November 9, 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 (GEC) meeting on Tuesday, November 15, 2011, in the Council Chamber of the Galbraith Building (Room 202, 35 St. George Street). Please note that this meeting is scheduled to end at 5:00 p.m. Let me take this opportunity to welcome new and returning members to the first meeting of this academic year. I would like to remind you that there is a webpage on the SGS website that is devoted to GEC business. There you will find general information about the Council, links to important information and documents for members, information about Standing Committees of the Council, and contact information (http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/governance/gec). The Dean and I look forward to seeing you on November 15th.

If you have any questions or comments about the attached agenda, or wish to send regrets, contact Mr. Anil Purandaré, 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.

[ORIGINAL SIGNED BY JANE ALDERDICE]
AGENDA
Graduate Education Council

Tuesday, November 15, 2011
3:10 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. (note end time)
The Council Chamber, Galbraith Building
Room 202, 35 St. George Street

Refreshments will be served

Regrets only to Anil Purandaré, SGS Governance Officer: 416-946-3427 or anil.purandare@sgs.utoronto.ca

1 Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of April 19, 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 Regulation Change: Composition of Examination Committee, Doctoral Final Oral Examination
   (documentation attached)

7 New Hood: Global Professional Master of Laws (GPLLM) (documentation attached)

8 For Discussion:
   8.1 Graduate Grading Practices Policy (documentation attached)
   8.2 Doctoral Completion Award (no documentation)

9 Other Business

10 For Information:
   10.1 External Awards Success Rate Report (documentation to be distributed)
   10.2 Fall 2011 GEC By-Election Report (documentation attached)
   10.3 Academic Integrity Annual Report 2010-11 (documentation attached)
   10.4 Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) Annual Report 2010-11
      (documentation attached)
The Dean called the meeting to order and welcomed all members and visitors. Members were informed that this was likely the last meeting of the year, but were also asked to hold the date of May 17, 2011 for a meeting in case of urgent business arising. Everyone was invited to remain after the meeting for a reception to celebrate the work done this year.

The Dean introduced and welcomed the new SGS Governance and Policy Officer, Emma Thacker. There is now a full staff complement in the reformed Governance and Policy area of SGS.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the Graduate Education Council meeting of April 19, 2011 will adjourn no later than 5:00 p.m.

The motion was CARRIED.

Approval of the Agenda of the Graduate Education Meeting of April 19, 2011

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the agenda of the Graduate Education Council meeting of April 19, 2011 be approved.

The motion was CARRIED.

1 Minutes of the Graduate Education Council Meeting of February 15, 2011

The minutes of the February 15, 2011 meeting were distributed with the agenda.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT the minutes of the Graduate Education Council meeting of February 15, 2011 be approved.

Seeing no discussion, the Dean called the question

The motion was CARRIED.

2 Business Arising from the Minutes

The Dean noted that SGS and the Graduate Education Council (GEC) are starting to experience the effects of changes to governance and new program proposals. There are no longer any GEC-approved items moving through governance elsewhere, and so there is nothing to report.
3 Dean’s Remarks

3.1 Quality Assurance Update and New Governance Processes
The Dean reported that after two years of consideration, the University has an approved quality assurance plan, the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP). GEC no longer approves new programs and major or minor modifications of curriculum under this process. New proposals are beginning to go through the new system and program reviews will also proceed under the new process. SGS continues to review all curriculum proposals.

3.2 Policies on Grading, Transcripts and Disruptions
A revised and unified graduate and undergraduate grading practices policy is in development within the University. It is being developed in parallel with revised policies on disruptions and on transcripts. An update will be provided in the fall.

3.3 Recent Decanal Memoranda
All SGS numbered memoranda are available on the SGS website. For reference, the following decanal memoranda were published since the last GEC meeting:
• Offers of Admission to Students Conditional upon Scholarship Support (March 1, 2011).
• Permission for SGS Division I (Humanities) Thesis Written in a Language Other than English or French (March 1, 2011).
• Changes to Regulations on Candidacy (March 8, 2011). This memo advertises changes approved at GEC on February 15, 2011.
• Changes to Regulations on Lapsing (March 8, 2011). This memo also advertises changes approved at GEC on February 15, 2011.
• Ontario Trillium Scholarship Program for International PhD Students (March 9, 2011).

3.4 Joint Degree Programs and “Cotutelles”
Arrangements for these continue to be fine-tuned. It should be possible to sign the first agreements for such joint programs late this spring. They do not require the same kind of governance approvals as other new programs, as they are simply working with existing programs at two different universities.

3.5 Graduate Briefing Session
The Graduate Briefing Session was held on March 8, 2011. Information presented at the session is available on SGS website.

4 Report of the Vice-Dean, Programs
Vice-Dean Elizabeth Smyth reported that SGS has been developing templates for joint degrees along with International Affairs and Student Services. They will be brought forward here in future.

The Collaborative Program Workshop was held on April 13, 2011. Over 50 people attended. There is an information item at the end of the agenda for the Collaborative Program Guidelines. The guidelines use the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) definition for a collaborative program (CP). New CPs do not require external appraisals; the process that is being established sees each CP having a lead Faculty, as always. Periodic reviews are commissioned by the Vice-Provost, Graduate Education, or delegate and in some circumstances those reviews may be bundled with reviews of other units. Criteria for reviews take quality indicators which are a combination of the indicators in the QAF and our own guidelines. Highlights of the revised review guidelines include:
• Demand for the program (section 4.2 in the guidelines): it used to be the case that CPs had to demonstrate a minimum of five students each year overall. In previous discussions, and at the CP workshop, it was noted that for some CPs, capacity would be significantly stressed if that actually took place. On other hand, there may be some years when no students opt for CP enrolment. So the revised guidelines use more flexible language.

• Reinforcing that reviews of CPs are an opportunity to review the MOA (section 4.7).

• Section 5 does not change the structure of CPs but revises wording to draw focus on the fact that CPs have a Program Committee which recommends a Director for appointment by the Dean of SGS, and that the Director must be a Graduate Faculty Member. The term of the Director is normally five years; it used to be three, which was residual from a CP having a review after its first three years; five years now makes more sense. It also clarifies that the role of the Director includes ensuring that there is student representation on the Program Committee, updating content in the Calendar entry for the CP and insuring that transcript notations are given to students who complete the CP requirements.

• Section 8 is new, and discusses CP reviews; these will occur on a cyclical basis; no external appraisers will be needed. Efforts are being made to simplify and streamline the process.

In response to a member’s question, the Vice-Dean affirmed that Directors’ terms are renewable, and that this will be made more explicit in the final version of the guidelines.

A member asked if it is a new requirement that the CP supervisory committee must include the student’s home program supervisor; the Vice-Dean replied that this is not a new requirement.

Another member asked whether sufficient demand would be demonstrated if only one student entered a CP every few years. The Vice-Dean replied that demand is one of the core indicators that the Program Committee would be asked to consider. As a field of study evolves, a CP might no longer be the best way to provide appropriate learning outcomes. Some CPs might have so many participating programs that even one student entering every year from each could over stress the CP. The Dean added that these are guidelines only, and that SGS is aware that some CPs are very small but provide good value at virtually no cost. The Vice-Dean noted that the Program Committee will have an opportunity during program reviews to say whether resources are being allocated in the best way for students to derive value from the CP; she invited further suggestions or clarifications after the meeting.

5 Report of the Vice-Dean, Students
There was no report.

6 Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB): Terms of Reference Revisions
By-law revisions have been discussed within SGS and have been reviewed by the chairs of GAAB, the Provost’s Office and the Office of the Governing Council. GEC approval is final. The Dean called on Vice-Dean Berry Smith to present the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the proposal 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.

A member asked whether the jurisdiction is restricted to PhD or all doctoral degrees. The Dean replied that the intent is to cover all doctoral degrees, including non-PhD (e.g. professional) doctoral degrees.
Another member asked for a summary of the substantive changes; Jane Alderdice, SGS Director of Quality Assessment and Governance, replied that the responsibility for administering graduate academic appeals falls within her office; Anil Purandaré is the Secretary to GAAB. The main substantive change is around timelines for appeals. At the moment, GAAB has eight weeks to deliver a decision from the time a student files an appeal; this has not proven feasible. The revision provides a more realistic deadline, and clarifies that the time to the deadline begins when the student files a complete package of materials accompanying the notice of appeal. The rest of the changes are proposed in order to clean up the language and provide more clarity.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

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

The Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) is a standing committee of GEC. GEC appoints all members of GAAB. Members were directed to see the motion sheet for more details. GEC approval is final. The Dean called on Vice-Dean Smith to present the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

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: Paul Thompson, Division I (new)
(three-year term) 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: Jason Grenier, Division III (renewed)
(one-year term) Behnam Nowrouzi-Kia, Division IV (renewed)
                   Kimberley Radmacher, Division I (renewed)

A member asked whether GEC was approving five-year terms for the renewing members. Ms. Alderdice clarified that according to the terms of reference of GAAB, new appointee terms for Chairs and Alternate Chairs are five years; once those terms are up, they can be renewed for one year each year.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.
8  Appointment of Hearing Officer for Code of Student Conduct

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. GEC approval is final. The Dean called on Vice-Dean Smith to present the motion.

MOTION (duly moved and seconded)

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.

The Dean noted that this was not a high activity area. A member asked whether Professor Phillips’s candidacy had been solicited and/or how the Hearing Officer was chosen. The Dean replied that someone with legal knowledge was sought; there is a pool of experienced people at the University to draw from. Professor Phillips is part of this pool, as he has experience as a Hearing Officer in another area of the University. The Vice-Dean further explained that the Code of Student Conduct is different the the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. The Code of Student Conduct involves a two-step process, starting with an investigation; only when a matter is not resolved at that level does it proceed to hearing. He added that it is quite rare at the graduate level for cases to proceed to hearing as they can and usually are resolved at the earlier investigative step.

Seeing no further discussion, the Dean called the question.

The motion was CARRIED.

9  Canadian Graduate and Professional Student Survey (CGPSS) Presentation

The Dean reminded members that it had been announced at the last meeting that the data from the last survey has been collected. SGS has received real enthusiasm from various offices in the University to learn more about the survey; therefore, Dr. Helen Chang, the SGS Graduate Education Research Officer, is presenting information to GEC today. Members received two versions of the slides: the one made available today corresponds with Dr. Chang’s presentation; a slightly altered and expanded one was distributed earlier with the agenda.

Dr. Chang explained that students who registered in fall 2009 were invited to participate in this survey; the respondents numbered 4,815. There were two versions of the survey, the regular one for doctoral-stream students, and a new, alternative version for those in professional programs.

A member commented that the results represented an amazing data set; it seems one could correlate the answers to find suggestions on how programs could be improved in the future. Dr. Chang responded that student-level data is available, but analysis has not been done at that level.

Another member asked whether it was possible to tell from the survey how the University fared in comparison to the best and worst of the “G13” (thirteen other graduate schools in Canada which participate in datasharing). Dr. Chang replied that there might be some difficulties in identifying comparison data due to protocols, but it might be possible to compare the top and bottom five institutions.

A member asked whether data is anonymous within the G13 dataset. In response, Dr. Chang said that data is available at the discipline level. She further clarified that the G13 data includes U of T on some slides (those that show all the G13), but does not on others (those that include “peers”).

Another member remarked that the University consistently appears to do relatively poorly on student life issues, and asked whether the data could provide insight on these. Dr. Chang explained that the granularity of the data is not that fine. The focus of the quantitative data (the only thing analysed so
far) is on academics. It is possible that some information on student life can be gleaned from the qualitative data, which has not been analysed yet.

A member said that the survey’s number of respondents seems low and asked whether it is appropriate to develop policy from it given the self-selection of respondents, and if it might be possible to make it mandatory in some way. Dr. Chang replied that the response rate has historically been around 36%. The Dean noted that this level of response is extraordinarily high in comparison to, say, student elections. The response is not ideal, but much information and many reminders were sent to students. This is a challenge faced by all surveys; given that the University’s participation rates are on par with those in other institutions, it is at least possible to use the data for comparisons. Another member noted that 30% is considered a pretty good response rate for surveys, and that this is higher than the response to alumni surveys.

A member remarked that some of the data indicates improvements between 2005 and 2007, but deterioration in 2010. Dr. Chang responded that the report shows the trend in the data over three years; the member further wondered if any policy recommendations might emerge from this. The Dean replied that, as with the earlier comments about correlating the answers to find trends, a University–wide discussion is needed. SGS does not have a mandate to tell divisions or units how to improve, but SGS would welcome a discussion about what can be made of the data; the advice of members on how to pursue this discussion is welcome. Another member asked whether it is possible for SGS to provide Faculties with line-by-line data for their students. Dr. Chang replied that this has never been done before; the Dean added that students are guaranteed anonymity. The member added that no names or other personal identifiers are desired, only the rest of the data. Another member noted that, in an ideal world, people would not feel threatened with sharing this kind of data, and that the point is not to form comparisons but to look at performance within the University. It would be wonderful for units to learn things from other units, but this may not be possible given the constraints on what data can be shared with whom. The Dean noted that it is not the intent of SGS to use this data to rank units.

A member asked what further analysis or follow-up can be expected. Dr. Chang responded that this depends on the time available. Analysis at the unit level is not something that has been done in the past. The data has been provided, but not compared. It might be a good thing to mine the qualitative data, but this is a huge job.

In response to a question from a member, Dr. Chang noted that a substantial number of students provided qualitative data, and that sharing it with units raises the same questions as had been raised in the previous discussion about sharing the quantitative data. Ms. Alderdice added that qualitative data was provided in the past but dealing with it is labour-intensive as every comment has to be reviewed to ensure anonymity.

The Dean thanked Dr. Chang and expressed his desire to continue having the survey results brought before GEC in future years.

10 Other Business

A member noted that the Doctoral Completion Award (DCA) still seems to be facing challenges and requested information. The Dean replied that SGS is in the process of implementing the award for the coming year. A committee chaired by the Vice-Dean, Students, has looked at the distribution and adjudication of awards and come up with principles and guidelines, application procedures, and more detailed allocations for the award for the coming year. Krista Steeves, SGS Assistant Director of Student Services, added that applications are due on April 27, 2011 from graduate units, and that these should be adjudicated in late May. The Dean further commented that the DCA remains a work in progress, but that he has confidence that transparency and clarity concerns have been addressed. The committee has spent considerable time directly on these issues. That will not address the fundamental concerns of people
A member said that the survey’s number of respondents seems low and asked whether it is appropriate to develop policy from it given the self-selection of respondents, and if it might be possible to make it mandatory in some way. Dr. Chang replied that the response rate has historically been around 36%. The Dean noted that this level of response is extraordinarily high in comparison to, say, student elections. The response is not ideal, but much information and many reminders were sent to students. This is a challenge faced by all surveys; given that the University’s participation rates are on par with those in other institutions, it is at least possible to use the data for comparisons. Another member noted that 30% is considered a pretty good response rate for surveys, and that this is higher than the response to alumni surveys.

A member remarked that some of the data indicates improvements between 2005 and 2007, but deterioration in 2010. Dr. Chang responded that the report shows the trend in the data over three years; the member further wondered if any policy recommendations might emerge from this. The Dean replied that, as with the earlier comments about correlating the answers to find trends, a University-wide discussion is needed. SGS does not have a mandate to tell divisions or units how to improve, but SGS would welcome a discussion about what can be made of the data; the advice of members on how to pursue this discussion is welcome. Another member asked whether it is possible for SGS to provide Faculties with line-by-line data for their students. Dr. Chang replied that this has never been done before; the Dean added that students are guaranteed anonymity. The member added that no names or other personal identifiers are desired, only the rest of the data. Another member noted that, in an ideal world, people would not feel threatened with sharing this kind of data, and that the point is not to form comparisons but to look at performance within the University. It would be wonderful for units to learn things from other units, but this may not be possible given the constraints on what data can be shared with whom. The Dean noted that it is not the intent of SGS to use this data to rank units.

A member asked what further analysis or follow-up can be expected. Dr. Chang responded that this depends on the time available. Analysis is currently done at the unit level, but a comparison between units is not something that has been done in the past. The data has been provided, but not compared. It might be a good thing to mine the qualitative data, but this is a huge job.

In response to a question from a member, Dr. Chang noted that a substantial number of students provided qualitative data, and that sharing it with units raises the same questions as had been raised in the previous discussion about sharing the quantitative data. Ms. Alderdice added that qualitative data was provided in the past but dealing with it is labour-intensive as every comment has to be reviewed to ensure anonymity.

The Dean thanked Dr. Chang and expressed his desire to continue having the survey results brought before GEC in future years.

10 Other Business

A member noted that the Doctoral Completion Award (DCA) still seems to be facing challenges and requested information. The Dean replied that SGS is in the process of implementing the award for the coming year. A committee chaired by the Vice-Dean, Students, has looked at the distribution and adjudication of awards and come up with principles and guidelines, application procedures, and more detailed allocations for the award for the coming year. Krista Steeves, SGS Assistant Director of Student Services, added that applications are due on April 27, 2011 from graduate units, and that these should be adjudicated in late May. The Dean further commented that the DCA remains a work in progress, but that he has confidence that transparency and clarity concerns have been addressed. The committee has spent considerable time directly on these issues. That will not address the fundamental concerns of people
who disagree with this change overall; that is a different issue, not under SGS control, and not one which
we are prepared to revisit until we have had more time to study the effect of this change.

A member returned to the question of a mandatory survey, but in particular one that might be
conducted when people are exiting their programs. Dr. Chang replied that there used to be a Survey of
Earned Doctorates, but it was ended in 2004 for financial reasons. The Dean noted that, in addition to
the question of cost, there is also the question of over-surveying. Nevertheless, suggestions on ways to
increase feedback participation are welcome. Another member suggested that increasing the number of
surveys risks decreasing the quality of the survey results. A member replied that an exit survey might be
more likely to get results from satisfied people. The Dean noted that there has been interest expressed
about finding out what makes unhappy students unhappy, and seeking results from happy students might
not be consistent with this. A member noted that his unit does an exit interview with all their students,
whether they graduate or not. Another member remarked that there must surely be expertise within the
University in conducting surveys. The Dean replied that such expertise exists at SGS, mostly within Dr.
Chang’s office, and elsewhere in the University. He thanked the members for their suggestions and
welcomed additional thoughts after the meeting.

11 For Information:

All documents were distributed with the agenda except for the revised Collaborative Program
Guidelines for item 11.5.

11.1 SGS Student Services Annual Audit of Graduate Units: Report

A member noted that the report says in one section that grades were entered incorrectly 17% of
the time, and asked how things can go wrong. Ms. Steeves replied that the data also captures grades
entered after the deadline, and not merely incorrect grades; this will be clarified in future reports.

Another member remarked that the report does not make it clear regarding supervisory meetings,
whether the issue is a lack of meetings or a lack of those meetings being recorded in ROSI; he added that
entering this data in ROSI is considered a very onerous task and not one that is highly valued; it is
probable that people track this on their own systems rather than ROSI. The Dean replied that SGS is
charged with pushing graduate units to enter this information in ROSI. Ms. Steeves added that SGS will
be doing some training with units around this in the fall, including sharing information from units that
are routinely entering this information in ROSI. The Vice-Dean, Students, added that every year he
encounters a handful of students who, when asked, report that they have not had a supervisory
committee meeting in over two years. He added that this is purely anecdotal and perhaps represent
extreme cases, but they still represent instances of this happening. A member asked what the
consequences are if SGS detects that meetings are not happening in a unit. The Dean replied that this
would be reported to the unit; SGS is not in a position to force these meetings to happen. He added that
there is general agreement on the principle of having these meetings annually; however, there is a gap
between principle and practice. A member noted that in his unit, a letter is generated if there is no
meeting during the year, and if the meeting still does not happen, the student is not registered in the fall;
however, when things are busy, the process may not be properly followed through. Another member
stated that about 90% of students have these meetings in his unit; he reported dealing with people at
another institution who were extremely impressed when they learned about this system. Yet another
member expressed surprise that this information was being tracked in ROSI at all, and asked whether it
might not be helpful to provide this information to students. Rodney Branch, the SGS Director of
Information Systems, explained that at the moment, the ROSI module exists largely for administrative
tracking. There is a desire among many to allow supervisors and students to record meetings on the
system.
11.2 SGS Graduate Education Council: Spring 2011 Election Report
Per the report, only three vacant seats remain (one each for students from Divisions I, III, and IV); there will be a by-election in fall to fill these vacancies.

11.3 New SGS Awards Annual Report
There were no questions or comments.

11.4 Draft Principles for Governance Review of Minor Modifications
The Vice-Dean, Programs, explained that SGS is developing this document to try and help Faculties and graduate units with the new governance process, not aggravate them. It outlines the principles used by Faculty Graduate Office and SGS to review curriculum proposals; the principles help graduate units distinguish between editorial versus substantial changes requiring governance approval. SGS hopes these assist the work of graduate administrators in particular.

11.5 Collaborative Program Guidelines, revised
The revised guidelines were e-mailed to members in advance of the meeting and paper copies were available at the start of the meeting. See Report of the Vice-Dean, Programs, item 4 above.

11.6 Adjournment
The Dean thanked everyone for the good work done this year, and especially thanked those whose terms are ending in June. Everyone was invited to stay and enjoy the reception.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

[ORIGINAL SIGNED BY JANE ALDERDICE]  
Jane Alderdice, Secretary  
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UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
Record of Attendance
GRADUATE EDUCATION COUNCIL
April 19, 2011

Present (Voting & Non-voting Members)

Corman, Brian (Chair)
Baker, Robert
Bayat Movahed, Hanif
Bina, Bardia
Bondy, Susan
Campbell, Malcolm
Capotoroto, Arianna
Damaren, Chris
Daniere, Amrita
De Nil, Luc
Gaitana, Gianina
Joseph, Jenny
Julian, Stephen
Keil, Charlie
Mount, Howard
O’Hogan, Cillian
Orwin, Donna
Papangelakis, Vladimiros
Piccardo, Enrica
Sheikh, Shamim
Smith, Berry
Smyth, Elizabeth
Stiles, David
Tsao, Eugenia
Williams, Charmaine
Williams, David
Yip, Christopher

In Attendance (Guests & SGS Staff)

Branch, Rodney
Chang, Helen
Steeves, Krista

Absent

Crapo, Adleen
Keith, Alison
Knight, Keith
Labrie, Normand
MacKay, Gillian
Tannock, Rosemary

Alderdice, Jane (Secretary to Council)
Purandaré, Anil (Assistant to Secretary)
MOTION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, November 15, 2011

ITEM 6 Regulation Change: Composition of Examination Committee, Doctoral Final Oral Examination

Proposal to change the following regulation:

General Regulations, Graduate Student Supervision: Doctoral Final Oral Examination

School of Graduate Studies

MOTION
THAT Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the School of Graduate Studies to change the Doctoral Final Oral Examination section of the SGS General Regulations (SGS Calendar 2011-12, clause 9.3.4) as follows:

• Increase the required number of voting members of the examination committee who have not been closely involved in the supervision of the thesis from at least one to at least two.

• The change is effective 1 July 2012.

See attached documents:
• Calendar entry

Prior Approvals and Discussion

The proposed change does not affect any of the following:

• The number of voting members of the examination committee (four to six members).
• The committee’s quorum (four voting members). SGS recommends that graduate units include at least five voting members to ensure the exam proceeds as scheduled.
• The number of members who have served on the supervisory committee (one to three members).

This change reflects current practice in many graduate units, ensuring that the examination committee has at least two members who are at arm’s length from the thesis.

Further Governance

GEC approval is final.
General Regulations

Graduate Student Supervision

9.3 Doctoral Final Oral Examination

All doctoral students must defend a thesis at a final oral examination organized by the graduate unit with the cooperation of the School of Graduate Studies (SGS), as follows:

1. The candidate shall defend the thesis at a final oral examination organized by the graduate unit with the cooperation of SGS. The process of scheduling the examination, allowing time for professional appraisal, can be expected to take at least eight weeks at the best of times, and candidates should discuss the timing with the graduate administration of their unit. Candidates should also ascertain whether their unit imposes regulations over and above the minimal conditions required by SGS.

2. The graduate unit will notify SGS eight weeks prior to the examination when the thesis is ready to go forward for examination. In the absence of any particular local procedure, the candidate's supervising committee will advise SGS that the thesis is ready to proceed. In rare cases, a thesis may proceed to examination without the approval of the supervising committee; candidates who wish to proceed without such approval should contact the SGS Vice-Dean, Programs.

3. The thesis will be sent to an appraiser external to the University of Toronto, appointed by SGS on the recommendation of the graduate unit. (The supervisor of the thesis will propose a list of three or more names of possible external appraisers to the Graduate Coordinator or Chair, who will choose one and send the recommendation to SGS for approval. The graduate unit will certify that the external appraiser has an arm's-length relationship to the candidate and supervisor.) The external appraiser should be a recognized expert on the subject of the thesis and should be external to the university as well as to its affiliated teaching hospitals and research institutes. Such an individual must be an associate or full professor at the home institution or, if the individual comes from outside the academic sector, must possess the qualifications to be appointed to an academic position at this level. Arrangements with external appraisers are the responsibility of the graduate unit. In particular, the graduate unit must allow the external appraiser sufficient time to act. The graduate unit must have a copy of the thesis delivered to the appraiser at least six weeks, and preferably longer, in advance of the examination date. Appraisals must be submitted to SGS at least two weeks in advance of the examination date; if they are not, the examination may have to be rescheduled. The graduate unit must also ensure that copies of the thesis are made available to all other voting members of the examination committee at least four weeks in advance of the examination date.

4. An examination committee, appointed by SGS on the recommendation of the graduate unit, will conduct the final oral examination. The examination committee must include at least four, but no more than six, voting members: one to three of the voting members will have served on the candidate's supervisory committee, and at least two voting members will not have been closely involved in the supervision of the thesis. Eligible for inclusion in the latter group are the external appraiser (in person or by audio connection), members of the graduate faculty of the candidate's graduate unit, and members of the graduate faculty of other departments, centres, or institutes of the university. The examination committee may include, in addition, up to two non-voting members, who will be members of the graduate faculty of the candidate's graduate unit or members of the graduate faculty of another graduate unit of the university. A quorum is four voting members. Graduate units must ascertain in advance the willingness of the persons named to act.

The SGS Vice-Dean, Programs, may modify the composition of the examination committee to fit exceptional circumstances.

5. SGS will appoint a non-voting chair to the examination committee. The chair will be a full member or member emeritus of the graduate
faculty, holding no appointment to the graduate faculty of the candidate's graduate unit.

6. The graduate unit is responsible for scheduling the examination, booking a room, and making appropriate technical arrangements.

7. The graduate unit must submit to SGS a Certificate of Completion together with the nomination form confirming completion of all other academic requirements, such as language and field requirements; an abstract of the thesis not longer than 350 words; and a copy of the examination program.

8. The graduate unit will send a copy of the external appraisal of the thesis to SGS as soon as it is received. The graduate unit is responsible for the distribution of copies of the external appraisal to the candidate (two weeks before the examination) and members of the examination committee. It should not be distributed beyond that group and the relevant administrative officers before the examination. The candidate is to be instructed not to communicate with the external appraiser/examiner until the examination is under way.

9. Members of the graduate faculty are entitled to attend the examination, and with the permission of the chair, they may ask questions of the candidate, but they must withdraw before the committee's discussion and vote. A qualified observer may attend, subject to the same restrictions, if the graduate unit has received approval for such attendance in writing beforehand from the SGS Vice-Dean, Programs. Otherwise, the examination is closed to the public. The vote at the examination takes into account both the thesis and the oral defence itself.

10. The examination committee represents the SGS Graduate Education Council and through it the university. It is therefore responsible for the standard of the doctoral degree in this university. Graduate unit examinations held immediately in advance of the final oral must not therefore interfere with attendance at, or thoroughness of, the final examination.

The committee must evaluate the external appraisal of the thesis, which is to be considered only as an individual opinion to be employed as the committee sees fit. It must examine the candidate on the content and implications of the thesis. Where someone other than the candidate is a co-author of any portion of the thesis, the examination committee must be satisfied that the candidate's personal contribution to the thesis is sufficient to fulfill the requirements of the doctoral degree. In addition to determining the adequacy of the thesis, the committee must satisfy itself that the thesis document meets the proper standards of scholarship.

The committee possesses the full authority of the School of Graduate Studies with respect to the examination.

11. A quorum for the final examination is four voting members, plus the examination committee chair who has no vote. Voting shall be by signed ballot, and the names of the examiners and their respective votes shall be read to the examination committee by the chair. If a quorum is not present, the chair may delay the examination to obtain a quorum or may postpone the examination to another date.

12. The candidate passes on the first examination:
   a. if the decision is unanimous; or
   b. if there is not more than one negative vote or abstention.

   If there is more than one negative vote or abstention, adjournment is mandatory.

   In the event of adjournment, the examination committee must provide the candidate, as soon as possible, with a written statement that indicates the reasons for adjournment and the committee's requirements for the reconvened oral examination. In addition, the examination committee must decide the approximate date of the reconvened examination. The time between the adjourned examination and the reconvened examination should be as short as circumstances will permit and in no case shall exceed one year.

   At the reconvened examination, no new committee members shall be added, except for necessary replacements. It is the obligation of the examiners to attend the reconvened examination.

   The candidate passes on the reconvened examination:
   a. if the decision is unanimous; or
   b. if there is not more than one negative vote or abstention.

   No further adjournment will be allowed.

   If a candidate is not recommended for the degree by the committee in charge of the sec-
ond examination, the candidate is ineligible for further doctoral candidacy at the university. The examination committee must provide the candidate, as soon as possible, with a written statement that explains clearly and directly why the examiners found the candidate’s performance unsatisfactory on the written and/or oral components of the examination, as may be relevant.

13. If minor corrections in style are a condition of acceptance of the thesis, the candidate must complete the corrections within one month of the date of the examination, and the supervisor will inform the candidate of the necessary corrections. The supervisor must notify the School of Graduate Studies directly in writing that the required corrections have been made by the candidate, with a copy of the correspondence sent to the graduate coordinator of the graduate unit, before the candidate is recommended for the degree.

14. If minor modifications are a condition of acceptance of the thesis, the chair of the examination committee will appoint a subcommittee of the examination committee (to be approved by the examination committee) to supervise the proposed modifications. One member of the subcommittee is designated by the chair, with the approval of the examination committee, as the convenor. The convenor will be responsible for the preparation of a statement detailing the modifications required. Modifications must be completed within three months of the date of the oral examination. The members of the subcommittee will report on the acceptability of the completed modifications to the convenor. If all members of the subcommittee approve the completed modification, the candidate will be passed without the necessity of reconvening the examination committee. The convenor of the subcommittee must certify in writing to the School of Graduate Studies, within three months of the original examination, that the modifications have or have not been satisfactorily completed. If one or more members of the subcommittee do not approve the completed modifications, the final oral examination must be reconvened within a year of the date of the original examination.

The examination committee must decide the nature of minor modifications, but it is intended that minor modifications should be more than corrections in style and less than major changes in the thesis. A typical example of minor modifications might be clarification of textual material or qualification of research findings and conclusions.

15. The Library and Archives Canada publication agreement must be signed by the candidate when the final thesis is submitted electronically through T-Space; see General Regulations, section 9.4 Submission of Theses. The format of the submitted thesis must comply with the School of Graduate Studies guidelines.

16. SGS requires that every doctoral thesis be published substantially as it is accepted.

It is the intention of the University of Toronto that there be no restriction on the distribution and publication of theses. However, in exceptional cases, the author, in consultation with the thesis supervisor and with the approval of the chair of the graduate unit, shall have the right to postpone distribution and publication for a period up to two years from the date of acceptance of the thesis. In exceptional circumstances and on written petition to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, the period might be extended, but in no case for more than five years from the date of acceptance of the thesis unless approved by the SGS Graduate Education Council.

For further details, students should consult Producing Your Thesis at www.sgs.utoronto.ca/informationfor/students/fi nup/producingthesis.htm.
**MOTION**

Graduate Education Council  
Tuesday, November 15, 2011

**ITEM 7**

Proposal for a **new hood** for the following degree offered by the Global Professional Master of Laws program:

**Global Professional Master of Laws (GPLLM)**

Faculty of Law

**MOTION**

**THAT** Graduate Education Council approve the proposal of the Faculty of Law for a new hood for the Global Professional Master of Laws (GPLLM) degree offered by the Global Professional Master of Laws program.

See attached documents:

- *Letter of Approval*

**Prior Approvals and Discussion**

It is the responsibility of Graduate Education Council (GEC) to receive and approve proposed hood designs.

The hood design was approved by the Chair of the Graduate Department of Law on August 30, 2011

**Further Governance**

If approved by GEC, the proposal will be brought to the Ceremonials Committee of Academic Board for final approval.
Dear Dean Moran:

Congratulations on the approval of the new Global Professional Master of Law (GPOLL) program. A new hood will now be created for graduands of this program.

In accordance with the University of Toronto master's hood pattern the new Global Professional Master of Law hood would be as follows:

- A shell of black corded silk with trim of white soutache braid on both outside edges, starting 1 1/2" from the back edge and tapering to 1/2" apart at the neckband. This is mandatory for all master's hoods.
- A lining of pink taffeta silk (representing the Faculty of Law) and a 3/16" silk strip of orange) representing the Faculty of Management) on both anterior and posterior edges under which is a 3/8" border of pink taffeta.

Please sign, date, and return the letter to my attention.

Once we receive the approved design, we will bring it forward to Graduate Education Council for initial approval and then forward the form to the Ceremonials Committee under delegated authority from the Academic Board for final approval.

If you would like assistance regarding colour choices for the hood, please contact Mr. Bert Harkes, Harcourts (416) 977-4408 (email: bertharkes@harcourts.com).

Yours truly,

Heather Kelly
Director, Student Services

Cc: Jane Alderdice, Director, Quality Assessment and Governance
FOR DISCUSSION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, November 15, 2011

ITEM 8.1

Graduate Grading Practices Policy

See attached documents:
- PDAD&G Memorandum #12, 2011-12, Re: Review of Grading Practices Policies
- Draft University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy
- Summary of Edits to Graduate Grading Practices Policy
- Draft University of Toronto Transcript Policy
- Draft Guidelines on Academic Transcript Notations
- Draft University of Toronto Policy on Academic Continuity
PDAD&C#12, 2011-12
MEMORANDUM

PLEASE CIRCULATE WIDELY

To: PDAD&C
    President of UTFA
    Presidents of APUS, GSU, SCSU, UTMSU and UTSU

From: Cheryl Regehr, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs
      Brian Corman, Vice-Provost, Graduate Education

Date: September 23, 2011

Re: Review of Grading Practices Policies

The 2009-10 report by the University’s Ombudsperson to Governing Council raised concerns about the University’s Grading Practices Policies. Specifically the report drew attention to the problematic relationship between the current University Grading Practices Policy [UGPP] and the Graduate Grading Practices Policy [GGPP]. It called upon the Office of the Provost to review the matter.

As a consequence, a working group was established in the Office of the Provost. This working group is reviewing, harmonizing, and updating the existing policies. The current policies cover three distinct issues: Grading Practices, Transcript Notations, and Academic Disruption. In the interest of greater clarity and simplicity, the Working Group has created three draft policies:

1. The Policy on Assessment and Grading Practices
2. The Policy on Academic Transcripts
3. The Policy on Academic Continuity

The draft policies on Assessment and Grading Practices, Academic Transcripts, Academic Continuity can be found at http://www.vpacademic.utoronto.ca/Initiatives.htm.

The Working Group welcomes comments and suggestions on these draft policies from all interested members of the University community at grading.policy@utoronto.ca.
University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy

Statement of Purpose
The University’s Assessment and Grading Practices Policy sets out the principles and key elements that should characterize the assessment and grading of student work in for-credit programming at the University of Toronto.

Overarching Principles
The purpose of the University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy is to ensure:
- that assessment and grading practices across the University are consistent and reflect appropriate academic standards
- that student performance is evaluated in a manner that is fair, accurate, consistent, and objective and in compliance with these academic standards.
- that the academic standing of every student can be accurately assessed even when conducted in different divisions of the University and evaluated according to different grading scales.

Scope of Policy
This policy applies to the evaluation of student performance in for-credit programming at both the graduate and undergraduate level within all divisions/faculties of the University. For graduate programs and students, any reference to “division/faculty” should be understood to refer to the School of Graduate Studies, and any reference to department should be understood to refer to the relevant graduate unit. The School of Graduate Studies is the only division that may develop additional grading regulations and guidelines for graduate studies. Where undergraduate and graduate practices differ, this has been indicated explicitly in the text. Otherwise all clauses should be understood to apply equally to students at either level of study.

Divisions/faculties may wish to develop procedures for implementing these policies according to their needs. These procedures must be consistent with this policy. In case of conflict or lack of clarity, this policy will be understood to take precedence.

This policy is in three parts:
- Part A: Grades
- Part B: Grading Practices
- Part C: Designators and Other Non-Grade Symbols Approved for Use in Reporting Course Results

Distribution of Policy
A copy of the University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy as well as the description of the grade scales and any divisional regulations and guidelines must be published in full in the Academic Calendar of each division and made available to students and to all instructors and others, including teaching assistants, involved in the evaluation of student performance, either electronically or, upon request, in hard copy.

A current list of grade scales and reporting symbols in use at the University will be maintained by the Provost’s Office with the support of the University Registrar and the Chief Information Officer [CIO]. This list will also record historical data on the use of grade scales and reporting symbols in each division.
PART A: GRADES

1. MEANING OF GRADES AND GRADE SCALES

1.1. Meaning of Grades
Grades are a measure of the performance of a student. They are an indication of the student’s command of the content of the components of the academic program. In assessing student performance and translating that assessment into grades, the University’s standards and practices should be aligned with those of our academic peers.

1.2. Grade scales
Once an assessment of the performance of the student has been made, the following grade scales are to be used. This scale shows the corresponding Grade Point value which will appear on the student’s transcript.

1.2.1. Undergraduate:
   ii. the numerical scale of marks, consisting of all integers from 0 to 100 (that is, 0,1...99, 100).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refined Letter Grade Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F = Fail
1.2.2. Graduate:
   i. a truncated refined letter grade scale A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, FZ (replacing C, D, and F);
   ii. the numerical scale of marks, consisting of all integers from 0 to 100 (that is, 0, 1...99, 100).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Truncated Refined Letter Grade Scale</th>
<th>Numerical Scale of Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>90 - 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>85 - 89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>80 - 84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>77 - 79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73 - 76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>70 - 72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FZ**</td>
<td>0 - 69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FZ = Fail

1.3. Alternate Grade Scales
In addition to the above, there are approved grade scales that are outside the standard grade scale system. These grades are assigned in some divisions/faculties for courses in which only broad evaluative distinctions in assessing the quality of student performance are judged appropriate. Any change to the grading scale for an existing course must be approved through governance as described in A 1.4 below. Approved alternate grade scales include:

1.3.1. Undergraduate
   i. H (Honours), P (Pass), F (Failure).
   ii. CR (Credit), NCR (No Credit).
   iii. Normally, all grades in an undergraduate course must be from the same scale. However, divisions/faculties may establish procedures that allow individual students to elect to be graded within a limited number of courses using an alternate grade scale (ie. CR/NCR where the course uses the normal numerical/letter grades).

1.3.2. Graduate
   i. CR (Credit), NCR (No Credit).
   ii. The final grades assigned in a graduate course must all be from the same scale.

1.4. Approval of Alternate Grade Scales
1.4.1. A division/faculty wishing to employ a grade scale or reporting symbol that is not defined in this document must obtain the prior approval of the Academic Board, acting with the advice of the Vice-President and Provost, or designate, and the University Registrar.
1.4.2. To be approved, a proposed grade scale must be dictated by the particular circumstances of a division and must be an entirely different scale rather than merely a minor modification of an existing scale.
PART B: GRADING PRACTICES

Individual divisions/faculties may wish to develop more detailed regulations and guidelines governing grading procedures. These must be consistent with this policy and the practices outlined below. In the case where there is any conflict between the two, this policy will be held to take precedence. All such divisional/faculty regulations and guidelines must be approved by divisional/faculty council and brought forward to the Committee on Academic Policy and Programs and, where required, to Academic Board for information or approval as appropriate. (The School of Graduate Studies is the only division/faculty that can develop additional grading procedures policies for graduate studies.)

1. COURSES

1.1. Disclosure of method(s) of evaluation of student performance
For both undergraduate and graduate courses, as early as possible in each course (and no later than the division/faculty’s last date for course enrolment) the instructor shall make available to the class, and shall file with the division/faculty or department, the methods by which student performance shall be evaluated. This should include whether the methods of evaluation will be essays, tests, class participation, seminar presentations, examinations, the relative weight of these methods in relation to the overall grade, and the timing of each major evaluation.

1.2. Consequences for late submission
For both undergraduate and graduate courses, instructors are not obliged to accept late work, except where there are legitimate, documented reasons beyond a student’s control. In such cases, a late penalty is normally not appropriate. Where an Instructor intends to accept and apply penalties to late assignments, this must be set out clearly in the course syllabus.

1.3. Changes to the method of evaluation
For both undergraduate and graduate courses, after the methods of evaluation have been made known, the instructor may not change them or their relative weight without the consent of a simple majority of students attending the class, provided the vote is announced no later than in the previous class. Any changes must be reported to the division or the department, or in the case of graduate courses, the graduate unit. The only exception to this is in the case of the declaration of a disruption. [Please see the University’s Policy on Academic Continuity.]

1.4. Multiple assessments
1.4.1. Undergraduate.
Student performance in an undergraduate course must be assessed on more than one occasion. No one essay, test, examination, etc. should have a value of more than 80% of the grade. Criteria for exemption may be determined by the division/faculty.

1.4.2. Graduate
In graduate courses, there is no requirement for multiple assessments. However, if any one essay, test examination etc. has a value of more than 80% of the grade, this must be made clear in the information described in B.1.1 above. If participation forms part of the final grade it should not constitute more than 20%.
1.5. Timing of assessment

1.5.1. Undergraduate

At least one piece of term work which is a part of the evaluation of a student performance and worth at least 10% of the final grade, whether essay, lab report, review, etc., must be returned to the student prior to the last date for withdrawal from the course without academic penalty.

1.5.2. Graduate

In graduate courses, there is no requirement for term work to be returned before the last date for withdrawal from the course without academic penalty. However, if no work is to be returned by this date, this must be made clear in the information described in B.1.1 above.

1.6. Access to commentary on assessed term work

Undergraduate and graduate students should have access to commentary on assessed term work and the opportunity to discuss the assessment with the instructor.

1.7. Final Examinations

1.7.1. Undergraduate

In courses that meet regularly as a class, there should be an examination (or examinations) conducted formally under divisional auspices and worth (alone or in the aggregate) at least one-third of the final grade. Criteria for exemption may be determined by the division. The relative value of each part of an examination should be indicated to the student.

1.7.2. Graduate

There is no requirement for final examinations in graduate courses. Where examinations are used, the relative value of each part of an examination should be indicated to the student.

1.8. Final grades

Final grades in undergraduate and graduate courses shall be recommended by the instructor, using the approved grade scales, to the Chair, Dean, or the Chair’s or Dean’s designate (and graduate Chairs in the case of graduate courses) on the basis of each student’s overall performance and in conformity with the information described in Part B 1.1 above.

2. EXAMINATIONS IN COURSES

2.1. Access to exemplars

For all undergraduate courses and graduate courses where there is a final examination, all divisions/faculties should provide access to copies of the previous years’ final examination papers and other years’ papers where feasible. Exemptions may be granted by an appropriate committee of the division or department.

2.2. Review of final examinations

All divisions/faculties should provide students with the opportunity within a reasonable time to review their final course examination paper where feasible. Divisions/faculties may charge a cost-recovery fee (for review) consistent with the Policy on Ancillary Fees.

2.3. Re-reading of examinations

2.3.1. Undergraduate

For undergraduate courses, all divisions should provide, in addition to the customary re-checking of grades, the opportunity for students to petition for the re-reading of their examination where feasible. Divisions/faculties may charge a cost-recovery fee (for re-reading) consistent with the Policy on Ancillary Fees.

2.3.2. Graduate

For graduate examinations, each graduate unit should provide students, upon request, with an opportunity for re-checking of marks. The rereading of graduate course examinations is governed by SGS procedures.
3. **GRADE REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

3.1. **Responsibility and Oversight**
The Dean (which in the case of graduate programs is the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies) or designate is responsible for:

- administering the implementation of the Assessment and Grading Practices Policy at the divisional/faculty level and overseeing the general consistency of grading procedures within the division/faculty

3.2. **Review and approval of final grades**
Final grades for undergraduate or graduate courses will be reviewed and approved by the Chair, Dean or Dean’s designate according to divisional review procedures. The Divisional review constitutes final approval of grades except where grades are changed on appeal.

3.3. **Adjustment of final grades**
The final grades recommended by the instructor in an undergraduate or graduate course should not normally be adjusted except where the Chair, Dean or Dean’s designate judge that the consequences of allowing the grades to stand would be injurious to the standards of the University, or are not in keeping with divisional grading guidelines. Divisional review processes may rely on past statistical data, including drop-out rates, mean arithmetic average, etc. as background information where available; however, this information should not be relied upon exclusively to judge whether a specific grade distribution is anomalous. Rather, the information should provide part of the basis for an overall review of grades in a division.

3.4. **Considerations in the review and approval of final grades**

3.4.1. **Conformity with Policy**
For undergraduate and graduate courses, the fundamental criterion that any divisional/faculty final grade review process should employ is whether the instructor has followed this Assessment and Grading Practices Policy.

3.4.2. **Distribution of grades**
The distribution of grades in any course, examination or other academic assessment must not be predetermined by any system of quotas that specifies the number or percentage of grades allowable at any grade level. However, a division/faculty may provide guidelines to instructors setting out a reasonable distribution of grades in the division or department. The division may request an explanation of any grades for a course that appear not to meet divisional guidelines, are not based on the approved grade scales, or otherwise appear anomalous in reference to the Policy. It is understood that this section will normally only be used when the class size is thirty students or greater.

3.5. **Informing instructors and students of grade adjustment**
For undergraduate and graduate courses where grades have been adjusted, by the Chair, Dean, or Dean’s designate, the Chair, Dean or Dean’s designate should ensure that the instructor as well as the students are informed. On request, the students or the instructor will be given the reason for the adjustment of grades and a description of the methodology used to adjust the grades. Students will be given a description of the divisional appeal process.

4. **GRADE REPORTING**

4.1. **Use of the grading scale**

4.1.1. **Undergraduate:**

   i. The refined letter grade and normally the numerical grade will be reported for courses using the standard grade scales.
ii. The H/P/F and CR/NCR scales may be used instead in courses approved to use that scale or for individual students as set out in A 1.3.1.iii.

iii. Where an undergraduate student has completed a fully graduate course the student will be assessed according to the undergraduate grading scale and the appropriate undergraduate grade will be reported on the undergraduate student transcript.

4.1.2. Graduate:
   i. For all graduate courses, final grades will be assigned according to the graduate grade scale referred to above.
   ii. The CR/NCR scale may be used instead in courses approved to use that scale.
   iii. Where a graduate student has completed a fully undergraduate course, the course will be clearly identified as an undergraduate course on their graduate transcript. The student will be assessed according to the graduate grading scale and the appropriate graduate grade will be reported on the graduate student transcript.

4.2. Use of Non-grade designators
For both undergraduate and graduate courses, all Designators and Non-grade Symbols used in reporting course results must correspond to the University-wide standard. A list of the currently approved designators and their meanings is given in the Part C.

4.3. Transcripts [Please see the University’s Transcript Policy for full details on the required content of the official University transcript]

4.3.1. Undergraduate:
Undergraduate transcripts must include:
   • a refined letter grade and normally the numeric grade, or the final grade using an approved alternate grading scale for each course completed
   • a "grade point average" based on a 4-point scale for all undergraduate divisions as described in A 1.2.3 except where the division/faculty has secured formal approval to be exempted from this policy or where CR/NCR has been used.
   • a comprehensive guide explaining all grades and symbols used on the transcript

4.3.2. Graduate:
Graduate transcripts must include:
   • a refined letter grade or other grade or designator for each graduate course completed
   • a comprehensive guide explaining all grades and symbols used on the transcript.

5. APPEALS OF FINAL GRADES
Every division/faculty shall establish divisional appeal procedures. (In the case of graduate programs this is the responsibility of the School of Graduate Studies.) Students may appeal grades regardless of whether marks have been altered by the review process or not. Divisional/faculty appeal procedures should be made available through the divisional/faculty academic Calendar, and available upon request at the Dean’s and/or Faculty Registrar’s Office.

6. OTHER ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS
 Appropriately qualified faculty members are responsible for the final evaluation of all assessments and grades for academic credit at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

Graduate
In graduate programs, graduate units may expect students to complete requirements for a degree other than course work, such as comprehensive or qualifying examinations, language examinations, field work or internships, major research papers, theses etc., Evaluations of performance in these requirements and/or settings should
accord with the principles set out in this Assessment and Grading Practices Policy. Doctoral Final Oral Examinations (FOE) are governed by the regulations established by the School of Graduate Studies.

Postgraduate Medical Education
The Faculty of Medicine member directly responsible for the supervision of the postgraduate medical education program is responsible for attesting to the successful completion of residency training using a “Pass/Fail” Final In-Training Evaluation Report. This attestation allows the learner to undertake qualification examinations administered by a national accrediting body, which will award a professional credential.

7. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN PLACEMENTS (eg., Clinical and Field settings)

The assessment of the performance of students in clinical or field settings should be conducted in line with this Policy. Accordingly, where a student's performance in and placement, clinical, or field setting is to be assessed for credit, the evaluation must encompass as a minimum:

- a formal statement describing the evaluation process, including the criteria to be used in assessing the performance of students and the appeal mechanisms available. This statement should be available to all students before or at the beginning of the clinical or field experience;
- in the case of undergraduate placements, a mid-way performance evaluation with feedback to the student written documentation of the final assessment.

In addition, for such clinical and field placements, divisions must ensure that:
- clinical and field assessors are fully informed regarding University, divisional and course policies concerning evaluation procedures, including the specific assessment procedures to be applied in any particular field or clinical setting.

8. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Situations where the instructor or a student is in a position of a conflict of interest, where there may be an appearance of a conflict of interest, or where a fair and objective assessment may not be possible, should be brought to the attention of the chair (the graduate chair in the case of graduate courses) or the Dean who is responsible for taking steps to ensure fairness and objectivity.
PART C: DESIGNATORS AND OTHER NON-GRADE SYMBOLS
APPROVED FOR USE IN REPORTING GRADE AND ASSESSMENT RESULTS

AEG: Aegrotat standing granted on the basis of term work and medical or similar evidence where the student was not able to write the final examination in the course. AEG is assigned by a division upon approval of a student’s petition. It carries credit for the course but is not considered for averaging purposes. (undergraduate)

DNW: Did not write/did not attend/did little work. DNW is assigned by the instructor and must be changed to another symbol during the divisional grade review. It carries credit for the course prior to the review but is not considered for averaging purposes. (undergraduate)

GWR: Grade Withheld pending Review. GWR is assigned by the division (School of Graduate Studies in the case of graduate courses) in cases where a course grade is being reviewed under the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. It is replaced by a regular grade upon completion of the review. It carries no credit for the course and is not considered for averaging purposes.

INC: Incomplete. INC may be assigned by the division or the instructor, according to divisional guidelines, normally as a final report, where work is not completed but where there are not grounds for assigning a failing grade. It carries no credit for the course and is not considered for averaging purposes.

IPR: In Progress. IPR is assigned as the report for a course that is continued in a subsequent session. The final grade will appear only once and only for the last enrolment period. It carries no credit for the course and is not considered for averaging purposes.

LWD: Permitted to withdraw from a course without academic penalty. The division may approve such an option and restrict the number of courses for which a student may exercise the option. It carries no credit for the course and is not considered for averaging purposes. LWD is relevant only if a division wishes to show the course on the transcript. (undergraduate)

NGA: No grade available. NGA is assigned by the division in the extraordinary case that a grade is not available for one of its students enrolled in a course. It must be replaced by a regular grade assigned by the instructor or by another symbol assigned during the divisional review. It carries no credit for the course and is not considered for averaging purposes.

SDF: Standing deferred on the basis of incomplete course work because of medical or similar reasons. SDF is assigned by the division upon approval of a student’s petition or an instructor’s recommendation. It must be replaced by a regular grade assigned by the instructor before the expiry of a specific extension period. It carries no credit for the course and is not considered for averaging purposes.

TRF: Program Transfer. Assigned by the School of Graduate Studies to a continuing research/seminar courses begun but not completed in the first program and not required in the new program to which the student has been officially transferred. (graduate)

WDR: Withdrawn without academic penalty. WDR is assigned by the division upon approval of a student’s petition for late withdrawal from a course for compelling extenuating circumstances. It carries no credit for the course and is not considered for averaging purposes. WDR is relevant only if a division wishes to show the course on the transcript.

XMP: Exemption granted on the basis of credit for work done elsewhere. XMP is assigned by a division upon approval of a student's petition. It carries credit for the course but is not considered for averaging purposes.
Draft Summary of Chief Edits to Grading Practices Policy — Errata

Two inconsistencies between the Draft Summary of Chief Edits to Grading Practices Policy and the Draft Assessment and Grading Practices Policy have been noted. They are as follows.

1) On page 1 of the summary, there is a reference to P2, 1.2.1, iii and 1.2.2, ii of the draft Policy. The change is summarized as “Points added concerning grading of undergrad students in fully grad courses and vice versa. Practice spelled out as policy to ensure consistency.”

   The sections referred to in the Policy should actually be Part B, 4.1.1,iii and 4.1.2,iii

2) From page 2 of the summary (where it refer to Part B of the policy) onward, the references it makes to the Policy are off by one or two pages (e.g. Part B of the Policy actually begins on page 4 rather than page 5).
Summary of Chief Edits to Grading Practices Policy

The attached document is a consolidation of the University Grading Practices Policy (revised April 9, 1998) and the Graduate Grading and Evaluation Practices Policy (May 12, 2004). In the process of combining the two documents many small changes to language and formatting were made with the goal of improving clarity and to bring the document into line with current norms for policy without changing the meaning of the document. At the same time, a number of elements were changed, deleted or added in order to bring the consolidated document better into line with current practice. This document is intended to identify these larger changes.

Not included in the below is a significant change in presentation, the use of sub headings to help the reader scan the policy more easily and a significant reorganization of content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page # and item #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2, 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2, 1.2.1, iii and 1.2.2, ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3, 1.3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3, 1.3.1, iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page # and item #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3. 1.3.2, ii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 – Part B introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 5, 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. 5, 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.5 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.5 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. 5, 1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.5 1.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page # and item #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 6, 1.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 6, 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 7, 2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7, 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 8, 4.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page # and item #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 1 of GPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2, 1.1, 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 6 of GG&amp;EPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4, 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 6, 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. 8, 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page # and item #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of Toronto Transcript Policy

See also University Guidelines on Academic Transcript Notations; University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy

Statement of Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to set out the principles that underpin the University’s understanding of its official academic transcript and to describe the minimum information that the transcript must include.

Overarching Principles
The academic transcript is the primary, official, consolidated record of a student’s academic performance and achievement.

• The transcript should reflect academic history only.
• The transcript should be a meaningful reflection of the student’s academic activity and achievement.
• The transcript must provide the reader with the information required to interpret the transcript.

Scope
University of Toronto consolidated transcripts are limited to degree level studies.

Required Content of the Academic Transcript
The academic transcript must include:

• an enrolment history, which traces chronologically the student’s participation at the University.
• details of program(s) including, for example, specialists, majors, and minors (undergraduate), fields or concentrations (graduate) and Degree; any other credentials granted; titles of any theses (graduate); and date of graduation.
• the refined letter grade and (for undergraduate courses) normally the numeric mark, or the final grade using an approved alternate grading scale for each course completed. (See the University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy.)
• course weight values, expressed using a uniform system of values that accommodates the curricular needs of all divisions/faculties.
• a "grade point average" based on a 4-point scale for all undergraduate divisions (undergraduate). (See the University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy.)
• an average grade for each course expressed using the refined letter grade scale (undergraduate). (Note: these calculations should be restricted to courses of a specific size.)
• transfer credit or advanced standing granted.
• selected academic honours, scholarships and awards sanctioned by the University. (See Guidelines on Academic Transcript Notations.)
• any annotation pertaining to special academic achievements that has been approved as appropriate. (See Guidelines on Scholarships and Awards Appearing on Transcripts -in development)
• information about the student’s academic standing including records of suspension and refusal of further registration.
• information concerning disciplinary sanctions ordered in a case of academic misconduct.
• a comprehensive guide explaining all grades and symbols used on the transcript

Access to Official Transcripts
Subject to a fee, students may request a copy of their transcripts.

Graduate students with both an undergraduate and graduate University of Toronto academic record may request that the University of Toronto Transcript centre send only their graduate academic record.
University of Toronto

Guidelines on Academic Transcript Notations

These administrative Guidelines have been developed in line with the University of Toronto’s Transcript Policy date) to provide a framework within which individual faculties/divisions will make decisions about the content of the academic transcripts they provide to their students. The existing Transcript Policy lays out the elements that must be included on an academic transcript. In addition, the faculties/divisions have well established norms governing standard content. The goal of the Guidelines is to support a level of clarity and consistency in the kinds of notations (both in respect to graduate and undergraduate level academic work) made on academic transcripts beyond those directly connected with the student’s completion of their degree and program of study requirements. In so doing, it is intended that the Guidelines will make these notations more meaningful and enhance the value of the transcript as the primary official record of a student’s academic performance and achievement.

These Guidelines are not intended to deal with transcript notations relating to academic misconduct. Those are governed by the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (1995) and related faculty/divisional level rules and regulations on academic integrity. In addition, the University has separate Guidelines on Scholarships and Awards Appearing on Transcripts (in development).

Definitions:
An academic transcript is the primary official consolidated record of a student’s academic performance and achievement.

Context:
The main body of a standard academic transcript at the University includes a list of all courses attempted, the grade result in each, the average course grade (undergraduate only), and sessional and cumulative grade point averages (undergraduate only); transfer credit or advanced standing awarded; titles of any theses (Masters and Doctoral); information about the student’s academic status including records of suspension and refusal of further registration and current academic sanctions; and the details of the program(s) (including fields, specialists, majors, and minors) and degree completed. See the University of Toronto’s University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy (date).

Beyond this comparatively standard content, University of Toronto transcripts can include a wide variety of free-hand transcript notations intended to recognize student achievement. These vary between Faculties. As stated above, the goal of these Guidelines is to regularize this content.

Principles:
In making decisions about annotations to the Academic transcript, the following principles are intended to provide guidance. Annotations to the transcript should:

1. Reflect academic work only.
2. Acknowledge academic work / achievement that is in addition to that required by the student’s program of study.
3. Recognize work that conforms to an agreed upon minimum commitment of time, effort, and performance.
4. Highlight the acquisition of skill / knowledge in discrete areas.
5. Refer to agreed upon categories of academic activity.
6. Recognize academic success.
7. Use standardized language.

The Academic Transcript is not the appropriate document to record:
1. Extra-curricular activity
2. Volunteerism

Categories of Transcript Notations:
A review of the range of academic activities for which students might reasonably expect formal recognition in the form of a formal transcript notation suggest that there are three broad categories. It is critical to note that in every case the achievement of the citation does not serve to meet degree requirements.

1. Completion of a Certificate or Diploma as defined by the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs (December 2, 2003)
The recognition on a student’s transcript of a formal approved Certificate or Diploma program is an accepted norm. These are understood as formal entities which may be taken alone or in conjunction with a student’s program of study, depending upon their specific requirements in line with the Policy on Diploma and Certificate Programs (December 2, 2003)

Example that would fall under this category:
- Any approved Certificate or Diploma.

2. Completion of a coherent cluster of for-credit courses that are less than a minor but provide the student with a degree of proficiency in a discrete area of study.
This transcript notion would recognize the completion of a specified amount of for-credit work that is distinct from a major or minor but has academic integrity. It is intended to indicate that the student has some working knowledge of or proficiency within the area cited.

Example that would fall under this category:
- The existing Undergraduate Language Citation offered by the Faculty of Arts and Science which recognizes the completion of two full courses or the equivalent in one of a wide variety of languages beyond the introductory University-level course with a minimum grade of at least B- in each course. (This results in the transcript notation: “Language citation in x”),

3. Completion of a defined series of non-credit courses, workshops, and activities that support student academic success or professional development goals directly associated with an academic program of study
This transcript notation would recognize a coherent category of activity intended to enhance a student’s learning directly related to their program of study.

Examples that would fall under this category:
- The existing Graduate Professional Skills program offered by the School of Graduate Studies which consists of a range of optional “offerings” with a time commitment roughly equivalent to 60 hours of work. (This results in the transcript notation : “Completion of the Graduate Professional Skills Program”)
- Professional Development programs being developed by undergraduate Divisions in conjunction with academic programs.
Minimum Commitment of Time and Effort
For a transcript notation concerning academic achievement to be meaningful, it is critical that minimum standards of time and effort be established. While there is a great variety possible, at the University of Toronto, the minimum commitment of time must be the equivalent of at least 36 hours of work at a University level. In each instance, the notation is dependent upon the successful completion of the activity which should be defined at the outset.

While these Guidelines establish a minimum, individual Faculties/Divisions may wish to establish minima that are higher.

Language of the Notation:
The language of the notation should be simple and consistent. It should, at the most straightforward, read:

1. “Certificate/Diploma in ……”
2. “Faculty of x citation in ……..”
3. “Completion of the professional development program in [area]”

Approval Process:
In the interest of ensuring a degree of consistency of meaning in University of Toronto transcripts, all Faculties/Divisions are asked to bring forward short proposals outlining the activity for which they propose to provide a transcript notation for discussion with the Provost’s Office.

Following Provostial approval, all proposals for transcript notation should be brought for faculty/divisional Council approval before the notation is implemented. The School of Graduate Studies is the only division that may approve transcript notations for graduate transcripts.
University of Toronto
Policy on Academic Continuity

Preamble
The University of Toronto is committed to fulfilling its core academic mission of educating students. It recognizes that events such as pandemic health emergencies, natural disasters, prolonged service interruptions, and ongoing labour disputes are potential threats to academic continuity. Good stewardship requires that the University undertake appropriate planning and preparation to promote continuity. At the same time, the University must be prepared to respond to extraordinary circumstances in which the normal academic operations of the University may be disrupted.

Scope
The purpose of this document is to provide a policy framework that will guide the University in enhancing its ability to fulfill its academic mission in the face of potential threats to academic continuity. It is intended to apply to circumstances and events that are potential threats to the continuity of the academic operations of the University and relates entirely to the principles and processes that should guide the University in this context. It applies to instances when the academic continuity of one or more programs, one or more departments or faculties, one or more campuses, or the whole University is disrupted and changes need to be made to the normal academic operations of the University. Additional related policies and guidelines are the Code of Student Conduct (Feb. 2002), Policy on Crisis Preparedness and Response (Feb. 2005), and the Emergency Preparedness and Crisis Management Plan (May 2009).

Principles
The following principles will guide the university in its preparation and planning for academic continuity and in its response to any potential disruption.

Primacy of the Educational Mission
The University is committed to taking appropriate steps to maintain the continuity of its academic programs and activities and to provide students with a reasonable opportunity to continue learning and complete academic requirements.

Integrity of Academic Programs
The University is committed to maintaining the integrity of all academic programs. Although steps may be taken under this policy which result in changes to academic programs and the educational experience of students, those changes must maintain the integrity of the academic program.

Fairness to Students
In seeking to maintain academic continuity, the University is committed to treating students in a fair and equitable manner. It recognizes that students have the freedom of choice to attend classes or not during a declared disruption without academic penalty insofar as the circumstances of the disruption make this practicable. However, where students have not attended classes that are meeting, they remain responsible for the course work and for meeting course requirements. A student who considers that a disruption has unreasonably affected his or her grade may appeal the grade following the divisional procedures.
**Timely Information**

Students, staff, and faculty need to be informed in a timely manner of changes to the academic program including altered course requirements, rescheduled academic activities, and procedures that will take effect at the end of any officially declared disruption to academic continuity.

**Ensuring Academic Continuity in the Event of Disruption**

The University, through resilient course and program design and other preparedness, will aim to minimize the potential for disruption of the University’s academic mission. In certain instances, however, extraordinary measures may be required in an effort to maintain or restore academic continuity.

**Authority to declare a state of disruption**

The Vice-President and Provost or the Academic Board have the responsibility and authority under this Policy to declare that a state of disruption has occurred. The state of disruption will continue until the Vice-President and Provost or the Academic Board formally declare it at an end. The purpose of such a declaration is to serve notice that the academic operations of the University will not proceed as normal. It provides the authority for the University to make changes to any aspect of its academic activities including the delivery of courses and programs, course and program requirements, modes of evaluation, and the length of the academic term, etc. consistent with the principles set out in this policy.

**Declaration of a state of academic disruption**

A state of disruption may be declared to affect one or more programs, one or more departments or faculties, one or more campuses, or the whole University. In the context of a declaration of a state of disruption, the University Assessment and Grading Practices Policy may not be practicable and may not apply.

**Coordination of University response**

The Office of the Vice-President and Provost is responsible for working with the dean’s offices of every division to co-ordinate the University’s response during a declared state of disruption. This co-ordination may include joint decision-making with affiliated institutions and field Placement / training sites.

**Communication of decision**

In the case of a declaration of a state of disruption, the Vice-President and Provost shall take steps to inform the University community at large of the changes being implemented and will ensure that Governing Council and its committees are kept informed of the steps being taken to support academic continuity.

**Responsibilities**

All members of the University of Toronto community share in the responsibility to enhance and maintain the continuity of academic programs.

The University has a responsibility to:

- Oversee the implementation of this policy
- Provide education and support to students, instructors and academic administrators regarding strategies for ensuring academic continuity
- Coordinate activity in the case of a state of disruption
- Inform all members of the community about a disruption, in a timely fashion and issue communication regarding procedures to help ensure academic continuity
Divisions/Faculties have a responsibility to:

- Develop guidelines in line with the institutional framework
- Communicate with staff, faculty, students, and field placement/training sites regarding division-specific plans

Academic administrators are responsible for:

- Ensuring that proactive measures have been taken to ensure academic continuity
- Overseeing changes to course procedures in the division in the case of a declaration of a state of disruption
- Where an instructor is not available during a disruption, their responsibilities will be fulfilled by the relevant academic administrator

Instructors are responsible for:

- Preparing course syllabi in a manner that supports academic continuity
- Altering course procedures, requirements and methods of evaluation in consultation with academic administrators to help ensure academic continuity
- Making reasonable accommodations for students who are unable to attend classes or complete academic requirements due to a disruption

Students have a responsibility to:

- Complete all coursework and academic requirements
- Keep informed of a state of disruption and changing academic requirements and procedures

---

1 The School of Graduate Studies is responsible for graduate programs and can delegate that responsibility to other Divisions where this is appropriate, consistent with this policy.
FOR DISCUSSION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, November 15, 2011

ITEM 8.2

Doctoral Completion Award

(no documentation)
FOR INFORMATION
Graduate Education Council
 Tuesday, November 15, 2011

ITEM 10.1

External Awards Success Rate Report

Documentation attached:
• The University of Toronto Tri-Agencies and Provincial Award Report
The University of Toronto Tri-Agencies and Provincial Award Report

Prepared for Graduate Education Council, November 2011

Introduction
The University of Toronto is an active participant in the Tri-Agency and OGS competitions. This report will briefly explain outreach, process and results of the NSERC, SSHRC, CIHR and OGS competitions for the past five years.

Outreach and Workshops
- The Graduate Awards Office at SGS offers a number of workshops for Graduate Administrators and students to prepare for the Tri-Agency and OGS application season on all three U of T campuses.

Process for Tri-Agency Awards
- Tri-Agency awards are announced by SGS in early September.
- SGS establishes the deadlines for submission of Tri-Agency award applications from the graduate units to SGS.
- SGS establishes a graduate unit quota of applications for submission using a formula, in consultation with the Vice-Dean Students. The formula is based on each unit’s success rate over the past three years.
- The SGS Awards Committee is comprised of Graduate Coordinators who serve a 2 year term. Each Tri-Agency Award has a subcommittee(s) with discipline relevant members drawn from across the university.
- Committee members pre-read applications and attend scheduled adjudication meetings to decide which applicants will be forwarded to Ottawa to fulfill the quota given to U of T by the respective Tri-Agency.

NSERC

Process
- The total number of NSERC awards available decreased from 2520 in 2010-11 to 1704 in 2011-2012. The decrease in the number of master’s level CGS awards reflects the end of the additional investment in this program announced in Budget 2009. As well, the overall number of available PGSD awards decreased.
- The number of applications received at SGS for the 2011-12 competition was 475 (603 applications in 2010-11).
- The University of Toronto submitted 315 applications and received 196 awards in the 2011-12 competition, which is a competition success rate of 62.2% (75.3% in 2010-2011).
- U of T’s percent of total awards increased from 10.3% in 2010-2011 to 11.5% in 2011-2012.

Highlights
- U of T is viewed as an overall award gainer, for example U of T received 196 awards in the 2011-12 competition, but 222 awards were taken up at U of T for the 11-12 academic year.
- The NSERC PGs and PDF competition was fully online for the 2011-2012 competition including electronic submission from SGS to Ottawa.

Prepared by Heather Kelly Director of Student Services and Laura Stathopoulos, Senior Award Officer, SGS

November 2011
### National results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total applications</td>
<td>3135</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td>3482</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>3324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards</td>
<td>2148</td>
<td>2354</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success rate</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewed at SGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forwarded = quota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - awards</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - Success rate</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forwarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - % of total</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results by Award Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uof T</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Uoff Share</td>
<td>Uof T</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGSM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGSD</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGSM</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGSD</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total U of T awards   | 219     | 2148    | 10.2%    | 225    | 2354    | 9.6%    | 245    | 2450    | 10.0%   | 259    | 2520   | 10.3%   | 192    | 1704   | 11.3%   |

### Comparative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Institutional Awards</td>
<td>% of National Awards</td>
<td>Institutional Awards</td>
<td>% of National Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NSERC has begun posting results of the National PGS competition online. The national statistics are not posted for the 2007-08 competition year.

Prepared by Heather Kelly Director of Student Services and Laura Stathopoulos, Senior Award Officer, SGS

November 2011
SSHRC

Process

- The total number of SSHRC Doctoral awards available has increased from 930 in 2010-11 to 981 in 2011-12.
- The number of SSHRC Doctoral applications received at SGS for the 2011-12 competition was 264 (285 applications in 2010-11).
- The University of Toronto submitted 210 Doctoral SSHRC applications to the 2011-12 SSHRC Doctoral competition and received 106 awards in the 2011-12 competition, which is a competition success rate of 50.5%.
- U of T’s percent of total awards increased from 10.3% in 2010-2011 to 10.8% in 2011-2012.
- Historically SSHRC has provided the breakdown of Doctoral and CGS awards given nationally. They no longer provide the number of awards broken down by type, but simply give an overall number of awards given nationally.

Highlights

- U of T is viewed as an overall award gainer, for example U of T received 214 awards in the 2011-2012 SSHRC competition, but 240 awards were taken up at U of T.
- The SSHRC competition was only partially online for the 2011-2012 competition.

Doctoral National results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total applications Canada Wide</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>1815²</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards Canada Wide</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success rate of applications forwarded</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications reviewed at SGS</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications forwarded = quota</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - awards received</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - Success rate of applications forwarded</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - % of total awards</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² The 2010-11 SSHRC Masters competition granted a high number of awards as the result of the Business related Masters Competition.
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# Results by Award Type – Doctoral

N/A= Information not available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T</td>
<td>U of T</td>
<td>Cdn</td>
<td>U of T</td>
<td>Cdn</td>
<td>U of T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - CGS award</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - SSHRC Doctoral</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T’s % of total awards</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results by Award Type – Masters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T</td>
<td>U of T</td>
<td>U of T</td>
<td>U of T</td>
<td>U of T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications reviewed at SGS</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications forward</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total awards</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total national awards</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T’s % of total awards</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparative Doctoral Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Institutional Awards</td>
<td>% of National Awards</td>
<td>Institutional Awards</td>
<td>% of National Awards</td>
<td>Institutional Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**CIHR**

**Process**
- The Graduate Awards Office does not have statistics on the CIHR Doctoral competition as students submit their application directly to CIHR.
- The number of applications received at SGS for the 2011-12CHIR Masters competition was 89 (141 applications in 2010-11).
- National results of the CIHR Masters competition are not easily accessible for comparative purposes, therefore unlike NSERC and SSHRC we are unable to report our national results.

**Highlights**
- U of T experienced significant growth in the number of CIHR Masters awards for the 2010-11 year. The expansion of the CGSM program was linked to Canada’s Economic Action Plan. CIHR announced a decrease to the overall application quota levels for the 2011-12 CGSMA competition. Consequently, U of T’s quota was diminished to 29.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications reviewed at SGS</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications forwarded = quota</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - awards received</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - Success rate of applications forwarded</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vanier**

**Process**
- The Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarships (Vanier CGS) program is designed to attract and retain world-class doctoral students by offering them a significant financial award to assist them during their studies at Canadian universities.
- Vanier winners must hold their award at the institution that submitted their nomination.
- International students are eligible for the Vanier awards.
- U of T’s quota for submission of applications for the Tri Councils’ is 231, which is to be allocated over a 3 year time period.

**Highlights**
- The Vanier nomination package now includes a leadership reference letter.
- Candidates who are nominated by a university where they have completed a previous degree were asked to provide a compelling rationale, in the “Special Circumstances” section, as to why they have chosen the same/nominating university to undertake their PhD. The university was also required to provide an explanation, in the nomination letter.
Results by Award Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009-10 UofT</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>U of T’s Share</th>
<th>2010-11 UofT</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>U of T’s Share</th>
<th>2011-2012 UofT</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>U of T’s Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vanier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSERC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHRC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIHR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awards</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OGS

Process

- OGS does not have a quota system for applications. All OGS applications are forwarded to the Ministry from the U of T for review.
- The Graduate Awards Office at SGS receives all OGS applications, with the exception of OISE applications, for review prior to being forwarded to Thunder Bay.
- A number of OGS winners are not offered the award initially but taken from the reversions list.
- Due to the new electronic system, no statistical reports provided by MTCU as with past years.

Highlights

- **2620** applications were submitted by U of T (vs. 2454 in 2010-11).
- U of T’s success rate for applications submitted to the OGS 2011-12 competition was **51.9%**, which is the highest to date. However, due to the lack of data provided by the Ministry last year it is difficult to determine whether this is an anomaly or a new trend.

U of T Percentage of Provincial Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of OGS applications province-wide</td>
<td>10907</td>
<td>11365</td>
<td>10904</td>
<td>10481</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of OGS awards</td>
<td>3668</td>
<td>3598</td>
<td>3628</td>
<td>3641</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - applications forwarded</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>2745</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>2620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - awards received</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of T - Success rate</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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OGS Results of U of T applications forwarded to the Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Applicants</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No. of Applicants</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No. of Applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Applications</td>
<td>2723</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2745</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

- NSERC and CIHR award applications are electronic, however, SSHRC is not. It is hoped that SSHC will migrate to ResearchNet which is used in the NSERC and CIHR competitions.
- OGS has adopted a partial electronic submission process. Unfortunately, due to staffing changes the 2011-2012 OGS Competition experienced significant administrative problems but collaborative efforts are underway by MTCU and OCGS to make improvements to the process.
- U of T Award results remain relatively stable. It would be helpful when providing institutional comparisons to know what percentage of their student population were eligible for the Tri-Agency Awards in relation to their national success rate. This information is not easily obtainable.
FOR INFORMATION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, November 15, 2011

ITEM 10.2

Fall 2011 GEC By-Election Report

See attached documents:

- Graduate Education Council: Fall 2011 By-Election Report
- Graduate Education Council Membership 2011-12 (REVISED)
Graduate Education Council: Fall 2011 By-Election Report
(October 18, 2011)

There were six positions on Graduate Education Council (GEC) open for election in the fall of 2011. A call for nominations was made on September 2, 2011. Balloting closed on October 7, 2011. All six positions have been filled. Three seats were filled by acclamation and three through the balloting process. The by-election was held to decide the GEC membership in the following constituencies:

Two student seats in Division IV (Life Sciences)
One faculty seat in Division IV (Life Sciences)

The Election Committee met electronically and confirmed the results on Friday, October 14, 2011. The full results are as follows:

Faculty Constituencies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Nominations</th>
<th>Graduate Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Div 1—Humanities</td>
<td>Heather Murray</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 vacancy)</td>
<td>[acclaimed]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div 4—Life Sciences</td>
<td>Martin Wojtowicz</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 vacancy)</td>
<td>[elected]</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>Div 1—Humanities</td>
<td>Michael Donnelly</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 vacancy)</td>
<td>[acclaimed]**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div 3—Social Sciences</td>
<td>Trinayan Misra</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 vacancy)</td>
<td>[acclaimed]*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div 4—Life Sciences</td>
<td>Nicholas Howell</td>
<td>Medical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 vacancies)</td>
<td>[elected]**</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iwona Wenderska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[elected]**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terms of office:
Faculty serve a three year, non-renewable term of office.
Students 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: Professor Charlie Keil, GEC Faculty Div. I member, Mr. Jack Lee, GEC Student Div. II member; Ms. Emma Thacker, SGS Governance and Policy Officer; and Ms. Jane Alderdice, Secretary of GEC and Chief Returning Officer.

A total of 2107 Division IV faculty members were eligible to vote; 103 ballots were received, 4 of which were spoiled. A total of 4253 Division IV student members were eligible to vote; 231 ballots were received, 8 of which were spoiled.
**Graduate Education Council Membership 2011-12 (REVISED)**

**Effective: October 18, 2011**

### Division I – Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members:</th>
<th>Term Ends June 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alison Keith (Chair)</td>
<td>Classics 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Keil</td>
<td>History / Cinema Studies Institute 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillian MacKay</td>
<td>Music 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Murray</td>
<td>English 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Noyes</td>
<td>German 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Members:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adleen Crapo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramiro Ramas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Donnelly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division II – Social Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members:</th>
<th>Term Ends June 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charmaine Williams (Chair)</td>
<td>Social Work 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Campbell</td>
<td>Curriculum, Teaching &amp; Learning 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Litvack</td>
<td>Social Work 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrica Piccardo</td>
<td>Curriculum, Teaching &amp; Learning 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Welsh</td>
<td>Sociology 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Members:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan Gordon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division III – Physical Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members:</th>
<th>Term Ends June 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shamim Sheikh (Chair)</td>
<td>Civil Engineering 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus Bussmann</td>
<td>Mechanical and Industrial Engineering 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Knight</td>
<td>Statistics 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir Papangelakis</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering &amp; Applied Chemistry 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Yip</td>
<td>Biomaterials &amp; Biomedical Engineering 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Members:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan Niklas Caspers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aatmi Desai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinayan Misra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division IV – Life Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members:</th>
<th>Term Ends June 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luc De Nil (Chair)</td>
<td>Speech-Language Pathology 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Cole</td>
<td>Public Health Sciences 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Campbell</td>
<td>Cell &amp; Systems Biology 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Mount</td>
<td>Institute of Medical Science 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Wojtowicz</td>
<td>Physiology 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Members:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Howell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Soliman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwona Wenderska</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administrative Staff: | Term ends June 30 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Hurlibey</td>
<td>School of Graduate Studies 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauline Martini</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering &amp; Applied Chemistry 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soobong Song</td>
<td>Nursing 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Secretariat: |
- Jane Alderdice (Secretary to Council)  
- Anil Purandaré (Assistant Secretary to Council)

### Schedule of Meetings: |
- October 18, 2011  
- November 15, 2010  
- January 17, 2012  
- February 14, 2012 (reserve)  
- March 20, 2012 (reserve)  
- April 17, 2012  
- May 15, 2012 (reserve)  

[www.sgs.utoronto.ca/governance/gec/meetings](http://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/governance/gec/meetings)
FOR INFORMATION
Graduate Education Council
Tuesday, November 15, 2011

ITEM 10.3

Academic Integrity Annual Report 2010-11

See attached documents:
• *Academic Integrity Annual Report to GEC 2010-11*
This report provides statistics on graduate student cases administered within the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) under the University of Toronto Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters (“the Code”). The SGS Office of the Dean is responsible for these cases.

Table 1 below shows the number of Code offence cases, by offence type, where a sanction was imposed at the level of SGS. The table provides data by academic year for cases that were concluded during that year.

Table 2 below shows the length of time, i.e., “timeliness”, from the date when an allegation of offence was received by SGS to the date that either a sanction was imposed at the level of SGS or the case was referred to the Office of the Provost. The table provides data by academic year for cases that were concluded at the SGS level during that year. There is only one year of data for timeliness since 2010-11 is the first year this information was recorded.

### Table 1: Number of Offences Resolved at SGS by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Section</th>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(a)</td>
<td>Forgery (documents, not transcripts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(b)</td>
<td>Unauthorized aid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(c)</td>
<td>Personation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(d)</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(e)</td>
<td>Re-submission of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.1(f)</td>
<td>Concoction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.3(a)</td>
<td>Forgery (academic records)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.i.3(b)</td>
<td>Cheating for academic advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Timeliness (including cases referred to the Provost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time between receipt of allegation and case resolved at SGS or sent to the Provost</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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See attached documents:

• Graduate Academic Appeals Board Annual Activity Report 2010-11
This report lists appeals to the Graduate Academic Appeals Board (GAAB) that were initiated in the preceding year.

The Secretary of GAAB ensures that the graduate unit, appellant, and the Chair and members of the Board receive all filed documentation determined as admissible by the Chair; this includes the notice of appeal and statement from the appellant, formal response from the graduate unit, formal reply by the appellant, and any subsequent filings by either the appellant or graduate unit. The Secretary schedules the appeal hearing, ensures a full quorum of GAAB members for the hearing panels, is present at the appeal hearing, and distributes the Chair’s written final decision to all parties.

The Secretary of GAAB also fields inquiries via e-mail, telephone or in person. Generally, inquiries are in the range of approximately a dozen per year. Consultation often includes both graduate unit and potential appellants, and only some of these become formal appeals. The SGS Vice-Dean, Students, may serve as informal mediator in some cases.

The Secretary ensures that the Board positions are filled, that is, that the Board is composed of a Chair and an alternate Chair, together with three faculty members from each academic division and three graduate students. Membership is renewed annually. This normally occurs on a yearly basis but may happen more frequently in the event of vacancies.

### FORMAL APPEALS
(Cases initiated during July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Basis of Appeal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master’s Students (Total: 6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Termination of Registration</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>Course Grade</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Landscape &amp; Design</td>
<td>Termination of Registration</td>
<td>Termination vacated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Professional Accounting</td>
<td>Termination of Registration</td>
<td>Termination vacated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Landscape &amp; Design</td>
<td>Course Grade</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>Course Grade</td>
<td>Appellant’s request granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Students (Total: 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Course Grade</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed in part and appellant's request granted in part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Course Grade</td>
<td>Appeal dismissed in part and appellant's request granted in part.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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