

## MINUTES

### Meeting of the Graduate Academic Policy Committee Monday, 13 February 2023, 12.30-13.50

Location: Zoom

**Present:** Michael Hunt (Chair), Susan Porter, Christiane Hoppmann, Curtis Suttle, Davide Elmo, Miriam Spering, Teresa Dobson, Sumeet Gulati, Max Read, Jennifer Fletcher (guest), Thomas Chang, Jolanta Aleksejuniene, Shannon Hagerman, Jenny Phelps (guest), Valter Ciocca (guest), Robyn Starkey (guest), Julian Dierkes (guest)

**Regrets:** Murray Carlson, Bruce MacDougall

#### 1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

<i>All</i>	}	<i>That the agenda be approved.</i>
------------	---	-------------------------------------

Carried

#### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

<i>All</i>	}	<i>That the minutes be approved.</i>
------------	---	--------------------------------------

Carried

#### 3. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

##### Audiology – Policy Change

- Valter Ciocca (School of Audiology & Speech Science) makes a presentation about a proposed change in policy concerning the academic progress of students who fail a course required to be progress in the program – the course can only be retaken the following year – Valter says the current wording of the calendar does not describe this requirement accurately.
- Susan asks if this would apply to all the courses in the Audiology program - elective or compulsory. Valter says the Audiology students do not take electives.
- Michael says a somewhat similar policy was implemented by his program and asks if the students who have failed the course(s) would be sent on leave, and if it is it useful to put it out explicitly that the students will be put on leave? – Valter says yes to both the questions and agrees with putting it more explicitly in the policy.
  - Plan is to keep wording as proposed, but to consider “procedure” on a case by case basis
- Susan asks about the ramifications for such an ‘enforced’ leave e.g. for international students whose visa status may get affected – Valter says there are no international students in their Masters program – Max says students would not be able to stay in the student housing and will be prevented from using other services on campus.

- Max asks about the rationale behind this proposed change – if it is deemed unwise to let a student go ahead into the practicum without having passed all the courses, it could be stated as a rationale in order to strengthen the policy – Valter agrees with Max and mentions there can be issues with client safety if students are allowed to proceed without having cleared all the courses.

*All } That the motion be carried.*

Carried

### **BPOC Graduate Excellence Award**

- Julian makes a presentation about the BPOC Graduate Excellence Award –
  - Board of Governors has allocated \$1 million per annum for BIPOC students for five years
  - decision was taken to separate this award into two categories: Indigenous and BPOC
  - we do not have any enrolment data about the number of such students and no data to come for some years
  - Engagement conversations – Julian highlights the challenges: central competition v allocation, International v. domestic, doctoral v. masters
- Jolanta asks how would a decision be made if there are three applicants and all are equally eligible for this award – Julian says the recruitment needs will be considered in such a situation and that it is up to the program to make a decision at that point – Susan says a merit-based mechanism could eventually be introduced because it is an award for excellence.
- Christiane asks when would such an award wouldbe available for the programs especially if it is conceived as a recruitment tool – Julian says his team is trying to have the 4YF and GSI allocation done by summer and they are hoping to have BPOC allocation added to that – hopefully by August 2023.
- Tom states the distinction between the allocation – based on enrolment and number of course-based students and awards – normally reserved for research-based students and asks if it would apply in case of BPOC Award as well – Julian acknowledges the distinction and says BPOC allocation will be based on total enrolment.
- Jolanta asks if the existing BPOC students would be eligible – Julian says there is no mechanism for them to answer the e-Vision question (sent out in the recent survey) so it will have to be an entrance award for now – Shannon asks if a broadcast can be made to the existing students about this award – Julian says it falls into a grey zone because of all the concerns around privacy but something along the lines of a question asked through e-Vision would be okay.
- **Action item: Julian will send out the exact wording used in eVision re: self-identification.**

### **Discussion**

- Michael provides an update about the Doctoral Exams – a couple of things we are working towards:
  - ensuring two non-supervisory committee members are part of the examination committee to balance the insight/vested interest of the supervisory committee.
  - removing the arm’s-length requirement for one of the two university examiners

- Michael mentions some of the issues arising due to the technical difficulties with Zoom meetings – esp. for hybrid meetings – As all doctoral exams are open to public, should the students be allowed to have an audience? – Robyn says half of the exams are on Zoom still and students choose the audience already – it is only about a quarter of the exams where people do not have an audience – She also proposes streaming the exams on YouTube
- Curtis and Shannon favor the idea of keeping doctoral exams open to public – Sumeet agrees and also favors Robyn’s proposal to stream it online
- Michael asks about a recent policy whereby if a supervisor reaches out to the external examiners before vetting has been done, such examiners will be disqualified – Susan says this should be assessed case by case – Shannon agrees.

4. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:58pm.