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## Excerpt from Senate Bylaw 1

### 8. Declarations of conflict of interest

| 8.01 | At the beginning of each meeting of Senate or any of Senate’s committees or councils, the chair will call for members to declare any conflicts of interest with regard to any agenda item. For agenda items to be discussed in closed session, the chair will call for declarations of conflict of interest at the beginning of the closed portion of the meeting. Members may nonetheless declare conflicts at any time during a meeting. |
| 8.02 | A member shall be considered to have an actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest, when the opportunity exists for the member to use confidential information gained as a member of Senate, or any of Senate’s committees or councils, for the personal profit or advantage of any person, or use the authority, knowledge or influence of the Senate, or a committee or council thereof, to further her/his personal, familial or corporate interests or the interests of an employee of the university with whom the member has a marital, familial or sexual relationship. |
| 8.03 | Members who declare conflicts of interest shall not enter into debate nor vote upon the specified item upon which they have declared a conflict of interest. The chair will determine whether it is appropriate for said member to remove themselves from the meeting for the duration of debate on the specified item(s). |
| 8.04 | Where Senate or a committee or council of Senate is of the opinion that a conflict of interest exists that has not been declared, the body may declare by a resolution carried by two-thirds of its members present at the meeting that a conflict of interest exists and a member thus found to be in conflict shall not enter into debate on the specified item upon which they have declared a conflict of interest. The chair will determine whether it is appropriate for said member to remove themselves from the meeting for the duration of debate on the specified item(s). |
In 2012, Dr. Teresa Menzies (Brock University) and Dr. Gary Gorman (Memorial University), completed their review of Conrad’s MBET and Grad Diploma programs. The reviewers offered a very positive assessment of Conrad’s programs and the group itself. They concluded their report with this summary statement:

“In conclusion the review team is very impressed by the MBET offered at [Conrad] and the instigation of future plans and development strategies. The CBET programs, current and planned, are innovative and evolving in line with the newest approaches to both Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship, not only in Canada but worldwide. CBET stakeholders are to be praised for their outstanding achievements and ongoing efforts.”

The reviewers also offered several developmental recommendations that helped catalyze a number of activities and efforts in the intervening period. This report is intended to offer the Senate a concise summary of Conrad’s activities addressing those recommendations. Despite a period of transition in leadership and all of the energies that requires, Conrad has made great strides and is positioned for even greater success in advancing UWaterloo’s strategic objectives related to entrepreneurship education, support and research. Review recommendations are italicized and followed by Conrad’s update.

Report on 2-Year Implementation Plan

1. Consider suggestions on program assessment. Conrad has always taken program design very seriously, as noted in the original response to the 2012 review. Encouragement to engage in rigorous program assessment and evaluation is therefore welcome. In the last year, Conrad has developed the capacity to start collecting and using better data on student outcomes, and we have started doing additional data collection on the student experience. Conrad is also working closely with the university’s institutional analysis and planning department on designing and implementing a measurement approach for entrepreneurship education outcomes as part of the university’s strategic plan initiatives. In the current year, we are independently initiating a “start-to-finish” curricular review with the goal of even better programmatic integration across courses, and a forward-looking
2. **Commence planning and fundraising for future space needs.** The reviewers noted that Conrad was constrained by its existing space, and noted that plans for future expansion of programming would require expansion of physical space. The following important steps have been taken:

- Rental of a small space to support undergraduate programming in the Communitichub.
- Confirmation of a move to occupy most of the second floor of the new Engineering 7 building, move-in planned for September 2018.
- Plans to occupy space in East Campus 5, both in the interim and beyond 2018 are taking shape, and should be finalized in 2015.

The space in East Campus 5 is being made available by the university to support undergraduate entrepreneurship programming initiatives. Conrad is working to coordinate with others at UW to raise funds for appropriate entrepreneurship space at UW in general, and specifically to support the completion of Engineering 7.

3. **Develop hiring timelines and draft profiles for new faculty appointments.** Since June of 2012, Conrad has doubled its number of continuing full-time faculty appointments from four to eight (four tenured faculty, one permanent lecturer, three continuing lecturers). The faculty expansion has both addressed short-falls in the past, and accommodated expansion of undergraduate programming in Engineering and beyond. Relative to our plans in 2012, we are slightly behind in faculty recruitment, but only because of two unsuccessful searches in early 2014. Conrad is currently recruiting candidates for those two tenure stream positions, and early indications are that the pools are strong and promising. Projected growth attributable to a roll out of a part-time MBET program and an expansion of undergraduate programming will require further hiring in the next 12 to 24 months. Precise profiles for those faculty members are partly contingent on the nature of our next two hires. A thoughtful, strategic approach is being taken to every hire, with broad involvement and input within Conrad at every step in the process.

4. **Work with the Advisory Council to identify research opportunities with local companies.** Conrad continues to work closely with members of its Advisory Council. We are keenly aware of the unique opportunity that may exist to support scholarly and peer-review entrepreneurship research in Waterloo, using data from our uniquely vibrant entrepreneurship ecosystem. Recent
work by Howard Armitage and Alan Webb (soon to appear in *Accounting Perspectives*) is a good example of our researchers' ability to draw on resources afforded them by our Advisory Council members and their networks. We foresee future projects of this type continuing to emerge, especially as our research capacity grows with new faculty hires.

In this area it is also worthwhile to note that Conrad, its faculty members, and its students engage in a great deal of applied research that takes advantage of our Advisory Council and its connections in the community. Our alumni are also important partners in this process. That applied research takes the shape of MBET practicums, case studies, and experiential projects in classes among others.

5. **Work on the development of at least one new Masters program.** In 2012, Conrad was exploring two potential new masters-level programs, one that would focus on product management, and the other on intrapreneurship (corporate entrepreneurship). Further research led us to reject the product management idea, and to adapt our thinking around the corporate entrepreneurship program. Instead of launching new masters programs, it is our plan to (re-)launch a part-time MBET program. This program will be delivered in a concentrated modular format, and we are investigating a launch in 2016.

6. **Enhance efforts for marketing and recruitment of the program.** Conrad has enjoyed noteworthy success in this area. Considerable investments of financial and human resources, a more data-driven evaluation of channels and past-strategies, and greater use of targeted online advertising and webinars are yielding fruit. Conrad had one of its strongest and largest MBET intakes in 2014. 2015 will see further restructuring in our marketing area and communications efforts. These will be necessary to facilitate anticipated expansion into a part-time MBET and expanded undergraduate programming.

7. **Launch the [Grad] Diploma [in Business and Entrepreneurship] for students in Engineering at Waterloo.** Conrad launched the Graduate Diploma in Business and Entrepreneurship (Grad Diploma) in fall 2013. We have been offering six masters-level courses in business and entrepreneurship since, two per term. These courses have seen significant uptake by UW's engineering graduate students. In the first four terms, 244 students enrolled in BE 600-
series courses. Demand going forward remains robust. Whether there is significant potential to attract alumni to enroll is still being determined.

8. Be central to UW’s entrepreneurship strategy, and move towards School status. Conrad is, indeed, central to UW’s emerging entrepreneurship strategy. In addition to its work in the graduate arena, Conrad has recently launched an undergraduate Option in Entrepreneurship within Engineering, and has now received all necessary approvals to offer a campus-wide Minor in Entrepreneurship starting in September 2015. Conrad has also developed and launched BET 100, an introduction to entrepreneurship that is available in an online format to students across campus in every academic term. Conrad is also developing plans to play a central role in coordinating and encouraging the activities of a community of entrepreneurship-related researchers across campus. Originally established as a research centre, Conrad needs to move to school status to more accurately reflect the full scope of its activities, to align with UW governance frameworks, and to further support UW’s aspirations in the entrepreneurship field. Required approvals will be sought in 2015.

During a period of transition and rapid growth, Conrad has made major strides on most of the review recommendations, and progress on all. We look forward to working on these and related projects going forward.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Mark Weber
Director
Conrad Business, Entrepreneurship and Technology Centre
Memo

To: Members of Senate Graduate & Research Council

From: George Dixon, VP Research

Date: May 26, 2015

Subject: Addition of Sub-Centre to Existing Interdisciplinary Centre on Climate Change

Background:

The Interdisciplinary Centre on Climate Change (IC³) received approval for a renewed five-year term from the Senate Graduate and Research Council in May 2014. In the time since, IC³ has worked extensively with the Dean of Environment, UW Advancement, the VP of Research, Dr. Blair Feltmate, and a number of industry organizations to identify opportunities and develop innovative partnerships that will advance research and policy solutions for improving resiliency to extreme weather and climate change-related risk in Canada.

These discussions have come to fruition with two new industry-funded partnerships in early 2015. One of these partnerships has been finalized and it was announced on April 17, 2015 that the Co-operators and Farm Mutual Reinsurance Plan committed $1.1 million to a new applied research network called Partners for Action (P4A) that is based the University of Waterloo's Faculty of Environment and will work extensively with IC³.

A second partnership with a major Canadian insurance company is in final stages of development with a draft gift agreement currently under review by the Secretariat. If approved, the agreement would bring $4.25 million in industry funds to UW over 5 years.

Proposed Sub-Centre Addition:

The subject of this memorandum is to propose the addition of a sub-Centre to IC³ in order to facilitate the establishment of this second industry partnership, subject to final approval by UW and the industry partner (anticipated by end of June 2015). As part of IC³’s overall mission to advance research on climate change through an interdisciplinary approach, the new sub-Centre would be dedicated to advancing climate change adaptation (particularly business-led adaptation) in Canada. This will leverage and strengthen UW’s already deep research strength in the field of climate adaptation. Figure 1 illustrates the significant number of citations of IC³ members climate adaptation focused work in the recent United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change assessment report.

Publicly, the sub-Centre will be referred to as the “[Company Name] Centre on Climate Adaptation”. The reporting structure and relationship between IC³ members and the added sub-Centre are outlined in Figure 2. This structure has been developed through close coordination with the Dean of Environment, the VP-Research, and Advancement.
Figure 1: Number of citations of IC3 Members’ work in each Working Group of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 5th Assessment Report (AR5)

![Graph showing citations by Working Group]

Figure 2: Reporting Structure of the Interdisciplinary Centre on Climate Change and Sub-Centre on Climate Adaptation

![Diagram of the reporting structure]

*IC3 was renewed by Senate in June 2014 for a 5-year period ending May 2019
Final Assessment Report  
Civil Engineering (MEng, MASc, PhD)  
June 2015

Background:

The Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering (CEE) (Civil Engineering until 2006) is one of the founding Departments of the University of Waterloo. The department began offering its graduate program in 1960, with its first Master’s degree being awarded by the University in 1962. CEE’s graduate program provides in-depth training and research opportunities in four fields of study: Environmental & Water Resources (E&WR), Geotechnical (GEO), Structures, Mechanics & Construction (SM&C), and Transportation (TRANS). Degrees offered include: Master of Engineering (MEng) in Civil Engineering or Nuclear Engineering (approved in 2004), a Master of Applied Science (MASc) in Civil Engineering, and a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Civil Engineering. In Fall 2013, CEE’s student population consisted of 972 undergraduate students, and 244 (204.6 Full-Time Equivalent [FTE]) graduate students.

CEE underwent a successful review in 2007. At that time, reviewers concluded: “Amongst the twelve Civil Engineering graduate programs in Ontario, the quality of the program at the University of Waterloo ranks in the top two.”

Summary of Review Process
Submission of Self-Study by Program: August, 2014  
Site visit: January 26-27, 2015  
External Examiners’ Report: February 12, 2015  
Departmental response: April 10, 2015

Review Team
External Reviewers: Dr. Leonard Lye, Department of Civil Engineering, Memorial University  
Dr. Ernest Yanful, Department Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of Western Ontario  
Internal Reviewer: Dr. Maria Liston, Department of Anthropology, University of Waterloo

The Associate Provost, Graduate Studies selected the external reviewers from a list provided by CEE. The Review Team conducted a site review over two days on January 26-27, 2015; the self-study report was provided to the Review Team prior to the visit.
The site review included meetings with the Provost & Vice President Academic, Associate Provost of Graduate Studies, Faculty of Engineering Dean and Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, CEE Chair and Associate Chair of Graduate Studies and representatives of CEE faculty, graduate students, and staff. The Review Team was given a tour of the CEE research facilities.

Summary of Review.

The External Reviewers, Dr. Leonard Lye and Dr. Ernest Yanful, submitted a very positive report of the graduate programs in Civil Engineering (MEng, MASc and PhD). They concluded that: “the UWaterloo Civil Engineering graduate program is very strong and comparable to civil engineering programs at other top Canadian universities.”

Strengths:

- “CEE graduate students at UWaterloo feel good about their program, especially the quality of courses and instruction.”
- “Faculty members in the CEE program are well qualified in their various fields.”
- The research productivity of faculty “is comparable to average productivity of faculty members in research intensive Civil Engineering departments in Canada”.
- “CEE admission standards … are in line with the standards of other major engineering departments in Canadian and U.S. universities”.
- “The moral of faculty staff and students is high”.

Weaknesses:

- The number of faculty supporting the GEO stream (4) is minimal.
- Graduate students raised concern about the availability and flexibility of graduate courses.
- Most PhD students “do not complete their comprehensive examination within the required four terms, but in the fifth term or later”.
- Funding for international MASc students should be “increased to provide a sufficient living stipend”.
- Travel conference support should be increased to encourage participation in conferences.

Reviewer Recommendations & Department Responses:

1. “There should be a clearer written policy in the calendar regarding minimum passing grades in engineering and course failures. The minimum passing grade in a graduate engineering course is not mentioned in the calendar. It is, however, mentioned that an overall average mark of 70% is required for progression.”
We agree. Implementation to occur within the next 12 months.

2. “CEE should encourage and monitor the participation of CEE students in the new MASc and PhD Collaborative Water Program. Students should not miss this unique opportunity.”

We agree. Implementation to occur within the next 12 months.

3. “Inequalities in the quality of graduate student office space should be addressed. The plan to renovate current inadequate and dated offices being used by GEO graduate students is commendable and should be implemented.”

This is being addressed to the greatest extent possible. Substantial financial resources are required for us to execute our plans to continue to renovate existing CEE space into higher-quality graduate student office space. This is a multi-year effort that may take five or more years and at least $300,000 to be realized.

4. “The 4 FTE faculty complement for the GEO group is the minimum and that UWaterloo should do all it can to increase or at least maintain this number. This should be considered mission critical.”

The GEO field of study will continue to be supported by 4 FTE faculty members. An increase in the faculty complement in this field of study is not anticipated in the foreseeable future.

5. “More graduate courses in the GEO area should be offered on a regular basis.”

Over the next 24 months we will carefully monitor the graduate courses in the GEO area with a view to increasing their availability and timing. In the next year (2015/16), two faculty members in this area are planning to take sabbatical leave, and one will be retiring (January 01, 2016). We have begun advertising to replace the impending retirement.

6. “The funding level for international MASc students should be increased so that sufficient funds are available for living expenses after the payment of fees.”

While we agree that this is a concern, there is little CEE can do aside from requiring supervisors to increase their funding level for international MASc students. We are not prepared to take action on this recommendation; however, we will continue to encourage supervisors of international MASc students to provide higher-than-minimum GRS payments.
7. “To encourage conference attendance and participation by graduate students, travel support should be increased. The department, faculty, graduate student union and the university could share this increase.”

Although we do not have supporting data, we believe conference attendance by CEE graduate students is quite high, particularly for PhD students. The largest part of these expenses should be borne by the supervisor since it is in their best interest to disseminate their research findings at these venues and provide their graduate students with a rewarding experience. We will collect the appropriate data to make an informed conclusion, and then re-visit this recommendation within the next 12 months.

The Dean of Engineering, Dr. Pearl Sullivan, viewed the External Review Report to be positive and endorsed the Department response. She commended the Department for the progress on a number of recommendations.

This report will go to Senate Graduate and Research Council on June 8, 2015, and to Senate on June 15, 2015.
The Department of Geography and Environmental Management (GEM) at the University of Waterloo (UW) and the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies (GES) at Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU) jointly deliver the Waterloo Laurier Graduate Program in Geography (W-LGPIG). The W-LGPIG was approved in 1992 and became fully operational in September 1993. The W-LGPIG offers four graduate programs: the Master of Arts (MA), Master of Environmental Studies (MES), Master of Science (MSc), and PhD degrees. Specialization fields across these programs include: Environmental and Resource Management, Environmental Science, Geomatics, and Human Geography. The joint W-LGPIG was appraised in 2007 and classified as Good Quality.

The directorship of the program alternates between the two universities every three years; the current Director, Dr. Johanna Wandel, is at the University of Waterloo. The Vice-President Academic & Provost of the two universities, on the recommendation of the Graduate Deans and the Faculty Deans and Department Chairs of the participating department of the two universities, appoint the Director.

**Summary of Review Process**
Submission of Self-Study by Program: July 2014
Site visit: March 19-20, 2015
External Examiner’s Report: March 29, 2015
Departmental Response: May 26, 2015

**Review Team:**
*External Reviewers:* Dr. Peter Keller, Department of Geography, University of Victoria
Dr. James Buttle, Department of Geography, Trent University

*Internal Reviewers:* Dr. Mustafa Yavuz, Department of Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering, University of Waterloo
Dr. Jane Rutherford, Department of Biology, Wilfrid Laurier University
The Associate Provost, Graduate Studies, at the University of Waterloo selected the external reviewers from a list provided by the W-LGPG program director. Each of the partner universities appointed an internal reviewer who accompanied the external reviewers during the visit to their home university. The Review Team conducted a site review of the joint Geography graduate programs over two days on March 19th to 20th; the self-study report was provided prior to the visit. Their agenda included meetings with representatives of each institution (Waterloo, and Wilfrid Laurier), including: Vice President Academic & Provosts, Associate Provost/Dean of Graduate Studies & Postdoctoral Studies, Associate Deans (Graduate Studies) and Deans of Faculties; Department Chairs; W-LGPG Director & committee members; faculty members, graduate students, and staff of the respective Departments, and Library staff. They were given a tour of the research facilities at each of the partner universities.

**Summary of Review.**

The External Reviewers, Dr. Peter Keller and Dr. James Buttle, submitted a very positive report on the Joint Graduate Program in Geography (MA, MES, MSc and PhD) programs. The Reviewers were “impressed by the overall structure and quality of this joint graduate program, its faculty and students”. They concluded that W-LGPG program “overall is a very strong and highly reputable graduate program competitive with the best in Canada and internationally”.

**Strengths:**

- The joint delivery of the program by UW and WLU “gives students access to a very significant pool of research faculty and research infrastructure not available in most other Geography graduate programs in Canada”.
- The joint program is “amongst the strongest graduate programs in the country” in “water-related research, particularly in wetland and northern environments as well as geomatics. The program also could have other strengths recognized to be amongst the top nationally if the research programs of faculty in the various sub-disciplines were aligned and promoted under strategic umbrella themes. As an example, Human Geography could seek to identify strength under “Climate Change” as well as “Governance”. Geomatics could identify similar overarching common themes.”
- The “technical Library and data support accessible to graduate students both at UW and WLU”.
- “Strong-to-excellent research and scholarly records” and external funding of faculty in all fields of study.
- A “very good track record of completion rates at both the Masters and PhD levels”.
- Student reports of the high quality of graduate supervision.
Weaknesses:

- “The number of courses required for completion of the research-based Masters program is greater than for comparable programs.”
- Concerns raised by some students for “delivery of graduate courses using undergraduate style course evaluations focusing on examinations”.
- Many of the 60 courses listed in the calendar are not offered on a regular basis.
- Potential loss of critical mass of faculty to offer graduate supervisory capacity in Human Geography.
- Limited enrolment of Master’s students from other universities.

Reviewer Recommendations & Department Responses:

The Reviewers offered 12 recommendations under three themes: a) Raising the Profile, b) Program and Courses and c) Resourcing. These recommendations and the program responses appear below.

a) Raising the Profile.

1. The quality and positioning of this program relative to others in Canada and internationally is poorly advertised and marketed, and therefore it operates in relative obscurity. The websites of both Departments and the joint program would benefit from investments to get the story out. It is unlikely that the expertise or resources to achieve this can be found within the units. We suggest that responsibility for program marketing and promotion be assigned elsewhere at UW and WLU, and that the unit then receive training in how to capitalise on social media and other methods to keep redesigned web-presences up-to-date and dynamic.

We agree with this recommendation. The program committee for the W-LGPIG will undertake to develop a better marketing strategy for this program, with the goal of raising the program’s overall profile in Canada. This graduate marketing strategy will be coordinated with current and future undergraduate marketing activities. In particular, we will endeavour to enhance our program website. We will be seeking assistance and resources from both UW and WLU to develop, implement, and maintain this enhanced marketing and promotion program.

2. Both Departments are encouraged to develop ways to identify and stay engaged with their graduate student alumni to track their careers and successes. This information can then become part of a revised web presence.

We agree with this recommendation. The program committee will work with the alumni affairs offices at both UW and WLU to review the current status of our alumni tracking and outreach activities. Information gained from these outreach activities will be used
to both enhance our marketing efforts and to address issues in the delivery of the program.

3. All graduating graduate students should receive an exit interview with a neutral party so that the program can receive ongoing feedback on the student’s experience with the overall program, their supervisor, and supervisory committee.

We agree with this recommendation. The program committee will develop a list of questions to guide these semi-structured exit interviews. Exit interviews will be administered by the graduate officers at UW and WLU, through a confidential process. Feedback from these exit interviews will be reviewed annually.

b) Program and Courses.

4. The numbers and specificity of graduate courses currently offered in the program’s curriculum could be simplified and generalised to accommodate flexibility and realism. Courses that have not been offered for several years should be removed, particularly in instances where the faculty member who initiated the course has left the university. The program should explore more generalized “umbrella” course titles within cognate areas that can then be “customized” with sub titles to reflect any one specific offering. Courses offered in any one year should be advertised and, if at all possible, courses offered for the following year should also be agreed upon and advertised so that there is an honest contract between entering students and the program.

We agree with this recommendation. The program committee will undertake a curriculum review with a view to streamlining graduate course offerings and eliminating older courses that can no longer be offered. This curriculum review will be undertaken in coordination with our responses to recommendations 5 and 6.

5. The number of required courses (five) is high for typical equivalent Masters programs of this type across Canada and we suggest that the possibility of reducing this by one course be considered. Courses that are cross-listed and/or offered by academic units other than the two Departments participating in the joint program should be clearly identified as such, with an explicit pointer that students must check the availability of these courses during their degree.

We are taking this recommendation under advisement. We are currently (at WLU) undertaking a detailed review of the course requirements for research masters programs across Canada. This information will inform a broader discussion regarding the appropriateness of the current course requirements and the possible revision of these requirements.

6. The learning outcomes, design and delivery of GEOG 691 should be revisited. We encourage that this process be externally facilitated through one of the two universities “Learning and Teaching Centres”, and that the process include input from past students
who have taken this course. Given relatively high enrolment numbers for this type of course (often over 50), the option to divide the course into two - one specific to Masters students, the other specific to doctoral students - should be considered. Separation of the two groups would also serve to establish a sense of community amongst the PhD student cohort across the program that appears to be missing at present. As starting discussion points for redesign of GEOG 691 we offer exploration of what may be simply “busy work assignments” vs. assignments that will help the students “advance in their program of study”, what aspects of professional development the course may wish to cover (e.g. writing proposals and grants, strategies for publishing, producing conference posters and presentations, preparation of teaching dossiers, project management, ethics, ... ), what the most effective ways are to teach these professional development skills, and how the course may facilitate community building across the graduate body, and between graduate students and faculty. The question of whether the course should remain Pass/Fail or be graded could also be revisited. Finally, thought could be given to how the course could be adjusted on an annual basis to reflect the research interests of that year’s cohort.

We agree with this recommendation. As part of the broader curriculum review undertaken in response to recommendation 4, we will undertake a review of the delivery of GEOG 691.

7. We would like to encourage the establishment of a weekly or bi-weekly seminar series across the entire program. We understand that such series exist within individual fields within the program but feel that a pan-program series would assist in promoting a greater sense of community amongst students in the program as well as raising awareness of the diversity, breadth and excitement of the discipline.

We agree with this recommendation. The department chairs at WLU and UW will coordinate to organize a pilot seminar series for the 2015-16 academic year. The initial response to this series will inform the continued development of a regular seminar series.

8. The stated timeline and deadline for the comprehensive examination should be aligned with the current reality (completion within the second year and by the end of the sixth term in the program). The evaluative pieces of the comprehensive examination should match clearly stated purposes and learning objectives and as much as possible facilitate delivering components of the doctoral theses (i.e. literature review, theoretical context, relevance to the discipline, statement of research problem to be advanced).

We do not agree that adjustments should be made to the comprehensive exam schedule. Normally, PhD students are required to complete the comprehensive exam in the 4th term of study (usually the fall term of the second year in the program). Most students successfully complete the comprehensive exam in the 4th term, or early in the 5th term (if there are scheduling issues). We believe this timing should be maintained to ensure that students move on to their thesis research in a timely manner. Delaying the
timing of the comprehensive exam would unnecessarily slow students’ progress through the PhD program. We will review the current structure of the evaluative pieces of the comprehensive exam with respect to stated desired learning outcomes.

9. The opportunities to prepare for a career that includes teaching, including advancing an understanding of delivery of pedagogy and developing teaching skills, should be made more explicit for PhD students. The possibility of incorporated this as requirements for completion of the doctoral degree should be considered.

PhD students are currently made aware of resources on the two campuses to assist them in the development of their teaching skills. We can examine efforts to reinforce the availability and awareness of these resources (e.g., via GEOG 691). We will explore the possibility of incorporating teaching skills into the requirements for the degree. However, adding the requirement that a PhD student teach a class will not be possible or advisable, for a variety of reasons.

10. The potential for developing a course-based Masters degree in Geomatics should be explored. There looks to be support for this amongst the Geomatics faculty, and it would be consistent with the desire on the part of UW to increase the number of professional Masters programs.

UW has discussed the possibility of creating a course-based masters in Geomatics before. This will be discussed again.

c) Resources

Given the current fiscal realities we do not offer specific recommendations for holding onto existing or securing new resources. However, we recommend following:

11. That the impact of not replacing vacated faculty positions on each of: 1) the joint graduate degree under review, 2) each Department’s undergraduate programs, and 3) other graduate program initiatives the two Departments are involved in, be given very careful consideration when it comes to reallocating or investing new resources in the Faculty. More specifically, we recommend that close consideration be given to a replacement tenure-track position at WLU in the Environment and Resources Management field not only to ensure coverage of critical needs in the undergraduate curriculum, but also to regain capacity to offer graduate courses and to supervise students in this field in the program. We understand that the strategic need for this position is recognized by the Administration at the highest level.

We agree with this recommendation.
12. It was brought to our attention by the students that there may not exist equal ease of access to facilities at the “other” university. The problem may arise in part from lack of awareness by all students of how access may be secured, in part from lack of awareness on behalf of the UW and WLU administrative structures as to why equal access is important given the nature of this joint-program. We recommend that W-LGPIG investigate and negotiate the resolution to issues of unequal access.

We are aware of historic complaints regarding access to resources. It should be pointed out that access to academic resources is equal for students from both campuses. Students from WLU and UW have the same access to wireless internet, the library, lab, online learning resources, and Ithenticate (through UW). The only difference, when it comes to access, is in the "social" resources - i.e. athletics, bus pass etc. These services are part of student fees and specific to each campus. We understand that WLU provides more access here. For example, UW students may use the WLU athletic facilities, but WLU students may not use those at UW. However, this is not a W-LGPIG issue and beyond the control of our academic units.

The Dean of Environment at UWaterloo has endorsed the department’s response to the reviewers’ recommendations.

This report will go to Senate Graduate and Research Council on June 8, 2015, and to Senate on June 15, 2015.
Present: Katherine Acheson, Anne Brousseau, Maya D’Alessio, Bernard Duncker, Jim Frank, Michael Hartz, Anwar Hasan, Bruce Hellinga, Sarah Hildebrandt, Robert Hill, Richard Kelly, Bruce Muirhead, Maureen Nummelin, Tamer Özs, Paul Parker, Samantha Shortall, Jennifer Simpson, Richard Staines, Mike Szarka, Suzanne Tyas

Secretariat: Mike Grivicic

Resources: Jennifer Kieffer

Guests: Heather Debling (2), Dawn Parker (2)


*regrets

Organization of Meeting: Jim Frank, co-chair of the council, took the chair, and Mike Grivicic, acted as secretary. The secretary advised that due notice of the meeting had been given, a quorum was present, and the meeting was properly constituted.

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None declared.

a. Excerpt from Bylaw 1, section 8. This item was received for information.

2. RENEWAL OF SENATE-APPROVED CENTRES & INSTITUTES: WATERLOO INSTITUTE FOR COMPLEXITY & INNOVATION

Dawn Parker, director of the institute, spoke to the renewal including: overview of the institute’s mandate and activities; networking via institute and application of research conducted; notable level of engagement of students; institute has track record of facilitating funding and grants. Members noted that funding renewal for the institute is a separate process, and that Thomas Homer-Dixon belongs to the Faculty of Environment. Council heard a motion to approve the renewal of the institute for a five year term ending May 2020. Kelly and Parker. Carried.

3. CO-CHAIRS’ REMARKS

Frank noted that Executive Council has been focusing on income sources and enrollment, and he observed that Waterloo is tracking well ahead of the previous year for doctoral students. He also noted activity and interest in the Canada First Research Excellence Fund and graduate student funding.

4. MINUTES OF 14 APRIL 2015 AND BUSINESS ARISING

A motion was heard to approve the minutes as distributed. Hellinga and Tyas. Carried. Members noted that data on declined offers of admission consists of only one round presently, but that this data is expected to be helpful as more is gathered moving forward.

5. CURRICULAR SUBMISSIONS

a. Applied Health Sciences. Council took all the items together and heard a motion to approve the items as presented. Tyas and Staines. Carried.

b. Arts. Council heard a motion to approve the revised language requirement in English as presented. Acheson and Tyas. Carried. Council heard a motion to approve the course revision in sociology as presented. Acheson and Tyas. Carried.

c. Engineering submission #1. Council heard a motion to approve course revisions in chemical engineering as presented. Hellinga and Hasan. Carried.
d. Engineering submission #2. Council heard a motion to recommend that Senate approve the degree name change in mechanical engineering as presented. Hellinga and Hasan. Carried.

e. Mathematics. Council heard a motion to approve course items (i)-(iii) as presented. özsu and Hasan. Carried. Council heard a motion to approve item (iv) as presented. Özsu and Hasan. Carried. Council heard a motion to approve items (v) and (vi) together as presented. Özsu and Hasan. Carried.

6. GRADUATE AWARDS

a. Department of Chemistry Scholarship for Graduate Student Excellence. Council took items (a) through (d) together. Hildebrandt observed that item (b) was cancelled in the past and that its submission here brings the award forward afresh. Council heard a motion to approve the four item as presented. Hildebrandt and Acheson. Carried.
b. Xerox Research Scholarship in Polymer Science and Engineering. See 6 (a).
c. Dr. Murray Brown Psychology Graduate Memorial Award. See 6 (a).
d. Patricia M. Rowe and M. Philip Bryden Psychology Travel Award. See 6 (a).

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Hellinga inquired as to the status of the fall break item and Grivicic observed that the item is going to Faculty Relations Committee and then prospectively to Council again in September 2015. Frank noted that the terms of reference for a mid-term break is still in progress, and is considering the dual student-employee nature of graduate students with respect to how mid-term breaks are treated.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be on Monday 8 June 2015, 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon in Needles Hall, Room 3001. [Secretary’s note: start time changed to 10:00 a.m.].

28 May 2015                  Mike Grivicic
                               Assistant University Secretary
TO: Members, Senate Graduate and Research Council

FROM: Marina Ivanova, Administrative Coordinator, Arts Graduate Studies & Research

RE: Graduate Affairs Group Report dated April 16th, 2015

The attached Arts Graduate Affairs Group report was approved by the Arts Faculty Council at the May 12th, 2015 meeting and is now being submitted for approval by the Senate Graduate and Research Council on June 8th 2015.

Marina Ivanova

Attach.
CURRICULAR ITEMS for approval [bottom right pagination]

A) Master of Public Service
   Memo: Graduate calendar change of admission average (Approval to change the admission requirement for MPS from 78% to 75%) [pg 1]

B) Psychology
   Memo: New wording for Psychology degree requirements [pg 2]

C) Psychology
   Course Activation: PSYCH 785 Attention and the Brain [pg 4]
   Course Activation: PSYCH 803 Meta Analysis [pg 6]

D) English
   Memo: Implementation of a coursework option in the Experimental Digital Media (XDM) degree [pg 7]
MEMORANDUM

To: Graduate Affairs Group
From: Daniel Henstra, Director, Master of Public Service program
Date: April 2, 2015
RE: Graduate Calendar Change – MPS Admission Requirements – Entrance Average

PROPOSAL

We request approval to change the minimum entrance average included in the MPS admission requirements from 78% to 75%.

Change to Graduate Calendar:

Existing: Successful completion of an Honours Bachelor’s degree, or equivalent, with an average of at least 78% (B+) in the final two years of the degree.

Revised: Successful completion of an Honours Bachelor’s degree, or equivalent, with an average of at least 75% (B) in the final two years of the degree.

RATIONALE

We have several reasons for this request. First, a minimum average of 75% has always been the de facto threshold for acceptance, consistent with the University-wide admission requirements. We wish to make an official change to the Graduate Calendar to avoid confusion and delay during the admissions process.

Second, due to the applied nature of the MPS program, and the centrality of its co-op component, applicant credentials other than academic achievement are of equal importance in admissions decisions, including employment and volunteer experience, quality of writing (as demonstrated in Statement of Interest), and English language skills. A minimum entrance average of 75% widens our scope of discretion to consider all of these factors.

Finally, a minimum entrance average of 75% is in line with other course-based professional Master’s programs at Waterloo, such as the Master of Business, Entrepreneurship & Technology, the Master of Public Health and the Master of Social Work.

Thank you.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Graduate Affairs Group  
FROM: Elizabeth Nilsen Associate Chair Graduate Studies, Department of Psychology  
DATE: April 9, 2015  
RE: New wording for Psych degree requirements

Currently, program requirements are:

Masters (MA)

Qualified candidates are usually admitted directly into a PhD program and may obtain a masters degree along the way, when they have completed the requirements for it. In special circumstances, admission into a masters program may be possible.

Degree requirements

The minimum requirements for the one-year masters degree are satisfied when the candidates have successfully completed either:

- Four two-term or eight one-term courses, accepted for graduate credit by the department, plus the masters research paper, or
- Two two-term or four one-term courses accepted for graduate credit by the department, plus the masters thesis

MASc

- 1-year MASc Program in Developmental & Communication Science
- 2-year MASc Program in Industrial/Organizational Psychology

PhD

For the PhD in Psychology, the department requires successful defence of the PhD thesis, completion of statistics and breadth requirements and satisfactory performance in a minimum of two two-term graduate Psychology courses or their equivalent in one-term courses. Further requirements for the PhD are outlined in sections describing the particular programs. While many courses may be taken on a Credit/Non-Credit basis, at least half the courses offered for a degree by the student must be graded.

Proposed new wording and order for program requirements

Qualified candidates are admitted to either a MA or a PhD program (in which a Master’s degree may be obtained along the way). The program to which candidates are admitted to varies by program Area (e.g., Clinical and Social applicants are typically accepted into an MA program, while Cognition, Cognitive Neuroscience, Developmental, and Industrial Organizational students are typically accepted to a PhD program). Candidates accepted to the MA program are expected to continue to a PhD program.

MA Degree requirements
The minimum requirements for the two-year Master’s degree are satisfied when the candidate has successfully completed:

- Two two-term or four one-term courses accepted for graduate credit by the Department, plus the Master’s thesis
- OR (only with special permission from department) Four two-term or eight one-term courses, accepted for graduate credit by the Department, plus the Master’s Research Paper

**PhD requirements**

For the PhD in Psychology, the Department requires successful defence of the PhD thesis, completion of the statistical and breadth requirements and satisfactory performance in a minimum of two two-term graduate Psychology courses or their equivalent in one-term courses. Further requirements for the PhD are outlined in sections describing the particular Area programs. While many courses may be taken on a Cr/NCr basis, at least half the courses offered for a degree by the student must be graded.

**MASc**

The Department offers two MASc programs:

- [1-year MASc Program in Developmental & Communication Science](#)
- [2-year MASc Program in Industrial/Organizational Psychology](#)
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title:
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: PSYCH Course number: 785

Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Attention and the Brain
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Attention and the Brain

Grading Basis: OPTIONAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: ☐

Course Description: This course will take students through the dominant theories of attention over the past century before exploring what various brain imaging techniques have added to these theories. For the latter portion of the course students will present key contributions to our understanding of attention from neuroimaging techniques covering the full range of dominant techniques used in the field (ERP, fMRI, TMS, tDCS). In groups, students will then devise changes to the experimental designs as presented with an eye to improving the study. These ‘brainstorming’ sessions will then be shared with the rest of the class.

The aims of the course are threefold: first, to expose students to the dominant theories of attention, second, to expose students to the pros and cons of a wide variety of neuroimaging techniques and third to develop their skills in experimental design within the constraints of those techniques.

New course description (for revision only):
Meet Type(s): Seminar
Primary Meet Type: Seminar

Requisites:
Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request: Rapid advances are being made in our understanding of how the brain controls attentional mechanisms, based largely on advances in neuroimaging techniques. While some of these techniques (fMRI, ERP) have been with us for decades, others (tDCS) represent more recent methodological advances. Furthermore, for techniques such as ERP and fMRI, statistical and design challenges are constantly morphing. Therefore, students taking a Cognitive Neuroscience PhD program
need to develop expertise in these leading edge approaches to understanding attention and the brain. This course aims to do that and critically involves experiential learning. Each neuroimaging technique has costs and benefits in terms of the questions that can be answered given the limitations of the tools. By having students design, in-class, their own experiments using each technique, they will develop the necessary skill set to navigate within the limitations of the tool while exploiting the advantages. Such a course is not yet on offer for students at UW.

Prepared by: Rita A Cherkewski  
Date: 6-Apr-15
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course □ New ☒ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title:
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: PSYCH Course number: 803
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Meta-Analysis
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Meta-Analysis
Grading Basis: OPTIONAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50

Course Consent Required: □ Department

Course Description: Meta-analysis refers to the quantitative synthesis of relationships that have been studied in the research literature. Meta-analysts integrate and synthesize effect sizes that are reported in prior studies. This course focuses on how to conduct a meta-analysis and interpret its results. To this end we will (a) go through the process of conducting a meta-analysis, (b) read and critique applications of meta-analysis, (c) conduct original meta-analyses in student teams in areas of interest to students, and (d) read and discuss primary research that applies, develops, or critiques meta-analysis.

New course description (for revision only):
Meet Type(s): Seminar
Primary Meet Type: Seminar
Requisites:
Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒

Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:

Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request: Meta-analysis has emerged as a powerful tool for synthesizing what we know about relationships within a literature and a method to answer research questions that are often difficult to address in any one single study. The importance of meta-analyses can be seen via their visibility in some of the top journals of psychology (e.g., Psychological Bulletin), where they are published regularly. Given the ubiquity of meta-analyses across different fields of psychology, a course on meta-analysis will help to students to become intelligent consumers of meta-analyses as well as prepare them to conduct their own meta-analyses in the future.

Prepared by: Rita Cherkewski Date: 31-Mar-15
The Department of English Language and Literature would like to propose one motion.

1. Motion: implementation of a coursework option in the Experimental Digital Media (XDM) degree:
   
   - Breakdown of coursework degree requirements
     
     • ENGL 700, Rhetorical Theory, with an added “digital bootcamp” element
     • 3 courses designated as XDM
     • 1 course designated as Literary Studies
     • 3 elective courses (one of which may be extra-departmental)
     • Language Requirement Milestone
   
   - Rationale: The department wishes to offer the coursework option in this degree for various reasons:
     
     • It is offered in our other two English MA degrees.
     • There is concern with the growing XDM cohort that the faculty members in digital studies will soon be overburdened with MRP supervision.
     • Potential students have noted that the MRP scared them away from the program. Students who are perfect for XDM go elsewhere or opt for RCD in order to avoid doing the MRP.
M E M O

TO:       Mike Grivicic
          Associate University Secretary

FROM:     B. Hellinga, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies
          Faculty of Engineering

RE:       Senate Graduate and Research Council Meeting

DATE:     May 25, 2015

Please place the following motion on the agenda for the next Senate Graduate and Research Council meeting. This motion was approved by Engineering Faculty Council on May 19, 2015.

1. The Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering’s (ECE) has one proposal for approval:
   a. The ECE proposal to split the Comprehensive Exam into two parts was been approved by
      EGSC, EFC and SGRC earlier this year.

      ECE is now asking for approval to revise their Comprehensive Exam milestones for PhD
      students to reflect this change. The new milestones will be put into place effective Fall
      2015. Please find more information in the attached document.

      Bruce Hellinga

BH: jec
Memorandum

Date: March 24, 2015
To: Bruce Hellinga, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies & International Agreements
From: Catherine Gebotys, Associate Chair, Graduate Studies, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Subject: PhD Comprehensive Examination Milestone Addition

SGRC approved the split of the Electrical and Computer Engineering PhD Comprehensive Exam into two parts (Background and Proposal) on March 9, 2015. As such the department would like to update its PhD Comprehensive Examination Milestone to reflect this change by replacing the existing milestone with two new ones effective for students entering the PhD program starting in the Fall 2015 term.

Therefore, the Electrical and Computer Engineering department requests that the current PhD Comprehensive Examination milestone be split into two new milestones; PhD Comprehensive Background Examination milestone and PhD Comprehensive Proposal Examination milestone.

All changes were approved by the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at a meeting held June 19, 2014 and subsequent email on 29 January 2015. Changes are to become effective Fall 2015.

Regards,

Catherine Gebotys
Associate Chair, Graduate Studies
Electrical and Computer Engineering

/SL
Faculty: Engineering
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
Milestone New ☒ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title: Comprehensive I

For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(\textit{e.g.} consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: Choose an item. Course number:
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces):
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):
Grading Basis: Choose an item.
Course Credit Weight: Choose an item.
Course Consent Required: ☐ Choose an item.
Course Description:
New course description (for revision only):

Meet Type(s): Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Choose an item.
Requisites:

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☐
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☐

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request:

SGRC approved the split of the Electrical and Computer Engineering PhD Comprehensive Exam into two parts (Background and Proposal) on March 9, 2015. As such the department would like to update its PhD Comprehensive Examination Milestone to reflect this change by replacing the existing milestone with two new ones for students entering the PhD program starting in the Fall 2015 term.
Faculty: Engineering
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☒ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title: Comprehensive II

For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: Choose an item. Course number:
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces):
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):
Grading Basis: Choose an item.
Course Credit Weight: Choose an item.
Course Consent Required: ☐ Choose an item.
Course Description:
New course description (for revision only):

Meet Type(s): Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Choose an item.

Requisites:

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☐
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☐

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/heldwith:

Rationale for request:

SGRC approved the split of the Electrical and Computer Engineering PhD Comprehensive Exam into two parts (Background and Proposal) on March 9, 2015. As such the department would like to update its PhD Comprehensive Examination Milestone to reflect this change by replacing the existing milestone with two new ones for students entering the PhD program starting in the Fall 2015 term.
Approved Doctoral Dissertation Supervisor (ADDS) Regulations

Preamble

The Approved Doctoral Dissertation Supervisor (ADDS) status is governed by a series of regulations governing how faculty members gain the privilege of sole-supervising PhD students. As such, they are regulations whose authority is vested in the Senate, and any changes to them are to be discussed at Faculty Relations Committee, Graduate Student Relations Committee and the Faculties, and then approved by Senate Graduate and Research Council and by Senate.

Introduction

This document sets out the qualifications necessary for faculty members to supervise PhD students. Faculty members who demonstrate the qualifications set out in this document will receive Approved Doctoral Dissertation Supervisor (ADDS) status, and only they will be:

- permitted to independently supervise PhD students;
- eligible for membership on the Graduate Studies Committee of a Faculty;
- eligible for membership on the University of Waterloo Senate Graduate and Research Council;
- eligible to be Graduate Officers, Faculty Associate Deans, Graduate Studies, or Associate Provost, Graduate Studies;
- eligible to chair PhD Examining Committees.

Qualification for ADDS Status

Faculty members who qualify for ADDS status must:

1. Be a faculty member at the professorial rank at the University of Waterloo (this includes clinical faculty);
2. Normally hold a PhD degree or a terminal degree in their field;
3. Demonstrate continuing competence and achievement in research or scholarship appropriate for the discipline;
4. Demonstrate appropriate familiarity with University of Waterloo policies and procedures on PhD supervision. This is preferably achieved by the faculty member attending a University-provided workshop or receiving training on supervisory procedures at the Faculty level;
5. Demonstrate appropriate supervisory experience: this can be achieved by the faculty member choosing one of the following:
   - Successfully completing a workshop series organized by the office of the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies and facilitated by CTE on graduate supervision, over the course of one year;
   - Successfully supervising to completion at least one Master’s thesis or Major Research Paper;
   - Having co-supervised or supervised a PhD thesis to completion (see Guidelines for Best Practice in Co-Supervision).
The above criteria are meant to ensure that faculty members have acquired the appropriate knowledge to facilitate becoming excellent PhD supervisors at Waterloo. For new faculty, ADDS status is to be awarded on potential excellence since building a proven track record of successful graduate supervision requires many years, numerous students and, depending on the discipline, can extend beyond the granting of tenure.

**Acquiring ADDS Status**

The process of acquiring ADDS status for a faculty member in the tenure-stream at the University of Waterloo is defined as follows:

- Faculty members satisfying all 5 criteria for qualification listed above can request consideration for ADDS status by their Department Chair;
- The Chair must confirm all 5 criteria are met and then pass along the request and any written comments to the Faculty Associate Dean, Graduate Studies for approval;
- If the Chair deems that any of the 5 criteria are not met, s/he will provide the faculty member in writing information as to which criteria are not met and guidance as to how to satisfy those criteria in order to become eligible. Faculty members can appeal the Chair’s negative decision to the Faculty Associate Dean, Graduate Studies and (in the event of a negative decision from the Faculty Associate Dean) to the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies;
- Individual Faculties may opt to constitute an appropriate advisory committee to the Associate Dean, Graduate Studies to adjudicate ADDS status requests;
- After the application is approved by the Faculty Associate Dean, Graduate Studies the recommendation for the granting of ADDS status will be forwarded to the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies for approval;
- If either the Faculty Associate Dean, Graduate Studies or the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies does not approve ADDS status at the present time, s/he will provide in writing guidance as to what is needed for the faculty member to become eligible. Faculty members can appeal denial of ADDS status by the Faculty Associate Dean to the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies.

**Retired Faculty**

Those faculty members who are supervising doctoral students when they retire may continue to sole-supervise these students until these students complete their degrees.

**Adjunct Faculty and Research Professors**

Co-supervision with a regular faculty member with ADDS status is normally a requirement for Adjunct Faculty and Research Professors. The Faculty Associate Deans, Graduate Studies, have the authority to waive the co-supervision requirement for a specific student, on the recommendation of the Department/School.

**Revoking ADDS Status**

When circumstances appear to warrant the revocation of ADDS status of a faculty member; the process for doing so is as follows:

- The Chair/Director of the faculty member's unit will recommend revocation of ADDS status to the Faculty Associate Dean, Graduate Studies. Justification for the
recommendation should be provided in writing, along with information on efforts that
have been made for remediation, and the faculty member in question should be
notified in advance of the recommendation and the reasons for it;

- The Faculty Associate Dean, Graduate Studies may reject the recommendation but
  must provide a written explanation for doing so;
- In some cases information may come to the attention of the Faculty Associate Dean,
  Graduate Studies, suggesting that revocation of ADDS status should be considered.
  In such circumstances, s/he should approach the Chair/Director to investigate, and if
  appropriate initiate the process;
- If the Faculty Associate Dean, Graduate Studies accepts the Chair/Director’s
  recommendation, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the Associate
  Provost, Graduate Studies, whose decision is final; the Associate Provost, Graduate
  Studies shall provide reasons for his/her decision in writing;
- If ADDS status is revoked/ the Faculty Associate Dean, Graduate Studies will notify
  the Graduate Studies Office to update the University list;
- Faculty members whose ADDS status has been revoked have the opportunity to
  requalify for ADDS status, if they can demonstrate the appropriate competencies
  required.

Other

- All faculty members of a Faculty Graduate Studies Committee should hold ADDS
  status. (Departments/Schools not offering PhD programs would be exempt.)
- Faculty members from departments that do not have a PhD program may acquire
  ADDS status and supervise graduate students from other departments within their
  Faculty where departmental regulations permit.


**Terms of Reference for a Mid-Term Break**

(note: changes from submission provided at February 2015 SGRC meeting are underlined)

A mid-term break (e.g., Winter Reading Week) is intended to act as a pause for students in an academic term, to reflect upon and catch up on their term’s work to date and, as necessary, prepare for any upcoming mid-term assignments and assessments.

During this pause, there are to be no scheduled meetings or assignments for students (e.g., classes, labs, tutorials, seminars, exams, TA-related work). While exceptions may exist (e.g., co-operative employment interviews, clinical rotations, PhD comprehensive exams, graduate thesis defenses), the pause applies to meetings involving both undergraduate and graduate students.

Deadlines for student submissions will not be scheduled during the break. Student services such as student advising support, Health Services, Counselling Services, the library and residences are expected to continue to provide service.

The above terms of reference are not meant to include responsibilities associated with graduate students in their roles as research assistants or in any other employment capacity (excluding TA-related work as mentioned above) with the university. In these situations, students and employers should clarify their mutual expectations concerning work-related responsibilities during the mid-term break.
MEMORANDUM

May 26, 2015

TO: Mike Grivicic, Assistant University Secretary, Senate Graduate and Research Council

FROM: Heidi Mussar, Assistant Director, Graduate Financial Aid & Awards

RE: Agenda items for Senate Graduate & Research Council – June 2015

Items for Approval
a) Faculty of Arts Departmental Graduate Scholarships – departmental operating funds
   The Faculty of Arts Departmental Graduate Scholarships have been established to administer graduate student funding contributions as part of the graduate funding package in Arts. Students must be registered full-time in a master’s or doctoral program in the Faculty of Arts. Eligible students must have a minimum 80% cumulative average in their current program or over the last two full-time academic years and be within the time limits of their program. Students must not concurrently hold a major scholarship such as OGS, CIHR, NSERC or SSHRC. These scholarships are automatically awarded by the department and Faculty and are normally awarded at the beginning of each term.
   Value of award varies (range is $500 - $9,000)

Items for Information
a) Suncor Fellowships in Social Innovation - trust
   Previously approved at SG&RC in March 2014, to provide two awards at $21,000 to doctoral students registered full-time in any discipline. Additional support of up to $4,000 per student was also made available for research travel or to attend a conference.

   An additional donation of $25,000 has been received to provide one more award for the 2015 academic year following the same conditions under which it was originally created. It is expected that once the funds are depleted, the award will be complete.