

MINUTES
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
Graduate New Programs and Curriculum Committee Meeting
Friday, November 29, 2013; 9:00 – 11:00am
Venue: Room 203, Graduate Student Centre, 6371 Crescent Road

Present: Tony Bi, John Church, Jessica Iverson (Minutes), Lindsey Kovacevic, Bill Ramey, Max Read, Clive Roberts (Chair), Susie Stephenson

Regrets: Joy Begley, Barak Caracheo

1. Adoption of Agenda

-Adopted

2. Minutes of Friday, November 15, 2013 Meeting

-Approved

3. Business Arising

-Further to the September 13, 2013 NPCC meeting, Applied Science has submitted an amended proposal form for CHBE 570 (3) for review by the Committee Chair; the proponent also submitted a curriculum consultation from Cellular & Physiological Sciences and has requested another from Physics (both as courtesies); the Chair is satisfied with the resubmission; the new course proposal will be put forward at the next meeting of the Senate Curriculum Committee

-Further to the November 15, 2013 NPCC meeting, Arts has withdrawn a proposal to change the grading type of GRSJ 500 from pass/fail to percentage; although the Committee did not have time to review the proposal, one member noted both the Curriculum Management System within the Faculty Service Centre and the Faculty Course Management System both already reflect percentage grading; as such, a curriculum proposal is not required

-Further to the November 15, 2013 NPCC meeting, Education has submitted an amended proposal form for the Human Development, Learning, and Culture Calendar entry for review by the Committee Chair; the Chair is satisfied with the resubmission; the proposal has been duly forwarded to the Senate Admissions Committee (changes to the PhD Admission Requirements) and Enrolment Services (all other changes) for entry into the next Calendar release

4. Held Over Proposals

Faculty of Arts Submitted by Stacy Campbell	
<p>SOCI 515 (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -provide list of possible instructors -rephrase Course Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -what skills or knowledge will students acquire? -often phrased as bullet points following the statement, "By the end of the course, students will be able to..." -objectives should be linked to assessment -provide greater detail for each component under Course Evaluation; include assessment criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -what are students required to complete? -how are they assessed? -provide details on course format <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -how is the course structured (method of 	<p>SOCI 514 (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the Committee noted students from many other programs take this course; most are not from Sociology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -provide curriculum consultations from affected units -how will the prerequisite affect those other students' programs of study? the Committee suggests including this specific question in the curriculum consultations -what is the intention with respect to adding the prerequisite? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -require Sociology students to take the course? -restrict non-Sociology students from taking the course?

<p>presentation of course material, labs, tutorials, web-based platforms)? -resubmit amended syllabus for review by the Chair Action: HOLD</p>	<p>-in the rationale section, explain why SOCI 502 is a “necessary prerequisite” for SOCI 514 -students have been taking SOCI 514 for years without completing SOCI 502, and final marks indicate they have done fine Action: HOLD</p>
---	---

<p align="center">Faculties of Law and Commerce and Business Administration Submitted by Joel Bakan</p>	
<p>Dual M.B.A./J.D. Calendar entry* -in order to clarify the double counting aspect of the dual degrees program, the Committee made the following amendment -<u>Removed</u>: Total minimum credits to be taken: 135 Total credits awarded: 147 (due to double counting of J.D. and M.B.A. credits) -<u>Replaced with</u>: Since 12 credits are shared between the two degrees, the total minimum credits to be taken is 135. Action: APPROVED</p>	

<p align="center">Faculty of Science Submitted by Nancy Cook</p>	
	<p>Atmospheric Science Calendar entry -clarify the second paragraph in the Program Overview and amend rationale statement accordingly -resubmit amended proposal for review by the Chair Action: HOLD</p> <p>EOSC 560 (3) Action: APPROVED</p> <p>Geological Engineering Calendar entry -the Master of Engineering entry should not appear in the Graduate Studies section of the Calendar, and M.Eng. should not be added to the list of degrees offered; rehome the entry and add a pointer from Graduate Studies to the appropriate Calendar page to redirect interested students (as per Civil Engineering and Mining Engineering, for example) Action: HOLD</p> <p>Geological Sciences Calendar entry -Honorary Professors are not Graduate Studies members and should not appear in the members listing; the text has been</p>

	<p>deleted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Honorary Professors can be listed in the Academic Staff List of the respective department and/or faculty <p>Action: APPROVED</p> <p>Geophysics Calendar entry</p> <p>Action: APPROVED</p> <p>Oceanography Calendar entry</p> <p>Action: APPROVED</p>
--	---

5. New Proposals

Faculty of Applied Science Submitted by Rebecca Bateman	
<p><u>General comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -with regards to closing the existing MA and MSc degrees, the Committee suggests considering the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -discontinuing the non-thesis option but retaining the thesis and then redesigning the curriculum for the retained program and renaming it; page 1 of the proposal (Executive Summary) would need to be amended, as would references throughout the document -this course of action would still likely require Ministry approval -the proposal makes references to an “expanded core” (pages 23, 29, 50), which the Committee found confusing; if the courses are required of all MCRP students, then they comprise the core <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -clarify or remove references throughout the document -for most courses, how do the evaluation criteria convert to numeric grades? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -ensure this is clearly conveyed to students in the syllabi -the grading rubrics for PLAN 523 and PLAN 526 are confusing, inconsistent and, in places, inappropriate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -for example, with regards to PLAN 526, a B could represent the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -“Poorly articulated problem or opportunity...” -“Demonstrates an acceptable comprehension of urban design theory...” -“Little evidence of deep thinking...” -“Generally poor attention to detail...” -the Committee has not yet fully reviewed the individual courses, however some 	

specific comments appear below; refer to annotated proposal document for further comments

Master of Community and Regional Planning degree program

Action: HOLD

PLAN 508 (3)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 509 (2)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 510 (2)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 520 (1)

-in the syllabus, provide more details on "Team Maintenance"

-how is it assessed?

-is there a rubric to guide students?

Action: HOLD

PLAN 521 (2)

-what is the nature of the assignments (i.e., what will students be doing? what do the assignments involve?)

-what are the assessment criteria?

-how do they relate to learning objectives?

-refer to page 54 of [Senate's Curriculum Guide](#) for further details

Action: HOLD

PLAN 522 (2)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 523 (2)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 524 (2)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 525 (2)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 526 (6)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 527 (3)

Action: HOLD

PLAN 528 (3/6) D	
------------------	--

Action: HOLD	
---------------------	--

6. Adjournment of Meeting

7. Next meeting: 9:00 AM, Friday, December 13, 2013, Room 203 of the Graduate Student Centre

*proposal for Senate Curriculum Sub-Committee of Graduate Programs