PhD Students' Handbook

2025 - 2026

Department of Political Studies

updated December 1, 2025

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the Doctoral program of the Department of Political Studies at Queen's University! The department's faculty and staff are committed to ensuring that your time as a graduate student at Queen's will be both challenging and rewarding. Our faculty are thrilled that you chose our department and look forward to working with you. This Handbook aims to provide a comprehensive guide to the PhD Program offered by the department.

The Handbook is intended to supplement the general regulations of the School of Graduate Studies and Postdoctoral Affairs (SGSPA), which may be found in the SGSPA Calendar.

We are here to assist you. Please reach out to Dr. Elizabeth Goodyear-Grant, Graduate Chair, for any questions about academics and funding (gradchair.pols@queensu.ca), and to Mikhaila Graf, Graduate Coordinator for everything else (gradpols@queensu.ca). My door, virtual or otherwise, is also always open (polshead@queensu.ca).

Once again, welcome to Political Studies at Queen's.

Jonathan Rose

OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT:

Department Head: Jonathan Rose

Departmental Manager: Barbra Lalonde

Graduate Chair: Elizabeth Goodyear-Grant

Graduate Coordinator: Mikhaila Graf

Undergraduate Chair: Rachel Laforest

Undergraduate Assistant: Samantha Martin

Graduate Field Convenors:

        Canadian Politics: Elizabeth Baisley
        Comparative Politics: Boyoon Lee
        International Relations: Andrew Grant (fall 2025), Wayne Cox (winter, spring 2026)
        Political Theory: Colin Farrelly
        Gender and Politics: Margaret Little

Unit Research Ethics Board, Chair: TBD

2. THE DOCTORAL PROGRAM

As described in the SGSPA Academic Calendar, our PhD program requires the successful completion of a minimum of six three-unit courses; field examinations in two fields; the demonstration of translation competence in a language other than English; the presentation and defence of a thesis proposal; and the writing and defence in an oral examination of a dissertation that meets SGSPA requirements. This is a four-year program, though it is common for students to take a fifth year considering their work on other publications, teaching, or extensive field research. Please see Appendix 1 for a snapshot suggested timeline for program milestones.

Faculty Supervisor

Sometimes called advisor, this handbook uses the terminology of supervisor to describe the role. On admission, each doctoral student will be assigned a supervisor from the student's primary field of interest, based on the information provided by the student's application. During the first two terms in the program, the supervisor provides program advice and mentorship and helps the student develop a thesis topic. Beginning in the fourth term, the supervisor is responsible for supervising the completion of the thesis proposal. The supervisor will normally be formally appointed as the student's thesis supervisor following the successful defence of the thesis proposal no later than the end of the fifth term. Incoming students should consult with their supervisor before or during registration on the selection of courses and fields.

Courses

PhD students normally take a total of six courses in their first two terms, including POLS 900 Methods of Political Studies, which is required; field courses in their two areas of concentration; and three other three-unit courses generally in their first and second fields. For more information on course work, see Section 3.

Field Examinations

PhD students are examined in each of two fields of concentration, a first field which is their main field of interest and a second field, which can be thought of sort of like a "minor". The fields are Canadian politics; comparative politics; political theory; international relations; and gender & politics. For more information on the field examinations, see Section 4.

Language Competence

PhD students must satisfy the department that they are able to read and understand professional literature in a language other than English. For information on the language requirement, see Section 5.

Thesis

In the fourth and fifth terms after initial admission, students prepare and present a thesis proposal for examination under the supervision of their supervisor and then proceed to the preparation of a dissertation for defence. For more information on the doctoral thesis, see Section 7.

3. EXAMINATION BOARDS' COMPOSITION, DECISION-MAKING, OUTCOMES

Field Exams
- three POLS examiners
- one examiner serves as chair
- decisions made by majority vote
- outcome categories for 1st field written+oral and 2nd field written or written+oral: passed, ==passed with distinction==,[1] failed.

Thesis Proposal Defence
- three examiners
- one can be external to POLS but must be Queen's faculty; the other two from POLS
- one POLS examiner serves as chair
- decisions made by majority vote
- outcome categories: passed, failed.

Thesis Defence
- examination committee is comprised of five members, the first of which is non-voting: Head/delegate/Chair, supervisor(s), Queen's examiner (usually a POLS dept. member), internal external, external external
- Head/delegate/Chair is expected to read thesis, provide written report prior to defence, and may ask questions but may also decide to stick to chairing duties; not a voting member of the thesis defence examination committee.
- decision by voting
- two votes places thesis in lowest outcome category (eg, if two vote passed and two passed with major revision, the outcome is passed with major revision).
- outcome categories are passed, passed with major revision, referred, failed.

4. COURSE SELECTION AND GRADING

The doctoral program requires the successful completion of six three-unit courses normally taken in the first two terms after initial registration, including the following required courses: POLS 900 and field courses in the student's two areas of concentration. See section 4 for more information on the required field courses.

Course Selection
Course selection should be made in consultation with the student's faculty supervisor and approved by the Graduate Chair. Each incoming graduate student will meet briefly with the Graduate Chair during the first couple of weeks of September to discuss course selection. Students may take up to two courses outside the department with permission of the Graduate Chair and following consultation with their supervisor and field convenor.

Check individual departments' websites for availability of courses. Some departments you may consider are: School of Policy Studies, Law, Philosophy, Global Development Studies, Gender Studies, Geography, and History.

---

[1] NOTE: A proposal is scheduled to go before the department in January 2026 from the Graduate Committee to revise the outcome categories for field exams to pass and fail, removing the distinction option. This handbook will be revised afterwards if the change goes forward.

Graduate students cannot register themselves in their courses through the student system (SOLUS); all course requests must go through the POLS Graduate Coordinator (Mikhaila Graf). Registration in courses from other departments may require an academic change request through the online system. For more information, please contact the Graduate Coordinator, Mikhaila Graf.

The non-credit Course of Research Ethics (CORE) is mandatory for all graduate students who will engage in research involving human subjects. It is a web-based tutorial providing familiarity with and practical application of Canada's national standard of ethics for research (as outlined in the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2). For more information and to access the course please check here.

POLS 900 Methods of Political Studies
This course is intended to prepare students for scholarly research. It deals with approaches to the discipline of political science and problems of research design. The course must be taken by all doctoral students. Doctoral students who have already taken a similar course at the MA level may be exempted by the Graduate Chair, following a discussion about the students previous MA-level course and submission of that course syllabus. Graduate Chair will then review and determine if the course satisfies the POLS 900 requirement. If so, they must choose another graduate course to make up the total of six required for the degree.

Course Marks
Final course marks are given in letter grades. Where instructors enter percentage grades:

F   : < 70 %
B- : 70-72 %
B   : 73-76 %
B+ : 77-79 %
A- : 80-84 %
A   : 85-89 %
A+ : 90+ %

Minimum Performance
Doctoral students must obtain an average of B on their Political Studies courses to proceed to the field examinations. A student who fails a course is normally required to withdraw from the program.

Late Assignments and "Incomplete" Grade (IN)
The department expects all students to submit assignments by the declared deadline. Without prior agreement, instructors are not required to accept late papers and will submit a grade at the end of term based on work received. If unforeseen events prevent submission of work, students should notify their instructor immediately and request academic consideration for extenuating circumstances. Normally, such arrangements will be worked out on a case-by-case basis with the instructor, following the guidelines established by SGSPA. If consideration is granted, the student will be assigned an IN (for incomplete) in the course(s).

When an IN is assigned in a course, missing work must be submitted no later than 15 May for Fall Term courses, or 15 August for Winter Term courses. If the missing work has not been submitted by these deadlines, a partial mark will become the final mark. University regulations are that a grade of IN will automatically lapse to an F (Fail) at the end of the term following the term in which the course was taken, if no change of grade has been submitted by then. The period for which an IN may remain on the record can sometimes be extended, in exceptional cases and with the agreement of SGSPA.

Appeals of Grades

If a student wishes to appeal a grade on an assessment in a graduate course, there is a process to follow. Department-level appeals can be made on individual course assessments, but not on final course grades because students have options for informal and formal appeals on individual assessments which together comprise the course grade.

Appealing a grade on an assessment in a graduate course must follow this procedure:

1. The student will submit a Letter of Appeal to the Instructor outlining the substantive reasons for the appeal, grounded in reasons related to the quality of the work. The Letter of Appeal to the instructor must be submitted within 14 calendar days of the date the grade was made available to the student. Appeals after 14 days will not be permitted. *Note: missing the deadline for an instructor-level review is not valid grounds to proceed to higher levels of appeal.*

2. The instructor will review the work in question. The instructor must provide a written decision to the student within 14 calendar days of receiving the student's Letter of Appeal. An instructor may decide to increase the grade, decrease the grade, or leave the grade unchanged. Once appeal is initiated, the original grade is negated, and any new grade can be assigned.

3. If a student wishes to appeal the instructor's decision, the student may appeal in writing to the Graduate Chair, which is the second level of appeal, stating the grounds on which the grade should be changed and these grounds must be related to the substance and quality of the work that was assessed or some procedural issue with the first-level appeal to the instructor. Appeal to the Grad Chair must be done within 7 calendar days of receiving the instructor's decision. After 7 days, appeal to the Graduate Chair will not be possible.

4. The Graduate Chair will initiate a review of the grade. The review process at this stage is as follows: the assignment will be assessed by two faculty members in the field, one of whom is the original instructor. These two grades plus any comments or supporting materials then go to the Head of department or Graduate Chair, who decides what the final grade will be. This grade could be higher, lower, or the same as the original grade. The Graduate Chair or Head will inform all parties of the result of the review in writing.

5. The third level of appeal is the SGSPA, following the policies on [“Appeal of an Assigned Grade in a Graduate Course”](#) (for passing grades in a course) or [“Appeal Against an Academic Decision”](#) (for failing grades in a graduate course). At this level, students are allowed to appeal final course grades and would be given all documentation and communications around any appeals of assignments in the course. These would be provided to the SGSPA by the course instructor and Graduate Chair. In the case of passing course grades, appeals can be made only on the basis of a specific procedural error(s) made in the grade review procedures of the department. Such an appeal would be lodged with the Academic Appeal Board of SGSPA as outlined in the Graduate Calendar.

Please note that it is not possible to appeal grades for presentations, oral exams, group work, class participation, or grades assigned by peer review. Practically speaking, such assessments cannot be objectively reviewed after the fact by a third party.

Please note these procedures described above do not apply when a failing grade (F) has been received on courses numbered 899 (Master's Thesis) or 999 (Doctoral Thesis). To appeal a failing grade (F) of a graduate thesis, the student must follow the Appeal of Thesis Examination Committee Decision, set out in the Regulation titled [“Appeals Against Academic Decisions”](#).

5. FIELD COURSES AND FIELD EXAMINATIONS

General

Students are admitted into a particular primary field, with a supervisor from that field. Students must choose a second field at the start of their first term, in consultation with their supervisor. Changes are possible, provided they do not entail delay in the student's progress and the student receives the approval of the Graduate Chair.

Doctoral students are required to write field exams in both of their fields of concentration. The purpose of the field examinations is to ensure that candidates are (1) prepared to teach university-level courses in their two fields, (2) ready to engage in dissertation research, and (3) have a broad base of knowledge of their field for future work, academic and non-academic. The exams test students' knowledge of the main literature and debates in their two fields. Students should be able to explain succinctly and clearly the mains concepts, questions, and schools of thought in the field. Students should be able to engage critically in the field's debates, identifying objections and possible responses to different positions. Students should also be able to apply the theories in question to specific cases.

Field exams are generally based on topics and readings covered in the field courses (POLS 910, 930, 960, and 980) but may include additional readings to be specified by the relevant field convenor before the end of Winter term. If no field course is offered (as in Political Theory), exams will be based on courses taken within the field, supplemented with a limited number of additional readings.

Timing and Format

Students write field examinations at the beginning of Term 4. For the first field, the student takes a written and oral exam.[2] For the second field, only a written exam is required, with an oral exam optional if the examination committee decides the written exam is not a clear pass (see more below). Only those students who have completed all their doctoral course work will be permitted to write the field examinations. The exams are evaluated as fail, pass, or pass with distinction.[3]

Field examination boards are comprised of three examiners in the field, with one of them serving as chair of the examination. All field exams should have a chair, even if no oral field exam will be held, and that chair should provide a written report to the student and Grad Coordinator after the assessment of the exam is decided. For written exams where no oral will take place, examiners should communicate about the exam and decide its outcome together, as they would in an oral exam. Exam outcomes are decided by majority.

The written exams normally take place in the computer lab in Gordon Hall and are written without books, notes or other assistance over four hours. If a student has accommodations through QSAS, please inform the Graduate Coordinator, Mikhaila Graf, as early as possible and at least a month in advance of the first written exam so appropriate arrangements can be made.

The oral examination for the first field is normally held one week after the written examination in the same field. In the oral examination, candidates are questioned on their written answers and on matters related to their preparation generally. They can expect to be asked to expand on incomplete answers but are not permitted to bring in and read additional written statements. In fact, students cannot bring materials to the oral exam other than a pen/pencil, blank writing paper, and a copy of their written exam.

---

[2] NOTE: A proposal is scheduled to go before the department in January 2026 from the Graduate Committee to remove the automatic oral exam requirement in first fields and introduce a process similar to that used for second fields, which is an oral component reserved for cases where students need to clarify or improve borderline written exam responses. This handbook will be revised afterwards if the change goes forward.

[3] NOTE: A proposal is scheduled to go before the department in January 2026 from the Graduate Committee to revise the outcome categories for field exams to pass and fail, removing the distinction option. This handbook will be revised afterwards if the change goes forward.

The examination board will evaluate the first field's written and oral exams together as fail, pass, or pass with Distinction. However, per the department's Unsatisfactory Field Exam regulation, "at least two days before the scheduled oral exam, the members of the oral board will advise the Graduate Coordinator of their judgement on the written exam. If the written exam is judged to be unsatisfactory by at least two of the three members, no oral board will be convened. The field convenor will convey the evaluations of the examiners to the student in writing." In other words, in cases where examiners assess a written exam to be a clear failure, with no reasonable chance of passing when combined with a student's performance in the oral exam, an oral exam will not be held, and an outcome of fail will be recorded for the exam attempt.

An oral examination for the second field may be held when the written exam result is not a clear pass and requires further clarification. The Graduate Coordinator will contact the student to arrange an oral examination if needed.

If a candidate fails a field exam, they may rewrite it, usually in January or at some date at least several months after a failed attempt to ensure sufficient preparation has occurred for the second attempt. Before a rewrite can occur, the student must meet (virtually or in-person) with the examiners and the Graduate Chair to receive feedback on the first exam and guidance on the second attempt, and this should ideally occur soon after the failed exam so the student can benefit from examiners' and Grad Chair's advice. To the extent possible, the candidate will be examined by the same board.

If a student fails any two attempts at the same field exam (primary or secondary field), the department will normally recommend to SGSPA the student withdraws from the program. In other words, two failed attempts are grounds for removal from the program.

6. LANGUAGE COMPETENCE

Candidates for the PhD must satisfy the department that they are able to read and understand professional literature in a language other than English. For students in Canadian politics, that language must be French. For students in other fields, the language is normally one appropriate for their research field. Students for whom English is a second language, who were schooled in a second language (e.g., French immersion at the high school level), or who already have demonstrable fluency in a second language may seek exemption from the language requirement. They should consult the Graduate Chair and provide details about their situation.

The examination of translation competence in a language other than English will involve the translation of a passage of approximately 400-500 words, drawn from a journal article. The student may use a standard dictionary, and within two hours must convey accurately, in grammatical and idiomatic English, the substantive content of the passage. The exam will be evaluated by up to two faculty members appointed by the Graduate Coordinator, often including the supervisor.

The purpose of the language requirement is to ensure that students can engage with relevant scholarly literature in a second language or conduct primary research in a second language, such as interviews or content analysis. The language requirement does not require professional-level fluency or technical translation skills, but rather a demonstrated ability to read and comprehend academic texts necessary for the student's field of research.

In accordance with SGSPA regulations, the language requirement should be fulfilled at least one year prior to the date of defence of the thesis.

7. ANNUAL PROGRESS REVIEW

The progress of each doctoral student in the first year of the doctoral program (PhD1) is reviewed at the outset of Term 3 by the Graduate Chair.

Beginning in the second year of the doctoral program, students must submit an annual progress report by July 1 each year, outlining their activity in the previous year. These reports will be submitted to the student's supervisor, asking for their written comments, and after that forwarded to the Graduate Coordinator for the Graduate Chair's review.

Failure to submit the annual progress review will result in an evaluation of unsatisfactory progress. These annual reviews are required by both department and SGSPA. For students beyond year 4, time limit extensions will not be approved unless an annual progress report has been submitted. In extreme cases, funding may be withheld if progress reports are not submitted.

The Graduate Chair will review all reports. If the student's progress is unsatisfactory or there are concerns, the Graduate Chair will write an assessment of the student's progress and invite the student to meet to discuss progress. If progress is judged to be unsatisfactory for two successive years, the department will recommend to SGSPA that the student be required to withdraw from the program.

The standard time limit for a PhD is four years, or 12 terms. However, it is common for students to take a fifth year, particularly if their research requires extensive field work. Requests for Time Limit Extensions to Year 5 are at the discretion of the department and are normally approved. Please note that after year 4, students are no longer guaranteed funding. During Year 5, the department is sometimes able to offer some Teaching Fellowships (TFs) for students to teach their own undergraduate course. How many TFs are offered in an academic year can vary and is subject to budget and the teaching needs of the department. TFs are awarded on a competitive basis.

Requests for Time Limit Extensions beyond Year 5 are made to SGSPA, based on a recommendation of the department. Students wishing to make such a request should submit in the SGSPA system, and approval flows are as follows: first to supervisor, then to Graduate Chair, and then to the Associate Dean of the SGSPA.

8. THE DOCTORAL THESIS AND THESIS PROPOSAL

Traditional and Articles-Based Theses
A doctoral thesis is a major, original scholarly work that demonstrates a student's ability to conduct independent research. They take various forms, and in political science, students generally have two options: traditional (book length and structured into chapters) and manuscript-based (articles). The School of Graduate Studies' regulations on theses call these "Traditional Theses" and "Manuscript, Project, Portfolio" format, respectively.

SGSPA guidelines describe the core manuscripts on which the article-based dissertation is based as "a series of main sections/chapters, each of which stands alone and could be suitable for dissemination though appropriate means to target relevant audiences... (e.g.) an academic journal, position paper, policy paper, technical report, popular article, evidence-based business case or other output relevant to the area of study" (pg. 14).

The article-based dissertation must be a coherent examination of a particular intellectual problem, not a series of papers on discrete topics. It is for this reason that the SGSPA guidelines require that an article-based dissertation include an introduction that explains "how the various sections/chapters forming the body of the thesis combine to address the main goals of the thesis" and a conclusion that addresses the significance, implications, and potential applications of the thesis' results. See SGSPA's Standards for

Graduate Theses for more on what should be included in each type of thesis, as well as the formatting and other requirements for theses. You can also see SGSPA Thesis Formatting and Other Resources.

In this respect, the article-based dissertation does not differ from the traditional model. What's different about the article-based dissertation is that the central parts of the dissertation consist of separate publishable papers on different aspects of the topic, instead of chapters that build one upon the other such that one must be read prior to the next. The papers that constitute an article-based dissertation are separate in that each could be understood independently of the others, whereas the chapters in a traditional format dissertation have a cumulative or developmental structure.

The article-based dissertation will contain the following elements for a minimum of five components:

1. **Introduction:** This first chapter defines the problem the papers address, explains the concepts and methods used in the ensuing papers, discusses the existing literature on the general topic, and identifies the original contributions provided by the rest of the thesis. This chapter is not normally intended for publication and should therefore not be referred to extensively in the separate papers. It is, however, written for a scholarly audience. The literature review may be separated into a distinct chapter, per the SGSPA's Standards for Graduate Theses.

2. **Three Papers:** The papers that constitute the core of the thesis must be structured so as to be submissible to a recognized refereed journal in the relevant field. They need not be published, but they must be the kind of paper that could be published, and independently, so that in principle all three papers could be published.

   Although the individual papers should be such that they can be read independently, they should be cross-referenced where appropriate.

   Co-authorship is permitted by SGSPA, either with a peer or with a faculty member, including the supervisor, but with the following restrictions, per sec. 2.4 of the Standards for Graduate Theses:

   a) for peers, the student who contributed the most is the one that gets to use the paper in their PhD thesis; if both students contributed equally, they may both use the paper in their PhD thesis;

   b) only one of the three papers may be co-authored; the majority of work in the articles-based thesis must be solo-authored work. For Political Studies, that means two of three articles.

   The articles may be published in journals before submission of the thesis, but the assessment of journal editors and referees is independent of the assessment the thesis by the dissertation committee.

3. **Conclusion:** The final chapter connects the results of the three papers and discusses the general implications of the research. Like the introduction, it is not normally intended for publication but is to be written for a scholarly audience.

The Thesis Proposal

Students should write their thesis proposal in Term 4, after the field examinations have been passed, under the guidance of their faculty supervisor. Functionally, the terms "thesis" and "dissertation" can be interchanged, with the Canadian and UK systems favouring the former and the US system the latter.

A thesis proposal should be 8,000 to 10,000 words, or roughly 30-40 pages, double spaced. It should normally contain all or most of the elements outlined below. Note the differences below across theses written in different sub-fields (political theory) and broad approaches (empirical v. interpretivist). As you can see, proposals look different depending on type of dissertation and the tradition in which you're

working. You should consult your supervisor(s) for definitive guidance on the structure and contents of your proposal, keeping in mind that the 8,000-10,000 word limit is a universal limit. Your supervisor is the chief and final authority on the contents of your proposal.

Elements of a thesis proposal:

- Clear articulation of the research puzzle, problem, tension, or objective
- Principal question(s) to be examined
    - can be conceptual, empirical, theoretical, and/or normative
    - for political theory theses, these are often "how" or "what should" questions rather than empirical hypotheses. For example, "how should we understand autonomy in contexts of interdependence?" The goal is to clarify the line of inquiry rather than specify variables or hypotheses. For interpretivist thesis, the focus tends to emphasize meaning-making, practice, or experience rather than causality or outcomes. For example, "rather than asking why states adopt certain refugee policies, this study examines how bureaucrats interpret their moral and professional obligations in implementing those policies."
- Theoretical framework
    - the conceptual and theoretical lens that structures your research
- Explanation of how the research question is situated within the main literature(s)
- Research design or argument structure and methodology
    - For empirical theses
        - Hypotheses or propositions to be tested (if applicable)
        - Empirical strategy, the bridge between theory and data - describes the plan for how data will be used to answer the research questions or test hypotheses. Many key elements of empirical strategy are described below.
        - Description of the kinds of data to be gathered or secondary data used
        - Methods of data collection (e.g., interviews, surveys, archival research, content analysis, observational methods)
        - Methods of data analysis (e.g., statistical modelling, thematic coding, discourse analysis)
        - Rationale for case selection or data sources
        - Discussion of validity, reliability, and/or credibility depending on the approach
    - For political theory theses:
        - Explain your interpretive stance. Are you reconstructing, critiquing, synthesizing, or extending a body of thought? Goal is to show intellectual positioning and architecture of argument.
        - Articulate central claim or argument
        - Explain mode of analysis. E.g., conceptual analysis, hermeneutic interpretation, critical theory, normative argumentation, or genealogical critique
        - Explain methods, if applicable - how you will read texts, construct arguments, and evaluate concepts. Goal is to show how you will *do* political theory, transparently and rigorously.
        - Anticipated objections or challenges and your anticipated responses
    - For theses in the interpretivist tradition
        - These tend to occupy a middle ground between empirical and theoretical traditions, combining deep engagement with meaning, context, and interpretation rather than causal explanation. Their structure often looks like other social science proposals, but the emphasis and epistemological grounding are different.

- Epistemological stance - explain what it means to know something interpretively (e.g., through understanding, contextualization, and dialogue rather than measurement)
        - Describe setting, cases, or field sites, and justify their selection in terms of depth and relevance, not representativeness.
        - Methods of data generation (eg, in-depth interviews, observational methods, ethnography; discourse, narrative, or document analysis)
        - Discuss how methods allow you to access meanings and interpretations of actors
        - Explain how you will make sense of your materials (eg, coding as interpretive, thematic analysis, discourse analysis, or narrative reconstruction).
        - Discuss how you will move from individual meanings to broader patterns or insights.
        - Common to see discussion of reflexivity and positionality
- Dissertation's expected theoretical, empirical, or methodological contributions. Eg: does it fill a gap, reframe a question, introduce a new perspective, extend past findings, develop new theory, develop or test new methods?
- Provisional chapter / article outline
    - brief description of each planned chapter or article, including its purpose and how it fits into the overall argument.
- Bibliography
- Proposed timeline of completion of the major milestones (e.g., analyses; data collection, if applicable; writing of various chapters/articles)

The thesis proposal defence should occur during the 5th term after admission, ideally as soon as possible in this term. This is generally Winter Term of year 2 of the program. The thesis proposal will be examined by a three-person committee including the student's supervisor. Normally all members of the committee are from within the department, or cross-listed in the department, but proposal boards may include up to one member who is entirely external to the department. Composition of the proposal board is determined by the supervisor and Graduate Coordinator in consultation with the student. It is normally the supervisor's role to recruit examiners and secure their agreement to participate in the proposal defence. The Graduate Coordinator will then handle the scheduling. Students are required to submit a PDF of the thesis proposal to the Graduate Coordinator.

One of the members of the examining board will serve as chair in the proposal defence. A good rule of thumb is to choose the examiner most arm's length from the student.

The examination board will seek assurance that the student is well-equipped to handle the project, and that adequate resources of time, supervision, literature, documents, and data or interview subjects are in hand or can readily be arranged. If the examination committee is satisfied with the proposal, the student will be notified that they can proceed to the thesis writing stage and the formal appointment of the thesis supervisor will be made.

Should the committee not be satisfied, the proposal will not be accepted, and must be revised and resubmitted within one month, and a second proposal defence will be arranged. If the committee is not satisfied with the re-examination, the student will normally be asked to withdraw from the program.

Ethics Approval
If a thesis topic involves living human participants a submission to the General Research Ethics Board (GREB) is required. Students can always consult with their faculty supervisor and / or the Chair of the Unit Research Ethics Board (UREB) for assistance. Ethics guidelines and the forms for the submission are available here. All student projects go through two layers of ethics review: first at the department level Unit Research Ethics Board (UREB), which will typically have a round or two of revisions before

forwarding the application to the university-level GREB for review. GREB has its own process. The whole process from UREB to GREB, start to finish typically takes several months (perhaps 3-4 months), but can be longer in busy periods. Students should plan accordingly and ensure they allot sufficient time for ethics clearance.

Students who will be engaged in research involving human subjects must take the web-based course of Research Ethics (CORE). This is a requirement by GREB/UREB as part of grad students' ethics applications.

Field Work Safety

Research involving field work will require a Field Research Safety Planning Record. Students should not embark on fieldwork without first acquainting themselves with the Off-Campus Activity Safety Policy (OCASP) and completing the necessary forms. Guidelines and forms are available here.

Resources for Research/Field Work Travel

SGSPA offers several travel awards of up to $3000 each for PhD students in the annual competition for the Graduate Dean's Travel Grant for Doctoral Field Research. Doctoral candidates may also compete for the Timothy C.S. Franks Research Travel Award if they want to travel outside North America. Additional funds may be available from the department. Please see the Awards section of the Grad School's website for more information.

Relationship with Thesis Supervisor

The supervisor guides and monitors the preparation of the thesis. Students should consult frequently with their supervisor on the progress of their thesis. Students should feel free to seek advice on how to overcome challenges they encounter during their work. The timeframe for completing various tasks should also be a frequent topic of conversation between supervisor and student. While supervisors are committed to monitoring and facilitating student progress, primary responsibility for a student's progress lies with the student.

For information on the respective roles and responsibilities of supervisors, supervisory committees, students, graduate chair/coordinators and departments please refer to SGSPA's *Guide to Graduate Supervision*.

Style Guide for Theses

Doctoral dissertations must conform to the specifications for style and formatting, etc in the SGSPA's Standards for Graduate Theses. This document and guidelines for submission of the final revised thesis may be found at SGSPA's website on degree completion.

PhD theses should be no more than 100,000 words (approx. 400 pages), inclusive of front matter, footnotes/endnotes, tables and charts, bibliography, appendices, and any other supplementary materials. Theses that exceed these limits may be refused an examination. The main body of the thesis (chapters/articles) is probably typically 200-250 words, to give a sense of how much other components add to page count. The norm now is to submit and distribute the thesis electronically to examiners, so submission of PhD dissertations as a single PDF is sufficient.

Thesis Submission, Defence, and Fees

A student must be registered in the graduate program in the term in which they defend their thesis.

Arranging the thesis defence often takes longer than anticipated, especially if the defence is to take place in the summer. Students must submit the final copy of the thesis to the Graduate Coordinator at least **six weeks** before the preferred examination date. The SGSPA requires a minimum of 25 working days

between submission and defence, and the Dept. of Political Studies requires an additional 5 days, for a total of 30 working days, minimum.

The Thesis Examining Committee is comprised of:
- Head of department/delegate, who also serves as Chair of the defence
    - this role is fused and this person is not a voting member of the defence committee by virtue of chairing. According to SGSPA, this person is expected to read the thesis and provide a written report prior to defence. This person may ask questions during the defence or may opt not to in order to focus on the chair duties.
- Supervisor(s) – if there is more than one, they count together as one vote
- Internal examiner - a faculty member from the department (inclu. cross-appointed faculty)
- Internal external examiner - a Queen's faculty member from outside of the department
- External examiner - faculty member from outside Queen's

The Chair's duties are timekeeping, note-taking, and refereeing, as well as reporting on the outcome. The other four members of the examining committee are voting members. According to SGSPA rules, two votes places the thesis in the lowest outcome category. So, if two people vote Major Revisions and two people voted Passed, then the outcome is Major Revisions.

According to SGSPA rules, all members of the examining committee except for the supervisor must be at arm's length from the student to avoid conflict of interest. In addition, the external examiner must be arm's length from the supervisor. See SGSPA's General Guidelines, under "Conflict of Interest and Arm's Length Provisions for Examiners" for discussion of acceptable arm's length in such cases.

It is normally up to the student's supervisor to identify and secure a suitable external examiner, Internal examiner, and department examiners. Once that is done, the Graduate Coordinator then handles the scheduling. Members of the examining committee are officially recommended by the Head and appointed by the Dean, though in practice the Head's recommendation follows consultation with the supervisor.

To avoid paying fees for an additional term, students should plan to have the defence at least two weeks before the end of the first month of the term. For exact dates check the Registrar's website.

9.   GRADUATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR (GRADS)

We are pleased to announce the launch in Fall 2025 of the Graduate Research and Development Seminar (GRADS), a weekly research and professional development forum for graduate students. The coordinator and developer of this initiative is Dr. Paul Gardner, with assistance from Grad Chair and Grad Coordinator.

Piloting this year and planned for a non-credit course in future years when formalized through grad curriculum channels, GRADS will run throughout 2025/26 with the expectation of regular attendance by MA and PhD students. It formalizes what has been an ad hoc mix of three initiatives: graduate professional development (run by the Grad Chair), research presentations (often run by the PSGSA), and mock job talks (typically organized by supervisors). **GRADS will meet in Mackintosh-Corry D216 during the Fall 2025 semester from 2:30-4:00pm on Thursdays.**

The goal of GRADS is to regularize feedback on student research and provide professional development opportunities. For the student research components, PhD students will present at two key stages: dissertation proposal (winter of Y2) and either a dissertation capstone or mock job talk (fall of the year they defend or go on the market, whichever comes first). These checkpoints offer targeted feedback at pivotal moments. Additional presentations of chapters or articles at other stages of the dissertation are welcome, subject to availability.

For those pursuing non-academic careers, GRADS builds transferrable skills: communication skills, synthesizing feedback, evaluating others' work, translating research to non-specialists (i.e., people outside your field), public speaking under pressure, designing persuasive visuals, and much more.

Presenters will circulate written work in advance. Presentations will follow a standard format: a 30-minute presentation followed by a 5-8 minute student discussant followed by an open Q&A. If demand is high, "conference-style" short talks will be available for mid-career students. Students have latitude to present their work in ways that supports their research agendas.

The other major component of GRADS will be professional development sessions, targeted at supporting MA and PhD development as well as supporting career development. GRADS enhances the quality and predictability of graduate professional development while fostering regular research exchange. For MA students, added benefits include exposure to advanced research and greater integration into the program, socially and academically.

Beyond its formal benefits, GRADS is an opportunity for faculty and graduate students to gather regularly, share expertise, and strengthen our community.

The 2025/26 schedule is included as appendix 2.

10.   FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Funding Packages
Offers of admission to the doctoral program in Political Studies at Queen's University include a guaranteed minimum level of financial support, which comes from a variety of different sources, including teaching assistantships, GRFs, research assistantships, Queen's Graduate Award or fellowship, and/or external scholarships or awards. The funding minimum for 2025-26 is $23,000, though SGSPA's Funding Guide notes that many departments, including ours, have average funding levels significantly higher than this. In 2024-25, all funding-eligible PhD students were above the minimum funding level, with average funding of $29,000.

Receipt of an internal or external award will be considered part of your funding package, per SGSPA policy, which can often result in an adjustment of funding sources. In some cases, the increase in funds from an internal or external award will mean funding from other sources is reduced, per the SGSPA's policy. For example, if a student wins a SSHRC doctoral award and already has a McLaughlin award (an internal award), the latter will be reallocated to another student, per SGSPA rules. Another example is that students cannot hold both an OGS and SSHRC doctoral award.

In all instances, however, the student's total funding package will be at least as high as their guaranteed minimum in their funding letter.

SGSPA rules and practices that prohibit or discourage the "stacking" of some awards is a common practice across universities. This is consistent with principles of equity in resource distribution and helps avoid or diminish situations in which a small handful of students take up a very large portion of available funding. See the SGSPA website under Funding Packages for more details.

The funding guarantee applies only as long as the doctoral student is registered full-time, active, and making satisfactory progress through their program and applies only to years 1-4 of the program. Students beyond year 4 are not funding eligible in the normal sense and are not covered by the minimum guaranteed funding policy. In such cases, funding in the form of TAships, TFs, or funding from the supervisor or other faculty member (eg, RAships) may be available.

In accordance with SGSPA regulations, doctoral students are guaranteed funding for four years at the level indicated in their offer of admission, provided they make themselves available for Queen's employment as specified in their offer of admission (normally a TAship or RAship). Please note that if a student declines an offer of employment from the university or any other component of their funding

package, the student forfeits that component of their funding package for that year and their funding will be adjusted accordingly. <u>In addition, to continue to qualify for the minimum guaranteed funding, students must apply for all major external and internal scholarships for which they are eligible (SSHRC, OGS at minimum).</u>

Students should take care to budget their finances to last twelve months. This is especially important in relation to stipends for TAships, which are paid in equal monthly installments for the duration of the term. The department does not have the funds to assist students who encounter financial emergencies during the summer months.

Teaching Assistantships

Offers of financial support typically include TAships. A semester-long TAship is typically 120 hours. TAships involve duties such as running tutorials, advising undergrads on their assignments and exam prep, and grading. TA training is paid as well.

Teaching assistants are typically assigned to courses in August for the academic year, in accordance with the posting provisions of the PSAC 901 Collective Agreement. The department's instructional needs are the primary determinant of assignments and are usually based on enrolments in first- and second-year undergraduate courses as well as the prospective TA's ability to assist in different courses.

In its decisions on hiring teaching assistants, the department adheres to the Collective Agreement (CA) between the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) on behalf of graduate teaching assistants and teaching fellows and Queen's University, which can be found on the [Human Resources website](#). Please ensure you become familiar with all aspects of your Collective Agreement.

If a student opts for TA or RA employment opportunities above and beyond of what's listed in their funding letter, the income from that additional opportunity would be on top of what's listed in funding letter and not result in "clawback" of funds from other sources. Eg, a student has an opportunity for a 3rd TAship in a given year, and the funding package they were offered outlined two TAships as part of the funding. In this case, the additional TA pay would not result in a "clawback" of funds from other sources such as QGA.

External Components of Financial Support

University and departmental regulations require that all eligible PhD students apply for external funding, when eligible, particularly Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and Ontario Graduate Scholarships (OGS). The deadlines for these are usually September/October (SSHRC) and January (OGS). Information and assistance are provided by the department, but students are responsible for meeting the deadlines.

International students are [now eligible for SSHRC funding](#) and will be required to apply. This is an incredible opportunity to enhance financial support for international students. International students are also eligible for a separately established International Ontario Graduate Scholarship (iOGS) competition which takes place in spring each year. International students are also urged to approach their home governments, Canadian NGOs, and international organizations and foundations.

Students should consult the [awards section of the SGSPA Calendar](#) and apply for fellowships, prizes and awards for which they qualify. Note in particular the <u>Donald S. Rickerd Fellowship in Canadian-American Studies, the W. C. Good Memorial Fellowship Award, the Alfred Bader Fellowship in Memory of Jean Royce, the Jean Royce Fellowship, and more. Our students have had a lot of success in winning these fellowships over the years.</u>

Failure to apply for external awards generally disqualifies a student from consideration for university fellowships (but not other types of funding, such as TAships).

Travel Awards

Full-time graduate students are eligible to apply for the student conference travel award of each academic year (September 1 to August 31). Awards may be used to provide partial support for travel, accommodation, meal, and registration fees associated with a recognized conference at which the student is presenting an authored or co-authored paper or poster. The student must be registered full time and within their funding eligible years in a graduate degree program at the time of the conference to qualify, though applications from students in year 5 and beyond will be considered if budget allows. The application form is available on our forms webpage and must be submitted and approved prior to the conference. Doctoral students should also be aware of the Dean's Travel Awards and the Timothy C.S. Franks Research Travel Award. A call for applications for these two awards will be sent to doctoral students annually.

Limit on Employment

Students should consult with their supervisor and the Graduate Chair before accepting any employment that will or might bring their hours of paid employment, including any teaching or research assistantship, to a total greater than ten per week (averaging the hours worked over an academic year). Moreover, SGSPA policy states that "under no circumstances will a student be permitted to register as a full-time student while maintaining full-time employment (more than 30 hours a week) elsewhere." If employment is deemed incompatible with full-time study, the student must apply for part-time status. For more information about employment while a full-time student, please see the SGSPA calendar under "Study Status/Full-Time".

11.   RESIDENCE

The SGSPA regulation regarding residence states that "to become fully involved in a field of study and to be satisfactorily in contact with members of the department and students in the field, it is necessary to be studying on a full-time basis and be full-time on-campus for some part of the degree program". The general expectation in the department is that doctoral students will maintain full-time on-campus status throughout the period of guaranteed support (12 terms, 4 years). This expectation applies most strongly in the early years of the program, when the student is taking courses, preparing for field exams, and formulating their dissertation proposal, and perhaps less so in later years, during the final stages of writing.

12.   FACILITIES

Student Space

The department provides office space for doctoral students. Assigned office space will typically be shared with other graduate students, depending on availability of space. Offices are intended primarily for work and study; the department has a lounge for faculty and graduate students to use for socializing.

Mailboxes

Each graduate student on campus has a mailbox in the General Office.

13.   RESEARCH CENTRES

The department is affiliated with a number of research centres, which focus on some of our main strengths. These centres bring in guest speakers, hold seminars, and more broadly, provide an opportunity for established scholars and students to engage in intellectual activity around shared

interests. Sometimes, additional Research Assistantship opportunities become available through the centres.

The Centre for International and Defence Policy ([CIDP](#))
The CIDP was established in 1975 as an interdisciplinary research centre within the School of Policy Studies. The Centre's research interests focus on defence policy, homeland security policy, and Canada's international policy. The Centre offers no courses but welcomes the active involvement of graduate students who have complementary research interests.

The Centre for the Study of Democracy and Diversity ([CSDD](#))
The CSDD is an interdisciplinary Centre aimed at advancing research and teaching about democracy and diversity, broadly conceived, including diversity of philosophy, religion, race, gender, ethnicity and nationality.

The Institute of Intergovernmental Relations ([IIGR](#))
This IIGR was established to provide a centre for research into the problems of intergovernmental relations in Canada and elsewhere. The Institute does not offer courses or grant degrees but is pleased to support the work of graduate students with an interest in federalism.

Canadian Opinion Research Archive ([CORA](#))
CORA makes available commercial and independent surveys to the academic, research and journalistic communities. Founded in 1992, CORA contains hundreds of surveys including thousands of discrete items collected by major commercial Canadian firms dating back to the 1970s. The CORA website includes readily accessible results from these surveys, tracking Canadian opinion over time on frequently asked survey questions, as well as tabular results from recent Canadian surveys, and more general information on polling. Individuals conducting research for non-commercial purposes can obtain access to the CORA electronic holdings and conduct searches of the database. Researchers can conduct the full range of bivariate and multivariate analysis on data through the Odesi interface.

14.   RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Student Code of Conduct
Graduate students are subject to the [Student Code of Conduct](#). The Preamble to the Code states that

> "students are expected to adhere to and promote the University's core values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and personal responsibility in all aspects of University life, academic and non-academic. It is these core values that are intended to inform and guide Student conduct as they foster mutual respect for the dignity, property, rights and well-being of others" (sec. i).

The Code is a behavioural contract (sec. ii). By registering at Queen's, students accept the right of the university to set standards of conduct, and to impose sanctions for conduct found to have violated those standards. The Code sets out these standards and procedures. The Code applies to non-academic misconduct both on university property and off university property, where students are taking place in sanctioned events, or students' conduct has a substantial connection to legitimate interests of the university, or a student represents, or would reasonably be perceived as representing, the university. The Code also applies to communication via electronic media, where there is a clear connection to the university community.

Sexual Violence and Harassment

Queen's is committed to protecting its members against sexual violence, and all forms of harassment, both as a matter of principle and as an element of academic freedom. Such protection is also a legal duty under Ontario and Federal law.

Queen's has a Policy on Sexual Violence, which defines consent and lays out procedures for handling complaints under the Student Code of Conduct.

According to Queen's Senate Harassment/Discrimination Complaint Policy and Procedure:

> "Queen's University recognizes that all members of the University Community have the right to be free from harassment and discrimination. This includes sexual harassment, harassment based on gender, race, ethnicity, religion, creed and sexual orientation or analogous grounds. Such harassment and discrimination has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's or a group's work or academic performance, or of creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive working, living or academic environment."

Sexual harassment involves the attempt by one person to assert power over another by "engaging in a course of vexatious comment or conduct of a sexual nature that is known or ought to be known to be unwelcome" (Ontario Human Rights Code). Sexual harassment can include but is not limited to:

- asking for sex in exchange for improving a test score
- repeatedly asking for dates and not taking "no" for an answer
- making comments about a person's physical attractiveness
- sharing pornography or sexual pictures (including online)

Human Rights and the Human Rights Office

As Teaching Assistants, or Research Assistants, many graduate students will also be employees of the university. As such, they are covered by Ontario Human Rights Code, as well as the province's Occupational Health and Safety Act, and the university's (interim) Workplace Harassment & Discrimination Policy.

The Queen's Human Rights Office offers a confidential service that assists individuals or groups at Queen's who wish to pursue informal or formal routes of complaint resolution following an incident of sexual violence, harassment or discrimination. If you have questions or would like to discuss a concern about violence, harassment, or discrimination, you can contact the Queens' Human Rights Office (613-533-6886; hrights@queensu.ca).

The Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Service (SVPRS)

SVPRS provides confidential, trauma informed and non-judgmental support for any student who has experienced sexual violence or intimate partner violence (IPV) at any time in their life.

Sexual Violence means any sexual act or act targeting a person's sexuality, gender identity or gender expression, whether the act is physical or psychological in nature, that is committed, threatened or attempted against a person without the person's consent, and includes sexual assault, sexual harassment, stalking, indecent exposure, voyeurism, and sexual exploitation.

Students do not need to file a complaint with either the University or with the police in order to access services.

The Student-Instructor Relationship

These guidelines and policies apply to course instructors and TAs, who are part of a course's instructional team. The university vests considerable power in instructors, who have a professional responsibility to act

in the best pedagogical interest of their students. When instructors become involved in intimate relationships with their students, it creates risks of favouritism and bias, both actual and perceived, and can undermine the trust upon which the student-instructor relationship depends. Sexual and romantic relationships between instructors and students are generally incompatible with educators' professional responsibilites. For this reason, the department strongly discourages intimate friendships as well as romantic or sexual relationships between instructors and students, which includes TAs and students.

Intimate relationships between instructors/TAs and students over whom the instructor/TA exercises pedagogical, supervisory, financial, or administrative authority constitute a conflict of interest and should be avoided. Where they occur, such relationships should be disclosed to Head of Department.

Professional Standards
It is an instructor's/TA's responsibility to maintain professional standards in their relationships with students.

It is always inappropriate to:

- comment on a student or colleague's physical appearance or attractiveness
- use language, gestures, humour or innuendo which could be interpreted to suggest that bias, discrimination, preferential treatment, sexual practices, or other non-academic criteria will be used in evaluating academic work
- use humour which, regardless of intent, could be interpreted to be offensive; issues such as ethnic or religious practices, sexual activities or preferences, or academic bias should not be subject to jest or sarcasm
- act in an unprofessional manner, including any of the above, at events organized by and/or for members of the department; this includes social events on or off campus.

It is advisable to:

- maintain a high level of professionalism and set a positive example of inclusive, respectful conduct at all times, especially at university or departmental events
- remember that in addition to high-quality research and teaching, there is an expectation of collegiality; the latter demands professionalism, a cooperative and inclusive attitude, as well as fairness and the appearance of fairness.
- take seriously any suggestions or complaints from colleagues or students about your behaviour or comments.

Labour Relations
Labour relations are governed by the Collective Agreement (CA) between the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) on behalf of Graduate Teaching Assistants and Teaching Fellows and Queen's University. The procedure for grievances is governed by Article 11 of the Collective Agreement. In general, concerns should first be brought to the attention of the employment supervisor for informal resolution, prior to filing a formal grievance according to the procedures laid out in 11.05.

Privacy of Student Files
Student files are held in the Main Office. In accordance with the Ontario Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA), a student's file is accessible only to the student herself/himself, the Graduate Coordinator, the Head, the Graduate Chair, and faculty members who sit on committees requiring examination of the files (normally the Graduate Studies Committee).

In accordance with FIPPA, students have access to all the contents of their file except documents written in confidence about them, such as letters of reference. Faculty members other than those mentioned above must have the student's written permission to consult his/her file.

15.   ADVISING AND OTHER RESOURCES

The Society of Graduate and Professional Students (SGPS) maintains a Peer Academic Advisor program. This service provides free and confidential advice, strategies for self-advocacy and referrals to graduate students at Queen's University. For more information, see https://sgps.ca/paa/.

Queen's University International Centre (QUIC) provides non-academic advising to international students. Students may contact an International Student Adviser at isa@queensu.ca. For more information about QUIC's services, see http://quic.queensu.ca.

The University Ombudsman provides independent, impartial and confidential advice to all members of the university, in the goal of facilitating the informal resolution of concerns and complaints. Students may contact the Ombudsman at ombuds@queensu.ca. For more information, see https://www.queensu.ca/ombuds/ .

APPENDIX 1: Progress Benchmarks

Prior to Arrival	▪ Faculty supervisor in primary field provisionally appointed to offer program advice
Term 1 **(Fall Y1)**	▪ Confirmation of secondary field, in consultation with supervisor and Graduate Chair ▪ Enrolment in POLS900 and two other courses, including field courses or other courses that fulfill field requirement ▪ Applications for SSHRC (Sept/Oct)
Term 2 **(Winter Y1)**	▪ Enrolment in three courses (including field courses, if applicable) ▪ Application for OGS (Jan.)
Term 3 **(Summer Y1)**	▪ Meetings with field convenors and other faculty in preparation for field exams at start of Term 4
Term 4 **(Fall Y2)**	▪ Field Exams held from end of Aug. to end of Sept. at start of Year 2. ▪ Preparation of thesis proposal
Term 5 **(Winter Y2)**	▪ Thesis proposal examination ▪ Head confirms supervisor ▪ Thesis research begins
Terms 6-10 **(Y3-Y4)**	▪ Research / field work ▪ Examination of language competence (1 yr. prior to thesis defence)
Term 11 **(Winter Y4)**	▪ First draft of thesis completed ▪ Preparation of final version of thesis for submission and defence
Term 12 **(Summer Y4)**	▪ Formal submission of thesis for defence ▪ Appointment of examining committee ▪ Oral defence of thesis ▪ Any corrections verified by examining board appointee(s) ▪ Submission of corrected thesis to Dean of Graduate Studies, if applicable

This timeline assumes completion within the 4-year funding window, but field research and other factors may delay completion.

Graduate Research and Development Seminar

Academic Year 2025-2026
2:30-4:00pm Thursdays
Fall: Mackintosh-Corry Hall D216
Winter: Robert Sutherland Hall 448

	Presentation	Discussant
9/4/25	PD: "What is GRADS?" and Grad Mixer	—
9/11/25	No Meeting	
9/18/25	PD: Applying for Grants/SSHRC	—
9/25/25	Olusola Ogunnubi	Jana Walkowski
10/2/25	Kaitie Jourdeuil	—
10/9/25	PD: Zotero Citation Management	—
10/16/25	No Meeting: Reading Week	
10/23/25	Badriyya Yusuf	Canan Sahin
10/30/25	Tehya Blake	TBD
11/6/25	PD: MRP Workshop (MA students only)	—
11/13/25	Admira Buzimkic (student only session)	TBD
11/20/25	Emile Lambert-Deslandes	—
11/27/25	Jana Walkowski	Admira Buzimkic
12/4/25	PD: Journal Publishing	—
12/11/25	PD: Demystifying the Ph.D.	—
12/18/25	Winter Break	
12/25/25	Winter Break	
1/1/26	Winter Break	
1/8/26	No Meeting	
1/15/26	Travis Leicher	Brendan Dell
1/22/26	Zachary Eden	Emmanuel Ampomah
1/29/26	John Maina	Claire Mountford
2/5/26	PD: Non-academic careers	—
2/12/26	No Meeting	
2/19/26	No Meeting: Reading Week	
2/26/26	Michael Hughes	Benjamin Ofosu-Atuahene
3/5/26	Rakib Jahan	Marie-Pier Allard Caron
3/12/26	PD: Research Data Management	—
3/19/26	Maham Afzaal	Cindy Cruz
3/26/26	Kimberly Fawcett Smith	Chelsea Dunn
4/2/26	Elliot Goodell Ugalde	Yerin Chung