

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**  
**Graduate Curriculum Committee Meeting**  
**April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016; 9:00 – 11:00am**  
**Venue: Room 203, Graduate Student Centre, 6371 Crescent Road**

**Present:** John Church, Justin Holme (Minutes), Norm Hutchinson, Kyle McCleery, Vivien Measday, Max Read, Ron Reid, Clive Roberts (Chair), Tom Scholte, Edmond Cretu, Kin Lo, Susie Stephenson

**Regrets:** Natalie Marshall, Edmond Cretu, Aaron Bailey

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

**Action: Approved**

**2. Minutes of April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2016 meeting**

**Action: Approved**

**3. Business Arising**

-The Committee Chair notes Craig Mitton of SPPH was contacted regarding the recent Health Economics Concentration proposal. In his email, the Chair outlined the discrepancy between what is on their website and what is in their proposal. Dr. Mitton will be looking into the matter.

**4. New Program Proposal**

<b>Faculty of Medicine</b>	
Submitted by Alexander Scott	
<p>Graduate Certificate in Orthopaedic Manipulative Physical Therapy  <b>Action: Approved, with recommendations</b></p> <p><b>-Location</b> - The Committee requests additional information on how program standards and supervisory quality will be maintained if students complete a practicum outside of Vancouver (particularly internationally). Please see page 1 of the Word document.</p> <p>-The Committee expressed concerns with the use of RHSC 501 as a requirement for this program. The Committee notes that students who are looking to take this program will have to register as unclassified students prior to the program start date in order to be eligible for RHSC 501. It is also important to note that unclassified students do not have registration priority and would only be granted a spot in the course should there</p>	

be space open.

-The Committee would like to know if there is a mechanism in place for getting students into this course prior to the beginning of the certificate program.

-The Committee notes concerns raised by Sue Stanton during the consultation process regarding RHSC 501 and encourages the proponents to address those concerns within the proposal.

-As a solution the Committee encourages the proponents consider incorporating RHSC 501 into the certificate program as a program requirement.

- The Committee requests more information on what an “alternate learning experience” will look like and what the evaluation method(s) used to grade these experiences will consist of. See page 4 of the attached Word doc.

-In the proposed Calendar entry, on page 7, the Committee suggests editing the top paragraph. “They must also have a minimum of one-year experience of recent clinical experience in orthopaedics” is awkward. Please see the attached Word document for details.

-The Committee asks for a small edit in the Student code of conduct section on page 8 of the Word doc. “Students enrolled in the...” The what? Please clarify.

- Instead of writing out the full English language requirements, the GCC encourages the proponents to utilize a link to the appropriate information already listed in the Academic Calendar. This will help avoid having to change multiple Calendar pages should these requirements ever change.

-The Committee asks that the dates be updated from 2012 and 2014 in the admissions content that refers to the English language requirements (or remove these requirements and provide a link to the Academic Calendar). See page 8 in the Word doc.

-Library consults – Multiple courses can be included in a single library consult. Individual consults are not necessary for each course. This was not clearly communicated to the proponents by the

Grad Curriculum Coordinator. In the future the proponents are welcome to save time and paper by including multiple course proposals in one library consultation form.

PHTH 580 (9)

**Action: Approved, with recommendations**

- The Committee asks that RHSC 501 (or equivalent) is listed as a prerequisite in the 2-column form.
- In the course requirements section for PHTH 580 you note that “students who miss more than two days worth of on-site instruction will be required to withdraw from the program.” The Committee asks that this information be included in the Academic Calendar entry as it is important information for students to have access to. See Word document page 13.
- The Committee also recommends rephrasing the last course requirement bullet for PHTH 580.
- The Committee expressed concerns over the Pass/Fail grading of PHTH 580. If a student fails one component of the course (eg. the mid-term, final exam, mentorship assignment) do they fail the whole course? Additional information outlining the Pass/Fail grading process, with a particular emphasis on what happens if a student fails one or more sections would be greatly appreciated.
- The Committee would like the proponents to be aware that credits from courses graded as Pass/Fail are not typically accepted as transfer/laddering credits into other programs.
- The Committee suggests removing the Clinical Mentorship Assignment as a graded component of the course and including it solely as a course requirement. However, if you wish to keep it as a graded component please note that “Pass” will be assigned a grade of 100% for the assignment. In this case 15% (as it is listed) isn’t the grade – it’s 100% for this section. With that said Pass/Fail does not translate into a graded

percentage. Please see Word document page 14.

-The Committee asks that you change the mentor ratio listed on page 17 to a maximum of 4:1. See Word document page 17.

PHTH 581 (3)

**Action: Approved, with recommendations**

-The Committee notes that the prerequisite in the Calendar entry should be RHSC 501 or equivalent.

-The Committee also recommends including a stand-alone statement informing students that PHTH 581 is restricted to students in the Grad Certificate in Orthopaedic Manipulative Physical Therapy program. These edits have been made directly to the 2-column form for will be kept for the final version with the proponents approval.

-Please see tracked comments for the on-line discussion grading rubric – page 24.

The Committee notes that there is a maximum of 24 points available in the rubric, but on-line discussion is worth 35%. The Committee recommends simplifying the rubric and/or making the rubric add up to 35 points.

-The Committee expressed its appreciation that a grading rubric was included for the on-line participation section of the course, however, it raised concerns about the challenges of carrying out the grading process. It noted that grading this type of discussion would be a substantial amount of work for the instructor and that in the end may not accurately capture the contribution of students to the discussion.

-The Committee recommends that the program instructors revise this before delivering the course to students.

5. Category 1 Proposals

<b>Faculty of Arts</b> Submitted by Lois Nightingale	
<p>ARTH 550 (3)  <b>Action: Approved</b>            - The Committee notes that graduate level Arts courses do not traditionally have course descriptions in the Academic Calendar and suggests confirming with the proponents that this is what they want for this course.            -The Committee suggests the course description be changed to “Methodological and Theoretical Issues” to limit the scope given as it is a 3 credit course. The Committee also feels the first sentence of the program description of the syllabus would also make a strong course description.            -The Committee would like the proponents to be aware that academic misconduct goes to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies first (prior to the registrar). See page 10/11 in the attached Word document.</p>	

<b>Faculty of Arts</b> Submitted by Lois Nightingale	
<p>FNIS 560 (3/6)  <b>Action: Approved pending SLAIS consultation</b>            -The Committee noted a few grammatical issues in the syllabus. These have been highlighted in the Word document using track changes.            -The Committee kindly asks that the proponents consult with SLAIS on the creation of this course and submit the appropriate consultation prior to SCC review.            - Assignment and Grade Allocation – The Committee recommends adding in additional information into the “Assignment and Grade Allocation” section. More detail on what constitutes quality participation is encouraged.            -The Committee understands that this course may not conform to standard ‘outcomes’ and ‘assessment of performance’ norms.</p>	

--	--

<p><b>Faculty of Forestry</b> Submitted by Suzanne Simard</p>
---

<p>FRST 511 (3)</p> <p><b>Action: Hold – resubmit with revisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Rationale – The Committee recommends including additional information in the rationale outlining why FRST 511 (3) is necessary given that a 400 level version exists, and a graduate version is currently being taught as a directed studies course.</li> <li>-The Committee believes that the proposed syllabus does not adequately highlight the differences between the undergraduate and graduate versions of this course. The Committee would like to see more information outlining the differences of quality expected from graduate students versus their undergraduate colleagues in addition to the increased quantity of work they are expected to complete.</li> <li>-The Committee believes that including a grading rubric would be beneficial for the Committee and for students taking this course.</li> <li>-For the peer assessment component the Committee recommends that graduate students are only graded by the instructor and not the undergraduate members of the course.</li> <li>-Please note that the current grading structure only adds up to 80% for graduate students.</li> <li>-The Committee notes that the proponents may wish to remove the undergraduate components of this syllabus and submit a more comprehensive graduate level version.</li> <li>-The Committee recommends including a more detailed reading list and class schedule.</li> <li>-The Committee notes that the syllabus for FRST 411 (currently online in PDF format) provides far more detail than the syllabus submitted for FRST 511.</li> <li>-The Committee recommends revising the learning outcome section of the syllabus. Using action oriented statements such as, “By the end of this</li> </ul>	
--	--

course students will be able to..." is encouraged.	
--	--

<b>Faculty of Applied Science</b> Submitted by Cate Palmer	
<p>-The Graduate Curriculum Committee has placed a hold on PLAN 531, 533,534, and 536 pending revisions and the submission of program/faculty consultations. Upon review the Committee wishes to stress to the proponents that the syllabi provided are completed to a level that reflects the detail and depth of content required by the Senate Curriculum Guide. It is understood that the syllabus submitted for GCC review will be very similar, or possibly identical, to the document provided to students taking this course. To that end please ensure each syllabus has been reviewed and approved by the internal faculty curriculum committee of your program. The GCC would also like to stress that program/faculty consultations are an important part of this process and requests that they are included as part of the revised proposal packages.</p> <p>PLAN 531 (3)  <b>Action:Hold resubmit with revisions</b></p> <p>-Please delete "This course introduces to..." in the poposed calendar entry (Word document page 1)  -Please remove "Course Requirements" from the syllabus (page 2) if no course requirements are listed.  -The Committee recommends revising the course objectives to include more active phrasing. For example, "by the end of this course students will be able to..." See page 2.  -The Committee believes more detail in the course scheduled is merited given its status as a graduate level course. See page 2.  - Course Assignments – The Committee would like a general statement on group work, how groups are formed, how group members grade each other, avenues for complaint for group members, etc... See page 3.</p>	

PLAN 533 (3)

**Action:Hold**

- The Committee requests program consultations from SLAIS, Education, and the First Nations House of Learning.
- The Committee encourages shortening the proposed Calendar entry. See page 5 for details.
- The Committee recommends revising the course objectives to include more active phrasing. For example, "by the end of this course students will be able to..." See page 7.
- The Committee recommends outlining which relevant sections of the key texts will be assigned or clarifying if it is the whole book that will be required reading. See page 8.
- The Committee asks that greater detail be included in the course description. The inclusion of weekend course structure, class length, transportation information, what students can expect during these weekend classes etc... would be appreciated by the Committee.

PLAN 535 (3)

**Action:Hold**

- Course is cross listed
- The Committee recommends taking out the undergraduate grading component from the syllabus and focusing on the graduate elements of the course.
- The Committee recommends removing the attendance component of the participation grade (5%) as attendance should be a requirement and not an evaluation criterion.
- The Committee feels that the attendance language as written gives students a reason to miss the mid-term. Recommend changing this. Page 11
- The Committee recommends including more detail in the course schedule including additional information on what "Trip generation" and "Trip distribution" are.
- The Committee unsure there is a real



<p>need to create this course. Could the course content not be covered by the current course offerings and cross listed courses?</p> <p>PLAN 536 (3) <b>Action:Hold</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The Committee asks that the appropriate faculty/program consultations are completed including one with LFS.</li> <li>-The Committee recommends editing the proposed Calendar entry. Suggests removing “This course explores the”. See page 15.</li> <li>-The Committee requests that any font inconsistencies are resolved in a revised copy.</li> <li>-The Committee requests additional information about group grading in the course. Please provide an overview of group and individual grading procedures for the group component.</li> <li>-The Committee asks that additional details on the policy brief on included in the syllabus, not just in a separate hand-out.</li> <li>-The Committee states that this draft syllabus is not complete and will be looked at when it is complete. Please see Senate Curriculum Guide and provide a completed syllabus as it would be presented to a student taking this course.</li> </ul>	
--	--

**6. Category 2 Proposals (Online Review)**

<p><b>Faculty of Medicine</b> Submitted by Craig Mitton</p>	
<p>SPHA 590 (1.5-6) Change to H/P/F <b>Action:</b> <b>-Approved</b></p>	

<p><b>Faculty of Applied Science</b> Submitted by Michael Isaacson</p>	
<p>Removal of Engineering Management Specialization Calendar language from Master of Applied Science Calendar entry <b>Action:</b> <b>-Approved</b></p>	

--	--

<b>Faculty of Applied Science</b> Submitted by Helen May	
URSY 520 (3) Course title change <b>Action:</b> <b>-Approved</b>	

**7. Adjournment of Meeting**

**8. Next meeting: 9:00 AM, April 8, Room 203 of the Graduate Student Centre**

\*Curriculum proposal in a program not administered by the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.