

Graduate Education Council Meeting

Date: February 24, 2016.

Time: 12:30pm– 2:00pm (Pizza lunch starting 12:30 pm)

Place: International and Graduate Affairs Building Room 1N05

Regrets: Linda Miller, Miriam Capretz, Erika Chamberlain, Greg Kopp, Pauline Barmby, Robert Wood, Jason Brown, Andrew Johnson, Joanna Quinn, Tilottama Rajan, Jessica Esseltine, Elizabeth Webb, Catherine Steeves, Debra Dawson, Catherine Nolan, Mark Vandenbosch, Matt Thomson

1. Approval of the Minutes of October 28th, 2015 (Attached)
2. Business arising from the Minutes
3. Reports from GEC Committees (Lorraine Davies)
 - Policy Committee
 - I. Professional Development Regulations (Attached)
 - II. Role of the Chair in thesis exams (Attached)
 - III. Decision when vote is tied 8.4.4.2 (Attached)
4. Informal discussions with the Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Renewal
http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/senate/renewal_cttee/Interim_Report.pdf
5. **Other business**

Announcements:

Dr. Karen Campbell is attending the April 27th GEC to discuss the Grad Funding Report
http://provost.uwo.ca/planning_reports/grad_funding_final_report.pdf

A reminder, please sign in on Council Attendance Sheet before leaving the meeting

Graduate Education Council Meeting
Minutes

Date: October 28th

Time: 12:30pm– 2:00pm (Pizza lunch starting 12:30 pm)

Place: International and Graduate Affairs Building Room 1N05

Attendees:

Jaime Brenes Reyes	Alicia Garcia	Catherine Nevin	Kristen Reilly
Erika Chamberlain	Maya Kumar	Cheryl Harding	Lori Johnson
Robert Wood	Greg Kopp	Tilottama Rajan	Liz Webb
Gordon Irvine	Jim Dickey	Abdallah Shami	Arzie Chant
Kyle Fricke	Doug Jones	Kate Choi	Tamara Hinan
Jan Plug	Joanna Quinn	Nanda Dimitrov	Rebecca Kasperavicius
Pam Bishop	Susan Knabe	Janet Holmes	Andrew Johnson
Lee Ann McKivor	Kamran Siddiqui		

Regrets: Margret McGlynn, Catherine Steeves, Stephanie Barton, Jessica Esseltine, Catherine Nolan, Pauline Barmby

1. Approval of the Minutes of May 5th, 2015 (attached)

The Minutes of the meeting were approved as circulated

2. Business arising from the Minutes – none

3. SGPS Announcements and Information (Linda Miller)

Dr. Miller provided background information regarding the Medical Leave bursary that went into effect September 1, 2015.

The Doctoral Excellence research award was also discussed; beginning September 1, 2016 Western University will launch the Doctoral Excellence Research Awards. The Doctoral Excellence Research Awards represent a new investment in graduate student support, in addition to the funding already invested by the University and Faculties in this area. A new doctoral student who is also a new tri-agency doctoral scholarship recipient will receive up to \$15,000 during their first year, and up to an additional \$10,000 for each subsequent year of the tri-agency scholarship. A continuing doctoral student who is a tri-agency doctoral scholarship recipient, will receive up to an additional \$10,000 for each remaining year of their tri-agency doctoral scholarship. Dr. Doug Jones expressed that there were concerns coming from the students in his Faculty who would prefer that funding be more equitably distributed among graduate students.

4. Reports from GEC Committees (Lorraine Davies, Miriam Capretz)

- Policy Committee

1. **Recommended that the Graduate Education Council accept and approve the following membership in the GEC**

- a. Graduate Chair Representative July 2015-June 30 2018) (3 year term)

1. Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry - Dean Betts

- b. Faculty Representatives (July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2018) (3 year terms)
 - 1. Engineering – Abdallah Shami
- c. Graduate Assistant Representatives (July 1, 2015 –June 30, 2017) -(2 year terms)
 - Arzie Chant
 - Lori Johnson
- d. Graduate student Representatives (July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016) (1 year term) with an option on a second year
 - Arts – Jaime Brenes Reyes
 - Music – Chantel Lemire
 - Education – Eric Smiley
 - Health Science – Kristen Reilly
 - FIMS – Rebecca Kasperavicius
 - Law – Andi Ghosh
 - Ivey – Maya Kumar
 - Schulich – Catherine Nevin
 - Engineering – Kyle Fricke
 - Science – Gordon Irvine
 - Social Science – Stephanie Barton

Approved as presented

- e. SUPR-G Graduate Student Representative Required – Term ends June 30, 2017)
(Nominees from the floor)
<http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/senate/cttees/supr-g.pdf>
 - i. Jenna Lorusso, Graduate Student (term ends June 2017)

2. Operations and Agenda Committee

Motion approved: That effective September 2015 the Graduate Education Council Operation/Agenda and Nominating Committee be discontinued September 15, 2015

Approved as presented

The issue of bringing agenda items forward to the Graduate Education Council was discussed. SGPS agreed that an email can be sent out indicating that members of the Graduate Community can bring items forward to their Associate Dean, who can convey them to the Policy Committee of GEC.

5. Dr. Karen Campbell

- a. Graduate Student Funding: solicitation of input
Open discussion related to Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies.

7.0 Professional and Career Development

Graduate students are encouraged to participate in professional development and career-related courses, workshops, talks and events. Graduate students do NOT need the approval of their supervisors or their programs to participate in these faculty, program and university-wide events. Professional development and career-related events can be found through the Teaching Support Centre, the Student Development Centre, the Student Success Centre: Careers, Leadership and Experience, the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies and individual Faculties. Participation in professional development and career offerings is expected to occur outside of TA duties, time-critical research duties, and shall not interfere with expected current Graduate program courses, meetings and responsibilities.

For more information please visit grad@uwo.ca

Doctoral Thesis Examination Board Roles

Chair:

- The Chair is a non-voting member of the Thesis Examination Board. As the Vice-Provost's (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) representative, the Chair presides over the thesis examination and provides leadership to ensure that the established procedures are followed. It is not appropriate for the Chair to ask the Candidate questions during the examination period.

CHAIR DUTIES:

- Determines when a quorum exists
- Opens and closes the examination proceedings
- Sets the order of questioners and the length of the two rounds of questions
- Monitors the length and conduct of the candidate's presentation
- If the External Examiner is not present, ensures that questions raised in the External Examiner's report are put to the candidate
- If requested by the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies), where the External Examiner has submitted a negative report but is not present, provides copies of the External Examiner's report to the Examiners to assist in their deliberations
- Intervenes if questioning becomes inappropriate
- Deals with behaviour that interferes with the proper conduct of the examination
- Moderates in camera discussion on the merits of the thesis, the candidate's oral presentation and responses to questions, the External Examiner's report, and other relevant matters
- Calls for a vote and recommendation
- Recalls the candidate and advises him/her of the recommendations that are to be made to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies)
- Prepares a report to the Vice-Provost (Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies) of the Examiners' assessment of the thesis and the candidate's oral performance

Chair Qualifications:

- Must have appropriate SGPS membership
- The Chair must not be a member of the candidate's program or the Supervisor's home program

8.4.4.2

The Thesis Examination Board Deliberates and Renders a Decision

- The Chair invites the Supervisor(s) to comment on the candidate, the thesis, and aspects of the oral defence.
 - In rare cases where the thesis has been submitted without the Supervisor(s)'s approval, the Chair informs the Examiners of the Supervisor(s)'s written reasons for withholding approval, before inviting the Supervisor(s) to speak.
- At the Chair's invitation, the Examiners alone discuss the thesis and the oral defence.
- The Examiners vote on the acceptability of the thesis and the oral defence by completing their Doctoral Thesis Examination Evaluation form. In cases where the External Examiner is not physically present, the Chair speaks to her/him privately and fills out the Evaluation form as directed.
- These forms are confidential, only to be seen and recorded by the Chair. For the oral defence, the Examiners must determine if the candidate's responses to questions and general level of scholarly knowledge meets the standard for the Doctoral degree and is consistent with the contents of the thesis. The Examiners must decide whether the thesis form and thesis content and oral defence were acceptable or unacceptable.
- There are 3 possible outcomes to the oral defense that the examiners may consider:
 - Acceptable - no changes
 - Acceptable with revisions/modifications
 - Unacceptable
 - **Examples of Acceptable with Revisions/Modifications:** May include limited typographical or grammatical errors; errors in calculation, labels for tables, nomenclature, and bibliographic form; the need for clarification of content in order to meet requisite scholarly standards. Examples may include some additions, deletions or editing of text; further analysis or discussion of some piece of data. Normally, candidates have up to 6 weeks to submit the final thesis after examination.
 - **Unacceptable:** A thesis judged unacceptable may contain for example, faulty conceptualization, inappropriate or faulty use of research methodology, misinterpretation or misuse of data, neglect of relevant material, illogical argument, unfounded conclusions, seriously flawed writing and presentation, and failure to engage the scholarly context.

The Chair collects the completed forms and tallies the results.

The Chair announces the results of the vote on the acceptability of the content and form of the thesis and of the oral defence and asks if further discussion is needed. In rare instances the Chair may allow Examiners to change their votes.

If a majority of the Examiners finds that each of the thesis content, thesis form, and the oral defence are acceptable, the candidate passes the Thesis Examination. The

Examiners' approval may be conditional on the candidate successfully completing revisions to the thesis content or thesis form. If the majority of Examiners find that any one of the thesis content, thesis form, and the oral defence is unacceptable, the candidate fails the Thesis Examination.

If the Examiners' decisions are equally split (2/2) between acceptable and unacceptable on any one of the thesis content, thesis form, and/or the oral defence, then the vote is weighted in favour of the external examiner's decision.

The Chair pronounces the Thesis Examination Board's decision.