Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
Graduate New Programs and Curriculum Committee Meeting
Friday, January 31, 2014; 9:00 – 11:30am
Venue: Room 200, Graduate Student Centre, 6371 Crescent Road

Present: John Church, Jessica Iverson (Minutes), Lindsey Kovacevic, Bill Ramey, Clive Roberts (Chair)

Regrets: Tony Bi, Lena Patsa, Max Read, Susie Stephenson

1. **Adoption of Agenda**
   -Adopted

2. **Resubmitted Proposals**

Faculty of Applied Science	
Submitted by Rebecca Bateman	
Many of the below edits have been noted in the proposal itself using track changes; please see the annotated document for all suggested changes.	
****Please resubmit the courses marked with three asterisks for review by the full Committee on February 21.*	
All other revisions can be submitted for review by the Chair. Please <mark>highlight</mark> all changes.	
Master of Community and Regional Planning degree program	
-amend rationale statement for the overall program to explain why there is a specific need; remove information that does not address this point; include the professional designation of future graduates (i.e., what the students will be upon completion of the program)	
-most course proposals lack specific rationale statements, however the information appears in the supporting syllabi (with regards to accreditation and academic objectives); add details to the two-column forms	
-in all grading rubrics, for the C+ the Committee suggests changing "serious" to "notable"; "serious" implies there are major concerns of understanding and effort (i.e., why isn't the grade a fail?)	
-in general, the Committee supports the assessment criteria for the proposed courses but found they didn't necessarily translate well to the grading criteria,	

hence the suggestion
Action: HOLD
 	
PLAN Course Code
Action: HOLD
 	
PLAN 508 (3)
-in the title, change "Introduction to" to "Foundations of" as Senate discourages the use of the former (it is implied that all courses will introduce students to new topics)
-students are evaluated based on their coverage of the following:
• First, what makes you think this person is a planner. What kind of planner is s/he?
• Second, describe and reflect on this planner's daily work.
• Third, reflect on what mixtures of skills and theories were drawn on by the planner, referring to the relevant literature throughout the course to support your argument.
• Fourth, connect all of the above with reflections on your own professional development.
  -with regards to the fourth point, will students with limited professional experience in planning be able to self-reflect? is this an appropriate expectation for a mixed class?
Action: HOLD
 	
PLAN 509 (2)
-this course is predominantly historical; for a professional program, why is this a core course?
  -justify why this background is essential for professional planners (there is good information on page 8 of the proposal)
Action: HOLD
 	
PLAN 510 (2)
-participation mark is unusually high (10% is the norm); the syllabus requires a better description of how students know they are doing well for that component
  -provide mechanisms for assessing participation OR reduce percentage
Action: HOLD
 	
PLAN 520 (1)***
-it is unclear how students can accomplish	

the goals noted in the overall academic objectives identified in the rationale statement in four sessions (12 hours in total)

    -the Committee is unsure that it is possible for a team-based learning activity to have the team form meaningfully, accomplish the stated goals and then participate in a peer evaluation exercise

-what are the in-class application exercises?

    -add an example to the syllabus to show how the activities relate to the learning outcomes

-the Committee suggests reassessing what students are supposed to achieve in this course; is it reasonable to become "competent" in the stated areas in four sessions?

-how are the competencies measured?

-when do students complete the exam?

-the assessment criteria and grading criteria are not aligned (i.e., the exam is not included in the latter)

-the math for the peer evaluation is confusing; the Committee did not find it to be a useful system

    -how is fairness to students ensured?

Action: HOLD

PLAN 521 (2)***

-what type of competency is the program attempting to develop in this course?

    -how is the course operated to develop these competencies?

    -what are students required to complete?

    -what part do the discussions play?

    -are four assignments adequate to develop the competencies?

-is it expected that students have a statistical background?

    -what if they don't have prior statistical knowledge?

    -is 24 hours of statistics enough time to develop competency, especially in the absence of a statistical background?

-where is it applicable to be original in statistics at this level (i.e., application versus development)?

-is there an exam?

-the Committee recommends adding a basic statistical text to the required readings (core info for weeks 1, 2, 6, 7), plus a resource for students entering without a statistical background

Action: HOLD

PLAN 522 (2)***
-in the rationale section, explain what qualitative data collection means in the context of planning
-provide details on the applied methods project
    -what is it?
    -how is it assessed?
    -how is the partner organization involved in the assessment?
-provide details on the group project requirement
    -what is it?
    -how is it assessed?
-the relationship between the course requirements and grading criteria is unclear
Action: HOLD

PLAN 523 (2)
Action: HOLD

PLAN 524 (2)
-participation mark is unusually high (10% is the norm); the syllabus requires a better description of how students know they are doing well for that component
    -what percentage of the overall component (25%) is attendance?
    -provide mechanisms for assessing participation OR reduce percentage
-how does a single paper capture the breadth of understanding of planning law? is it sufficient to develop the skills the program wants students to haven as a result of having taken this course?
Action: HOLD

PLAN 525 (2)
Action: HOLD

PLAN 526 (6)
Action: HOLD

PLAN 527 (3)
-is the sole basis of the pass/fail grade dependent upon the sponsoring agency? what is the role of the faculty supervisor in assigning a grade?
    -amend assessment criteria so that it is clear that the faculty supervisor decides whether or not the student passes, not

the external supervisor
-the learning outcomes largely describe how students interact with their supervisors
    -what is the overarching purpose of the internship?
Action: HOLD
 	
PLAN 528 (3/6) D
-the syllabus does not list learning outcomes, although the second paragraph of course overview includes relevant details
    -create a separate learning outcomes section and format as per usual (i.e., By the end of the course, students will be able to...")
Action: HOLD	

3. **Adjournment of Meeting**

4. **Next meeting: 9:00 AM, Friday, February 7, 2014, Room 203 of the Graduate Student Centre**

*proposal for Senate Curriculum Sub-Committee of Graduate Programs