

MINUTES
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
Graduate New Programs and Curriculum Committee Meeting
Friday, January 10, 2014; 9:00 – 11:00am
Venue: Room 203, Graduate Student Centre, 6371 Crescent Road

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

Regrets: N/A

1. **Adoption of Agenda**
-Adopted
2. **Minutes of Friday, December 13, 2013 Meeting**
-Held over for approval at next meeting
3. **Business Arising**
-N/A
4. **Held Over Proposals**

Faculty of Applied Science Submitted by Deb Feduik	
	<p>CIVL 526 (3) -how do the updated title and description better reflect course content? -provide an academic justification -resubmit amended proposal form for review by the Chair Action: HOLD</p> <p>CIVL 540 (3) -the Committee thinks the new title does not convey the content as well as the old one; without the description, it could be considered a different course -the Committee suggests reconsidering the proposed title; consider retaining 'waves' in the title and including "offshore structures" in the description -how do the updated title and description better reflect course content? -provide an academic justification -resubmit amended proposal form for review by the Chair Action: HOLD</p> <p>CIVL 572 (3) -in 2011 the title was changed from Environmental Geotechnique to Contaminated Site Investigation and Management, and now the change is being reversed</p>

	<p>-explain why the title is being reverted -how does the updated title better reflect course content? -provide an academic justification -resubmit amended proposal form for review by the Chair Action: HOLD</p> <p>EECE 592 (3) Action: APPROVED</p> <p>Chemical and Biological Engineering Graduate Programs TOEFL Requirement -proposal will be forwarded to the Senate Admissions Committee Action: APPROVED</p> <p>Mechanical Engineering MSc Program Requirements Action: APPROVED</p>
--	--

5. New Proposals

<p style="text-align: center;">Faculty of Applied Science Submitted by Aimee Wesley</p>	
	<p>NURS 595 (3) -the Committee thinks this change could possibly be considered Category 1, however it is difficult to assess as presented -submit outline of the current version of NURS 595 for comparison purposes -some of the alternative formats for the SPAR (detailed on pages 10-11 of the guidelines) do not necessarily translate to what is required for a major essay -in the rationale section, explain how the content of SPAR is the same as the major essay; if the content is substantially different, the proposal may be elevated to Category 1 -in the rationale section, explain how exactly the course name change reflects recent adjustments to the standards in the field of nursing regarding small scope projects and approaches -add a standalone Learning Outcomes section to the guidelines that explains what skills or knowledge students will acquire -often phrased as bullet points following the statement, "By the end of the course, students will be able to..." -Learning Outcomes should be linked to assessment Action: HOLD</p>

	<p>Master of Science in Nursing Program Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -replace “Scholarly Practice Advancement Research Project (SPAR) (3 credits)” with “3-credit research project (NURS 595)”; similarly, replace “thesis (6 credits)” with “6-credit thesis (NURS 599)” -the last sentence of the requirements reads, “The student may complete a...” -must students complete one or the other? -if yes, replace with, “The student must complete either a...” <p>Action: HOLD</p>
--	---

Faculty of Medicine Submitted by Erin Smith	
<p>SPPH 521 (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the Committee notes a previous version of SPPH 521 was closed in Summer 2013, however the rationale section for that change states the course was not taught prior to 2000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -confirm if there are any students who have taken the previous version of SPPH 521 that would thus be blocked from registering in the new version -the rationale section states SPPH 521 is a “central component of a larger set of curriculum changes within the MSc and PhD programs” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -is it a required course? -for which programs, specifically? -add details to the rationale section -begin the Course Format section of the syllabus with a description of the format (i.e., begin with the second bullet; the preceding information is not a description of the format) -under Assessment and Evaluation, for small group work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -who is doing the assessment—students or instructors? -how are students assessed? -does everyone in the group receive the same mark? -add details to the syllabus -under Grading, for C Level (55% to 67%), the Committee finds the use of “doctoral” confusing, as it is the only time it is mentioned <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -who takes this course—masters students, doctoral students, both? -if both, is there separate grading for the 	

<p>two groups of students? -if both, could the syllabus just read “graduate students”? -change “Faculty of Graduate Studies” to “University of British Columbia” as it is the University’s policy -again under Grading, for A Level (80% to 100%), in the first line the Committee suggests changing “greatly exceeds course expectations” to “meets highest expectations” Action: HOLD</p>	
--	--

<p>Faculty of Dentistry Submitted by Maire Skelly ***Discussion of the following proposals was chaired by Bill Ramey***</p>
--

<p>DENT 539 (3) -how is the course actually operated? -expand Course Format section to be more specific about the students' interactions with the resources listed -under Learning Outcomes it says students are “to critically read and evaluate quantitative research articles,” but the Committee is unclear how students are learning to do such an evaluation -link Learning Outcomes to assessment -under Assessment, the note at the end of the section is not entirely accurate as 6 credits of pass standing (60-67%) may be counted toward a master's program; the Committee suggests replacing the note with a link to the G+PS Grading Practices: https://www.grad.ubc.ca/faculty-staff/policies-procedures/grading-practices -provide curriculum consultation from Statistics Action: HOLD</p> <p>DENT 540 (3) -provide more information on the research proposal; specifically: -what type of topics would be considered reasonable? -how is the proposal developed? -when does preparation begin? -what is the deliverable? -how is it evaluated? -what is the relationship between the proposal and the actual mark? -add details to the syllabus -submit library consultation form -on the third page of the syllabus under Oral</p>	
--	--

Examination, there are two periods at the end of the second sentence; amend Action: HOLD	
--	--

Faculty of Education Submitted by Christine Wallsworth	
	Society, Culture and Politics in Education MEd Program Requirements Action: APPROVED

Faculty of Law Submitted by Chira Perla	
	LAW 507 (4) Action: APPROVED
	LAW 508 (3-4) d Action: APPROVED
	LAW 509 (3) Action: APPROVED
	LAW 562 (3) Action: APPROVED
	LAW 563 (3) Action: APPROVED
	LAW 564 (3) Action: APPROVED
	LAW 565 (4) Action: APPROVED
	LAW 566 (4) Action: APPROVED
	LAW 567 (3) Action: APPROVED

6. Adjournment of Meeting

7. Next meeting: 9:00 AM, Friday, January 24, 2014, Room 203 of the Graduate Student Centre

*proposal for Senate Curriculum Sub-Committee of Graduate Programs