

Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

Wednesday, January 10, 2018

2:00 to 4:00 pm

University of Alberta Council Chamber, 2-100 University Hall

Attendance at FGSR Council – Jan. 10, 2018
Department/Unit Faculty Representatives

Anthropology	Andie Palmer
Biochemistry	David Stuart
Biological Sciences	Tracy Ravio
Business (non-departmentalized) - MBA	Michael Maier
Business (non-departmentalized) - PhD	Trish Reay
Chemicals & Materials Engineering	Vinay Prasad
Chemistry	Anita Weiler
Civil & Environmental Engineering	Dave Chan
Communication Sciences & Disorders	Joanne Volden
Dentistry (Medical Sciences)	Pat Flood
Economics	Heather Eckert
Educational Policy Studies	Jorge Sousa
Educational Psychology	Veronica Smith
Electrical & Computer Engineering	Marek Reformat
Elementary Education	Doug Gleddie
English and Film Studies	Albert Braz
Extension (non-departmentalized) (MACT, MACE)	Rob McMahon
Faculte Saint-Jean (non-departmentalized)	Samira El Atia
History & Classics	Margriet Haagsma
Human Ecology	Pushpanjali Dashora
Humanities Computing	Maureen Engel
Laboratory Medicine & Pathology	Jelena Holovati
Library & Information Studies	Ali Shiri
Linguistics	Johanne Paradis
Mathematical & Statistical Science	Vincent Bouchard
Mechanical Engineering	Morris Flynn
Medical Genetics (Medical Sciences)	Sarah Hughes
Medical Microbiology & Immunology	Kevin Kane
Modern Languages & Cultural Studies	Micah True
Music	Christina Gier
Native Studies (non-departmentalized)	Paul Gareau
Nursing (non-departmentalized)	Diane Kunyk
Occupational Therapy	Lili Liu
Oncology	Alan Underhill
Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences (non-departmentalized)	Scot Simpson
Physical Education & Recreation (non-departmentalized)	Normand Boule
Physical Therapy	Mark Hall
Physics	Frank Marsiglio
Physiology	Greg Funk
Political Science	Yasmeen Abu-Laban
Political Science	Jared Wesley
Psychiatry	Esther Fujiwara
Psychology	Anthony Singhal
Rehabilitation Medicine - Rehabilitation Sciences	Patricia Manns
School of Public Health (non-departmentalized)	Jeffrey Johnson
Secondary Education	Catherine Adams
Surgery	Fred Berry
Women's and Gender Studies	Felice Lifshitz

Associate Deans (Graduate) Representatives for Departmentalized Faculties

Arts	Tom Spalding
Science	Renee Elio

Ex-Officio Representatives

FGSR Dean & Vice-Provost (FGSR Council Chair)	Dean Zwicker
FGSR Vice-Dean	Debby Burshtyn
FGSR Associate Dean	Naomi Krogman
FGSR Associate Dean	John Nychka
Senior Administrative Officer, FGSR (Secretary)	Amy Dambrowitz
Vice-Provost and Chief Librarian	Kathleen De Long
Delegate, Centre for Teaching & Learning*	Carla Peck

Graduate Program Administrators Committee (GPAC) Representatives

Faculty of Extension	Eileen Crookes
Department of Anthropology	Heather Cook

Graduate Student Association (GSA) Directly Elected Officials (DEO) Representatives

VP Labour	Sasha van der Klein
VP Academic	Firouz Khodayari

Graduate Student Association (GSA) Council Representatives

Biomedical Engineering	Kevin Solar
Business PhD	Dasha Smirnov
Chemical and Mechanical Engineering	Abdulrahman Albeladi
Civil and Environmental Engineering	Mostafa Tawfeek
Educational Policy Studies	Julie Mooney
Educational Policy Studies	Alleson Mason
Electrical and Computer Engineering	Adan Wang
Internetworking	Khushmit Kaur
Medical Genetics	Istahil Abdullahi
Oncology	Clara Fallone
Renewable Resources	Liz Fedra Huayta Hernani
Surgery	Hayden Danyluk
Surgery	Jonathan Mora
	Tony Zheng

Observers – Non-Voting

Assistant Dean, Advancement*	Meghan Unterschultz
FGSR Executive Assistant & Operations*	Andrea Riewe
Alumni Council - FGSR Representative*	Christopher Michell-Viret
Graduate Ombudsperson*	Brent Epperson
Executive Assistant to the Vice Dean and Associate Deans*	Dena Giroux
Governance Policy Coordinator*	Janice Hurlburt
Supervisor, Admissions / Program Services*	Joyce Anderson
Acting Supervisor, Awards*	Trish Smith
Drama Representative*	Selena Couture

*Non-Voting

FGSR Council January 10, 2018

1.0 Call to Order at 2:03 PM

2.0 Approval of Agenda for January 10, 2018

Moved/seconded: Chris Michell-Viret/Yasmeen Abu-Laban

Approved by a show of hands.

3.0 Approval of Minutes of November 29, 2017

Moved/Seconded: Morris Flynn/Margriet Haagsma

Approved by a show of hands.

4.0 Matters Arising from the Minutes

None.

5.0 Report from the Dean (Heather Zwicker)

The Dean began with an acknowledgment that we meet on Treaty 6 Territory, and that our vibrant community is enriched due to the culture and contributions of First Nations, Metis, Inuit and all Indigenous peoples of Canada.

A welcome was extended to new members of Council, including Trish Reay from the Business PhD department (David Deephouse is currently on leave). The Dean reminded Council that we put resources and useful information on the website, and we are always available to answer questions by email.

Killam Updates:

- The deadline for the Killam Award for Excellence in Mentoring is on March 10, 2018. Council was encouraged to think about nominations for outstanding supervisors. We intend to bring the 2017 winner to an upcoming Council meeting, so that she can give her inspiring acceptance speech. ([More details can be found here](#))
- 2017 marked the 50th anniversary of the Killam endowment. The trustees undertook a nationwide impact study to ensure the legacy of Izaak Walton Killam and Dorothy Johnston Killam is intact, and that their endowment monies are supporting the best and brightest of students. (The Killams also founded the Canada Council for the Arts.) The Trustees would like to see Killam Professorships given to mid-career individuals, so that it will propel their careers forward (the VP Research is looking into this). FGSR is looking into raising the value of the scholarships and prizes and how we can connect winners to the world at large (e.g., media training to learn to speak compellingly, or connecting Killam winners with honorary doctorate recipients). There will be more to come on this, and comments or thoughts are welcome. The

goal is to make sure Killams are paid as handsomely as the Vanier or Trudeau Awards, but without diminishing the number of Killam awardees.

Great Supervisor Award: This is an opportunity for all dept/programs to nominate a “great supervisor.” The purpose of the relatively informal award is to recognize supervisors who demonstrate strong supervisory skills or who foster mentorship in their programs. Send us the name and brief description of what makes your nominee a great supervisor (3 sentences) - 1 nominee if you have fewer than 30 professors, and 2 if you have 31 or more professors. The deadline to submit nominations is Friday, January 12, 2018 by 4 PM to ascdean@ualberta.ca.

Boilerplate Language: FGSR has created some boilerplate language which you are free to take and use. We have provided a description of the role of FGSR, what we do, what we offer, etc. We believe this will be especially helpful as you navigate the quality assurance process. It also provides a summary of the substantive changes to FGSR policy and service over the past 5 years. It resides on the FGSR website [here](#).

Graduate Enrolment Report: FGSR is putting the finishing touches on the enrolment report. It will make its way through governance and the appropriate admin committees, depending on space in their agendas. We always take the opportunity to provide the reminder that 1 in 5 students at the UofA are grad students. The report will also come to this group at the February Council meeting.

Grad Impact Week: We are working with our CARI counterparts (especially Calgary and Lethbridge) to create a Grad Impact Week. The purpose will be to raise awareness of graduate studies to the world at large, with the government and internal audiences top of mind. We aim to showcase what our graduate students do and how they make positive contributions to the world. We will treat this year as a pilot and the week will include the 3MT finals, grad students talking to media outlets, a “day in the life of a grad student” photo-story, and social media of some sort (#gradimpact ?). We want this to be a week where grad students are unmissable, and where they are celebrated and trumpeted for all the great work they do. Please be involved and engaged, and participate on social media if you are so inclined. More details to come.

Question: Will GSIP be highlighted?

Response (HZ): Yes, GSIP will be a key part. The government is pleased with the program and it will be important to highlight it.

6.0 Student Presenter: Stephen Lane "Sensing with Resonances"

Stephen is a graduate student studying physics, and working on developing resonant optical sensors. He is also an experienced TA, and has worked on developing both undergraduate lab curriculum and

graduate student TA training. Stephen engagingly shared his research on developing optical sensors through resonances. His physics research translates to biochemical and biomedical applications (i.e. antibody sensing).

7.0 **FGSR Council Membership Update (Heather Zwicker)**

3 Changes were made to the FGSR Council Membership criteria:

1. The Vice Dean position has been included (this was a previous omission)
2. Under additional members, clarification was added to note that “normally” a member of Council is the graduate coordinator or the associate chair.
3. Third, clarification has been added to where graduate student representatives come from - Students should be from “as broad a range of graduate programs as possible, with not more than two graduate students from a given graduate program”.

***MOTION:** Be it resolved that the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research Council approves the proposed changes to the composition of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for recommendation to General Faculties Council Executive for approval.*

***Moved/Seconded:** Marek Reformat/Samira El Atia*

Discussion on the motion:

Question: What about departments with multiple programs?

Response: In fact, we didn't revisit the particular statement explaining a dept/unit. The difficulty is that freestanding programs may not have a clear unit, and if we included a representative from every program, we wouldn't have a manageable body. To avoid complexity, we have gone with 'departments' - this provides the diversity from across campus, and the idea is that people actively managing grad programs are the intended representatives. We are an inexact body with a bit of raggedness within the system, and this seems to be working well. We would always entertain requests for representation on council from programs that do not feel well represented.

The motion was approved.

8.0 **MA in Policy Studies (Jared Wesley)**

Edmonton is one of few provincial capitals without a graduate program devoted exclusively and comprehensively to the study of public policy. This is a lost opportunity with regard to scholarship, governance, and public service in the province.

This motion is for a new specialization within an existing degree program. At present, the institution offers a Master of Arts (MA) in Political Science from the Department of Political Science. This program would be a second MA offered by the department in the field. The program will have two streams -

course only (for those who have practical experience already), and with a practicum (for those who do not have professional experience in the field).

The program has been a collaborative creation with a push to differentiate from programs like that of Calgary. The program is set apart by a pracademic approach (working to prepare students for a variety of professions); by its trans-governmental reach (not attached only to the provincial government like many programs); by its focus on experiential learning (internships and co-ops, and also ensuring classes include experiential components); and by its inclusion of politics and the political environments (there has been a national trend towards Policy Schools, and outcomes have been challenging. Our program will be unique in that it will explore the unique space between policy and politics). These differentiations will be built into the program through content, technical skills and behavioral competencies.

Jared noted that they have been overwhelmed by the positive response from the community, especially in the employer demand study that was done.

***MOTION:** Be it resolved that the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research Council approves the proposed "Master of Arts in Policy Studies" to be offered by the Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts.*

***Moved/Seconded:** Michael Maier/Tom Spalding*

Discussion/Questions:

Do you have similar entrance requirement as political science?

Yes, the minimum requirements are mirrored and very similar.

Have there been consultations with grad students?

Yes, Grad students sit on our faculty council, and have provided good input and approval.

Will there be a TAsip or RAship?

This hasn't been fully resolved yet, as from year to year, the supply/demand varies. The short answer is that the funding letter will involve that internship component (guaranteed co-op placements), which will be a big part of the funding. Other opportunities will be provided to students as they arise.

Will this be under GSIP or other paths?

If it's a government opportunity, it will fall under the GSIP route; if it is a non-profit opportunity, it may go the MITACS route.

How are you dealing with international students and their maximum allowed work hours?

The 12 hours/week guideline has been used to be safe regarding the Collective Agreement.

If practicums fall during the summer months, will there still be placements, or will this be a downtime seasonally?

Employers noted they prefer summer since they have more work to be done. In the proposal, it is a model, but departments will be flexible for placements during other times of the year.

Will students transfer back and forth from policy studies to political sciences? How will you manage this?

We don't want what is happening in other programs across Canada to happen here, where the programs are poaching from each other. To that end, the program was designed to make sure the cohort will share courses and experiences, but still have the pathway available.

So that it doesn't become a tool of an outside entity (i.e. government), what are the safeguards for University autonomy in this?

An open approach to collaborating with the community has been taken, and we don't know of any institutional safeguards that could be put in place. However, professors teach as they would like. We take a collegial approach, and are flexible to cohorts if desired.

D. Burshtyn: We see the future possibility of having the program accredited, and that would not allow government interference. However, we haven't historically seen instances of curriculum dictating in the past.

Who would be the accrediting body?

CAPPA - Canadian Association of Programs in Public Administration. We would also seek to go for accreditation from the US body, (which other Canadian institutions have not pursued).

Will you remove the specialization name?

Yes, we will do that.

Could you discuss the internal reallocation of campus revenue noted?

D Burshtyn: This is a new way of proposing the budget; these budgets are not subject to approval by FGSR Council, only the academic parts of the proposal are being approved. We are expected to produce budgetary numbers at the program level for government purposes, even though our internal budgeting is not done that way.

The motion was approved.

9.0 Graduate Calendar Checklist (Debby Burshtyn)

Janice Hurlburt from FGSR has been working with our partners in governance, and a University Calendar cleanup is required to ensure alignment with existing UAPPOL policies. The need for a cleanup has been triggered by instances where there were real omissions in the calendar (even though they were on dept websites, e.g.).

For example, the Calendar might state a GPA of 3.2 is required, while the program website indicates a 3.6 is required. The Calendar is the authoritative source for program requirements, so it should state the rule (in this case, the lowest acceptable GPA). However, if you wish to notify applicants that the program is, in practice, more competitive than the lowest acceptable GPA would indicate, the program website could qualify the requirement by stating that 3.2 is the minimum but 3.6 is the "normal competitive GPA."

FGSR is developing a resource package and a clear process for all units to follow. GPAC will also be informed at their January meeting.

A couple notes on omissions:

- Anything from websites or guidelines that turns out to be a change needed in the Calendar that didn't go through academic governance in your Department/Faculty will need to go through the usual governance route, including ASC or APC.
- Changes will need to go through your faculty governance by the end of June. Then in early fall, changes will be taken through appropriate GFC governance, so that they can go into the Fall 2019 Calendar.
- Unless the admission or a program requirement is below FGSR minimums, changes won't need to go through FGSR Council.

Discussion/Questions:

Does this mean core courses must be in the Calendar as well as on program websites?

Yes. Courses must be approved through governance.

Is approval at department, Faculty or FGSR Council required if we can't find proof of adequate approval?

Probably - if you don't already have department or Faculty approval, that may be required. But FGSR will work with you on a simplified process, if feasible.

If we publish a Handbook every year, and we are required to keep amending the Calendar every year, it will be quite a bit of work.

Come up with Calendar wording that is more flexible - e.g., a range of courses determined by a committee.

Some of our programs have seen quite dramatic changes, so something that appears simple may provoke unwanted discussion.

We understand. Departments have merged and programs have changed, and across the university we do not always put resources into following up through the appropriate governance channels. However, it is important to do so. Again, FGSR will work with you on an expedited process, where feasible.

Does waiving minimums run afoul of FGSR policy and put us in conflict with the University Calendar?

If requirements fall below FGSR minimums, they must come to Dean of FGSR for approval on a case by case basis.

The Dean emphasized that the University Calendar is our contract with our students, and we need to make sure programs are correctly described in the Calendar and on our program websites. It is more important to do this process well rather than quickly; we owe it to our students to be clear. Since the discussion at Council has suggested that the problem is larger than we anticipated, FGSR will develop a coherent process and work with programs to ensure proper governance and alignment of documents.

10.0 Supervisory Guide Overview Handbook (Naomi Krogman)

The goal of this Handbook is to improve supervision and mentoring across campus in alignment with our renewed commitment to improving supervision and mentorship of graduate students. We currently have many resources on our website with helps in various areas, but finding the appropriate information requires labor on your part. We want to distill the most important topics down to one document that is generalized to be applicable across the Campuses. We want to name positive practices, and call out negative situations so that we can provide a place for chairs to go back to when inappropriate actions come to light.

The Handbook is a substantial piece of work, and we are coming to you early with a rough provisional draft. Follow up conversations will be forthcoming, allowing us to distill our thoughts over time. In other words, this is your first glance at a document you will see again in the future.

The draft has been worked on in conjunction with the Ombuds Office, Provost's Office, Office of Safe Disclosure and Human Rights, Department Chairs, and graduate students, who have provided their cumulative knowledge.

The Handbook will bring together policies and services (e.g., Collective Agreement with the GSA; Faculty Agreement; Research Integrity Policy; Sexual Violence Policy; Discrimination, Harassment and Duty to Accommodate Policy). These are living standards that guide supervision. It is important to provide this for new faculty in particular.

Council members are welcome to email Associate Dean Naomi Krogman regarding omissions or areas we need to be aware of (e.g., departmental sensitivities). We may choose to create an additional document to discuss "healthy labs" in the future, as we know this is a challenging area.

Discussion/Comments:

Many agreed this was an excellent endeavor and a great document.

- Involve people in the writing stage - for instance, could the Great Supervisor nominees be asked for input?
 - It was agreed that this will take a lot of different types of people reading this, so that we can be clear but not overly narrow. Debby Burshtyn may take this around to departments for consultation as she did last year with some of the policy items.
- Include a Contact Us link if the linked policy doesn't help with a concrete solution. Identifying a chain of command in the event of an ongoing dispute would be helpful.
- Correction: Graduate Students' Association.
- Correction: Office of the Student Ombuds.

- Maybe a separate section for how to mentor international students as they adapt in the first year, since this is a common challenge that requires guidance.
- It is helpful to have the view that this is demonstrating cultural shifts in supervision and mentorship: this isn't just for new faculty. Some info at the top about that context would be helpful.
- Include resources and guidance about issues of family life for students (including maternity leaves and childcare issues)?
- There are a couple initiatives and dialogues happening across campus regarding creating a more family friendly campus. Many are not just grad student issues, but they can be piggybacked for postdocs as well.
- Funding should be its own complicated section, as a lot of conflicts arise out of financial issues.
- Also useful would be suggestions for supervisors to self-evaluate and self-reflect. This would be helpful for grad chairs to have as they assess supervisors.
- Could we have a seminar for incoming supervisors?
- Could we make it come alive - by including quotes in the margins to give examples?
- This document could be used by Department Chairs in annual reviews - that way it could reach people who wouldn't take the time to read it.
- There would be value in having a section discussing what to do when a relationship is dissolved (even if it's not grounded in conflict).
- A section on how to set up a student for success if you are leaving on sabbatical would be helpful.
- Could a section on professional development activities for supervisors be added?
- Consider providing guidance on what to do with a disappearing student - when you can't get them to respond or they are in a slump: tips on training to get them involved in their programs again.
- Will this also be an online tool?

It was brought forward that some of the people who need to read this the most will not. Is there a way to make reading it mandatory? Additionally, new faculty are looking for guidance, and we want to show them the momentum and culture shift - however, forcing them to read guidelines is hard.

At present, the answer is no, but we are moving towards this. We imagine a world where appointment to supervisor is approved by a body like FGSR. The Handbook is the beginning of a developing an environment where we can confidently state that our supervision is sound and based on best practices. You are all partners in this!

11.0 IELTS Band Change (Debby Burshtyn)

This is a discussion item to bring you up to speed with discussions that are happening around campus. By way of background, the Registrar's Office has increased the Undergrad IELTS band and the question came to FGSR of whether we would want to increase ours as well. The Policy Review Committee has looked at the U15 data that was collected, and has canvassed the minimum entrance requirements for

specific departments (the majority of whom list their requirement as the FGSR minimum). If we were to raise the minimum for FGSR, it would raise the minimum for all those who depend on this. However, we don't know the impact of the raise on your intake pool or student success. Programs can still set higher minimums than the FGSR minimum, and the minimum can also be waived on a case by case basis (as brought forward to the Dean of FGSR), so there is still leeway on both sides.

The overall goal is to ensure our entrance requirements ensure that we have students who would be successful. Since the undergrad minimum went from 5 to 5.5, it was immediately thought that if grad students train undergrad students, they should have the same minimum requirements.

Discussion/Questions:

One individual noted they would be in favor of the change as they routinely find that grad students who are on the minimum end have difficulty, and their department already looks for a higher minimum instead.

Another noted that some departments require more technical skills, versus language skills. Changing the minimum would have an impact on them, as a change from a 5 to 6 is quite high. It was also noted that some students will improve their writing skills as they move through their program. This change would have an impact on their enrolment.

Another department noted that moving the IELTS band up to 6 is a welcome change.

The Office of the Student Ombuds supports an increase. Their concerns are about department providing exceptions to this minimum. We do not serve students well by admitting on the basis of strong technical skills without the language skills that are essential to producing research and scholarship.

Dean Zwicker noted that we don't have the data to analyze whether there a correlation between the IELTS band score and student success. If departments were willing to share that information, FGSR would be interested in seeing those results.

12.0 Governance Report (Debby Burshtyn)

Report is as submitted.

D. Burshtyn noted two highlights:

- The ELP waiver went to GFC, had a thoughtful discussion, and then was passed.
- Tucked near the back of the governance report is a visual on the new subheadings that will appear in the FGSR section of the calendar. We are working to better link people to the info they need in the Calendar.

13.0 PD Requirements Discussion (Heather Zwicker)

At spring 2018 convocation, we plan to survey our Master's students as they will be the first group to complete the PD Requirement (IDP and 8 hours) which took effect in the fall of 2016. We will canvass them on the usefulness of that requirement and ask for ways we can improve. Dean Zwicker asked for brief responses to the following question, noting that the topic will likely be brought back in the future:

- a) Should we waive the PD requirement for students who move from a Master's to a PhD if they complete the PD requirement during their Master's program?
- b) How long should part-time graduate students have to complete their PD/IDP requirements?

Discussion:

On (a):

- If you have just finished your Master's, it is repetitive to do this in your first year of the PhD, but if it has been three or four years, it makes sense to refresh the IDP and professional skills. A time-based waiver would also make sense.
- Could the PD requirement be made optional? Or perhaps an optional "update"?
- There are substantial changes in imagining a career path from the vantage point of a PhD as compared to a Master's. Repeating the 8 hours may not be helpful, whereas adjustments to the IDP may be crucial.
- For Master's students going into a PhD, having a conversation with their supervisor would be beneficial, and the IDP can ground that conversation (in the best scenario). Case by case, the supervisor could decide whether it is necessary to complete again.

On (b):

- Within 18 months makes sense.
- Consider how far along in the program a student is: completing the PD requirement by the halfway mark or one-third mark (for instance) might make sense.
- There are quite a number of students who work and study, and they would benefit from having a longer time to complete the PD.

14.0 GSA monthly report (Firouz Khodayari)

The report was submitted as written, with no additional questions.

15.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:59 PM.