GRADUATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
September 9, 2015 (Revised)
MINUTES

Attendance: Heather Kanuka – Chair, Jonathan Anuik, Alex Da Costa, Joe da Costa, Jorge Sousa, Evelyn Steinhauser, Makere Stewart-Harawira, Joan White

Absent/Regrets: Katherine Koch
EPSGSA and Sessional reps were not assigned to the committee by the time the meeting was scheduled.

1. Approval of Agenda:
   H. Kanuka asked if there were any changes/additions to the meeting’s agenda. Since K. Koch was not planning to be at the meeting, there will be no Library Report (#5) so this item was removed. J. da Costa asked that under Other Business, the item ‘undergraduate diploma’ be added.

   J. da Costa moved that the revised agenda be approved. Seconded by J. Anuik. CARRIED

2. Approval of May 13, 2015 Minutes
   J. Anuik moved that the May 13, 2015 minutes be approved. Seconded by J. da Costa. CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
   The items from the minutes to be discussed further were already on the agenda for this meeting.

4. Handout: Terms of Reference for the committee
   All of the committee were given a copy of the committee’s terms of reference. H. Kanuka read out the committee’s terms of reference and indicated she had some questions concerning both the mandate of the committee and the membership structure and voting rights. After further discussion, it was decided that the committee’s terms of reference will be brought forward to Department Council for further discussion and possible changes; ie students are not to be present during admission decisions and the sessional rep is not to vote concerning supervision issues.

5. Library Report
   K. Koch was unable to attend the meeting, so this item was removed from the agenda.

6. MEd Application Deadline Dates
   J. White introduced this item by informing the committee that over the past several years FGSR had been downloading work to departments across campus which was creating heavier workloads for both the academic staff and graduate administrator, particularly in the area of admissions. In an effort to streamline the process and to also address the various needs of the specializations in the department, she suggested that instead of having three MEd application deadlines, that there only be one for the entire year. She indicated that this was in line with what other departments in the Faculty were already doing. The one application deadline did not eliminate the possibility of exceptional students being admitted later if requested and students who were not yet admitted could take up to three courses as Open Studies students prior to admission. These Open Studies courses would then do two things, 1) demonstrate the student’s capability at the graduate level and 2) could be transferred into the MEd program.
once admitted. J. White also indicated that over the past year she had seen more than usual numbers of international students unable to obtain their student visas in time to come to Canada by their original entrance date. Deferrals were obtained for them, but the June 1 application deadline was especially troublesome for many of the international students this year. Therefore, J. White suggested that the March 1 application deadline be the one and only MEd deadline in the department.

The current MEd application deadlines are: October 1, March 1 and June 1

**Motion:** M. Stewart-Harawira moved that the October 1 and June 1 deadlines be eliminated and that the department’s MEd application deadline for each year be March 1. Seconded by J. da Costa.

J. da Costa was not sure that only a March 1 application would be good for the EDAL specialization since many of the students who apply for EDAL graduate studies, do so after the March 1 deadline because of the approval process that is needed via the schoolboards prior to applying.

E. Steinhauser indicated that an October 1 and March 1 application deadline would be good for the IPE program since their students needed to first know that they were admitted before applying for funding, just the opposite of EDAL.

During further discussion several alternative dates were proposed in lieu of the March 1 application deadline, including combining the PhD deadline with one other MEd deadline. As the discussion continued, M. Stewart-Harawira decided to withdraw her earlier motion.

The committee decided that two MEd application deadlines would be best for the department with one of them being specific for International applicants.

**Motion:** J. da Costa moved that the department’s MEd application deadlines change from three to two deadlines: October 1 and March 1, with the March 1 deadline being for domestic applicants only. Application deadlines for cohort programs will be decided upon at the time the cohort program is being approved. Seconded by E. Steinhauser. **CARRIED**

Applicants who apply for the October 1 deadline can be admitted for the following January, May, July or September terms. This deadline is also the only deadline that international students can apply for. Applicants who apply for the March 1 deadline can be admitted for the following May, July and September entrance dates. This deadline is only available to domestic applicants.

This item will be brought forward to Department Council’s September meeting.

7. **Doctoral Admissions for 2015**

H. Kanuka indicated that with the new academic year, a discussion on doctoral admissions should begin. J. White informed / reminded the committee of the history concerning this discussion and FGSR’s reason for the department to ‘control’ the number of doctoral students admitted every year. But she went on to say that since FGSR’s initial mandate to the department on this, there has been a change. The U of A is now encouraging departments to admit as many students as possible.
In light of this a discussion started asking questions such as whether a target on this was even needed, as well as implications regarding individual staff workload.

**Motion:** J. Sousa moved that instead of a department target figure this year, that there be no target on doctoral admissions for 2015. Seconded by M. Stewart-Harawira.  

**CARRIED**

8. **Part-time Graduate Studies**  
J. Anuik asked that this item be tabled for next meeting.

9. **Graduate Courses – review/overlap**  
J. da Costa continued the conversation that had started on this item last year. He had been informed by many students that there seemed to be an overlap of subject areas in several of the department's graduate programs and it was a concern. He indicated that although the department had many courses, there were a much smaller number of them that were actually different in content. He often has to advise his students to take courses from other departments to complete programs, as well as ensure the student's program was covering all they needed.

Further discussion also pointed out that:  
1) the Graduate Affairs Committee and Department Council Committee should only be approving courses based on the coherence to a program, course objectives, and not on the specifics of the course itself, ie readings,  
2) the current department course outline template is too flexible and should be more specific to guide individuals on what is needed for the review process. And to add to the template the verification that all of the specializations had reviewed the new course and could see no overlap,  
3) course descriptions should be short and simple to allow flexibility in teaching and changes in the subject area as time goes on. Being too specific causes the department to have to make changes to existing descriptions often and/or create new courses, ie EDPS 681.

This item will be on the October agenda for further discussion.

10. **Doctoral program requirements, department milestones, etc.**  
H. Kanuka informed the committee that FGSR is asking the department to identify ‘milestones’ to track the completion of student's programs in the first three years. With FGSR's new policy (as of July 2014) indicating that the candidacy of a student's doctoral program is to be completed by the end of the third year, departments are now being asked to track completions of the milestones to reach that goal. Not reaching that goal will result in students having to apply for an extension to the deadline.

After further discussion,  

**Motion:** J. da Costa moved that the department’s milestones to candidacy completion would be: 1) Courses (8 or more depending on admission criteria); 2) first draft of proposal, and 3) candidacy completion. Seconded by J. Sousa.  

**CARRIED**
J. White asked if the FGSR Academic Integrity and Ethics Training (AI&ET) requirement in every graduate student’s program should not also be a milestone. The requirement was twofold: 1) completion of either EDPS 581 or 681, depending on what program the student was in and 2) FGSR’s Graduate Ethics Training (GET). She indicated that even though Department Council’s policy (February 2014) stated from then on that the GET portion of the requirement was to be part of the courses’ requirements, not all students are complying. As well, grades for the courses are being submitted without evidence that this requirement has been completed. H. Kanuka indicated that this would need to be address in a different way since it is something that should now be part of the EDPS 581 or EDPS 681 course outline. Specifically, if students have not completed the AI&ET in EDPS 581 or 681 an IN needs to be assigned by the course instructor (changed with AI&ET is completed).

11. October Business

Due to time J. da Costa’s item, Post-graduate Diploma, will be discussed at the October meeting.
J. Anuik indicated that his agenda item Part-time Graduate Studies be eliminated altogether; thus it will not appear of further GAC agenda, unless requested.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.

The GAC meeting is scheduled for October 14, 2015.
1. Approval of Agenda
   H. Kanuka indicated that there might be a change in the order that items are discussed if time was to become a factor for the meeting.

   J. da Costa moved that the agenda be approved. Seconded by J. Sousa.
   CARRIED

2. Approval of September 9, 2015 Minutes
   J. da Costa indicated that a change in item #11 needed to be made. The discussion item he was asking to have discussed for this meeting was about the department’s postgraduate diploma, not the undergraduate diploma. This will be changed in the September minutes.

   E. Steinahuer moved that the revised September 9, 2015 minutes be approved. Seconded by J. da Costa.
   CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
   None

4. Library Report
   K. Koch reported that the library will be offering several workshops for both staff and students. For example 1) Open Access Publications using the library’s institutional repository, ERA: Education Research Archive, 2) SAGE Research Methods, and 3) how a person’s research can impact future researchers. She also reminded the committee that the library is a good resource to help link class material for courses.

5. Graduate Recruitment
   As a new professor in the department, A. Da Costa asked if he could have an explanation of how the department recruits graduate students. J. White gave a brief report that the Faculty of Education, for this year, was organizing attendance at various graduate student recruitment sessions in 1) Edmonton, 2) Alberta, and 3) possibly outside the province. She indicated that currently the graduate administrators were being asked to attend these sessions to promote the graduate programs across the faculty, but volunteers from students and staff would also be welcome to attend. Sometimes the events were only a few hours, while others were either a day or several days. As well, the faculty has created new department brochures that showcase each department’s graduate programs, etc. These are distributed to all that are interested during the recruitment sessions.

   J. da Costa indicated that the method of recruitment can be different, depending on the specialization. For example, often the way to recruit students for the ACHE specialization is
by networking with people in the field. C. Thomas also noted the ultimate recruitment tool is the students, themselves, as they either go through or have completed their graduate program in the department. By ‘word of mouth’ they can present positive encouragement to enrol as graduate students in our department and/or the U of A.

J. Sousa asked if the Faculty was discussing a way to promote and/or inform others of the research that was being done by staff across the Faculty of Education. J. White did not know of any discussion having occurred. H. Kanuka indicated that she would bring this item as a suggestion to the Faculty of Education’s Graduate Academic Affairs Committee. K. Koch indicated that a good resource to help prompt the department would be Isabela Varela, Communications Manager, in the faculty’s Technologies in Education Department.

6. Paper-based thesis guidelines
H. Kanuka informed the committee that J. McClay, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, Faculty of Education was asking departments across the faculty to ensure that they had guidelines established for the completion of paper-based theses. FGSR was already accepting both the standard format and the paper-based format for thesis-based students as a completed document for convocation. H. Kanuka indicated that although the paper-based format was seldom used in the department, guidelines are needed to ensure that if a student chooses to do the paper-based route that the department has guidelines. The guidelines were distributed to the committee. After further discussion, it was decided that J. Sousa and M. Stewart-Harawira will review the guidelines and present possible changes.

This item will be brought forward for the November meeting.

7. Graduate Courses – review/overlap
As this item was a continuation of a discussion started last month, H. Kanuka briefly reviewed what had already been discussed before proceeding. It had been decided, previously, that due to a possible course overlap that a proposed resource called Curriculum Mapping might be useful. It had been decided that the EDAL specialization courses would be the first ones reviewed/mapped as a pilot to see how this might work and if it was useful in what the department wishes to achieve; which is to determine if, in fact, there is course overlap occurring.

J. Sousa asked for a definition of what the word ‘overlap’ meant. H. Kanuka indicated that it generally meant that courses with the same content, same textbook(s) and similar objectives would be considered overlapping each other. J. Sousa thought a better word would be duplication, which was agreed by all, so the term ‘overlap’ will now be replaced with ‘duplication’.

It was also decided that new courses, whether EDPS 501 or permanent offerings, would, from now on, be required to be reviewed by all four specializations before they are presented to this committee for approval/recommendation.

8. Undergrad Diploma / Postgraduate Diploma
J. da Costa informed the committee of the history of the postgraduate diploma in the department. The postgraduate diploma was one that originally came from the Department of Educational Administration. Sometime after the department merged in 1994 to become Educational Policy Studies, the graduate diploma was placed on ‘hold’ and no further direct-entry into the program would be available. He was now asking the committee to consider
removing the ‘hold’ for the graduate diploma to allow the department better access to the program for students who were struggling to complete a doctoral program. J. White asked if the removal of the ‘hold’ was to allow for more direct-entry into the program, meaning a specific application available online for students to use to apply directly into the program and then complete as well as information about the program on the department website. J. da Costa indicated ‘direct-entry’ was not what he felt was needed but rather a department policy on whether or not a professor has the option to suggest the transfer into a postgraduate diploma without having to seek approval of that option from the graduate coordinator every time. In the past the option to transfer has not always been approved by the graduate coordinator. After further discussion:

Motion: J. da Costa moved that the department’s postgraduate diploma continue to not be open to new admissions but that it become an option which doctoral students in either the PhD or EdD can chose to transfer into if deemed advantageous to the student.
Seconded by J. Anuik.
CARRIED

This will be brought forward to Department Council for further discussion and possible approval. If approved, this will be a department policy and information item for all department advisors but will not be noted on the department website as an option.

J. da Costa then briefly discussed the Undergraduate Diploma. This diploma’s admissions are done by the Undergraduate Student Services office in the faculty, therefore the management of the undergraduate diploma was through the department’s Undergraduate Committee. He informed the committee that often the undergraduate diploma had been, in the past, used as a way to allow students to increase their GPA to enter graduate studies later. With the department’s minimum of 3.0 for graduate admission, the undergraduate diploma was seen as a way to help the student obtain the necessary graduate GPA as well as completed a program after a minimum of 8 courses. Though, if a student only needed one or two courses to increase their GPA, admission into the undergraduate diploma was not necessary as they could possibly complete the courses as a U of A Open Studies Student. Currently there was a moratorium on the undergraduate diploma for the department which meant that there was no ‘direct-entry’ option available for student to apply.

In the past, when students were admitted into the undergraduate diploma, it was to help them increase their GPA and the courses taken were graduate level. The question concerning what graduate courses the students would take and if it would affect the courses they took if admitted into a graduate program was asked. J. White indicated that prior to the diploma being placed on hold, the courses in the program were a combination of undergraduate and graduate courses. This could still be required. Also none of the graduate level core courses would be approved for the undergraduate diploma simply because they were designated for graduate students only. Further discussion on this would need to occur within the department’s undergraduate committee. A decision by them would need to be made as to whether or not the program would return and what courses (undergraduate/graduate) would be required, if any.

There were two more items to discuss but because the students were being asked to leave the meeting for item #9, it was decided that item #10 would be discussed first.
10. On-line Courses
H. Kanuka had been informed by the Faculty of Education’s GAAC that this department appeared to not have any online, blended course offerings for students. As a response to this, she was planning to offer EDPS 581 (core MEd course) in Spring 2016 as an online course. Since this course often has more students wishing to take it than spaces available, this would be a pilot offering to learn if the core course is beneficial to students being offered as an alternate delivery. It was felt by many members of the committee that a face-to-face class offering is more beneficial to students. S. Cortez and C. Thomas indicated that both course format options can be beneficial to a student but that the online courses did take more time and possibly more beneficial to distance-based students.

At this point, H. Kanuka thanked the two student representatives for attending the meeting and indicated they would need to leave the meeting before the next item is discussed. As well, Dianne Oberg, Chair of the Department, joined the meeting for the last item.

9. MEd admissions
H. Kanuka distributed a sheet containing staff/student supervision information for the department. As well the review comments that had been submitted for the 10 MEd files being reviewed were also distributed.

Each specialization coordinator then discussed the files that their area reviewed for admission. The following were discussed as acceptable admissions:

- Adult, Community and Higher Education (ACHE) = 3 reviewed; 3 admitted
- Educational Administration and Leadership (EDAL) = 4 reviewed; 1 admitted
- Theoretical, Cultural and International Studies in Education = 3 reviewed; 3 admitted

Indigenous Peoples Education (IPE) = no files were received/completed to be reviewed for the

D. Oberg asked if the letter from the department to the student contain the statement that informed the student that although they were being admitted, there was no guaranteed funding available to them. It was agreed that this should be included in the letter.

H. Kanuka adjourned the meeting at 12:10am.

The GAC meeting is scheduled for November 4, 2015.
GRADUATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
November 4, 2015  
MINUTES

Attendance: Heather Kanuka – Chair, Jonathan Anuik, Sarah Cortez, Alex Da Costa, Jeannette Sinclair, Makere Stewart-Harawira, Coralee Thomas, Joan White

Absent/Regrets: Joe da Costa, Katherine Koch, Jorge Sousa, Evelyn Steinhauer

Guest: Dianne Oberg

1. Approval of Agenda

D. Oberg asked that the item she wished to discuss under ‘other business: thesis supervision’ be moved as the first item of the agenda. J. White asked that information about the Pearson Test of English Academic be placed as an item under ‘other business’ but discussed after item 8 on the agenda.

J. Anuik moved that the revised agenda be approved. Seconded by A. Da Costa.

CARRIED

2. Approval of October 14, 2015 Minutes

A. Da Costa moved that the October 14, 2015 minutes be approved. Seconded by S. Cortez.

CARRIED

9a. Other Business – Department Policy on Supervision

D. Oberg indicated that over the past several months she had been working with a few students, renew supervision for their thesis-based program. The reasons for the change in supervision varied, but the current department policy was causing problem in some cases. The department’s policy that was approved in December 2014 about Graduate Student Supervision is respected, according to Dr. Jill McClay, Associate Dean, FGSR, the department was still required to locate ‘supervision’ for the students that they admit into the program. The student’s need for a supervisor is paramount in both FGSR and Faculty’s view. With this in mind she has now already arranged for ‘out-of-department’ supervision for a couple of thesis-based students in the department. She invited anyone to come and meet with her if there were questions about these decisions.

M. Stewart-Harawira asked about a possible situation where it was felt that a student was unable to proceed and/or complete their graduate program? D. Oberg felt that this was a different issue and one that could be dealt with in a different manner. Making hard decisions about grading and thesis work was needed when it came to students who might not be able to complete a program. Failing grades or a failure in candidacy was sometimes necessary. The paperwork, meetings and difficult conversations that are associated with a failure was necessary and should be taken up in difficult circumstances.

C. Thomas asked if there was a problem with the current faculty/student supervision ratio in the department. D. Oberg did not believe there was. Supervision issues can stem from academic staff being on sabbatical, leaving the University or possible passing away. The department has experienced all of these scenarios over the past couple of years which has
resulted in an unusual number of students needing new supervision than normal. And the choice of how many a staff member could supervise was up to that individual to decide.

H. Kanuka asked if an amendment to the current department policy should be proposed; inserting the work ‘Normally’ to reflect that this policy was to be followed most of the time. She also indicated that although the department had another policy that required every doctoral thesis-based student to have a ‘back-up’ supervisor when admitted, there was really no way to ‘enforce’ that person to become the supervisor if the original supervisor was unable to continue.

**Motion:** M. Stewart-Harawira moved that the current department policy approved by Department Council in December 2014, re Supervision of Graduate Students be rescinded.

After further discussion, M. Stewart-Harawira withdrew her motion. It was decided that the exact wording of the Department’s policy and FGSR’s policy around supervision will need to be reviewed before a further decision on this could be made. This information will be brought to the next GC meeting in December for further discussion.

If, in fact, the current department policy referred to supervision assigned at the time a student is admitted, A. Da Costa asked for clarification about the MEd thesis-based supervision. Since all MEd students in the department are originally admitted as course-based and then later could apply to move to thesis-based how did the decision on supervision apply there. J. Anuik outlined the procedure that he follows when discussing graduate students with his new MEd students. Asking the student if they are possibly interested in completing a thesis-based program often helps to define how the student’s program course structure will proceed. But some student may not know this answer at the beginning of their program. J. White indicated that a MEd course-based student can switch to the MEd thesis-based route as early as the 2nd semester in their program, if they complete the required three courses in the first semester. But as to what the three courses are, is not outlined. D. Oberg indicated that in Elementary Education, they had the requirement that the three courses that a student would need to complete prior to switch to the MEd thesis-route, was 1 research course, 1 theory course and 1 course in their specialization area. J. White directed the committee to a form that was available on FGSR’s website and had been distributed to staff earlier this year. The form, “Suggested Conversation Checklist for a New Graduate Student” could be useful in helping staff obtain the necessary information to guide the student through their graduate program.

**3. Business Arising from the Minutes**

J. Sinclair asked for clarification about the procedures concerning the review of graduate files by the department. Were the files reviewed by all academic staff? Answer: Yes the practice has been that all doctoral applications are reviewed by all academic staff during the admissions review process. In the past it was done via hard copies in a secure room, but now with the new ApplyGrad system, the review can now be done electronically. H. Kanuka indicated that the recent MEd admission review (October deadline) was done electronically for the first time.

**4. Library Report**

None

**5. Candidacy with conditions (discussion)**
H. Kanuka talked about this option that is provided by FGSR at the completion of a candidacy whereby the student has passed the exam but there is sufficient work to still be completed to require conditions to be required before the final paperwork is submitted to FGSR. The option should be viewed as a positive result rather than a negative one and the documentation and accountability requirement attached to it is there to help and safeguard all participants.

M. Stewart-Harawira asked what the department expectations were for the completion of a candidacy and what is the size of the document that should be produced for a candidacy to proceed? H. Kanuka felt that the expectations of the supervisory committee should be what are fulfilled at the candidacy, and the expectation can be different for each student. S. Cortez indicated that in the doctoral core course EDPS 681 the document that is to be produced for the candidacy is discussed. She also suggested that a one day seminar be done to help students learn what is expected at a candidacy and what the components of a candidacy exam are. This last suggestion is a topic for another meeting.

J. Anuik asked how often conditions on a candidacy would happen since there are often changes to be made on the proposal after the completion of a candidacy. D. Oberg indicated that in her 10 tenure as Chair in Elementary Education she had less than a hand full of candidacy that were completed with conditions. The norm is that this option is used for exceptional cases where more than the normal amount of work is needed for the student to complete to proceed in their program.

6. Doctoral Students Completion GPA (discussion)
H. Kanuka asked that this item be tabled and brought forward for the December meeting.

7. Difference between EdD and PhD (discussion)
H. Kanuka asked the committee if they could explain what the difference was between the department’s EdD and PhD programs. J. White indicated that the EdD program originally came from the EDAL specialization when the department merged in 1994. At that time the program was more a practical research based program, included courses and a field experience component. But over time the field experience component was dropped and now the only real difference were the residency requirements between the two. D. Oberg indicated that Elementary Education once had an EdD program but the structure was found to hinder student’s progress so was discontinued. H. Kanuka indicated that she would discuss the EdD with the EDAL specialization group to learn if it was still considered a valuable program. If so, she would be asking them to provide GAC with additional information about the program to help answer the question.

8. Master to Doctoral Program (discussion)
H. Kanuka indicated that even though FGSR does have a Master’s Bypass policy, she wanted the committee to be aware that if a student goes from a Bachelor’s program to the PhD, if they are not able to complete the PhD, they would not be given a Master’s but would go back to a bachelor’s program. This would affect students that would have not completed a master’s prior to being admitted into the PhD program.

9b. Other Business
J. White talked about the Pearson Test of English Academic. This is one of 5 English Language Proficiency exams that are approved by FGSR for students to complete to fulfill the English Language Proficiency admission requirement. In a recent presentation she
learned that the exam is now more widely used around the world, is completed electronically and the dates this particular exam is conducted are now several times a week rather than a limited number (ie 50 dates for IELTS) available by the other exams. The exam uses authentic, academic content so students are better prepared to use English in classes. And the results of this exam would be available between 2 – 5 days after the exam was completed. Because this type of exam was now more readily available, she suggests that the department no longer review application files where the English Language Proficiency exam is pending, but rather inform applicants of this other exam so that all documents can be submitted by the department’s application deadline.

H. Kanuka adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm.

The GAC meeting is scheduled for December 9, 2015.
GRADUATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
December 9, 2015  
MINUTES 

Attendance: Heather Kanuka – Chair, Jonathan Anuik, Sarah Cortez, Alex Da Costa, Joe da Costa, Jeannette Sinclair, Jorge Sousa, Evelyn Steinhauer, Joan White

Absent/Regrets: Katherine Koch, Makere Stewart-Harawira, Coralee Thomas

Guest: Kris Wells

1. Approval of Agenda
H. Kanuka added two items to the agenda:
   a) Business Arising – change of wording to Department Council Motion concerning supervision for department graduate students
   b) Other Business – reviewer comments for graduate applications

J. da Costa moved that the revised agenda be approved. Seconded by J. Anuik. CARRIED

2. Approval of November 4, 2015 Minutes
J. Sousa asked that at the end of the minutes the adjournment time be changed from 12:00am to 12:00pm.

Discussion also arose concerning Item #3 under Business Arising. Clarification was needed about what was stated concerning the practice of the admission file review. J. White clarified that in the past when hard copies of the doctoral application files were being reviewed they were placed in a room for all of the academic staff to see, review and submit comments on. The comments were then collected and distributed to the specialization committees for their decision process. The MEd application files, again hard copies, were not open for all to see. Each specialization reviewed the applicants for their area to review.

Over the last couple of years the application/review/admission process across the university changed to help streamline the process. This process was now entirely online. Last March was the first time that the department used this new online system, from A-Z. The March deadline was for MEd admissions so the department’s academic staff was only given access to their own specialization application files. This time, though, the review/comments were being inputted onto the new online system for all to see. The collection of those comments was then referred to when the admissions committee (GAC) made March admission decisions. Due to time factors, the opportunity for the specialization groups to review the comments and make decisions was bypassed. J. White indicated that for the next admission intake (doctoral) and all future intakes, time will be given for all academic staff to have the opportunity to review the relevant files submitted and for the specializations to meet in their respective groups to discuss the files before the names of who is nominated for admission is submitted to the Graduate Affairs Committee for final decision.

A. Da Costa moved that the revised November 4, 2015 minutes be approved. Seconded by J. Anuik. CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
H. Kanuka brought forward the first of her two additional items for the committee: change of wording to Department Council Motion concerning supervision for department graduate students.

Back in December 2014, Department Council had moved the following:

**Motion 2: Supervision of Graduate Students**
… that every student admitted to and enrolled in one of the Department of Educational Policy Studies thesis-based graduate programs must have at least one supervisor from the department for the duration of his or her program.

Even though the motion was supported by many members of Department Council, the wording of the motion had caused a problem over the last year due to the number of academic staff that had left the U of A for various reasons. The wording required the department to ensure that a student in the department had a supervisor from the department, no exception, which, it was discovered, was problematic and would not be supported by FGSR. Supervision of graduate students could now come from other departments across campus.

**Motion:** J. Anuik moved and J. da Costa seconded that every student admitted to and enrolled in one of the Department of Educational Policy Studies thesis-based graduate programs **should normally** have at least one supervisor from the department for the duration of his or her program.

Discussion then arose concerning the word ‘normally’ and the possibility of adding ‘or one committee representative’ to the motion.

**Motion:** J. Sousa moved and J. da Costa seconded that every student admitted to and enrolled in one of the Department of Educational Policy Studies thesis-based graduate programs **should normally** have at least one supervisor **or one committee representative** from the department for the duration of his or her program.

After discussion concerning the additional wording of ‘or one committee representative’ to the motion it was approved/CARRIED.

Then

**Motion:** J. Sousa moved and J. da Costa seconded that every student admitted to and enrolled in one of the Department of Educational Policy Studies thesis-based graduate programs **must, normally**, have at least one supervisor **or one committee representative** from the department for the duration of his or her program. CARRIED

The new motion will be brought forward to the next Department Council meeting.

4. **Library Report**
None

5. **EDPS 515: Permanent Course Proposal (Kris Wells)**
K. Wells joined the meeting to discuss and answer any questions concerning his EDPS 501: Sexual
and Gender Minorities in Education and Culture course that he was requesting become a permanent course offering.

**Motion:** J. Anuik moved and A. Da Costa seconded that EDPS 501: Sexual and Gender Minorities in Education and Culture course be approved as a permanent course offering.

K. Wells indicated that the course was first offered in 1999 but was not offered again until this past Fall 2015. When offered this past fall, the course readings, etc. were updated but the subject matter of the course remained the same. The feedback concerning the course had been positive and TCI was in support of it being a permanent course offering. Question: why was the course being submitted as a permanent course number now when 1) there had been several years between the first and second offering of the course and 2) why in the Fall 2015 term when the 2nd offering of the course was just now completing. K. Wells indicated that the chair of the department had requested that this course move to become a permanent course offering now and J. Anuik indicated that though the course had not been offered twice in a closer timeframe, the Graduate Affairs Committee had approved the course last year as a EDPS 501, in its revised state, for a 2nd time offering; as well TCI had approved and was in support of the course becoming a permanent number.

J. Sousa asked why the course outline had not been distributed and reviewed by the other specializations prior to coming to GAC. It was his understanding that all course outlines, whether new or moving to a permanent course number would be circulated for all to see to possibly identify any overlapping aspects that may be occurring with other department courses. H. Kanuka noted that the review would have been done on the first offering.

After further discussion the motion was approved/CARRIED.

This will be brought forward to the next Department Council meeting.

6. **Laddering Diplomas and Certificates into Course-based Master’s (discussion)**

H. Kanuka referred to a FGSR Council document concerning a proposed calendar change on this subject. FGSR Council was asking departments to review this information and submit any feedback before a final decision on the change was voted on at the next FGSR council meeting. H. Kanuka did not see any issues with the proposed changes but asked the committee members to review this information and let her know if there were any concerns. As the department’s FGSR representative, she could take any concerns to FGSR Council before their final vote in January.

7. **Difference between EdD and PhD (discussion)**

Further to a discussion that started in November, H. Kanuka indicated she had talked to the EDAL specialization group about the EdD program as their specialization seemed to be the most active in this program. It appears that the only real difference, on paper, was the residency requirement. Therefore she asked the committee if there was no real strong reason to keep two doctoral programs in the department, that the EdD program be placed under a department moratorium. J. da Costa gave a brief history on what the EdD program had been more than a few years ago and that the type of research and dissertation produced could be different from the PhD program but not necessarily. He also referred to information provided on FGSR’s website concerning what was needed to enter an EdD and what the outcome of the program should be. As this was new information for many of the members of the committee, FGSR’s information will be printed and reviewed at the next GAC meeting to continue this discussion.
8. Capping Exercise document (discussion)

H. Kanuka informed the committee that she had received feedback from a few instructors who had taught EDPS 900 in the past; specifically concerning the capping exercise paper that is required at the end of the course/program. One of the concerns was some students were registering in two courses plus the EDPS 900 course in the same term. The concern was that if the EDPS 900 course was to be considered the final course in a student’s MEd course-based program, and the resulting paper was to be the culmination of the student’s program, was it wise to have them still completing courses before registering/completing EDPS 900? J. Sinclair indicated that for the IPE students it was needed when it came to funding, as students needed to be full-time in order to receive band funding. This is also possibly the reason why some other students are doing the same.

The idea of a possible different format for the course was briefly discussed and EDPS 900 guidelines of the capping exercise paper (October 2005) were accessed online. This topic and the EDPS capping exercise guidelines will be brought to the next GAC meeting for further discussion.

9. Other Business

H. Kanuka brought forward the second additional item for the committee: reviewer comments for graduate applications. She indicated that due to the new online application/review/admission process, comments/remarks that are made about an admission file will now be recorded online. This means that these comments could be FOIPP’d if requested. Therefore, she stressed that comments made on the new online system should be clear and concise.

She also indicated that all academic staff will be able to view all of the doctoral applications but the MEd applications will still be only viewed by the specialization groups, unless otherwise requested. J. da Costa asked if the doctoral applications will be clearly marked as to what specialization they are applying for. J. White was not sure but would check. If it appeared that that possibility was not possible, then she would provide each academic member with a list of the doctoral applications and their specializations to help in the review process. She also confirmed that this time the specialization committees would be given time to review and meet together to discuss possible admissions before names were submitted to the Graduate Affairs Committee.

J. Anuik adjourned the meeting at 12:00pm.

The GAC meeting is scheduled for January 13, 2016.
GRADUATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
January 13, 2016  
MINUTES

Attendance: Heather Kanuka – Chair, Jonathan Anuik, Sarah Cortez, Alex Da Costa, Joe da Costa, Katherine Koch, Jeannette Sinclair, Evelyn Steinhauer, Coralee Thomas, Joan White

Absent/Regrets: Jorge Sousa, Makere Stewart-Harawira

2. Approval of Agenda
H. Kanuka added one item to the agenda under Other Business: student’s switching from MEd course-based to MEd thesis-based programs.

J. da Costa moved that the revised agenda be approved. Seconded by J. Anuik.
CARRIED

2. Approval of December 9, 2015 Minutes
A. Da Costa moved that the December 9, 2015 minutes be approved. Seconded by J. Anuik.
CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
J. da Costa asked about the timeline to review the doctoral application files. J. White confirmed that more time would be allocated for the specialization groups to review and meet to discuss doctoral admissions than was given in the October MEd admission process. Applicants were being informed that they would be notified in last March, at the earliest.

J. da Costa asked if the doctoral applications would have the specializations designated on them for all to see for the review process. J. White indicated the ApplyGrad system is unable to do this at this time, but she will be sending to each specialization group a list of the files that were pertaining to their area of study.

4. Library Report
K. Koch reminded the committee that the library now has a new website and encouraged all to go and view it. March 7, 2016 is to be Open Education Week at the U of A. and there will be speakers, panels during the week. Further information about this will be distributed once available. K. Koch offered to attend Department Council at some time to give a short presentation on SAGE, now available through the library. She also confirmed that the smart rooms in the library have a capacity of 20 or less people and to contact the library to book them.

5. Difference between the EdD and PhD (discussion)
Continuation of a discussion in both November/December meetings, H. Kanuka started the conversation by reminding all of the FGSR admission criteria for EdD applicants. She also talked about the article that she had distributed to the committee that talked about the EdD program. Some points from the discussion:

- In the US a PPD program was now being used for part-time, professionals who wished to obtain a doctorate. The PhD was more commonly being used for individuals who wished to become researchers, academics and would attend full-time.
- Concern from J. da Cosata: by possibly eliminating the EdD program in the department, past graduates might feel that their program was now being de-valued. He also mentioned that introducing a new program, at this time, would now mean that it would have to be a cost-recovery program.

- H. Kanuka thought that by changing the EdD to a PPD that we could avoid the ‘cost-recovery’ requirement.

- Athabasca University, the University of Calgary and Royal Roads University were now all offering cost-recovery doctoral programs. People could still work full-time and then attend courses on the weekends, special school sessions. Often the fees for the program were being covered by the organization/company that they work for.

- Question: what makes the EdD different from a PhD, if nothing then why not eliminate it?

- The current FGSR residency requirement for the EdD was now basically all about money since the field experience component was no longer required and many of the students in the program were doing their full-time portion later in their program; when doing thesis research and thus only paying fees, and not actually being on campus.

This item will continue to be discussed by this committee but it was decided that it would be on the agenda for at the next Department Council meeting for discussion/feedback and possible direction. As well FGSR’s admission criteria concerning the qualifications of an applicant applying for an EdD will be placed on the department’s website.

6. Capping Exercise document (discussion)

Continuation of a discussion started in December’s meeting, H. Kanuka started the conversation by referring to the department’s guidelines about the capping exercise document – taken from the department’s website. This document outlines the options concerning the final product of the EDPS 900 course registration. Some points from the discussion:

- the course was set up to replace the former project required in the capping exercise and thus should be taken either with the 10th and 11th course in a student’s program or after the completion of the 11th course.

- Reason for original change in course-based program: 3cr course was created to replace the 6cr project in the course-based program. The change was required because the 6cr project was becoming a mini-thesis for many students which was resulting in program advisors basically having thesis-based students and not course-based students.

- But the way the 12 course, course-based program was currently structured, some students, especially the international students, were asking to register in the EDPS 900 capping exercise course before completing their 9th course.

- The EDPS 900 capping exercise course was generally offered in Winter and Summer terms, but this next year (2016/2017) it was scheduled to be offered in Winter, Summer and Fall terms.

- Besides the concern about when the student takes the course there is a concern about the final result (capping exercise document) that is submitted by students as the completion of the course/program.

- Question: should the course structure change? Maybe be an oral or written exam at the end of the 11th course, or a learning portfolio?

- Request: To change the word “may” in #2 of the current capping exercise guidelines to “required”; might solve the problem of student interpreting what is required in the course.

- Question: maybe a more hands-on approach by the instructor needs to happen to help students understand what is required and should be completed in the course.
- Question: maybe the course should be alpha graded rather than CR. Past experience has shown that students work harder in a course when an alpha grade is assigned as the final grade for a course.

This item will continue to be discussed by this committee but it was decided that it would be on the agenda for at the next Department Council for discussion/feedback and possible direction on this.

7. Other Business

Students switching from MEd course-based to MEd thesis-based program.

H. Kanuka asked the committee to look at the department’s procedures for students switching MEd programs. From the discussion:

1) First point (#1) states: Have completed a minimum of three courses prior to applying.
   a. This does not necessarily mean that the student will have completed EDPS 581 prior to applying. As a result the student’s submitted proposal could be weak. Maybe requiring that EDPS 581 be completed prior to applying to switch was needed.

2) The application deadlines currently in place are two tight for a review process to be completed (referring to #2 in the procedures).
   a. Since 2001/2002 when the deadlines were approved by Department Council, FGSR has shorted the timeframe that departments now have to submit paperwork for students to switch.
   b. FGSR now requires the decision to be submitted by the registration deadline of a term. Thus if December 31 is the deadline, then the paperwork needs to be submitted to them by mid-January if the student wishes to switch for the January term. The same for April, if switch was to occur in May.
   c. With the shore timeframe, specialization committee are being asked to review and submit results in a two week period.
   d. To solve this, J. White proposed the following changes:
      i. April 30 deadline to switch for July, September or January term
      ii. December 31 deadline to switch for May, July or September term

A suggestion was made that instead of the April 30 deadline maybe a June 31 deadline should be in place so that each one was 6 months apart. If so, then the corresponding entrance dates would adjust as well.

3) Who was reviewing the documentation that was submitted (referring to #3 in the procedures)?
   a. J. White outlined the current procedure
      i. Paperwork from student and supervisor is received by Graduate Administrator
      ii. Student’s transcript printed and included with documentation
      iii. Paperwork is then reviewed by the specialization group the student is in
      iv. Final result is communicated to Graduate Coordinator/Administrator
      v. If approved, paperwork sent to FGSR to process the switch and student is informed of the result.

4) Question: why was there a need for the MEd students to come into the program as course-based and then later switch. Answer: in the past many students were admitted into the thesis-based route and then later switching to course-based route and/or switching back and forth after the initial admission. So in order to give students time to decide if a thesis is what they would like to complete, MEd students are now only admitted into the course-
based route and must complete the requirements in the procedures to switch to the MEd thesis-based route.

This item will be discussed again at the next GAC meeting.

J. Anuik adjourned the meeting at 11:45pm.

The GAC meeting is scheduled for February 10, 2016.
Graduate Affairs Committee Meeting for February 2016 was cancelled
3. Approval of Agenda
H. Kanuka indicated that item #5 on the agenda will be moved as the last item to be discussed as this meeting.

J. Anuik moved that the revised agenda be approved. Seconded by J. da Costa.
CARRIED

2. Approval of January 13, 2016 Minutes
J. Anuik moved that the January 13, 2016 minutes be approved. Seconded by J. da Costa.
CARRIED

3. Business Arising from the Minutes
Any business arising was already on the agenda for this meeting.

4. Library Report
No Library Report

6. Difference between the EdD and PhD (discussion)
Continuation of discussion: After this item was discussed at Department Council it was referred back to the Graduate Affairs Committee. H. Kanuka proposed that the current EdD program in the department be placed on a moratorium and that the department move forward to develop a Professional Practice Doctorate for Education (PPD) in its place. The PPD program would be for doctoral students who wish to take the program part-time and are not planning to enter the academic profession upon completion. The program would also be more ‘practice-based’ in nature. The PhD could then be for a smaller group of students who do wish to be in the program full-time and later possibly enter the academic profession. The PhD would also be more ‘research-based’.

J. da Costa informed the committee that with the new provisional government now in place, any new graduate programs would no longer need to be ‘cost-recovery’. But the programs could still be offered either on-campus, off-campus or both (ie, alternate delivery). The alternate delivery option means that courses would have a 9 unit fee index opposed to the normal 6 unit fee index (for 3cr courses). This would then mean that the fees for the course would be 15% to the U of A and the rest to the department.

E. Steinhauer asked if by simply changing the residency from full-time to part-time for the EdD would not be the better solution. Answer: The EdD already has two residency patterns of study in place, one being full-time (12 months minimum) and the other part-time (3 courses in a year for three years). She also asked if the PPD would be viewed a ‘lesser’ doctoral
degree than the EdD and/or PhD? Answer: the name Professional Practice Doctorate in Education be changed to ensure that it is viewed as a viable doctoral degree.

J. da Costa asked the committee why the department’s current doctoral programs required eight (8) courses? Why not have a doctoral program that is shaped more for the student taking the degree; previous academic experience, etc. being taking into account when developing their specific doctoral program?

E. Steinhauer asked since the PPD would be more ‘practice-based’, if a student was to start that program and then later wish to switch to the PhD would that be possible? Answer: Yes the student could switch but if the candidacy had already been completed under the PPD, they would be required to do another candidacy in the PhD since the focus of the program would change from ‘practice-’ to ‘research-based’.

A. Da Costa asked about the funding for students in the doctoral program. Was there any guaranteed funding available to them (ie throughout their program)? Answer: There was very limited funding available for any of the graduate students in the department and none were guaranteed funding throughout their program.

After further discussion, H. Kanuka suggested that she could draft up a proposal concerning the moratorium of the current EdD program. But after further discussion, it was decided that a needs analysis should be done to determine whether the need for the moratorium and possible new PPD program was actually something our students would find more viable. Both current and past students who have not or did not complete the PhD / EdD programs would be included in the needs analysis. Faculty would also be included in this analysis. H. Kanuka will be contacting the Ethics division to determine which, if any, ethics approval is needed for this analysis to be done.

7. **Capping Exercise document (discussion)**
Continuation of discussion: H. Kanuka opened the discussion by outlining the capping exercise information that was obtained from the other five education departments in the faculty. Each department appeared to have different ways in which this course was completed.

- **Elementary Education** – Face-to-Face presentation
- **Educational Psychology** – written document of no more than 50 pages excluding references, etc.
- **Educational Studies** – Synthesis paper of 20-25 pages plus references
- **Secondary Education** – 500 word written abstract; in the format of a portfolio, an annotated bibliography, a resource document a website, a PowerPoint, a written research report, an art work/collection of art works, or some combination of theses.
- **School of Library and Information Studies - ePortfolio**

J. da Costa thought that ‘face-to-face’ presentation option could be one that could be done every term which could possibly eliminate students being required ‘stay longer’ in the program simply because the capping exercise course is not offered every term.
It was mentioned that the Educational Studies program is structured so that the student is drawing specifically from their program, throughout their program.

J. Sousa wondered if the synthesis paper option was one that could be used but would need to be done with the student’s program advisor. This would then mean that the decision on how to complete the capping exercise would need to be determined at the beginning of the student’s program and the student would be working closely with the program advisor, throughout their program to complete the synthesis paper. This could then eliminate the need for the EDPS 900 course.

E. Steinhauer asked that the Indigenous Peoples Education specialization be exempted from this new structure and that the EDPS 900 course still be an option for them. H. Kanuka suggested that the ePortfolio or mini-conference option would require students to complete 12 courses. The capping exercise (EDPS 900) option would require students to complete 11 courses plus the capping exercise course.

The only possible issue with this is if the course is offered in a term and not full at 10, enrollment issues could arise.

The question as to why the MEd, Course-based program requires 12 courses was asked. Answer: EDAL needs to have more courses in this program because the current undergraduate program does not have enough courses in this area. The graduate program then provides the students with the necessary courses to increase their background in this area.

H. Kanuka indicated that based on the discussion it appeared that a mini-conference or portfolio completion of the capping exercise was what the committee felt would be a good way to complete this requirement in the MEd, course-based program. This would also eliminate the need for an EDPS 900 course. She will be presenting a proposal on this item at the next GAC meeting.

At this time it was decided that only two more items on the agenda would be discussed, the last being Doctoral Admissions.

8. **Transfer from Course-based to Thesis-based (discussion)**
   Tabled for next meeting

9. **Application documentation – admissions (discussion)**
   Tabled for next meeting

10. **Milestone #2 (discussion)**
    J. White briefly reviewed the Department Council motion that was approved in September 2015:

    …that the department’s milestones to candidacy completion will be: 1) Courses (8 or more depending on admission criteria); 2) first draft of proposal, and 3) candidacy completion.
This pertained to FGSR’s new policy about doctoral students completing their courses/candidacy by the end of their third year. Departments were to come up with 'milestones' in order to help track the students in the first three years for this requirement.

J. White asked how the committee wanted #2 of the motion to be ‘tracked’. After a discussion it was decided that committee would request Department Council to remove #2 from the motion as it was not ‘trackable’ and was generally completed just prior to the scheduling of a candidacy oral.

**Motion:** J. da Costa moved and J. Sousa seconded that GAC request that the milestone #2 (first draft of proposal) outlined in Department Council’s policy entitled Doctoral Program Requirements and Milestones be removed from Department Council’s September 2015 motion.

CARRIED

This item will be brought forward to Department Council this month.

### 5. Doctoral Admissions – recommendations

H. Kanuka opened the discussion by stating that a combined total of 8 doctoral students were possibly being recommended for admission.

ACHE – 1  
EDAL – 3  
IPE – 3 (possibly – interviews scheduled for the following week)  
TCI – 1

All of the recommended students had now assigned supervisors and backup supervisors. IPE was asked about one of their applicants who had a Bachelor’s (BEd, LLB) but no Master’s program and a low GPA. E. Steinhauer indicated that because the applicant had submitted numerous publications and presented numerous presentations the specialization felt that they should consider the applicant for possible doctoral admission. The interview would determine whether they would proceed with that admission or not.

J. da Costa informed the committee that direct entry from the MEd to the PhD can be done with minimal paperwork, it would not require a new application process.

**Motion:** E. Steinhauer moved and J. Anuiik seconded that up to 8 doctoral students be admitted for the 2016.  

CARRIED

This item will be brought forward to Department Council this month.

### 11. Eliminate May/July doctoral entrance dates (discussion)

Tabbed for next meeting

### 12. Doctoral recruitment award

Tabbed for next meeting

### 13. Other Business

None
H. Kanuka adjourned the meeting at 11:50pm.

The GAC meeting is scheduled for April 13, 2016.
GRADUATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
April 13, 2016
MINUTES

Attendance: Jonathan Anuik, Sarah Cortez, Jorge Sousa, Katherine Koch, Jeannette Sinclair, Evelyn Steinhauer, Joan White

Absent/Regrets: Alex Da Costa, Joe da Costa, Makere Stewart-Harawira, Coralee Thomas

The meeting did not commence as after waiting for 10 minutes, it was learned that H. Kanuka, chair of the committee, was unable to attend the meeting. It was decided that the motions that were to be discussed as the meeting would be decided upon by email.

Motions sent to committee by email April 15, 2016; all voting members except C. Thomas voted and approved the motions April 19, 2016:

Motion #1: J. da Costa moved that the following wording be changed in the Transfer from a Course-based to a Thesis-based MEd Program guidelines:

1) to change the wording of the first point under number 1 to "have completed a minimum of three courses, which would include EDPS 581, prior to applying."

2) to change the wording in number 3 to "When all applications have been received, the specialization groups will review each application; the specialization coordinator will make a recommendation to the Graduate Coordinator.

3) to change the wording in number 5 to "The supervisor must be approved by the Graduate Coordinator and/or Department Chair.

4) Add the following information at the end of the guidelines:

FGSR Fee information: https://uofa.ualberta.ca/graduate-studies/current-students/tuition-and-fees

Minimum Units of Course Weight and Registration requirements: https://uofa.ualberta.ca/graduate-studies/about/graduate-program-manual/section-6-program-planning-and-registration/6-2-minimum-units-of-course-weight-and-registration-requirements

Seconded by J. Sousa.
CARRIED

Motion #2: J. da Costa moved that the application deadlines to transfer from a course-based to thesis-based program change from April 30 and December 31 to June 30 and December 31. Seconded by J. Sousa

Reason: To move the deadlines to the end of two terms, 6 months apart.

CARRIED
Motion #3: J. da Costa moved that the June 30 deadline will allow students to transfer into the new program route in either September or January terms. The December 31 deadline will allow students to transfer into the new program route in May, July or September terms. Seconded by J. Sousa.

Reason: The reason for the last motion is to allow the department the necessary review and processing time. FGSR's timeline to be notified of this change has become tighter requiring a change at the department level.

CARRIED

Motion #4: J. Sousa moved that the department's current doctoral entrance dates of May and July be eliminated. Seconded by J. da Costa.

Reason: Since the implementation of the new program fee structure for thesis-based students (Fall 2011) any thesis-based student that starts on or after September 1, 2011 are required to be registered in THES for both the Spring and Summer terms. The THES registration is completed by FGSR and cannot be replaced by courses. For example if a student plans to register in a course for spring, they are paying both the program fee for the THES registration and the additional course fee for the spring term.

This policy also applies to any thesis-based student (ie doctoral in this case) who starts in May or July term, they are required to register in THES and if they also wish to take a course that term are charged extra fees for that course registration.

I have been verbally informing applicants of the above since the new fee structure was implemented but it would be better if the students were not given the option to start in May or July. This would then help to avoid any possible confusion or misunderstanding (which has happened) concerning what is required in the May or July terms at the beginning of their program.

CARRIED

These motions will be brought forward to Department Council in April.

The Graduate Affairs Committee meetings scheduled for May 11, 2016 and June 8, 2016 are to be cancelled. The next meeting for this committee will be either in September or October 2016.