

# TRU SENATE AWARDS & HONOURS COMMITTEE

Place: OM 2822

Date: Thursday, September 27, 2012

## MINUTES

Present: Marjorie Budnikas, Gordon Down, Stephen Eaglestone, Wayne Hendry (non-voting), Jack Miller, Tim Norman, Ginny Ratsoy, Christopher Seguin (non-voting), Martha White.

Absent: Christine Anderson, Chris Axworthy,

- 1) The meeting began at 11:40 AM. The agenda was adopted with the addition of 4.3 Selection of a Chair (SE/MB).
- 2) The minutes of May 10, 2012 were adopted with the addition of Jack Miller as Present (MB/TN).
- 3) Old Business
  - 1) Gordon distributed the attached *Policy Considerations* document listing unresolved procedural issues in discharging Policy ED 9-1 (Academic Achievement Awards). It was agreed Gordon would incorporate the discussion/deliberations and re-distribute the revised document for comment and adoption at the November meeting.
- 4) New Business
  - 2) Gordon welcomed Martha White as Staff Rep. – her name is with the Senate Steering Cee. It was discussed that other than the three ongoing *ex officio* appointments, Senate committee appointments are for three year terms, except students, who are appointed annually.
  - 3) Christopher confirmed that Advancement completes public background checks on all Honorary Doctorate nominees. In other words, a similar in-depth check to what the press would perform when investigating an individual. Anything coming to light would be included in the nomination package. Criminal record checks are not performed. Gordon will respond to Dean Mehta with this information.
  - 4) Per the Terms of Reference, the Chair is “*A member of the Committee elected by the Committee for a two year term. No person shall serve more than two consecutive terms as Chair.*” Gordon indicated he has now completed two terms as Chair and advised we need a volunteer from the committee. It was agreed Gordon would distribute a list of duties a new chair could expect, in particular separating duties of the chair from duties of the Manager, Financial Aid & Awards with respect to committee related business. Interested members will then respond and a vote can be held by email.
- 5) The meeting was adjourned at 1:01 PM. (JM)

## Awards & Honours Committee – Policy ED 9-1 – considerations regarding Medals

- a) **Establishing the adjudication set:** Reg I.2. Dictates we consider only graduates eligible for last October's or this June's convocation. Policy ED 17-0 dictates that students must apply to graduate by March 31 in order to be eligible for June's convocation. Therefore, the group of graduates eligible for a medal are **those who applied to graduate between April 1 of the preceding year and March 31 of the current year.**

When or whether the graduate chooses to convocate is irrelevant, but the deadline to apply for graduation/convocation does dictate the adjudication parameters. In some cases, graduates may have finished all of their degree requirements and wait (intentionally or not) one to two years before applying to graduate, and be considered for that year's medal.

- b) **Assessment** is based on the GPA of the last 60 credits completed prior to graduation. In the past we have declared campus students with less than 60 TRU credits ineligible for a medal, because campus does not grade transfer credit or PLAR. For example, students with only 57 TRU credits were disqualified. This is generally only a concern with "two year" degrees.

**Do we continue this practice**, or look only to II.1.f., and require only 24 graded TRU credits?

- c) The **residency requirement** in Reg II.1.f ensures that every medal is based on at least 24 graded TRU credits. A very key inference in this reg is that the 24 credits were completed within the 60 credit assessment period. **Does the policy need revision to be explicit on this point, or is a committee motion to this effect sufficient?**

MOTION: The Awards & Honours Committee clarifies and affirms that the 60 credits completed prior to the granting of the degree, upon which the medal assessment is based, must include at least 24 graded TRU credits, as specified in Regulation II.1.f. Graduates who do not meet this requirement will not be considered for a medal.

- d) The policy recognizes that **course density**, set at 8 semesters minimum, is important in establishing equity in medal adjudication. With our current transcript recording practice, it is not possible to assess the number of semesters taken to complete transfer credits without going to the original transfer transcripts for each contender. This must be done within an extremely tight time frame. For students with less than 60 credits taken at TRU, how do we determine if the course density requirement was satisfied?

- e) In **establishing distinct degrees for medal purposes**, if we consider the two Bachelor of Technology degrees (*Technology Management* and *Trades and Technology Leadership*) to be distinct for medal purposes, does that then mean there are nine distinct Bachelor of Commerce degrees – how can that be feasible for medal purposes?

- f) The **Governor General's collegiate bronze** has generally been adjudicated by faculty using only the courses required for the diploma (e.g. a CSOM student also working on a BSc.). This is difficult for academic diplomas. Should we leave this unchanged with the onus on the Chairs (as it used to be for all of the baccalaureate medals), or consider a policy change to a process similar to the degree medals (e.g. the last 60 credits)?
  
- g) It would be helpful to pre-establish general parameters for I.5. "a medal may not be awarded" – build averages from the past for that degree and only normally accept one (or more?) standard deviations away, or ?