, Computer Science (July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2013)
Jane Phillips, Chemical Eng. & Applied Chemistry (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2014)

Division IV Faculty Members
Members: Reina Bendayan, Pharmacy (July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2013)
Luigi Girolametto, Speech-Language Pathology (July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2012)
Michael J. Wiley, Anatomy (July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2013)

Student Members
Members: Jason Grenier, Division III (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012)
Behnam Nowrouzi-Kia, Division IV (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012)
Kimberley Radmacher, Division I (July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012)
MOTION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, April 19, 2011

ITEM 8

Proposal to appoint the SGS Hearing Officer for the Code of Student Conduct
School of Graduate Studies

MOTION
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the appointment of Professor Jim Phillips (Law), as the SGS Hearing Officer for the Code of Student Conduct, for a three-year term commencing July 1, 2011 and ending June 30, 2014.

Prior Approvals and Discussion

The Code of Student Conduct requires that the Graduate Education Council (GEC) appoint a Hearing Officer for Code of Student Conduct cases; nominations are made by the Dean.

Further Governance

GEC approval is final.
FOR INFORMATION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, April 19, 2011

ITEM 9

Canadian Graduate and Professional Students Survey (CGPSS) (presentation)

See attached document:

• Canadian Graduate and Professional Students Survey (CGPSS), 2010 Aggregate Results
Canadian Graduate & Professional Student Survey (CGPSS)

2010 Aggregate Results

Helen Chang, Ph.D.
SGS Graduate Education Researcher

CGPSS 2010

- Conducted online in Feb-March 2010
- 4,815 valid responses (36.5% of graduate student population)
- Two versions of 2010 CGPSS instrument
  - Regular → doctoral stream students
  - Professional → professional master’s students

Respondent Profile

- The respondent sample is reasonably representative of the graduate student population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Citizen</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study permit</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other visa</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Master's</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Master's</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with Program, Quality of Interactions & Coursework

- Over 97% of students gave positive evaluations to the intellectual quality of faculty
- Over 93% of students are satisfied with the intellectual quality of their fellow students
- Overall, 2010 values are slightly lower than 2007 but satisfaction still remains high

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of program</th>
<th>Count 2005</th>
<th>% 2005</th>
<th>Count 2007</th>
<th>% 2007</th>
<th>Count 2010</th>
<th>% 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The intellectual quality of the faculty</td>
<td>4576</td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>4971</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>4605</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intellectual quality of my fellow students</td>
<td>4449</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>4822</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between faculty and graduate students</td>
<td>3889</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>4353</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of graduate level teaching by faculty</td>
<td>4014</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>4444</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>4124</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of academic advising and guidance</td>
<td>3433</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>3747</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>3422</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of staff members in my program</td>
<td>4008</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>4039</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Satisfaction

- If you were to start your graduate/professional career again, would you choose...
  - The same university?
  - The same field of study?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Count 2005</th>
<th>% 2005</th>
<th>Count 2007</th>
<th>% 2007</th>
<th>Count 2010</th>
<th>% 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) the same university?</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) the same field of study?</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Skills Development: Doctoral Stream Students

- Satisfaction increased for most professional skills development activities from 2007 to 2010 (increases highlighted in yellow)
  - with the exception of doctoral students’ ratings of advice/workshops on career options and research positions (similar to G13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Count 2005</th>
<th>% 2005</th>
<th>Count 2007</th>
<th>% 2007</th>
<th>Count 2010</th>
<th>% 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses, workshops or orientation on teaching</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice-workshops on academic writing in your field</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice-workshops on grant proposal writing</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice-workshops on publishing your work</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice-workshops on writing effective reports</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice-workshops on peer review of papers</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice-workshops on career opportunities</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages shown represent the proportion of students who answered ‘Definitely’ or ‘Probably’ to the questions above.
Professional Skills Development: Professional Master’s Students

- New in 2010 survey
- Professional master’s students show high levels of participation in most professional skills activities
- Lowest satisfaction with career and job preparation advice and workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Participated</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice/workshops on preparing for professional practice</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/workshops on the standards for writing in your profession</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/workshops on career options</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/workshops on professional ethics</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/workshops on job presentation and professional practice</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for internships, practicum, and experiential learning</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for contact (lectures, seminars, discussion) with</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Participated Satisfied

Percentages shown represent the proportion of students who answered ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’ or ‘Good’ to the questions above.

Research Activities

- 95.3% of doctoral stream students involved in independent research
  - continues trend from 2005 (74.7% in 2005, 94.5% in 2007)
  - 83.8% rated the experience as Excellent, Very Good or Good in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>DOC MAST ALL</th>
<th>DOC MAST ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting independent research since starting your program</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in research methods (before beginning your own research)</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research collaboration with one or more faculty members</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with faculty in writing grant proposals</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publication & Presentation Activities

- Compared to 2007, a higher proportion of research master’s students are participating in publication and presentation activities in 2010 (increases highlighted in yellow)
- Doctoral students’ participation in presentation activities has been increasing since 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Published as sole or first author in a refereed journal</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-authored in refereed journals with your program faculty</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave oral or written presentation at national scholarly meetings</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended national scholarly/professional meetings</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages for ‘Satisfied’ represent the proportion of students who answered ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’ or ‘Good’ to the questions above.

Research Training & Career Orientation

- Opportunities to Publish & Present

G13 Benchmarks

- Since 2002, the proportion of students without graduate debt has increased slightly (47.6% in 2002, 49.1% in 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergraduate Debt</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>3051</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>6427</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$1 - $19,999</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$20,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$40,000 - more</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2010, U of T performs higher than its G13 peers on all benchmarks

Financial Support

- Doctoral student respondents only
- Respondents agreed with all aspects of positive behaviour from their thesis advisor at levels higher than 80%
Financial Support

- A lower proportion of U of T doctoral stream students carry graduate debt than the G13 average; opposite for professional master’s students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt amount</th>
<th>U of T Doctoral stream</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>All G13 Doctoral stream</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate debt</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1 - 19,999</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000 - 39,999</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000 - more</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate debt</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1 - 19,999</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000 - 39,999</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000 - more</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Resources & Student Life

- Library facilities used by the highest proportion of students and rated by 95.4% of users as ‘Excellent’, ‘Very Good’ or ‘Good’.
- Athletic facilities (90.5%) and international office (81.5%) also received very positive satisfaction ratings though used by fewer students.
- Students continue to be least satisfied with food services (41.2%).
- Students are more likely to attend social functions organized by:
  - their department (89%) or advisor/research group (94.4%)
  - than university-wide (47.4%) or residence events (75.3%).

General Assessment - U of T

- 90% of students give positive evaluation of academic experience at U of T.
- Over 85% of students positively rate the graduates/professional program and overall experience at U of T.
- Lower levels of satisfaction with student life experience.

General Assessment - G13

- Satisfaction levels at U of T are consistently higher than at our G13 peers in:
  - academic experience
  - graduate program
  - overall experience

Overview of Results

- Despite graduate expansion starting in 2005, our students continue to show high levels of satisfaction with their academic experience.
  - High levels of satisfaction with the intellectual quality of faculty and fellow students.
  - The majority of doctoral students evaluate the behaviour of their thesis advisor positively.
  - 90% satisfaction with the academic experience.
  - 95%+ satisfaction with library services.
- Our students are conducting independent research at the highest rates ever (over 95%).

Overview of Results

- In 2010, doctoral stream students are more satisfied with professional skills development activities.
- A lower proportion of our doctoral stream students are carrying graduate debt than the G13 average.
- U of T doctoral stream funding packages.
- U of T’s performance exceeds the G13 average on:
  - students’ satisfaction with academic experience, graduate program and overall experience.
  - all benchmarks in 2010.
Distribution of Results

- Full aggregate report posted online
  - SGS website under ‘Graduate Education Research’
  - main U of T website under ‘Measuring Our Performance’

- Department, Division and Faculty reports distributed to Faculty Deans and graduate chairs

Questions?

Helen Chang, Ph.D.
Graduate Education Researcher
helen.chang@utoronto.ca
416-946-5382
FOR INFORMATION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, April 19, 2011

ITEM 11.1

SGS Student Services Annual Audit of Graduate Units: Report

See attached documents:
• SGS Audit of Student Files 2010-11 Report to Graduate Education Council
Mandate

The responsibility and authority for standard admission decisions and the maintenance of the official student file were devolved to graduate units in 1999; henceforth, the School of Graduate Studies has implemented an annual audit of student files to ensure that the minimum admission standards and proper documentation are maintained and that student records are properly managed. It also allows SGS to provide in-person support and advice regarding particular problems faced by graduate units.

Summary

This year, the second year of our third five year audit cycle, a total of 272 admission and registration files were randomly selected from fifteen graduate units. Overall, we found a decrease in the number of errors compared with the averages of the first and second cycles.

General admission, registration and ROSI diagnostic findings are recorded in this report with an explanation of the most frequent errors.

Admission Files

Admission files (127) were randomly selected from newly admitted students who started their program in September 2010. The proportion of errors decreased compared with the averages of the first and second cycles.

For admissions audit criteria see Appendix A.

Most Frequent Admission Errors:

1. Final official and authentic copies of transcripts. The final official and authentic copies of transcripts must be included in the official student file. The final ROSI transcript for UofT applicants were missing. SGS Officers have since verified the missing transcripts were printed and included as part of the official student record.

2. Admission recommendation form. This form must be signed by the Graduate Coordinator to ensure proper admission condition codes were correctly assessed, which are subsequently applied to both the admissions offer letter and ROSI. The admission recommendation form was either missing from the official student file or was not signed by the Graduate Coordinator.
3. Correct entry of admissions data in ROSI. Graduate units must update the ROSI admission codes once an applicant fulfills an outstanding admission condition. ROSI admission codes were not updated after an admissions offer letter was issued.

Registration Files

Registration files (145) were randomly selected from students who were registered for the 2009-10 academic year. The proportion of errors decreased compared with the averages of the first and second cycles.

For registration audit criteria see Appendix A.

Most Frequent Registration Errors:

1. Grades were incorrectly entered into ROSI. Final grades were entered by the graduate unit after the SGS deadline.

2. Annual PhD supervisory committee reports. For PhD students after year two of their program, annual PhD supervisory committee reports must be included in the official student file and recorded on ROSI to ensure students met with their supervisor on an annual basis to discuss the progress of their thesis.

3. Course Add/Drop forms. Course Add/Drop forms must be signed by the instructor and the Graduate Coordinator when courses are either added or dropped after SGS deadlines. The forms were either missing from the official student file or did not have the appropriate departmental signatures.

ROSI Diagnostics

The ROSI diagnostics report all relevant ROSI data for the 2009-10 academic year from the fifteen graduate units that were audited this year.

The most widespread errors by graduate units are the failure to record mandatory annual supervisory committee meetings on ROSI and adding courses, as well as, registering students after the SGS deadline.

It is of concern that in the audit of graduate units there were 466 missing post-year two annual supervisory committee meetings in ROSI. We do not know whether this is a lack of ROSI data entry or whether annual supervisory meetings are not being held.

Conclusion

We are pleased to report that the overall proportion of errors in managing the official student record by graduate units is decreasing compared with the averages of the first and second cycles. To ensure this encouraging trend continues, the School of Graduate Studies is committed to supporting graduate units towards strengthening admission, registration and ROSI data entry best practices through workshops and further training sessions.
### Appendix A

#### Admission Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th># of Files</th>
<th>Non-Compliant Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final official and authentic transcripts</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified translations of non-English documents</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate degrees from acceptable institutions</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable average in final year of degree</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable English language facility scores</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two letters of reference</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed application form signed by student</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission recommendation forms</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer of admission issued with correct conditions</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer is to appropriate/approved graduate program</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSI data entry</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registration Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th># of Files</th>
<th>Non-Compliant Files</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student is reg. in correct degree/subject POSTs</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time/part-time status is correct</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program withdrawal</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave of absence</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Extension</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstatement</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program transfer</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Registration</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration/Enrollment Form (or SWS)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Add/Drop form</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities (dept. exams, lang. req.) on ROSI</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer credits/exemptions</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade submission form</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade entered correctly on ROSI</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course extension form on file for SDFs</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual PhD supervisory committee report</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidacy complete for PhDs beyond year 3 (or 4)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register without payment form</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register without payment correctly entered on ROSI</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL INFORMATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal status</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name change</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item 11.2

SGS Graduate Education Council: Spring 2011 Election Report

See attached documents:

• GEC: Spring 2011 Election Report
There were fourteen positions on Graduate Education Council (GEC) open for election in the spring of 2011. A call for nominations was made in February. Balloting closed on April 1, 2011, with an extension to April 8 for students in Division II. Eleven positions were filled by acclamation. An election by secret ballot was held to decide the representatives in two constituencies: Student Member from Division II (Social Sciences), and Administrative Staff from any Graduate Unit. The Election Committee met on May 6, 2010 and determined the results.

Faculty Constituencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Nominations</th>
<th>Graduate Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2—Social Sciences</td>
<td>Sandy Welsh [acclaimed]</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 faculty vacancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Markus Bussmann [acclaimed]</td>
<td>Mechanical and Industrial Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 faculty vacancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Life Sciences</td>
<td>Donald Coles [acclaimed] Nick Collins [acclaimed]</td>
<td>Public Health Sciences Ecology and Evolutionary Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 faculty vacancies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Constituencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Nominations</th>
<th>Graduate Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—Humanities</td>
<td>Ramiro Ramas[acclaimed]*</td>
<td>Spanish and Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 vacancies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—Social Sciences</td>
<td>Michael Dick [elected]** Dylan Gordon [elected]*</td>
<td>Information Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 vacancies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Physical Sciences</td>
<td>Jan Niklas Caspers [acclaimed]**</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 vacancies)</td>
<td>[1 seat remains VACANT]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Life Sciences</td>
<td>Mohamed Soliman [acclaimed]*</td>
<td>Molecular Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 vacancies)</td>
<td>[1 seat remains VACANT]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Staff Constituencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Nominations</th>
<th>Graduate Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Units</td>
<td>Soobong Song [elected]**</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 vacancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Victoria Hurliehey [acclaimed]**</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 vacancy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms of office:
Faculty serve a three year, non-renewable term of office.
Students and administrative staff have the option of a one (*) or two (**) year term of office, to a maximum of three consecutive years.

Election Committee:
The Election Committee consisted of: Prof. Charlie Keil, GEC Faculty Div. I member, Mr. Bardia Bina, GEC Student Div. III member; Mr. Anil Purandaré, SGS Governance and Policy Coordinator; and Ms. Jane Alderdice, Secretary of GEC and Chief Returning Officer.

A total of 5,787 Division II student members were eligible to vote; 132 ballots were received, 8 of which were spoiled. A total of 257 administrative staff members from graduate units were eligible to vote; 47 ballots were received, of which none were spoiled.

A by-election will be held in fall 2011 to fill three vacant seats that remain vacant following this election: Division I Students (1 vacant seat), Division III Students (1 vacant seat) and Division IV Students (1 vacant seat).
ITEM 11.3

New SGS Awards Annual Report

See attached documents:
  • New Award Record Report
### New Award Record Report 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>New Award Name</th>
<th>Date Award Approved</th>
<th>Endowment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Awards</td>
<td>Andy Anderson Memorial Scholarship</td>
<td>23-Jun-10</td>
<td>$43,593.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSC</td>
<td>Sally and Paul Wang Graduate Scholarship in Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>15-Mar-11</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSC-CHE</td>
<td>Irving O. Shoichet Graduate Scholarship</td>
<td>1-Feb-11</td>
<td>Annual Donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCLA</td>
<td>Professor Jeffery A. Stinson Graduate Student Endowment Fund</td>
<td>15-Apr-10</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCLA</td>
<td>Professor George Baird Graduate Student Endowment Fund (GSEF)</td>
<td>29-Apr-10</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts&amp;Science</td>
<td>The Avenor Graduate Award</td>
<td>30-Jul-10</td>
<td>$81,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts&amp;Science</td>
<td>Donald K Aynsley Scholarship</td>
<td>30-Jul-10</td>
<td>$7,192.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts&amp;Science</td>
<td>George Becignuel Memorial Award</td>
<td>30-Jul-10</td>
<td>$6,343.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts&amp;Science</td>
<td>Robert Lantos Cinema Studies Scholarship</td>
<td>14-Jun-10</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENT</td>
<td>Jaro Sodek Memorial Award</td>
<td>24-Jan-11</td>
<td>$73,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>John and Barbara Vivash Scholarship in Piano Performance</td>
<td>26-Aug-10</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Clive and Sue Mortimer Opera Scholarship</td>
<td>18-May-10</td>
<td>Annual Donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Sheila Kirpalani Indian Music Scholarship</td>
<td>22-Sep-10</td>
<td>Annual Donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Audrey's Place Foundation Graduate Nursing Scholarships</td>
<td>26-Aug-10</td>
<td>$41,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISE/UT</td>
<td>Ruth Hayhoe Xu Meide Scholarship Fund (GSEF)</td>
<td>6-Apr-11</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISE/UT</td>
<td>Janet E. Waite Graduate Scholarship Fund (GSEF)</td>
<td>6-Apr-11</td>
<td>$110,446.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISE/UT</td>
<td>Michael Skolnik Graduate Student Award Fund (GSEF)</td>
<td>6-Apr-11</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISE/UT</td>
<td>Jack Quarter Prize in Social Economy</td>
<td>15-Mar-11</td>
<td>$50,345.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISE/UT</td>
<td>Muriel and Danny Fung Graduate Scholarship</td>
<td>7-Jun-10</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISE/UT</td>
<td>Azim Premji Foundation Fellowship</td>
<td>15-Apr-10</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTMAN</td>
<td>The Leacross Foundation Award for Women at the Rotman School of Management</td>
<td>26-Aug-10</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTMAN</td>
<td>Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR) Scholarships</td>
<td>15-Mar-11</td>
<td>Annual Donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTMAN</td>
<td>The John and Deborah Harris Family Foundation Award</td>
<td>15-Mar-11</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Gayle Gilchrist James Scholarship</td>
<td>8-Apr-10</td>
<td>$177,346.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Eva Eileen Macleod Scholarship</td>
<td>16-Dec-10</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Arthur Dalfen Scholarship</td>
<td>6-Oct-10</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Dorothy Shekter Scholarship</td>
<td>29-Nov-10</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>FIFSW ALUMNI SCHOLARSHIP</td>
<td>29-Nov-10</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Marion Soloway Scholarship in Social Work</td>
<td>31-Jan-11</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Scholarship/Grant</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Gene Dufty Odell Memorial Bursary Fund</td>
<td>15-Mar-11</td>
<td>$272,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTM/ERIN</td>
<td>Philip Leong Graduate Scholarship (MMPA)</td>
<td>30-Sep-10</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTSC-PHSSC</td>
<td>Brian Greenwood Graduate Scholarship in Environmental Science</td>
<td>28-Feb-11</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 11.4

Draft Principles for Governance Review of Minor Modifications

See attached documents:
  • Minor Modifications: Principles for governance review
Effective January 2011, graduate curriculum approval is the responsibility of the Faculties involved in graduate education across the University, following interim procedures. Proposed changes to graduate admission or program requirements or other curriculum changes that require governance approvals are categorized as Minor Modifications under the University of Toronto’s Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP). These changes receive final approval from Faculty Councils.

Through both its oversight role of graduate education and its responsibility for the graduate Calendar, SGS reviews and provides guidance on proposed minor modifications in advance of approvals.

Principles for governance review:

1. **Changes must be handled in accordance with quality assurance standards**
   The University operates on principles of transparency and accountability as articulated in the SGS Calendar, the provincial Quality Assurance Framework, and other University documents.

2. **Curriculum changes (minor modifications) must adhere to University and SGS regulations and policies**

3. **Changes must be clear, documented, and searchable**
   Students, faculty and university administrators must be able to easily trace clear changes to admission and program requirements.

4. **The SGS Calendar must reflect only approved curriculum**
   The Calendar is the contract between the student and the University. Students must complete requirements according to the Calendar in effect at the commencement of the student’s program.
FAQs:

1. Is a small proposed change to admission requirements a minor modification or merely editorial?
   Any change that affects admission requirements, including specific courses, substitution of courses, stated requirement deadlines, or other requirements would require governance approval. If the change means that some students would no longer be eligible or other students would now be eligible, then it is a minor modification. If a proposed change involves clarifying language only, then governance action would not be required.

2. Does the change affect a student’s selection of courses and other academic activities as part of fulfilling the program requirements?
   Any changes that might affect an applicant’s eligibility for admission, whether easing or tightening/raising requirements, would require approval, e.g., changing a grade requirement that is above the SGS minimum, additional requirements such as statements of interest, an additional reference letter (SGS requires 2), language requirements, background in u/g program including number of required courses, etc. Substitutions of one requirement for another, eg. creating a course in place of a seminar requirement, or substituting one course for another, would require approval, partly to get the approval on the record, but also to ensure that full consideration is given to impact of the change on various cohorts of students.

3. Will the modification affect a student’s eligibility for graduation at degree audit time?
   Any change that means a student has to select something different to complete their program would require approval. Students must complete the program that is in the Calendar program entry at time of admission or be subject to approved exception, either for a whole class or individually. Completed program requirements are assessed against the Calendar at time of first registration. In some cases, a change may ease program requirements and be effective immediately, thus affecting a cohort of students whose new requirements may not be reflected in the Calendar of first registration.

4. Does an admission or program requirement change that appears to be non-controversial and perhaps even trivial still require governance approval?
   If the change will affect students, it is advisable to secure governance approval – this ensures that it is on the record and traceable in future.

5. Do deadlines for particular requirements need to be included in the program requirements section?
   Language should reflect clear deadlines that are required for a student to remain in Good Academic Standing. Changes to these deadlines require governance approval.
ITEM 11.5

Collaborative Program Guidelines, Revised

See attached document:

- Graduate Collaborative Program Guidelines
GRADUATE COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Revised April 2011

1. Definition of a collaborative program

The Quality Assurance Framework for Ontario provides a definition of Collaborative Programs:

A collaborative program is an intra-university graduate program that provides an additional multidisciplinary experience for students enrolled in and completing the degree requirements for one of a number of approved programs. Students meet the admission requirements of and register in the participating (or “home”) program but complete, in addition to the degree requirements of that program, the additional requirements specified by the collaborative program. The degree conferred is that of the home program, and the completion of the collaborative program is indicated by a transcript notation indicating the additional specialization that has been attained (e.g., “MA in Political Science with specialization in American Studies”). Proposals for new Collaborative programs will follow the Protocol for Expedited Approvals and thereafter will require cyclical review.

2. Administrative Oversight

Proposals for new collaborative programs require both University of Toronto approval and the approval of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the “Quality Council”). The approvals process is expedited for new collaborative program proposals. This means in particular that collaborative program proposals do not require external appraisal. See Proposal for a New Collaborative Program section below.

Each collaborative program is aligned with a “lead” Faculty, that is, a Faculty responsible for coordinating and overseeing the governance-related issues for each program. Each collaborative program is identified with an SGS division for administrative purposes.

Each Collaborative Program has a Director, appointed by the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Vice-Provost, Graduate Education (SGS D&VPGE). See Administration of a Collaborative Program section below.

Periodic reviews of existing Collaborative Programs are commissioned by the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, or the Vice-Provost’s delegate. While there is an established schedule, the lead Faculty or
the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, may suggest a review of an existing collaborative program at any time. See Review of a Collaborative Program section below.

3. Proposal for a New Collaborative Program

Members of graduate units interested in developing a new Collaborative Program are encouraged to bring ideas forward to the Faculty Graduate Office associated with their graduate unit at an early stage for discussion. (The “lead” Faculty will be determined in consultation between the Faculty Graduate Office and the School of Graduate Studies.) Once the kernel of the idea has been fleshed out, the Faculty Graduate Office will contact the Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs; the Director, Academic Programs and Policy, coordinates the development of new programs under the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP) [insert link].

The Office of the Vice-Provost, Academic Programs, will host a consultation meeting for all those involved in the initiative which is intended to provide an opportunity for support and advice at an early, productive stage concerning curriculum, resources, and related issues, including UTQAP requirements and required approvals. Appropriate templates and guidance on how to complete them will be provided by the Provost’s Office. SGS will provide advice on the design and development of graduate programs and is involved in the review of draft proposals. After approval by the appropriate Deans’ Offices and full consultation with the Provost’s Office, including SGS review, a proposal for a new collaborative program, which will include a memorandum of agreement between the participating programs, is ready to move forward through the quality assurance and governance processes.

4. Quality Indicators for Collaborative Programs

Collaborative programs offer a multidisciplinary experience to students who are already enrolled in a graduate degree program. Topic areas for collaborative programs are often on the cutting edge of new thinking and research in an area.

All proposals for new Collaborative Programs and existing Collaborative Programs coming forward for review should provide clear and well-articulated information concerning the following:

4.1 Objectives and added value
- Academic objectives of the program / academic focus
- The added value for students of participating in the Collaborative Program and how that value is provided (e.g. course requirements, multidisciplinary focus, exposure to other viewpoints, topics of thesis research, etc.)
• The relationship of the collaborative program topic area to the participating degree programs.

4.2 Demand and enrolment
• Demand for the program
  Note: Normally the program should be able to demonstrate at least one new student in each participating program every few years.
• How enrolment levels provide an adequate intellectual environment for students
• Whether the new Collaborative Program will attract new enrolments or primarily draw on students already entering the home (participating) programs.

4.3 Core faculty
• Evidence that there is at least one Graduate Faculty member from each participating graduate unit who is conducting research in the area of the collaborative program.

4.4 Admission and program requirements
• Program description and complete admission and program requirements for the Collaborative Program, including core course, seminar requirements, etc. and state clearly whether the requirements are in addition to the participating program requirements
  Note: Each collaborative program normally should have as a minimum requirement, a core course (.5 or 1.0 FCE) to be taken by all students. The home unit determines whether the core course will be credited towards the student’s home program requirements and this understanding is reflected in the MOA. The core course provides graduate-level teaching directly in the subject area of the collaborative program. Normally there is a core course requirement at each level of the collaborative program, i.e., master’s and doctoral.
• A detailed description of how the requirements for the Collaborative Program can be accommodated within the requirements for each participating program
• If individual students are allowed to complete the Collaborative Program at both the Master’s and PhD levels, an explanation of how each program is distinctive.

4.5 Common learning experience
• A description of the common learning experience or intellectual activity that is required at each level, i.e., master’s and doctoral, of a collaborative program.
  Note: This is especially important to consider in those few collaborative programs in which there is no core course. (Nevertheless, a core course is strongly recommended.) Seminars also provide a common learning experience in many programs.

4.6 Need and uniqueness of program
• Information concerning any similar programs offered in Ontario, in Canada, or elsewhere with examples
• How the program at the University of Toronto is different from and/or the same as others.

4.7 Resources and memorandum of agreement
• Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), including:
  o the responsibilities of each participating program and unit and supporting units, if any, and
  o costs associated with the program and the way these will be shared or otherwise covered, including advertising, core course delivery, space, administrative support, etc.

4.8 Administration
• The adequacy and appropriateness of the administration of the Collaborative Program addressing any necessary arrangements in the MOA, as necessary, to ensure smooth program delivery.

5. Administration of a Collaborative Program

The operation of the program is the responsibility of the Program Director and the Program Committee. They work in cooperation with the collaborating departments and the participating programs. Each collaborative program is governed by a memorandum of agreement. The Director is appointed by the SGS D&VPGE on the recommendation of the Program Committee; nevertheless, the Director works with the Vice-Dean, Graduate Affairs, of the lead Faculty on governance matters, course proposals or admission/program requirement changes, for example.

5.1 Program Committee
Each collaborative program has a Program Committee. The Program Committee usually is composed of a faculty representative from each participating graduate unit; in the case of large numbers of participating units, an agreed-upon method of rotating program representation is included in a MOA. It is the responsibility of the Program Committee to initiate and recommend the appointment of a Collaborative Program Director; this normally occurs in the final year of the Director’s appointment. Duties of the Program Committee are outlined in the MOA.

5.2 Director
Each collaborative program has a Director. The Program Committee recommends a Graduate Faculty Member as the Director of the Collaborative Program to the SGS D&VPGE, after consultation with chairs/directors of participating graduate units and in consultation with the current collaborative program director, if any. The SGS D&VPGE approves the appointment of the Director of a collaborative program, after consulting with the individual’s home unit
chair/director. The Director’s term is normally is five years. The duties of a collaborative program director are as follows:

a) Chairs the Program Committee, and ensures that the Program Committee has appropriate representation, according to the Memorandum of Agreement
b) Maintains appropriate content of program entry in the SGS Calendar, the website, and any other promotional material
c) Administers the collaborative program including applications, admissions, record-keeping, and budget, if any
d) Approves individual admissions to the collaborative program, and ensures that students are formally enrolled in the collaborative program as soon as possible
e) Approves individual student programs in conformity with the standards of the collaborative program and ensures that students registered in the program have supervisory arrangements in accordance with the program’s requirements; monitors the progress of students in the program; ensures that appropriate academic advising is available to students in the program
f) Ensures that a collaborative program core faculty member is a member of each student’s thesis examination committee, in cases where a thesis is required
g) Certifies completion of program requirements for each student enrolled in the program
h) Ensures that students, who complete the requirements of a collaborative program, receive the following notation on the graduate transcripts: “Completed [session date] - Collaborative Program [degree short-form] in [name of program]”
i) Submits for approval to Faculty Graduate Affairs Office recommendations for changes to core course/s or the program and its requirements, or related academic matters
j) Maintains communication with the heads of participating graduate units regarding activities and evaluation of the collaborative program
k) Provides reports to the Faculty Graduate Affairs Office and/or SGS on the program’s activities, including registration and graduation figures, as required and/or requested
l) Ensures that the Memorandum of Agreement is followed and kept up-to-date, including:
   - Monitors changes to admission and/or program requirements in participating programs that might affect Collaborative Program requirements
   - Recommends additions/deletions of participating programs to Collaborative Program, ensuring continuity of program for students already registered
   - Provides lead Faculty Graduate Affairs Office with up-dated Memorandum of Agreement or Addenda when changes are made.

Some of these responsibilities may be performed in consultation with, or delegated to, the Program Committee or others according to the Memorandum of Agreement.
6. **Program closure**

Collaborative programs continue when there is demonstrated sufficient demand for the program, adequate enrolment, successful outcomes, adequate resources, and with a favourable review report. Divisional and University level governance approval is required to close a collaborative program. If a program closes, budget contributions, as applicable, revert to the Faculty or Faculties from which they came.

7. **Adding New Graduate Programs to an Existing Collaborative Program/Removing Programs from Participation in an Existing Collaborative Program**

The Program Director may recommend to the Vice-Dean, Graduate Studies, of the lead Faculty the addition of a new graduate program to an existing collaborative program as a minor modification. The process is explained on the SGS website. Minimal information is requested, and an Addendum to the existing MOA is created. Approval of the lead Faculty Dean or designate is required.

A similar process is followed for removing programs from participating in an existing collaborative program.

8. **Review of an Existing Collaborative Program**

The Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, is the Commissioning Officer for reviews of graduate collaborative programs. Reviews are conducted on a cyclical basis according to a schedule established by the Commissioning Officer, and according to established review protocols under the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP). In some cases, the Commissioning Officer may delegate the responsibility to a Faculty Dean when there is agreement that it is desirable to “bundle” the collaborative program review with the review of a unit or another program.

**Review Procedures:** Contact the office of the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education.