SCHOOL OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES
Graduate 🎓 Education Council – Committee Meeting
MINUTES
December 9, 2020
12:00pm – 1:30pm

Join URL: https://westernuniversity.zoom.us/j/94121451070
Meeting ID: 941 2145 1070
Passcode: 5a738m

Nandi Bhatia; Catherine Nolan; Pam Bishop; Denise Connelly; Sharon Sliwinski; Andrew Botterell; Lyn Purdy; Tom Drysdale; Kamran Siddiqui; Jisuo Jin; Jamie Baxter; Lauretta Frederking; Dennis Klimchuk; Edmund Goehring; Jacqui Specht; Diane Bryant; Grant Campbell; Sam Trosow; Lauren Cipriano; Carolyn Schild-Poulter; Liying Jiang; Marc Moreno Maza; Kim Shuey; Dianne Bryant; Doug Woolford; Stephen McClatchie; Nica Borradaile; Francois Poire; Lina Dagnino; Arzie Chant; Shayna McKay; Joanna Blom; Lori Johnson; Martin Ross; Mohammed Estaiteyeh; Martin Nord; Blair Benning; Alyssa Jervis; Greg Robinson; Ji Su Song; Spencer Heuchan; Joshua Patenaude; Stephen Tuffs; Linda Miller; Lorraine Davies; Ruth Martin; kirstyn seanor; Bobby Glushko; John Cuciurean; G. Tigert; Aisha Haque; Ron Wagler; Lauretta Frederking

Regrets: Dennis Klimchuk, Stephen McClatchie, Sharon Sliwinski, Nica Borradaile

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Approval of the Minutes from October 21, 2020 Approved

3. President Dr Alan Shepard will speak

Report from GEC Policy Committee for Approval:

I.   Review of Guidelines for Reviewing and Assessing Student Progress through the Degree and decision to send to GEC for approval – Postponed to next meeting

II.   Review of 8.4.2 and the allegation of a scholastic offense revision to GEC – approved

Other Business

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES
Graduate Education Council – Committee Meeting
MINUTES
October 21, 2020
12:00pm – 1:30pm
Join Zoom Meeting
https://westernuniversity.zoom.us/j/95025416084
Meeting ID: 950 2541 6084
Passcode: 854951

Nandi Bhatia; Catherine Nolan; Pam Bishop; Denise Connelly; Andrew Botterell; Lyn
Purdy; Tom Drysdale; Kamran Siddiqui; Jisuo Jin; Jamie Baxter; Paula Dworatzek;
Dennis Klimchuk; Edmund Goehring; Jacqui Specht; Diane Bryant; Grant Campbell;
Sam Trosow; Lauren Cipriano; Carolyn Schild-Poulter; Liying Jiang; Marc Moreno
Maza; Kim Shuey; Dianne Bryant; Doug Woolford; Stephen McClatchie; Nica
Borradaile; Francois Poire; Lina Dagnino; Arzie Chant; Shayna McKay; Joanna Blom;
Lori Johnson; Martin Ross; Mohammed Estaiteyeh; Martin Nord; Blair Benning; Alyssa
Jervis; Greg Robinson; Ji Su Song; Spencer Heuchan; Joshua Patenaude; Stephen
Tuffs; Linda Miller; Lorraine Davies; Ruth Martin; kirstyn seanor; Bobby Glushko; John
Cuciurean; G. Tigert; Aisha Haque; Ron Wagler

Regrets: Sharon Sliwinski, Lauretta Frederking

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Approval of the Minutes from April 28, 2020 - Approved

2. SGPS Overview – Data –Ruth Martin

3. Own Your Future - Julie Jonkhans

4. Qualitative Research On-line Modules – Lorraine Davies

5. Quantitative Research On-Line Modules - Ruth Martin

6. Pathfinder Update – Matt Dumouchel

7. Quality Council year-end report from cyclical reviews and major mods for information
only - Candace Loosley

Other Business

Item 1: Review of Guidelines for Reviewing and Assessing Student Progress through the Degree and decision to send to GEC for approval:

Research-Based Program Guidelines for Reviewing and Assessing Student Progress through the Degree

Overview

Monitoring and assessing student progress are key to maximizing graduate student engagement and success, timely completion of the degree, and graduate program quality. Regular student progress assessment helps programs and students identify academic excellence. It also helps to make visible and address problems or challenges students are experiencing that may interfere with thriving and with degree completion.

To support student progress, programs are expected to clearly communicate their degree requirements and the expected timing of these requirements to students. They are also required to monitor and assess student progress at least annually, and to communicate these results to their students.

Meeting Program Expectations

It is expected that degree requirements across the duration of the program are clearly communicated to students in progress meetings and via program web pages, program guides, through the on-line pathfinder degree planning portfolio.

Throughout their time in the program, students are expected to be aware of how degree expectations for maintaining good standing in the program align with their own progress.

At a minimum, supervisory committee members and Graduate Chairs (or equivalent) will support their students' timely progression by regularly (at least annually) assessing and documenting student progress and then by discussing these outcomes with students.

To maintain good standing in their program, graduate students are expected to meet program expectations for the timely completion of the degree.

Annual Progress Evaluations -

Graduate Chairs (or equivalent) are responsible for overseeing student progress through Pathfinder. In this regard, they work with students' supervisory committee members. Graduate Chairs and supervisory committee members are expected to regularly communicate with each other and with students.

It is the Graduate Chair's (or equivalent) responsibility to:

1.   ensure that students are notified of the timeline for submission of their annual (at a minimum) progress report;

2.   ensure that pathfinder feedback is appropriate and effective and is communicated to students including expectations going forward;

3.   offer support and advice to all students, including those who are struggling or failing to meet program expectations;

4.   offer support and advice to supervisors

Pathfinder and Annual Progress Evaluations

The on-line Pathfinder degree planning portfolio facilitates the monitoring, evaluation and communication of student progress in research-based degree programs.

At regular intervals, and at least yearly, graduate programs will request that their students submit a pathfinder portfolio for review and evaluation. Submitting a portfolio is considered a degree requirement and to maintain good standing in a program it must normally be completed within two weeks of notice.

The progress review process facilitated by Pathfinder involves the following steps:

1.   Student is asked to complete the portfolio by [date], including comments and feedback.

2.   The student's advisory committee members comment on the student's portfolio, including the progress made since the last review and respond to the student's comments and feedback.

3.   The Graduate Chair (or alternate, if the Graduate Chair is the student's supervisor) reviews the student's portfolio and the comments of the advisory committee members and, based on these, provides their input.

4.   The portfolio is returned to the student for review, comment, and acknowledgement.

At any point during this process, a participant may return the portfolio back to the previous reviewer in order to discuss.

It is expected that the entire review process will take no longer than 30 days. At the end of the Pathfinder portfolio review process, the content of the portfolio, including comments and a progress assessment, are archived in Pathfinder for future review.

Guidelines when a Student is not Meeting Degree Expectations

When a progress review finds that a student is not meeting degree expectations, the following steps need to be taken:

1.   The Graduate Chair (or equivalent) connects with the Supervisor and the Student (and if appropriate Supervisory Committee members) to request meeting (it is not necessary that it be one meeting with everyone).

2.   A purpose of the meeting is to remove any possible barriers to student progress and to consider other ways to support student progress. A second purpose is to clarify how and why the student has not met program expectations, and to articulate what is required to meet degree requirements.

3.   The results of the meeting are documented. A plan of study for the upcoming year/immediate future (or alternate timeframe) with goals and dates, is created and agreed upon by the Student and Supervisor, with support of the Graduate Chair. It is important that the student understand that failure to meet program expectations is grounds for withdrawal.

4.   This progress plan is uploaded to Pathfinder.

For students who are not meeting degree expectations, regular follow-up is recommended.

It is strongly advised that students communicate with their supervisory committee and Graduate Chair if they are unable to meet the progress plan timeline so that barriers and challenges can be examined and discussed. If warranted, additional supports should be put in place. Graduate Chairs, supervisory committee members and students can request meetings as needed.

Consistently failing to meet degree expectations, despite ongoing support to succeed, are grounds for withdrawal. Communication in this regard is documented and shared with the student.

Sustained Lack of Progress: Guidelines for Withdrawal for Failure to Meet Program Expectations

When a student consistently fails to meet degree expectations, supervisory committee members and/or the Graduate Chair convene to discuss the merits of withdrawing the student from the program. If there is agreement that withdrawal is warranted, a meeting is arranged with the student. In this meeting, the program communicates the reasons for their preliminary decision to withdraw the student and offers the student the opportunity to respond both in the meeting and, in writing, afterward.

After considering the circumstances surrounding the failure to meet degree expectations, including the student's feedback, the Graduate Chair (in consultation with the supervisor) makes a final decision about whether to withdraw the student.

The student is notified in writing of the withdrawal decision. This notification includes relevant information about the appeal process.

Item 2: Review of 8.4.2 and the addition of wording to address the allegation of a scholastic offense:

8.4. DOCTORAL CANDIDATE

COMPLETION OF THE THESIS DEGREE REQUIREMENT

8.4.2 – SGPS Approves the Thesis Examination Board and Thesis Examination (and Public Lecture, if Applicable)

SGPS approves the Thesis Examination Board provided by the candidate's program. Doctoral candidates must submit the thesis six weeks before the approved date for the Thesis Examination. This ensures adequate time for:

§ Providing access to the thesis for the Examiners

§ Examiners to read the thesis and prepare their reports

§ Examiners to submit reports to SGPS

Candidates are required to present a Public Lecture on their thesis research, normally within twenty-four hours before the Thesis Examination. The Graduate program sets the time and place for the lecture. SGPS announces the public lecture on its website. The lecture is open to all members of the community. The Examiners should normally attend the Public Lecture and Thesis Examination.

Doctoral Only - Effective May 2012, public lectures are mandatory for all programs.

The Thesis Examination and Public Lecture may be postponed or cancelled if any step in the examination process is not completed on schedule (e.g. the candidate fails to submit the Thesis for Examination on schedule, or the Examiners fail to submit evaluations on time) or if there is a credible allegation of a possible scholastic offence.

Note: The thesis defense is normally a closed event unless the student and program, by mutual agreement, request that the defense is open to the university community (e.g. faculty, academic colleagues, students).

Commented [CK1]: Same process for Master's