

**MINUTES**  
**Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies**  
**Graduate Curriculum Committee Meeting**  
**November 30, 2018**

**Present:** Patricia Badir, Edmond Cretu, Karin Mickelson, Max Read, Andrew Riseman, Lily Takeuchi, Warren Williams, Jenn Fletcher (minutes)

**Regrets:** Vince Duronio, Cay Holbrook, Kin Lo, Catherine Rawn, Lauren Small

**1. Adoption of Agenda:** Adopted

**2. Minutes of November 9, 2018 Meeting:** Approved

**3. Business Arising**

- Patsy noted all GCC-approved category 1 proposals put forward at the last SCC meeting were approved. During that meeting, one SCC member raised concerns about the GCC being too rigid in its review of graduate-level proposals. Patsy is scheduled to meet with this member in the coming weeks to discuss her concerns.

**4. New Proposals – Category 1**

<b>Faculty of Science</b> <b>Submitted by Nancy Cook / Warren Williams</b>
<p><b>CHEM 506 (3) – New course</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Friendly recommendations:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ A few grammatical errors were identified.</li><li>○ The wording for learning objective #5 is inconsistent with the others so the proponents may want to consider revising it.</li><li>○ Consider replacing “powerpoint” with “audiovisual” under Literature Presentation to reflect the fact that not all students use PowerPoint.</li></ul></li></ul> <p><b>Action:</b> Approved</p>
<p><b>CHEM 528 (3) – New course</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Friendly recommendations:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Assessment of the group proposal seems disconnected from the learning objectives. Consider either adding new learning objectives to address the development of a new product (research plan, budget, etc.) or adjust the emphasis of the evaluation criteria and grading to reflect the learning objective as written.</li><li>○ For the group project, consider having all students involved in all aspects of the project rather than each team member responsible for a different part. This may assist with students’ learning about all aspects of the proposal.</li></ul></li></ul> <p><b>Action:</b> Approved</p>

**Faculty of Land and Food Systems  
Submitted by Virginia Frankian**

**FOOD 519 (3) – New course**

- Some of the items included under Checklist for Course Preparation are course requirements and should be listing as such.
- The syllabus included with the proposal states that the project is optional while the supplementary memo states that it is required. Clarification is needed.
- The syllabus describes a number of possible scenarios (e.g. completing the project vs. not, selected to give a presentation vs. not, working on project individually vs. in groups of 2) but a single overall grade breakdown is provided. How will students in the other scenarios be graded?
- Under Discussion Boards it is noted that grades are awarded for “good questions”. A definition or example of a good question should be provided or alternate wording should be used (relevant question, for example).
- Resubmitted proposal to be reviewed by the Chair

**Action:** Held

**Faculty of Applied Science  
Submitted by Kelsie Atwater / Carol Jaeger**

**CHBE 587 (3) – New course**

- While the CHBE and FOOD versions of the courses have different prerequisites and foci, it was unclear why there was inconsistency in the administrative content of the syllabi provided.
- A reconciled syllabus with clearly defined pathways for the different groups of students would help the Committee to understand the relationship between the various versions of the course.
- Resubmitted proposal to be reviewed by the Chair

**Action:** Held

**5. New Proposals – Category 2**

**Faculty of Land and Food Systems  
Submitted by Virginia Frankian**

**PLNT 542 (3) – Revise course title**

**Action:** Approved

**Faculty of Science  
Submitted by Nancy Cook / Warren Williams**

**Data Science – Revise program requirements**

- Friendly recommendation: “Students not pursuing the Computational Linguistics option are **also** required to complete the following courses “

**Action:** Approved

**Faculty of Forestry**

**Submitted by Gayle Kosh / Stavros Avramidis**

**FRST 583 (3)** – Delete course

**Action:** Approved

**FRST 563 (3)** – Revise course code, revise description

**Action:** Approved

**FRST 570 (1-6) c** – Revise course code

**Action:** Approved

**FRST 572 (1-6) d** – Revise course code

**Action:** Approved

**FRST 573 (3)** – Revise course code, revise description

**Action:** Approved

**FRST 576 (3)** – Revise course code, revise description

**Action:** Approved

**Faculty of Applied Science**

**Submitted by Kelsie Atwater / Carol Jaeger**

**APSC 540 (3)** – Revise course title and description

**Action:** Approved

**MINE 509 (2)** – Revise credit value

- There appear to be inconsistencies in the number of contact hours for the course that made it difficult for the committee to determine whether the credit value change is appropriate. Clarification of the number of contact hours in the new 3-credit version of the course is required.
- Response to be reviewed by the Chair

**Action:** Held

**Faculty of Arts**

**Submitted by Heidi May / Catherine Rawn**

**Theatre Design** – Revise MFA program requirements

**Action:** Approved

**ASIA 576 (3-9)** – Revise course title

**Action:** Approved

**RELG 514 (3-12)** – Delete course

**Action:** Approved

**GEOG 514 (3)** – Revise credit value

**Action:** Approved

**GEOG 545 (3/6) d** – Revise credit value

**Action:** Approved

**Faculty of Applied Science / Faculty of Medicine  
Submitted by Kelsie Atwater / Carol Jaeger / Lena Kang**

**Biomedical Engineering** – Revise program requirements

**Action:** Approved

**BMEG 550 (3)** – Revise course description

- The changes to the course description suggest substantial changes have been made to the content of the course. This should be resubmitted as a category 1 change proposal with the appropriate supporting documentation.

**Action:** Held

**Faculty of Faculty of Medicine  
Submitted by Lena Kang**

**Master of Public Health** – Suspend admission to distance learning option

**Action:** Approved

**Faculty of Applied Science  
Submitted by Kelsie Atwater / Carol Jaeger**

**CIVL 559 (3)** – Delete prerequisites

- Why are the prerequisites no longer needed. Rationale statement should be expanded to explain this.
- Resubmitted proposal to be reviewed by the Chair

**Action:** Held

**CIVL 569 (4)** – Revise credit value

- Why is the credit value for the course being changed? Rationale statement should be expanded to explain this.
- What are the contact hours for the new 3-credit version of the course?
- Response to be reviewed by the Chair

**Action:** Held

**CIVL 570 (3)** – Revise credit value

- Why is the credit value for the course being changed? Rationale statement should be expanded to explain this.
- What are the contact hours for the new 3-credit version of the course?
- Response to be reviewed by the Chair

**Action:** Held

**6. Other Business**

- Patsy provided a brief overview of the syllabus policy currently under review by Senate. This policy is expected to outline a list of components that must be included in all UBC course syllabi. The Committee expressed a preference for the inclusion of the same set of components in the syllabi they review.

**Next Meeting: Friday, January 11, 2019**