

MINUTES
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
Graduate New Programs and Curriculum Committee Meeting
Friday, March 21, 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 (Substitute Chair), Max Read, Susie Stephenson

Regrets: Clive Roberts (Chair)

1. Adoption of Agenda

-Adopted

2. Minutes of Friday, March 7, 2014 Meeting

-Approved

3. Business Arising

-On February 21, 2014, the Senate Curriculum Sub-Committee of Graduate Programs approved a proposal to add “post-baccalaureate” as a Calendar descriptor to the existing PharmD. Since the approval, the Office of Planning and Institutional Research (PAIR), the campus group that provides reports and statistical information to the government, has raised concern with the descriptor; although “post-baccalaureate” is technically accurate, the term is not used in that way at UBC (instead, it describes degrees like the JD and MD, i.e., non-graduate). PAIR was in favour of the “post-graduate” descriptor originally proposed by Pharmaceutical Sciences, but that term is also not accurate within a UBC context as it usually means a degree following a graduate degree. In place of “post-baccalaureate” both “graduate” or “graduate-level” were suggested as alternate descriptors. The Committee accepted “graduate.” The proponent has been informed and the original proposal has been revised.

4. Resubmitted Proposals

Faculty of Medicine Submitted by Erin Smith	
SPPH 550 (3) Action: APPROVED	

5. New Proposals

Faculty of Medicine Submitted by Tracy Henderson	
RSOT 519 (4) -in the rationale statement, explain how the new credit values were determined (i.e., how many course hours was the 10-credit version, and how was the 4-credit version calculated?) -spell out all abbreviations and acronyms in the syllabus that are not defined -“online” is one word -correct throughout the syllabus -page 2 of the syllabus indicates an assignment rubric is attached, but it is missing -attach rubric -the Grading Criteria table is a distribution of the grade across terms and activities; by	

what set of criteria will students be graded?
how is this converted to a grade?

- Small Group Tutorials in section IV lists a set of criteria; the Synthesis Exercises and Health Mentors Program should include similar details

- the relationship between the language used in the evaluation section and the topical outlines is unclear; the names of the activities should be consistently reflected in the outlines so that students know what they are required to do

- in the Clinic Visits table on page 4 of the syllabus, week 10 precedes week 6

- amend as needed

- what is the Health Care Team Challenge in the Interprofessional Learning Activities table on page 4 of the syllabus? how does it factor into evaluation?

- as per the Interprofessional Learning Activities table on page 6 of the syllabus, this seems to be an ongoing component of the course, however the Grading Criteria table on page 2 indicates the Health Mentors Program only takes place in Term 1

- amend as needed

- resubmit proposal form and syllabus for review by the Chair

Action: HOLD

RSOT 549 (5)

- in the rationale statement, explain how the new credit values were determined (i.e., how many course hours was the 18-credit version, and how was the 5-credit version calculated?)

- spell out all abbreviations and acronyms in the syllabus that are not defined

- “online” is one word

- correct throughout the syllabus

- page 3 of the syllabus indicates an assignment rubric is attached, but it is missing

- attach rubric

- some of the items listed under Method of Instruction do not clearly align with the Method of Evaluation and Topical Outline sections

- use consistent language throughout to avoid confusion

- what are the evaluation criteria for the debates?

- page 2 of the syllabus indicates Small Group

<p>Tutorials will be in each term, however they only appear in terms 4 and 5 in the outline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -amend as needed -the Committee suggests restructuring the second paragraph of point 3 on page 9 of the syllabus -state that the pair of students facilitating the first seminar will not be required to provide members with relevant readings 3 days prior due to the short lead time, but that all other students will -remove the sentence beginning with, "Leniency may..." -resubmit proposal form and syllabus for review by the Chair <p>Action: HOLD</p> <p>RSOT 528 (3)</p> <p>Action: APPROVED (Proposal will be submitted for the next level of approval once the issues for RSOT 519 and RSOT 549 have been addressed.)</p> <p>RSOT 538 (7)</p> <p>Action: APPROVED (Same comment as above.)</p> <p>RSOT 558 (9)</p> <p>Action: APPROVED (Same comment as above.)</p> <p>Master of Occupational Therapy Program Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the proposal was elevated to Category 1 so that the Calendar will be updated when the related courses have been approved; no further action required <p>Action: APPROVED</p>	
--	--

Faculty of Science Submitted by Nancy Cook	
<p>PHYS 573 (3)</p> <p>Action: APPROVED</p> <p>ZOOL 500 (1-6) c</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the relationship between activities and grades is unclear -for the peer evaluations, is the grade for this component determined by what the peers have assigned the students, or is it determined by the work the students did in evaluating their peers? how do the evaluations relate to the assignments? 	<p><i>The Faculty of Science submitted six additional proposals that do not appear below. Science was ensuring that the College for Interdisciplinary Studies Calendar entries for the programs pertaining to the Faculty were deleted. The CfIS chapter of the Calendar was removed in the last release, and as such, the proposals are not required.</i></p> <p>Bioinformatics Calendar entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -under Program Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy, the proposed first sentence of

<p>-what are the assignments? what are students required to do? -for the final proposal, are there criteria that relate to the rubric provided? -the nature of the peer groups is unclear -how are they comprised? -what sort of feedback do they give? -what are the evaluation criteria for the feedback? -how are consistency and fairness ensured? -submit amended syllabus for review by the Chair Action: HOLD</p>	<p>the second paragraph reads, "Students proceeding toward a Ph.D. must pass an oral qualifying examination within the first 36 months of study." -the Committee questioned whether this qualifying examination was the comprehensive examination, and if so, if the sentence should be changed to read, "All doctoral students are required to successfully complete a comprehensive examination, which consists of an oral and written component." -it is Senate's policy that students must reach candidacy within 36 months and therefore it is not necessary to restate in the Calendar entry Action: APPROVED</p> <p>BIOL 548 (1-6) c Action: APPROVED</p> <p>BOTA 512 (2/3) c Action: APPROVED</p> <p>Genome Science and Technology Calendar entry Action: APPROVED</p> <p>Geological Engineering MEng Calendar entry **RESUBMITTED** Action: APPROVED</p> <p>Microbiology and Immunology Calendar entry Action: APPROVED</p>
---	--

Faculty of Applied Science Submitted by Deb Feduik	
	Civil Engineering PhD Program Requirements Action: APPROVED

Faculty of Education Submitted by Christine Wallsworth	
	EDST 548 (3) Action: APPROVED LLED 599 (9) Action: APPROVED

6. Adjournment of Meeting

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