At the request of Mr. David, the Chair added Matters Arising after Approval of Minutes (322.2).

### 322.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**MOTION: REVEL/VEALE**

That Council approve the Agenda of the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council meeting for November 21, 2001

**CARRIED**

### 322.2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**MOTION: DAVID/DOUGLAS**

That Council approve the Minutes of the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council meeting held October 17, 2001 with the following corrections

**CARRIED**

H. Wieser read into the minutes the following changes:

- Page six (6), fourth (4th) line from the top “Mr. Wieser replied that this is a question of trust, and he has worked extensively on this document” to be read as “Mr. Wieser replied that this is a question of trust, and we have worked extensively on this document.” He stated that the Faculty of Social Work, the PDCL Group, and FGS APC have spent considerable time on this proposal.

- In the second line of this paragraph “PPCL” should be changed to “PDCL initiatives.”

Mr. Douglas questioned the accuracy of the figure on page two (2) in the middle of the page: “The Chair noted that international students constitute 3.9% of full-time enrolment.” Mr. Douglas thought that the percentage should be around 7 – 8% given that there is a total of 350 international students out of 4000 graduate students. Mr. Douglas would like to know an accurate figure.

[Subsequent checks indicate that, according to OIA statistics, in Fall 2000 there were 330 full-time visa...]
students, representing 12.2% of full-time graduate enrolment.]  

Mr. Jones clarified that the number in item 321.4 Report from the Chair, “MBA enrolment is down 16%” is due to the closure of the MBA programs in Poland and the Czech Republic and not to a decrease in MBA enrolment on campus.

322.2.1 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

Referring to item 321.9, Mr. David asked when a motion regarding some delegation of approval of PDCL initiatives might be forthcoming. The Chair noted that the diplomas might still need to be approved by Council because they might ladder into a graduate degree program. Mr. Wieser added that both certificates and diplomas might ladder into a graduate program, but because diplomas are awarded at convocation and FGS Council has to approve graduating students in graduate diploma programs, it is appropriate that Council approve the diploma programs.

When the Chair asked if Mr. David was satisfied with this response, Mr. David replied that other members of Council with more experience might want to be intimately involved with these approvals or that they simply want to be notified.

Ms Reimer thought that PDCL program approvals should continue to be brought to Council although lengthy discussions might not be necessary. Ms Reimer felt that it was not always clear why some matters come to Council, but a certificate program might be fairly important in the reputation of this university.

Mr. Davison agreed that because all these programs have to go through General Faculties Council, appropriate discussion was necessary, not just at the committee level but also at Council. When the documents proposing a PDCL program are put together they should be watertight, well argued, with good rationales and thorough discussion before they are approved and moved on to the next step of the process.

Mr. Krivy mentioned that from the Registrar’s viewpoint it is important that Council is involved because the Convocation Officer needs the official graduation list for students receiving a diploma. Mr. Krivy continued that the students require approval from the Faculty Council in order for their names to go on the graduation list. It would be inappropriate for Council to approve the names of people receiving diplomas when Council did not approve the actual diploma program in the first place.

Mr. David suggested a Graduate Division of Continuing Education to deal with many of these matters. This would lighten the load of individual Council members. The FGS Academic Program Committee could deal with the research-based programs, and another committee of this Council would deal with matters that are non-research based.

The Chair pledged to take this to the Academic Program Committee and bring any recommendations to the FGS Executive and Council. FGS Executive had been discussing the differences between professional degrees and the more traditional degrees and the consensus was that they must be dealt with somewhat differently.

322.3 MS PATRICIA PARDOE, DIRECTOR OF THE DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTRE

The Chair welcomed Ms Pardoe. Ms Pardoe introduced Council to the many services that are offered by the Disability Resource Centre and especially through the Nat Christie Adaptive Technology Centre. She did emphasize that students need medical documentation to be eligible for the services of the Disability Resource Centre.

322.4 REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

The Chair highlighted four items.

1. The Alberta Heritage Master’s Scholarships
   The Alberta Heritage Master’s Scholarships are $2,000 awards distributed directly by the Provincial Government to successful Master’s students in their second year. These students must be registered full-time and must also have been registered full-time in their first year. The University of Calgary will likely be allocated 450-500 awards. The delay in the processing of the awards was caused by the University of Alberta’s inability to provide the Province with their numbers of second year Master’s students.

2. Printing of the Graduate Calendar
   The Chair thanked everyone, and especially Ms Stroud, for all the hard work put into finalizing the Calendar. The Graduate and Undergraduate Calendars in both printed and web-based versions will be available by April 1, 2002.

3. Council documents at www.grad.ucalgary.ca
The Chair proposed that Council documents be mounted on the web in Word and PDF format. The agenda and green and pink sheets and a handful of material (i.e. proposals, etc) would be available at Council. Two months of documents would be available on the web and material from earlier dates would be available upon request. As a transitional consideration, or if a member would be greatly inconvenienced, there would be the possibility of providing the paper material on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Kawamura pointed out that it would not save any trees if the members print out their own material. The chair thought that the members would print only sections that were of importance.

Mr. Barclay was concerned that members would not read the documents. Ms Reimer said that this type of thing has become a major issue in the Faculty of Nursing since they too had been trying to circulate more electronically. A faculty member must go into the website, make the decision on what to print and what not to print, and in some instances might not be prepared if the wrong documents are printed.

Ms. Reid thought it was a terrific idea and noted that she was reading documents on the web more often these days.

Mr. Davidson suggested that electronic distribution be tried for two meetings and then discussed again. Mr. Mitchell suggested printing the documents double-sided. Ms Ritter commented that she was getting more and more documents electronically and it is taking more and more of her time to print them. She felt that her time was more expensive than a tree.

The chair requested that Ms Stroud poll Council about this issue, with a vote of 51% winning.

4. Graduate Studies and the Budget

The chair updated Council on the development of the budget plan. The overall institutional goals are quality, research culture and transparency. The strategy is to move University of Calgary mission upmarket, focus more on upper level undergraduate and graduate level education, and less on expanding undergraduate enrolment. Part of that goal is increasing enrolment significantly in high quality graduate programs, with special focus on doctoral programs and research-intensive Master’s programs. It is clear that undergraduate enrolment will stabilize, and the Enrolment Policy Committee is considering raising undergraduate entrance requirements.

One proposal is to increase full-time plus part-time graduate enrolment to 5600 by the year 2005, and that would put the graduate enrolment at 20% of total enrolment of 28,000. This might involve an increase of about 650 in Master’s programs and an increase of about 900 in full-time doctoral enrolments. This would mean a doubling in the number of full-time doctoral students.

Mr. Bruce asked why the University of Calgary would want to double the doctoral enrolment and not the Master’s enrolments?

The Chair responded that at other research universities that are ranked substantially above the University of Calgary, the doctoral enrolment as a percentage of total graduate enrolment is much higher. The University of Alberta’s percentage is double that of the University of Calgary.

Second, large numbers of highly qualified graduate students at the doctoral level are needed to help support the growth in research funding and research activity. Some Master’s programs have a large number of students, but especially in the sciences, it is difficult to maintain larger research programs without more doctoral students.

Third, over the next ten years Canada will need about 30,000 PhDs capable of teaching at the university level to replace retiring faculty and accommodate growth.

Mr. Barclay asked the Chair if he foresaw a greater proportion skipping the Master’s program and going right into the doctoral program or more Master’s students continuing into the doctoral program, or both?

The Chair responded that he foresaw both and if we do a better job of recruiting, we can take more students in the Master’s program and transfer them to the doctoral program after the first year.

Mr. Barclay asked if the University of Calgary was moving away from the Canadian system where the Master’s degree is a valuable degree and moving right into the UK–US system where the PhD is required? The Chair responded that it was a matter of proportion, but in the terms of growth, we want to see higher growth in research-intensive programs and especially in PhD programs. At the Canadian Association of Graduate Schools’ (CAGS) meetings, speaker after speaker from the United States mentioned that they had just discovered that there is a great market for the Master’s degrees. We continue to hold the view that Masters degrees are valuable and an important part of our graduate education plans.

Mr. Knopff commented that if we are going to go down this path, we must look more carefully at our fast tracking rules. Our fast tracking rules might not be an attractive option because once that path is taken there is no backtracking and no consolation prize.
Mr. Davison explained that in the Medicine fast tracking was done very carefully and could be a model for the rest of the University.

The Chair stated that one of the key issues is graduate student support. At present the level of support is $22.2 million per year or approximately $6,800 per full time graduate student. The breakdown is $5.1 million in GAT funding; $2.9 million in GRS and various top ups, $2.3 million in internal scholarships, $5.6 million in external awards and $6.2 million from trust accounts.

Ms Ritter asked if the $6,800 dollars per full-time student includes both professional programs and research-based programs?

The Chair clarified the definition of full time student as listed in the OIA statistics includes both. There are just over 3000 full time graduate students. The Chair commented that a $2 million dollar increase in GRS funding alone is necessary to bring this funding to the 1993/1994 level in constant dollars per eligible student. This is the starting point for negotiations. Only external student awards have kept up with inflation. We would like to guarantee a minimum of $15,000 per year for doctoral students for four years and $12,000 per year for Master’s students for two years. The total cost to the University of Calgary would be about $25 million assuming that 53% of the funds would be external. The President responded positively to this goal when it was presented to him. However, the expected shortfall at the University of Calgary’s operating budget is a minimum of $7 million, and therefore all the units are being asked to prepare a 3 year budget with a total cut of 5% over 3 years. For the Faculty of Graduate Studies, this means a cumulative cut of $215,000, which is about half of our budget for staff. The Chair noted that since graduate education and research is a high priority, the Faculty of Graduate Studies will be building a case to increase funding for graduate students, especially for full-time doctoral students. This will require a significant budgetary reallocation and some new money. The expectation is that there will be a sizable fundraising campaign and the possibility of substantial re-allocation. The President and most of the deans are supportive and we need to start planning for effective recruiting of top graduate students who are able to qualify for external funding.

In reply to a question from Mr. Bruce on information and how to apply for external funding, the Chair referred Council to the FGS website and annual presentations in September about applying for grants. The Faculty of Graduate Studies is also planning to offer additional seminars, and putting together material to support programs in their recruitment endeavours. He asked Council to check the FGS web site to see the featured recruitment poster from the Faulty of Medicine and what they are doing to recruit top students.

The Chair further mentioned that more attention would be paid to completion rates for graduate students.

He also commented about using professional course-based Master’s programs to generate surplus revenue to help support the research and teaching mission. Mr. Svrcek asked if that means stealing from the rich and giving to the poor, to which the Chair responded that if the University moves to differential tuition fees much of the additional revenue might go back to the unit to support its research-based programs.

### 322.5 CODE OF CONDUCT

The Chair wanted to make more explicit our expectations of graduate students: we admit them into the program, and we want to make sure that they know our values that should guide them in making decisions. We also want to make more explicit what is unacceptable behaviour.

Mr. Svrcek asked if students could legally be asked to sign a Code of Conduct. The Chair stated that he was checking with Legal Counsel and that the last line may have to be changed from “I understand this Code of Conduct and I agree to abide by it” to “I understand this Code of Conduct.” Mr. Svrcek asked what we could do if a student chooses not to sign the Code?

The Chair said that the Code was not intended to be compulsory, but rather it was made available in the hope that it would clarify expectations. It is not a legal document but clear guidelines and assurance that students have read them and have an understanding of what our expectations are, and what we consider unacceptable.

Mr. David stated that if a student does not have to sign this document, it is meaningless.

Mr. Davison noted that it is a Code of Conduct, it is not a legal document. The important thing is that the student has read it, understood it, and has made a commitment to abide by it. This is exactly what we want from our students: honesty, sensibility, and a decent sense of behaviour.

Ms Taras mentioned that looking at this document as a prospective policy that employees would have to sign in an employment situation, it might be better if each department could attach to this document what plagiarism means and how to avoid it. For example, her faculty has a lot of foreign students, and has had some problems with unintentional plagiarism. Ms Taras believes that we have to make the assumption that the students are not coming here to cheat and plagiarize. We should approach this by having a handout that shows how the student can avoid this and make them sign when they have read and understood it.
The Chair stated that “Examples of Supplementary Guidance” has been distributed to show something that is typically attached. There is a link on our website that deals extensively with issues of plagiarism, especially in the electronic era, and some of the search tools that could be used to check for plagiarism in papers that are handed in by students.

Mr. Srvec wondered how the university will deal with a student who is behaving in a manner that constitutes misconduct (Non-Academic Misconduct, Sexual Harassment) both on and off campus. The Chair explained that there had been a number of cases that involved off-campus behaviour of students and apparently they fall under our rules.

Ms Reid commented that there is a need for a Code of Conduct for supervisors. A bad supervisor can ruin the lives of a number of students. If the student is entering into a commitment with a supervisor then there has to be same commitment with the student.

Mr. Davison suggested that supervision during Sabbatical Leaves should also be addressed. He also felt that honesty and academic conduct are simple concepts, and he could not understand how students with an undergraduate degree do not seem to have an understanding of the concepts of plagiarism and cheating. Mr. Krivy reminded Council that plagiarism, cheating and the whole issue of misconduct are described in the Calendar.

Ms Stratton wanted to know why we are devising a Code of Conduct if there is one already in the Calendar? The Chair thanked everyone for their input and noted that the Statement of Principles of Conduct is buried on page 653 of the University Calendar. He noted that he would take all the comments into account and present a revised document to Council at a future date.

322.6.1 QUESTION PERIOD
There were no questions.

322.7 ACADEMIC PROGRAM COMMITTEE
322.7.1 SOCIAL WORK DIPLOMA PROPOSAL AND CALENDAR DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION: TARAS/REVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council take the Faculty of Social Work’s Proposal and Calendar Description from the table and withdraw the Proposal and Calendar Description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

322.7.2 REVISED SOCIAL WORK DIPLOMA PROPOSAL AND CALENDAR DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION: WIESER/DAVISON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council approve the Faculty of Social Work’s Revised Proposal to offer a Post-Master’s Diploma: Advanced Studies in Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Wieser referred Council to the changes that are outlined on the green sheets 322.7.2. The revisions were reviewed by the PDCL Group and Faculty of Graduate Studies APC and found to be in order. If Council approves the proposal, it will go to GFC APC. Ms Rogers commented that this proposal had been in the works for a couple of years and thanked Council for its indulgence. This program will meet an expressed need in the Social Work community for Post-Master’s advanced studies and it will bring an increase in their doctoral enrolment.

Mr. Davison commented that it is important that documents that come to Council meet with external scrutiny.

Mr. Krivy asked if the admission gpa was increased to 3.50 because that is the FGS requirement for doctoral studies? Ms Rogers replied that this was a mistake in the last document, and that 3.50 on a four-point scale is the admission gpa required for the Diploma program.

Mr. Barclay indicated eight half-courses are required but there is no list of where these courses are drawn from: how many of these courses currently exist and how many are new courses?

Ms Rogers responded that there are no new courses and it requires that four of the eight be in research type courses like research methods and data analysis. Of the remaining four, two can be in a student’s area of interest and two are core doctoral courses that are open to Post-Master’s students.

In reply to a question from Mr. Barclay, Ms Rogers stated that methods and statistics courses would be changed to read “open to PhD and Post-Master’s Diploma students.”
MOTION: JONES/WIESER
That the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council approve the Proposal of the Faculties of Management and Social Work to offer a Joint MBA/MSW Degree Program
CARRIED

Mr. Wieser indicated that the Councils of the Faculty of Management and of the Faulty of Social Work have approved the proposal. The MBA has over 20 courses and 8 electives, 4 of which are taken from the Social Work Faculty. The MSW has 10 half courses and 4 electives, 2 of which could be from the Management Faculty. From the MBA perspective, the required courses would be 24 instead of 20. Social Work would have a substantial increase from 10 to 24. Students choosing this particular option would hold a Bachelor of Social Work degree and therefore the candidate would have considerable Social Work background. The two faculties requested the joint degree and there is presently no other joint degree program in the Faculty of Graduate Studies. APC strongly supports this proposal as the graduates will be qualified in both disciplines with minor sacrifice in the specific discipline in either program. Mr. Krivy advised that two separate parchments will be given. APC recommended that only one parchment should be awarded but that this issue does not need to be dealt with immediately.

Mr. Jones stated that the joint program meets the requirements for the MBA. All the core MBA requirements are covered and there are some opportunities for specialization. It provides the opportunity for students already holding a Bachelor of Social Work to continue to do graduate level social work in the context of the MBA.

Ms Rogers commented that this joint degree program would fill a need in social service organizations for human services management.

Mr. Krivy inquired if the candidate could be awarded an MBA at the end of year two if a student elected not to finish the MSW portion? Mr. Jones replied that at the end of the second year the student would have completed all the MBA core requirements plus four electives and would therefore be eligible to be awarded the MBA.

Ms Pounder would like the sentence page 2 (3rd line) clarified: The MBA program normally requires 8 electives and these will include 4 social work options (this has been mentioned); the MSW requires 4 and has 2. What does the 4 and has 2 mean?

Ms Rogers stated that the MSW requires 4 options, two of which would be fulfilled by MBA options.

The chair suggested that Mr. Wieser make the minor changes to the proposal before it goes to GFC.

322.8 SCHOLARSHIPS

322.8.1 HEADACHE SOCIETY & CHR SCHOLARSHIP – TERMS OF REFERENCE

MOTION: GRANT/BARCLAY
That the Faculty of Graduate Studies Council approve the Headache Society & CHR Scholarship
CARRIED

322.9 OTHER BUSINESS

The chair mentioned that the December Council meeting might be cancelled for lack of agenda items.

The chair acknowledged and thanked Mr. Krivy for all the work that he has done and all the contributions he has made over the years.

322.10 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5.45 p.m.