



GRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

*Report to Academic Council
at its meeting of April 18, 2017*

FOR ACTION

1. Program Reviews – Final Assessment Report

The Graduate Studies Committee recommends:

That Academic Council approve the summary reports of the graduate program reviews outlined below.

Rationale

In accordance with UOIT's Quality Assurance Framework, the Committee reviewed the reports and recommendations for the following two programs that underwent a cyclical review to ensure that they meet provincial quality assurance requirements and to support their ongoing rigour and coherence:

- Master of Health Sciences
- Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy in Applied Bioscience
- Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy in Materials Science

Each review involves an examination, by both program faculty and staff and outside reviewers, of the program's goals and requirements, its curriculum content, structure, modes of delivery, and assessment of student learning, and its use of available resources to support the program. Their work has generated a valuable set of documents that reflect a great deal of care and attention to the ongoing development and refinement of programs that best meet the needs of students and best represents the current state of each particular field of study. The Committee commends all Faculty and staff who contributed to these program reviews for their important input into the process.

The attached report provides an overview of the outcomes of the recommendations resulting from the program reviews, identifies particular strengths of the programs as well as opportunities for improvement and enhancements, and outlines the agreed-upon implementation plan.

2. Graduate Faculty Regulation

The Graduate Studies Committee recommends:

That Academic Council approve the proposed revisions to the Graduate Faculty Appointments regulation.

Rationale

The proposed amendments were made in order to clean up the calendar copy, correct an omission that was approved in error last spring and change the terminology from "status" to "appointment". There are no significant changes to content. To simplify the process for nomination, we added one sentence to the introductory paragraph and removed the repeated sentences in each appointment category. In order to reduce the emphasis on review criteria, these were repositioned near the end of the section and given a header "review of appointments". Finally, the appeals information that was listed under two appointment categories and omitted in error from another, is now consolidated under a new heading titled "Appeals".