

Report #F2000-1 of the School of Graduate Studies

a) Course Management Policy (Graduate Studies)

R. Mendelson presented the report on behalf of the School of Graduate Studies. She indicated that Council had been working on various policies over the course of the past year. For certain policies, particularly, the Appeals Policy and Course Management Policy, undergraduate policies needed to be approved prior to finalization of the corresponding graduate policies.

In regard to the Course Management Policy, this would be for graduate courses. Graduate students taking undergraduate courses would use the undergraduate Course Management Policy. She identified the principles which were similar to the undergraduate policy principles, noting that courses were not semesterized and that status was calculated differently.

R. Mendelson put forward the motion that Academic Council approve the Course Management Policy (Graduate Courses). This motion was seconded by M. Truelove.

A discussion ensued at Academic Council regarding the participation of graduate students in the formation of this policy. It was noted that the policy was consistent with the practices for undergraduate students, but the question was raised whether the material could be tabled for the next meeting of Academic Council. The motion was put forward by J. Davenport and seconded by C. Wright to table the policy for the next meeting of Academic Council. This motion was defeated. Council was informed that graduate students are present on the Graduate Council and all committees of the School of Graduate Studies. It was also noted that policies can be reviewed once they are in place in order to evaluate their effectiveness.

Council engaged in detailed discussions regarding the timing of this policy, with it being noted that the formation of this policy predated the arrival of the present graduate students at Ryerson. A question was also raised

during the discussion as to whether graduate students would be joining Academic Council as members.

Further in the meeting, it was noted that this issue is going forward for consideration by the Composition Committee. A friendly amendment was put forward by C. Wright to have a review date (in one-year's time), added to the original motion.

The amendment and the motion were duly approved.

b) Graduate Students' Academic Appeals Policy

In relation to the Graduate Students Academic Appeals Policy, R. Mendelson noted that there is no corresponding Dean of Graduate Studies for the Dean of the Faculty present in the undergraduate Appeals Policy. As a result, there was one tier removed as compared to the undergraduate Appeals Policy. It was suggested that the removal of this tier improved the efficiency and speed of the appeal being processed. It was noted that graduate students would be handled through this process regardless of whether the course was an undergraduate or graduate course. One member of Council inquired about York University courses since there are joint programs for graduate students. R. Mendelson replied that the jurisdiction of the faculty member would be relevant, and this was provided for in the Memorandum of Agreement (between the universities). Students would be made aware of the respective appeals policy to follow.

A number of Council members expressed concern about the reduction in the number of levels of appeal, and a question was raised as to whether the infrastructure could be increased for graduate students. R. Mendelson responded by pointing out that the faculty advisor would be able to meet with graduate students and could be of assistance to them through the appeals process. The Secretary of Academic Council also provided the comment that the number of levels of appeals would not necessarily have any impact on the due process the student receives while proceeding through the appeals process. A motion was put forward by J. Davenport and seconded by C. Wright to refer the Appeals Policy back to the Committee. In the ensuing discussion, it was discerned that graduate

students who wish to appeal presently would be left without a policy on which they could base their appeal, if this was deferred. Both the pros and cons of proceeding to Committee were discussed by Council, with a vote subsequently being taken.

This motion to defer was defeated.

As a result of a friendly amendment by the original mover of the motion, R. Mendelson, an additional component was added to the original motion, namely to add that a review process would take place during the coming year.

The original motion and amendment were duly approved.

c) Guidelines for the Preparation and Submission of Graduate Programs

The purpose of these guidelines was reviewed, noting it was to provide programs the opportunity to review and modify their program content. A motion was put forward by R. Mendelson and seconded by D. Northwood for Academic Council to approve the Guidelines for the Preparation and Submission of Graduate Program Modification.

This motion was approved.

d) Policies and Procedures for Admissions and Studies - Requirements for Doctoral Programs

A similar set of policies and procedures for the master's program was approved by Academic Council in March of this year. Those policies were used as the basis for the requirements for doctoral programs, with modifications in the areas of doctoral thesis requirement and examinations.

One Council member inquired about the ability of a master's candidate to apply to transfer to a Ph.D. program and vice-versa. R. Mendelson responded that in exceptional circumstances, such transfers could occur dependent upon the individual's capacity. It was noted that admission requirements are program specific.

A further question was raised regarding the time limits for a degree program. R. Mendelson indicated these limits were in the interests of both the student and the university.

A friendly amendment was proposed by C. Zamaria to change the word "occupation" to "studies" on Page 69 of the Agenda.

In addition, the use of terms "years", "semesters" and "terms" would be clarified.

E. Doolaar proposed a friendly amendment to have "two" consecutive terms changed to "three" on page 71 of the Agenda, under the heading "Program Withdrawal".

The issue of residency for graduate students was raised. R. Mendelson indicated there would be program differences. Faculty advisors were referred to in the policy, however, any workload considerations were considered to be beyond the mandate of the Committee. This issue will be considered by other sectors of the community. A Council member inquired as to what constituted a clear standing for a graduate student. R. Mendelson responded that "B" has been chosen since it is consistent with graduate programs elsewhere. She noted that each graduate course could have its own practice. The timing for the start date for graduate studies was also being considered, with it presently being September 1. Another issue currently under consideration is how many times a student may attempt a comprehensive exam.

J. Davenport put forward a friendly amendment to the original motion which was that a review be undertaken in a timely fashion. It was accepted by both mover and seconder. It was noted that it would not be

practical to review this policy until there were graduate students at the Ph.D. level present in the University.

Following conclusion of the discussion, the motion was duly approved.