

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**  
**Graduate New Programs and Curriculum Committee Meeting**  
**Friday, May 23, 2014; 9:00 – 11:00am**  
**Venue: Room 203, Graduate Student Centre, 6371 Crescent Road**

**Present:** John Church, Jessica Iverson (Minutes), Lena Patsa, Bill Ramey, Max Read, Clive Roberts (Chair)

**Regrets:** Tony Bi, Lindsey Kovacevic, Susie Stephenson

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

-Adopted

**2. Minutes of Friday, April 25, 2014 Meeting**

-Approved

**3. Business Arising**

-Further to the April 25, 2014 NPCC meeting, Law's proposal to add a P/T option to the existing Master of Laws (Common Law) proposal was reviewed and approved by the Senate Curriculum Committee on April 28, 2014, and then by the Senate on May 14, 2014; the proposal was elevated from Category 2 to Category 1 by the NPCC, and thus was subject to further review; the change was still approved in time to be entered into the 2014/2015 Academic Calendar

**4. Resubmitted Proposals**

<b>Faculty of Arts</b>	
Submitted by Beth Hirsh	
	SOCI 514 (3) <b>Action: APPROVED</b>

**5. New Proposals**

<b>Faculty of Dentistry</b>	
Submitted by Maire Skelly	
	Combined PhD and MSc/Diploma in Clinical Dental Specialty programs -the Admission Requirements section will be forwarded to the Senate Admissions Committee for review and approval <b>Action: APPROVED</b>
	Craniofacial Science TOEFL Requirement -the proposal will be forwarded to the Senate Admissions Committee for review and approval <b>Action: APPROVED</b>

<b>Faculty of Applied Science</b>	
Submitted by Luke Parkinson	
	<u>General comments:</u> -in many cases the Committee found the rationale statements did not fully explain the changes in question; greater detail would allow the Committee to better understand the proposals

-in the future, when a large number of proposals is submitted it would be helpful if the School could prepare a cover memo that provides some background information on the reason(s) for the changes; again, greater detail, even at a broad level, would allow the Committee to better understand the proposals

ARCH 500 (9)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 501 (9)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 502 (2)

-the Committee noted a statement about a non-refundable fee is being removed from the course description

-what is happening to the fee?

-will students still be charged?

-expand rationale statement to explain the above

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 503 (3)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 504 (3)

-the Committee noted a statement that restricts the course to B.En.D. students is being added to the course description, and it is unusual to restrict a graduate course to undergraduate students

-is the restriction intended to appear in the description?

-why don't B.En.D. students take ARCH 404, the equivalent undergraduate course?

-expand rationale statement to explain the above

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 505 (3)

-the Committee noted a statement that restricts the course to B.En.D. students is being added to the course description, and it is unusual to restrict a graduate course to undergraduate students

-is the restriction intended to appear in the description?

-why don't B.En.D. students take ARCH 405, the equivalent undergraduate course?

-expand rationale statement to explain the above

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 511 (3)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 512 (3)

-the description exceeds the Calendar maximum of 40 words (it is 50)

-the Committee suggested the following description, which is in line with typical Calendar language, "Quantitative and qualitative means for understanding statics, materials and flow of force through a structure."

-confirm if suggestion is acceptable

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 515 (3)

-the course description was revised slightly to be in line with typical Calendar language

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 517 (3)

-the course description was revised slightly to be in line with typical Calendar language

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 520 (9)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 521 (9)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 522 (3)

-two of the proposed prerequisites (ARCH 504, ARCH 505) have undergraduate equivalents (ARCH 404, ARCH 405), which could possibly pose problems with course registration

-does the School have a mechanism in place for handling students who have completed the undergraduate courses?

-how are students informed that they could register for the course if they have completed the equivalents?

-why are the prerequisites needed?

-expand rationale statement to explain the above

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 523 (3)

-the course description was revised slightly to be in line with typical Calendar language

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 524 (3)

-the proposed prerequisites (ARCH 504, ARCH 505) have undergraduate equivalents (ARCH 404, ARCH 405), which could possibly pose problems with course registration

-does the School have a mechanism in place for handling students who have completed the undergraduate courses?

-how are students informed that they could register for the course if they have completed the equivalents?

-why are the prerequisites needed?

-the Committee noted a statement about the course being open to non-SALA students is being removed from the description

-why are students outside the School no longer able to register?

-are the proposed prerequisites (ARCH 504, ARCH 505) open to non-SALA students?

-expand rationale statement to explain the above

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 525 (3)

-the proposed prerequisites (ARCH 504, ARCH 505) have undergraduate equivalents (ARCH 404, ARCH 405), which could possibly pose problems with course registration

-does the School have a mechanism in place for handling students who have completed the undergraduate courses?

-how are students informed that they could register for the course if they have completed the equivalents?

-why are the prerequisites needed?

-expand rationale statement to explain the above

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 526 (3)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 529 (3)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 531 (3)

-the description exceeds the Calendar

maximum of 40 words (it is 49)  
-the Committee suggested the following description, which is in line with typical Calendar language, "Analysis and design of advanced assemblies. Integration of multiple building systems within a wide range of construction types, and more complex enclosures in a variety of climatic conditions. Emphasis on technical performance, durability and sustainability."

-confirm if suggestion is acceptable

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 532 (3)

-to be consistent with ARCH 512, should Architectural remain in the course title?

-confirm

-the course description was revised slightly to be in line with typical Calendar language

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 533 (3)

-the Committee noted the title for this course's prerequisite, ARCH 513, is

"Environmental Systems and Controls 1"

-to be consistent with the other proposals, should the number in the title for ARCH 513 be changed from Arabic to Roman?

-if yes, the Graduate Curriculum

Coordinator will create a proposal to change ARCH 513 on behalf of SALA and will add the proposal to this batch

-confirm

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 537 (3-9) d

-given the change to variable credits, which implies a range of course content and credit options, the Committee asked that this proposal be resubmitted as Category 1 with the necessary supporting documentation (course syllabus, budget and library consultation forms)

-the course syllabus should be an example of what would be circulated to students (the Committee understands the document will change depending on the offering)

-in the rationale statement, fully explain the change in credits

-does the School anticipate offering the

course for anything other than 3 credits?  
-what would students be required to do in a 3-credit version of the course versus a 9-credit version?  
-how will the credit value be determined?  
-the form 3-9 the dash implies that the course may be taken for any number of credits from 3 to 9 inclusive, whereas the form 3/9 implies that the course will be offered for either 3 credits or 9 credits → which is correct?

-remove "or permission of the instructor" from the proposed prerequisite statement because permission is always implied

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 540 (9)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 541 (3)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 543 (3)

-what is the basis for the case studies, especially in light of the fact that students are no longer required to complete ARCH 521 as a prerequisite?

-is the "prior design work" referred to in the description from ARCH 521?

-if so, the proposed description may need to change

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 544 (3-12) d

-given this course is already variable credits (3/6), the Committee could not determine whether the proposal should be resubmitted as Category 1 (as in the case of ARCH 537, for example)

-explain how the credit value will be determined and the Chair will decide the next appropriate steps

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 545 (3/6) d

-in the first line of the description, would "individual" be more appropriate than "independent"?

-confirm

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 548 (3)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 549 (9)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 555 (3)

-the Committee found the proposed description confusing

- the description should describe the purpose of the standalone course, not the program requirement for the co-op option
- the duration of the co-op should either remain at 4 months in the description, or if 8 months is preferred, there should be a single co-op course worth 6 credits; do not conflate the two

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 556 (3)

-the Committee found the proposed description confusing

- the description should describe the purpose of the standalone course, not the program requirement for the co-op option
- the duration of the co-op should either remain at 4 months in the description, or if 8 months is preferred, there should be a single co-op course worth 6 credits; do not conflate the two

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 561 (3-9) d

-given the change to variable credits, which implies a range of course content and credit options, the Committee asked that this proposal be resubmitted as Category 1 with the necessary supporting documentation (course syllabus, budget and library consultation forms)

- the course syllabus should be an example of what would be circulated to students (the Committee understands the document will change depending on the offering)

-in the rationale statement, fully explain the change in credits

- does the School anticipate offering the course for anything other than 3 credits?
- what would students be required to do in a 3-credit version of the course versus a 9-

credit version?

- how will the credit value be determined?
- the form 3-9 the dash implies that the course may be taken for any number of credits from 3 to 9 inclusive, whereas the form 3/9 implies that the course will be offered for either 3 credits or 9 credits → which is correct?

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 562 (3)

**Action: APPROVED**

ARCH 568 (3)

-the Committee suggested the following title, "Research Methods: Concerns and Issues"

- not only it be consistent with ARCH 570 and ARCH 571 but also would not imply the course is a methods course
- confirm if acceptable

-resubmit for review by the Chair

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 571 (3-9) d

-given the change to variable credits, which implies a range of course content and credit options, the Committee asked that this proposal be resubmitted as Category 1 with the necessary supporting documentation (course syllabus, budget and library consultation forms)

- the course syllabus should be an example of what would be circulated to students (the Committee understands the document will change depending on the offering)

-in the rationale statement, fully explain the change in credits

- does the School anticipate offering the course for anything other than 3 credits?
- what would students be required to do in a 3-credit version of the course versus a 9-credit version?

-how will the credit value be determined?

- the form 3-9 the dash implies that the course may be taken for any number of credits from 3 to 9 inclusive, whereas the form 3/9 implies that the course will be offered for either 3 credits or 9 credits → which is correct?

**Action: HOLD**

ARCH 572 (3)



	<p>-the Committee suggested the following description, which is in line with typical Calendar language, “Structural principles and corresponding mathematical representation as three- and four-dimensional digital models using structural analysis software.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-confirm if suggestion is acceptable</li> <li>-resubmit for review by the Chair</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: HOLD</b></p> <p>ARCH 573 (3-12) d</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-adding “Research Seminar” to the title would be inconsistent with “Lectures, seminars and labs” noted in the description</li> <li>-clarify relationship between the title and description (i.e. should lectures and labs be removed from the latter?)</li> </ul> <p><b>Action: HOLD</b></p> <p>ARCH 577 (3)</p> <p><b>Action: APPROVED</b></p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Faculty of Arts</b> Submitted by Stacy Campbell	
<p>MUSC 535 (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-on the two-column proposal form, the description of the course can be shortened in the rationale statement; the purpose of, and need for, the course are the important parts, and those points have been fully explained</li> <li>-the Committee suggested shortening the first paragraph of the rationale statement by removing everything that follows, “...practice through staging, multi-media, and alternative formats.”</li> <li>-in the syllabus, change Course Learning Objectives to Learning Outcomes and reformat them to describe the 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...”</li> <li>-in the syllabus, more information is needed with regard to assessment criteria; specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-what assignments, mid-terms, or exams will be required of students?</li> <li>-how do the assessment and evaluation components fulfill the stated learning outcomes?</li> <li>-what will each component of the course evaluation be worth (mark breakdown)?</li> <li>-what are the assessment/evaluation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

criteria for each assignment (i.e., on what basis will students be graded)? -submit amended syllabus in MS Word format <b>Action: HOLD</b>	
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

**6. Adjournment of Meeting**

**7. Next meeting: 9:00 AM, Friday, June 6, 2014, Room 203 of the Graduate Student Centre**

\*proposal for Senate Curriculum Sub-Committee of Graduate Programs