291.1 Approval of Agenda

The Chair welcomed new and continuing members and called the meeting to order. The following three documents were distributed at the meeting:

i) Western Association for Graduate Schools Annual Meeting Program.
ii) Ballots for Silver Anniversary Graduate Fellowship Committee.
iii) Nova Graduate Scholarship terms of reference.

Two additional items were added to the Agenda: Nominations for two members of the Silver Anniversary Graduate Fellowship Committee and the terms of reference for the Nova Graduate Scholarship. The Chair noted that these two additional items would be dealt with between Agenda Items 3 and 4.
It was MOVED by Mr. Stein, SECONDED by Ms. Grant that the Agenda be approved.  

CARRIED

### 291.2 Minutes of Last Meeting

Minutes of the Last Meeting had been distributed with Agenda material. Mr. Barclay requested that the following amendment be made to the Minutes: page 5, 7th paragraph should read: Regarding Group A Courses as listed on page 9 of the proposal, Mr. Barclay noted that he believed ZOOL 370 (typically high demand course) does not exist anymore. (The underlined words were changed.)

It was MOVED by Mr. Revel, SECONDED by Mr. Helmer that the Minutes of the 290th Meeting, held on February 19th, 1997 be approved as amended.  

CARRIED

### 291.3 Chair's Comments

The Chair began his comments by taking a moment to thank Shelley Wind, who has been with the Faculty of Graduate Studies for the past ten years and will be pursuing a new career with the Strategic Studies Program. He noted that she had done a tremendous job and would be missed.

The Chair asked Council to APPROVE a MOTION for a vote of thanks.  
SECONDED by Mr. Goren.  

CARRIED

He also took the opportunity to welcome Mary-Jane Leeder who will be replacing Shelley.

At today's meeting there were a number of substitute members: Mr. Ghent for Mr. Lawton; Mr. Pynt for Mr. McDougall; and Ms. Wiesenberg for Ms. Hutton. Also attending were, Mr. Ross and Mr. Jamieson for item 4.1 on the Agenda.

### 291.3.1 Course Grade Point Average and Percentage Grade Distribution by Discipline Graduate Level Courses - 1995-96
Additional Remarks by Chair:

1997-98 FGS Awards and Fee Scholarships

A memo had previously been distributed to Graduate Coordinators concerning FGS Awards and Fee Scholarships. This memo dealt with the necessary changes that have occurred this year. Originally the major reason the University decided to stop that process is that it was an uncapped budget and it was growing as fees grew. It was donated to the Faculty as a fixed amount with very little chance of change. Therefore, there is a fixed amount for what is still an uncapped demand. As fees go up, the amount that is available to distribute on scholarships to major grant holders is constant and this becomes very difficult to budget. A case has been made for that budget to roll over because it cannot be overspent. The 1996-97 year’s budget was overspent by about 150 thousand dollars, which came out of the unused carry over that had been put aside originally for grandfathering students in program. The demand is still potentially uncappable in a sense that if the University gets more and more major scholarships that amount is going to grow as well. We are also in a situation where the calculation of the amount to departments was based on total student numbers not students paying full time fees, which meant the longer students were in program the more funding was given which is not appropriate. The changes announced in the memo will bring the budget under control. In the longer term, a function of the Situation Assessment could be to rationalize the funding that we have and to make a case in a new strategic direction for more funding. The Chair indicated that he expected next year that MRC scholarships will also be allocated to students on the basis of excellence and we will go back to allocating funding the same way as we do to SSHRC and NSERC. The Chair felt it was appropriate to discuss the matter at Council and ask if any further explanations are required. Various comments and e-mail notes have already been received from individuals but the central issue is there is a fixed pool of money and the allocation of it is becoming increasingly difficult.

Open Scholarship Competition

The Chair commented on the Doctoral Scholarship Committee Meeting held this morning. In terms of the actual scholarship allocations, the awards allocation cannot
be made until early April when we know the major national awards that are being
given. If there are Faculty members who are actively recruiting a student and wish
to know if that student is on the list, they may contact Andrea and she will try to give
them an indication. It will only be a firm indication of funding if they are among the
Silver Anniversary, Killam or Pan Canadian scholarship recipients. The Chair is
attempting to expedite the scholarship process to make it more competitive as part
of the Situation Assessment. The difficulties surrounding available funding are quite
major and it will be a significant exercise to see if this funding can be used more
effectively to compete at the stage when students already have offers from other
universities.

**Western Association of Graduate Schools**

The Chair next discussed the handout of the Agenda from the WAGS conference he
had attended the previous week. One of his major observations from the
conference was the amount of change taking place at universities throughout
Canada and the United States. The first workshop was devoted to perspectives in
change (student demographics, technology, implementing change, successful
change, changes of administrative systems.) He noted that one of the most massive
changes taking place in the States is in the area of Distance Education between
universities and partnerships with other universities. He felt change in Canadian
universities was slow in comparison to the States, but the U of C seemed to be
ahead of many Canadian universities, especially in respect to the consultation
process involving the whole University.

**Graduate Secretaries Luncheon Meeting**

The Chair attended a meeting on February 18th with the Graduate Secretaries,
which focused on the Situation Assessment. The majority of comments revolved
around how processes could be streamlined in order to lessen the workload. Over
the past few years, as there has been a devolution to departments, there has been
an increase in workload which has not been funded. Some of this workload is
unnecessary. One of the main concerns centered around the large number of
inquiries and applications, very few of which are actually recommended for
admission, but yet all the legal documents are collected. Some departments have
already streamlined their processes by prefiltering applications at the inquiry stage
which greatly decreases the numbers. The Chair made a suggestion that the
application process could be done through the web with the capability of printing
application forms, which the students could mail directly to departments. This could
cut down on the time-consuming and expensive process of mailing out applications.
A decision was made to put together a working group to address the present
processes and issues, including what could be done in the Graduate Studies office
to help reduce the departments=workload.

**Additional Agenda Items**
Silver Anniversary Graduate Fellowship Committee

This Committee is responsible for policy matters related to the Silver Anniversary Graduate Fellowship and approves the recommendation from the Scholarship Committee. Two Committee members, not necessarily council members, were needed as replacements for this Committee. Mr. Stein (ENEL) and Ms. Spratt (GLGP) were nominated by Ms. Stratton. A clarification was requested by Mr. Revel. He wondered if the Committee only ratifies a decision or recommendation from the Graduate Studies Scholarship Committee and would it not be more efficient to make this a subcommittee of the Scholarship Committee rather than strike another Committee. The Chair replied that in terms of scholarships, because of the very large amount of this scholarship, there are major policy matters which warrant a separate committee. The Chair asked for any further nominations. No nominations were received from the floor.

It was MOVED by Mr. Revel, SECONDED by Mr. Barclay that nominations cease. CARRIED

Mr. Stein and Ms. Spratt were elected to serve on the Silver Anniversary Graduate Fellowship Committee.

Nova Graduate Scholarship - Terms of Reference

Prior to voting on this item some discussion took place. Mr. Barclay questioned exactly what was meant by minority." Ms. Ward replied that she understood this to be "native people." The Chair felt that we would need an operational definition, and he asked Ms. Ward to get a clearer definition from Nova. He requested Council that a vote be taken for approval pending clarification of the meaning of minority.

It was MOVED by Mr. Lee-Sing, SECONDED by Mr. Goren to approve the Nova Graduate Scholarship. CARRIED

291.4 Academic Program Committee

291.4.1 PhD Program in Environmental Design

Ms. Stratton began the discussion by explaining that, because the Masters in Environmental Design has not been in the Faculty of Graduate Studies, a significant amount of information was gathered about what the PhD program would involve.
Consequently the process had been ongoing for a year. In the end the Academic Program Committee was happy to recommend that this program be approved with a couple of provisions, which are listed on the first page of the proposal. The first of these is the recommendation that there be a limit of three PhD students per supervisor. The second would be that a review take place in five years due to the uncertainty about the nature of the professional degree versus the PhD, which is clearly the intention of Environmental Design. She then asked Mr. Page, Dean of Environmental Design, to give some background of the program. He explained that this program has been in the planning stages since 1990, basically because of the interest from students concerning such a program combined with some external pressure from industry. When the Access funds became available they were able to expedite the process, as much of the planning had already taken place.

The floor was then open to comments and questions:
Mr. Helmer began the questions by asking, as the program is under the Faculty of Graduate Studies, would Access funds be available for Graduate Research Scholarships. Mr. Ross replied that funds would be available.

Ms. Grant expressed concern that there seemed to be an omission of clear interdisciplinary connections within the university, including participation by Science or Social Sciences. Mr. Ross stated that the nature of the explicit requirements for the interdisciplinary component in this program are similar to the interdisciplinary elements in the Masters program, so that within Environmental Design there are four different groups: Environmental Science, Planning, Industrial Design and Architecture. Course work will be required that guarantees all PhD graduates will have gained and demonstrated the knowledge to work within interdisciplinary, problem solving teams. In addition, the PhD supervisory committee will have at least one member of the University from outside the Faculty, some of whom would be expected to come from Science or Social Sciences. The other Faculties with which Environmental Design have the closest connection are Law, Engineering and Management. Mr. Page added to this comment, that they are presently discussing a joint appointment with Management or Engineering.

Ms. Grant wondered if a student from Environmental Design is given a TAship in an undergraduate program, would the instructor be involved in this decision. Mr. Ross stated that there has been some discussion concerning this, but they would be happy to remove this rider if it causes any confusion.

Ms. Miller questioned having 20 students as she felt this was a large number for a new program. Mr. Ross indicated that this was the number they had submitted in their Access application and consequently had planned the program based on this number.

Mr. Goren noted that the external evaluator had asked for a committee of four, but
there are three people on this committee. Mr. Ross replied that the external reviewer had recommended four people with a view to adding an extra EVDS member, in order to enhance the expertise. If Council felt it was important to have four members on the committee this would not pose a problem for Environmental Design.

Mr. Mosley then brought up the fact that a PhD program in Resources & the Environment (CRE) was passed last year and questioned the need for a PhD in Environmental Design. Mr. Ross explained that there are two very important distinctions between the programs. Firstly, the PhD students in Environmental Design will have interdisciplinary skills. The second difference is, although CRE students cover a wide range of expertise, the areas within Environmental Design of Industrial Design, Architecture, and Planning are somewhat distinct from what most CRE students have done. Mr. Jamieson added that the formal course work, which they feel is an essential requirement for their students, is different from the course work expected from CRE students including a much larger intervention component.

Mr. Helmer inquired why the composition of the PhD Supervisory Committee was different than most Committees. Ms. Stratton stated that it was felt necessary have a member from outside the university, who was a recognized expert in the field.

Mr. Wieser questioned what will happen when the Access funding runs out. Mr. Ross reported that they had received assurance from senior administration, if the program is successful, funds will be rolled over into the base budget of the University.

Mr. Goren wondered if there would be an overlap between faculty members in EVDS and in the CRE program. Mr. Ross replied that their EVDS faculty members are from EVDS and the members from CRE are drawn from the whole University. Mr. Page then reiterated the differences between the two programs saying that CRE is more academically focused while EVDS is professionally focused, like Engineering or Management.

Ms. Valentich inquired what criteria was available for review in respect to a professional doctorate. Ms. Stratton reported that the Handbook of Supervision and Examination describes what a PhD dissertation is supposed to be, and among other things it should make a contribution to knowledge, which is usually translated as work that is publishable. So while the interventionist component would be an expectation of EVDS, another requirement would be to make a difference in a practical context.

Mr. Barclay noted a discrepancy between the timing of review. One area has it in five years, while another section shows the year 2000. Mr. Ross stated that the Access funding review will be in four years and Ms. Stratton said that APC had intended the academic review to be done at the same time, but perhaps four years would be too
Mr. Barclay felt all the indicators may not be place in four years in order to make a decision. Ms. Stratton confirmed that this is always a concern but in many areas, it is not always easy to separate financial and academic considerations. The decision about when to do the academic review would depend in part on when enough dissertations were complete.

Mr. Barclay stated that the document focuses on the programs of Environmental Science and Planning. Mr. Ross agreed that their strengths are largely within these two areas but they also have some supervisory capability in Industrial Design and Architecture. Ms. Stratton added while they realize most students would be in these two of four disciplines, this is similar to many programs.

Mr. Barclay then questioned whether there would be a route to transfer from the Masters to the PhD program. Mr. Ross assured Council this would be possible and in fact, he presently has a student whom he is encouraging to transfer. Mr. Barclay felt this could present problems as the Masters Program is not in the Faculty of Graduate Studies. Mr. Ross did not see this as a concern as the student would be expected to meet the same requirements for the PhD program as students transferring from a different discipline.

Mr. Hurka inquired whether the Access money would be rolled over into the base budget for all programs to use. Ms. Stratton noted previous practice has been that the money go into the pool for all programs.

Ms. Grant wondered whether there would be any changes in their academic staff numbers which presently stand at 26 full time and 20 part time. Mr. Ross answered they planned to add one faculty member as of July 1st, and in September 1997 they would lose three.

Ms. Grant then commented on PhD supervision in respect to the number of Faculty members who travel in EVDS. Mr. Ross realized this is a concern but assured council their academic staff have learned to make special arrangements with their students. As an example, Mr. Ross will be teaching in Ecuador this summer and one of his students will be going to Ecuador to participate in his course. Mr. Ghent inquired why EVDS has kept the Masters program separate from Graduate Studies. Mr. Page replied that this decision was made prior to him becoming Dean in 1990 and understood it was at the specific request of one of the accreditation groups. The Chair suggested this issue could be dealt with in the Situation Assessment.

Mr. Mosley expressed further concern about the CRE program. At the last APC meeting the question arose as to why Environmental Design was pursuing a PhD route as opposed to a Doctorate in Environmental Design, which
would be the natural route from the Masters in EVDS. The response received was because of the credibility of the PhD. Mr. Mosley wondered if, rather than creating another PhD at the University, the CRE program could readjust some of the course requirements and produce PhDs from the faculty and establish a doctorate in Environmental Design that is the professional degree with the interventionist approach. Mr. Ross responded that, regardless of what changes could be made to course requirements, the result would still be a PhD in the Resources and Environment. What they want in EVDS is a PhD degree, a degree in which they contribute to and disseminate knowledge in their field. A professional degree, in many respects, is done at the Masters level. It is the intellectual contributions that Environmental Design is interested in making at the PhD level. Mr. Jamieson reinforced Environmental Design’s position by stating that CRE has no academic faculty members, nor academic staff, offers no courses, belongs to the whole university and anyone can supervise within it. Environmental Design plans to take great care to see that CRE is not constrained in any way.

Mr. Bisztriczky wondered what the demand would be for people with a PhD in EVDS. Mr. Ross felt that with the number of inquiries from industry for these type of graduates, there seemed to be a much needed demand both academically and professionally.

At this point the Chair felt that a sufficient amount of discussion had taken place and council should have enough information for a decision.

Ms. Stratton MOVED that the Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies approve this proposal for a PhD in Environmental Design with a limit of three PhD students per faculty member and with the provision that a review, which need not be external to the University, be conducted in five years to assess whether the program proves to be a classical PhD or a professional doctorate. Such a review would take into account at least the nature and placement of publications and other indications of students’ scholarly accomplishments, the nature of research proposals and candidacy examinations, time to completion, and career placement. SECONDED by Mr. Page.

CARRIED
(24 in favour; 3 opposed)

The proposal will now be passed on to the Academic Program Committee of GFC

291.5 Discussion of Research and Graduate Studies - "Situation Assessment@
Council members received draft three in their Agenda packages. This third draft includes questions that arose after the last Council session. There was also some refinement in some of the other areas, such as statistical data to be collected. It was felt that the previous CTF process had not adequately addressed the background for research in Graduate Studies at the University. The major part of the activities currently taking place, is for all faculties to initiate an activity within their own faculty to produce part of the Situation Assessment. The difference between this process and the CTF process is that documents that went to CTF were appraised by CTF and then became part of their document. Documents coming to Graduate Studies will be part of the binder, so each part will be an authored document from a particular constituency.

The assumption is that the Associate Dean of Research in each Faculty will put together a group to facilitate this process. The Chair presumed that Graduate Coordinators will be involved within their Faculties. The whole process is intended to be open - all comments and contributions will be welcomed. The GSA Executive will be making a contribution and they felt the most effective route would be to have a town hall meeting once the first binder has been completed. Hopefully, the outcome will determine where effort should be made in order to make the most difference to the University. The Chair foresees the outcome of the first stage as being an informative document with a great deal of information and a very broad perspective. By the end of April the information will form the basis for the next stage of activity that will deal with policy issues, leading to a strategic direction.

Ms. Valentich remarked that the time limits will put constraints on how much actual work could be done. The Chair assured her that the introduction to the document would reflect the time frame and that the goal was to have enough information available to set up task forces.

Mr. Hurka brought up the matter of Data Gathering and noted this could be a problem within the time limits. The Chair replied that if the quantitative data is not easily accessible from a central source it should be reported as not available. A major task of the Situation Assessment will be to determine the systems needed to make data readily available.

291.6 Other Business
There was no other business.

291.7 Adjournment

It was MOVED by Mr. Lee-Sing, SECONDED by Ms. Grant that the meeting be adjourned. CARRIED
The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.