

Graduate Council
June 16th, 2015 1:30 pm
GH 111

Present: Dr. D. Welch (Chair), Ms. S. Baschiera, Dr. A. Deza, Dr. A. Dean, Dr. A. Holloway, Dr. T. Adams, Dr. W. Wiesner, Dr. A. Grenier, Dr. A. Shi, Dr. T. Kroker, Dr. D. Novog, Dr. M. Thompson, Dr. C. Hayward, Dr. N. Agarwal, Mr. P. Self

Regrets: Dr. S. McCracken, Dr. I. Zeytinoglu, Dr. S. Hanna, Dr. S. Streeter, Dr. G. McClelland, Dr. K. Bird

By invitation: Dr. E. Allard, Dr. R. Friendly

A G E N D A

I. Minutes of the meeting of May 19th, 2015

The minutes of the meeting of May 19th, 2015 were approved on a motion by Dr. Welch, seconded by Dr. Deza.

II. Business arising

There was no business arising.

III. Report from the Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies

There was no report.

IV. Report from the Graduate Associate Deans

Dr. Agarwal reported that the Business Ph.D. program had gone through its cyclical IQAP review and the proposed EMBA program has also had its external site visit. Dr. Hayward reported that the sixth Faculty of Health Sciences Research Plenary had been a great success. She also noted that there are a few new program proposals coming from the Faculty Health Sciences and that they are currently waiting to hear from the MTCU on funding for the M.Sc. in Child Life Studies and Pediatric Psychosocial Care proposal. Dr. Welch reported that there was a request from the MTCU to submit a list of all new programs expected to be submitted before the Strategic Mandate expires.

V. Report from the Associate Registrar and Graduate Secretary

Stephanie Baschiera reported that the two new Ph.D.s proposed by the Health and Aging program had received MTCU approval. The proposed Ph.D. in Labour Studies and M.Sc. in Child Life Studies and Pediatric Psychosocial Care have both been approved for expedited review by the MTCU. She also noted that they are planning a more collaborative approach for new program reviews at Graduate Council.

Ms. Baschiera asked that programs let her know of any outstanding issues not already reported to her team regarding the admissions module of Mosaic. The module went live in March and many issues that need correcting before the next admissions cycle have been identified. Any additional feedback should be sent to Stephanie. Dr. Welch noted that feedback would particularly be valuable from programs who did not make the most use of the old systems.

VI. Report from the Assistant Dean, Graduate Student Life and Research Training

Mr. Peter Self reported on three items. The first item was the indigenous undergraduate summer research scholars program, funded through Provost's office. They're aiming for twelve participants this year, with supervision for the students spread across the faculties. The second item was Roller Skating with the Dean, with 75 participants signed up. Finally, Mr. Self reported that his team is planning to hold three one-day writing sessions, with some workshops mixed in. The majority of the time will be spent writing and the sessions will be held in Mills Library.

VII. Faculty of Engineering – New Graduate Career Development Policy

Dr. Thompson presented information about the Faculty of Engineering's proposal for a Graduate Career Development Policy. The Faculty of Engineering has been running career development workshops in an attempt to get students to think about what they're going to do with their degree after they graduate. This was started largely as a reaction to feedback that the faculty had received from Ph.D. graduates who felt they had been 'misled' about the career paths available to them. He noted that the Faculty has really good career counselling staff for undergraduate students and they're planning to expand to be able to serve graduate students as well. The proposed plan is that each incoming Masters and Ph.D. students be required within their first year to take a one-on-one tutorial with a career development counsellor that they then hand into their program. Dr. Thompson noted that the Faculty is planning to offer a 'carrot' for good proposals: students that do very well would have the opportunity to talk to an alumnus. Engaged alumni would like to assist but the resources are limited. Dr. Thompson emphasized that what they're really trying to get passed is the requirement to participate in career planning.

A council member asked if this will only apply to new students.

Dr. Thompson confirmed that this is the case. The Faculty is working to set up a workshop for current students before the end of August to give them the same opportunity.

A council member asked for clarification about the competition and reward aspect, concerned about the growing awards culture that clashes with the mandate to educate all students. He asked why not mentor the worst fifteen proposals rather than the best fifteen. Dr. Thompson responded that he understood the perspective. He thinks the most important aspect for students is that they meet with the career counsellors and came out with an awareness that they have a goal (even if it changes over the course of their degree). Pedagogical outcome is the awareness that's gained by the meeting. Dr. Thompson agreed that it would be nice to have the alumni mentoring those that didn't take it quite so seriously but wants to be careful as there is a concern that it may dissuade alumni for participating. The council member agreed that career trajectories for graduate students is a broad concern across faculties and he noted he is very much in favour of seeing info about career trajectories available to students. He suggested a workshop with best 15 proposals for a broader group of graduate students might work well. Dr. Thompson responded that he doesn't want to enforce any marking requirement.

and that awareness is what students are supposed to get out of it. He also noted that this is just one part of the initiative. MIIETL courses are also available to students as are the modules at mygradskills.ca.

Another council member noted that they may want to ask students to be opted in for alumni counselling. He also suggested that a lot of departments have something like what is being proposed. Dr. Thompson agreed that there is a lot of variation between departments; because the experience for students can be mixed, the Faculty is trying to provide an even experience to all students.

Dr. Welch noted that one of the things that had changed between the initial proposal and final one is the level of feedback involved. He suggested that feedback could be provided from the staff providing the career planning services. Dr. Thompson responded that he is cautious about promising to deploy resources and noted that many different kinds of sessions will be available to students.

Dr. Hayward asked how this would be handled administratively. Dr. Thompson responded that they'll handle it the same way they handle supervisory committee reports.

Dr. Hayward asked if the portfolio is a requirement whether it would be described in the handbook or the calendar. Dr. Thompson has asked program to update the handbooks first and the plan is to coordinate the calendar later.

Council members discussed the appropriate place for the new information to appear in the graduate calendar.

A council member asked if there was any chance the career counselling could impact them negatively for a career in engineering. Dr. Thompson responded that the role of the career counselling would be to assess their place in their department and areas of research and assist the student in question with finding companies or industries that might be appropriate. He also noted that there might be a potential co-op component.

The council member asked for confirmation that the career counseling would not involve the type of tests that measure suitability. Dr. Thompson confirmed that this is the case.

A guest noted that some students might be concerned that their supervisor knows they're checking into careers other than academia and wondered about the mechanism for privacy around the career counselling. Council members discussed who would be reviewing the career information. A council member noted that it is much more common for students in engineering to enter a career in industry.

A council member asked if a friendly amendment is required with respect to the language around the ten best portfolios.

Dr. Welch agreed that a friendly amendment to strike out the requirement on the ten best portfolios and to consider that a detail of implementation should be included.

Dr. Welch moved and Dr. Thompson seconded, 'that Graduate Council approve the new Graduate Career Development Policy as described in the documents, with the friendly amendment noted.'

The motion was **carried**.

VIII. Faculty of Health Sciences – Revised Police Check Policy

Dr. Hayward explained that the Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy programs require students to submit to a vulnerable sector screener. Sites participating in clinical placement require a police check and students have to fulfill this requirement as part of their clinical placement. Dr. Hayward noted that there can be a 'Not Clear' police records check for similar names and, in some cases, even if you were the victim of the crime. The updated policy has been put forward to reflect some changes on how the police check had been administered at various levels and to include in more detail the implications of and necessary course of action with respect to an initial 'Not Clear' check. The updated policy also more clearly addresses what is required for international candidates and students. There have been minimal issues since the policy was originally approved and it is exceedingly rare for this issue to affect admission or progress through the program. If they were found guilty of a serious issue there would be a way of rescinding an offer or expelling an existing student as they would be unable to complete their clinical training program.

Dr. Welch noted that the key issue is that as things stood in the past a student might believe that just qualifying academically would be sufficient for them to be entitled to complete a program. The changes to the policy are simply communicating the fact that these programs have additional requirements that are outside of the academic programs.

Dr. Hayward agreed and noted that the academic requirements for the programs in question require students to take a clinical placement (which, in turn, requires students get the police check). The panel meets to review students that don't have a clear record check (in most cases this is due to the person sharing a name with a perpetrator, victim or something that didn't lead to charges).

Dr. Hayward noted that a couple of minor revisions to the copy council members had received were required to Section (i) concerning the undergraduate and graduate associate dean titles

A council member asked if all programs would be affected by this change.

Dr. Hayward responded that it is only required for OT and PT. If someone was working on their thesis that required a clinical setting placement, they could also be affected.

Dr. Hayward moved and Dr. Holloway seconded, 'that the change to the Police Records Check Policy be approved by Graduate Council.'

The motion was **carried**.

IX. Teaching and Learning Certificate Calendar Copy

Dr. Friendly noted that the certificate itself and courses have already been approved; the information presented is just an outline of information for the calendar. They took the suggestion of Graduate Council to include clear instructions about speaking to supervisor, particularly where EDUCATN 750 was concerned, due to the credit issue/degree requirement.

Dr. Welch noted that 750 is a credit course but that it doesn't satisfy the degree requirements. Dr. Friendly noted that 751 and all the other courses in the program have no credits and Dr. Allard noted that students have the option to register for either EDU 750 or 751.

A council member asked why a student would take it for zero credit when you could have it appear on your transcript. Dr. Friendly responded that the zero unit courses will still appear on the transcript.

A council member asked a question about fees. Dr. Welch responded that you have to be registered as a graduate student to take the courses. Dr. Allard responded that to take it for credit you have to be registered as a graduate student

A council member asked if students have to be approved as a post-degree student to take the course. Dr. Welch responded that this is different than taking a course in a traditional graduate program.

A council member asked which programs recognize 750 as part of the degree requirement. Drs. Friendly and Allard responded that they were told that it's not a simple matter and it would involve contacting each program to find out. Dr. Welch recalled that one graduate program allows it for sure.

Dr. Agarwal moved and Dr. Deza seconded, 'that Graduate Council approve the Teaching and Learning Certificate Calendar Copy as described in the documents'

The motion was **carried**.

X. Calendar Revision

Ms. Baschiera noted that the section that the proposed change concerns is 5.2.1. The highlighted yellow text provided to council members for inclusion is this section is an exact copy and paste from the offer letter. Currently the information is only codified in the offer letter, by including this phrase from the offer letter in the calendar, everyone will have fair access to the regulations as they stand.

A council member asked why the letter of offer can't show what the change in funding would be if they won an external award, noting that the lack of clarity is a problem.

Ms. Baschiera responded that the offer letter is a template that goes out. The folks preparing the offer wouldn't necessarily have all of the information about scholarships and funding changes possible. There are also system considerations.

Dr. Welch responded that now that the school has gone into a new mode of offering letters of admission we are in a better and worse place on being able to be clear on what all of the downstream possibilities are. However, enumerating all the possible outcomes in the offer letter is nearly impossible, particularly considering the variability between programs.

Mr. Self confirmed the variability between programs, noting that some programs let them keep a huge portion of funding and some claw back to assist funding other students.

A council member noted there is a lack of clarity for their own planning. Dr. Welch responded that at least the text proposed clarifies that the program is the deciding factor. Dr. Hayward commented that one of their graduate programs indicates on their website what stipend would be if you won award A/B/C.

Council members discussed the minimum amount of scholarship funding to be retained if there was an award.

Dr. Welch noted that it is definitely best to have clarity on what the current situation is, and that's what this motion should address.

Dr. Hayward asked how this is operationalized. Does winning one of these trigger an offer letter? Ms. Baschiera responded that the text to be added to the calendar is exactly the text that would appear in the revised offer letter. This is with respect to the funding at the point of admission. If there is a discrepancy between the original offer and revised offer, the calendar will prevail.

Dr. Hayward asked who is double-checking that in each instance that the recipient will get a copy of the correspondence. Dr. Welch responded that the program would be responsible

There was discussion among council members about what happens if there after the point of admission and how this will get communicated.

A council member said there is no real time where you become aware administratively about changes in funding.

Dr. Welch responded that the funding will have to be altered in some way as a change in the system. The program would submit the change to be implemented to SGS. Brooke Gordon would be the best person to discuss the details but the program would have to initiate the change in any case.

Dr. Ibhawoh noted that much of it falls to the program in any case and all SGS can provide is a high-level standard for programs to follow.

A council member asked if there was or could be a policy around how financial changes should be communicated. The concern is that without some sort of statement the rules would change from year to year and might create an inequity between years.

Council members agree that this is program level decision.

A council member noted that it's the student issue that they're concerned about – it needs to be clear what they can expect if they do win an award.

Another council member referred back to Dr. Hayward's earlier comment about programs outlining the funding they would receive in the case of different awards via their website.

Dr. Welch noted that the issue varies most strongly on a Faculty scale. The calendar change proposed only clarifies what actually happens. Faculties need to discuss among themselves if they would like to be clear exactly on what their programs do.

Dr. Hayward asked that the change of pay forms include a box noting 'have you communicated the change of pay to the student' to prompt programs.

Dr. Hayward moved and Dr. Wiesner seconded, 'that Graduate Council approve the change to the Graduate Calendar section 5.2.1 as described in the document.'

The motion was **carried**.