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A. OPEN SESSION

OPENING REMARKS

Dr. Deane welcomed newly elected Senator Prof. Bridget O'Shaughnessy and welcomed back Dr. Wilkinson, who had returned from research leave.

Dr. Deane then made a few comments on the progress of the funding formula review being conducted by the provincial government. There was currently a realization that the government needed more information on the province's post-secondary institutions and it was expected that any proposed formula would follow a second round of the Strategic Mandate Agreement exercise. One cause for concern was that a preliminary report on the formula review stated that the universities were inordinately focused on research and that there needed to be a re-alignment of teaching and research activities. If this continued to be
an issue in the review, it would have a significant impact on five Ontario universities. It was felt that the case for research-intensive universities would have to be put very strongly.

On the local horizon, Dr. Deane encouraged Senators to watch for and take part in the employment equity census that would be launched on January 27. The goal of employment equity was to create an inclusive workplace environment for all staff and faculty by identifying and removing barriers in employment practices, and the more who took part in the survey, the more useful the information would be.

He also noted the continuation of the research showcases and upcoming speakers in “The Engaged University” lecture series and the “Perspectives on Peace” series, as well as the much anticipated McMaster Model United Nations in February.

I APPROVAL OF AGENDA – OPEN SESSION

Dr. Deane confirmed that no requests had been received to move any items from the Consent to the Regular agenda of the Open Session.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the Open Session agenda for the meeting of January 13, 2016, and that items II and III be approved or received by consent.”

The motion was carried.

CONSENT

II MINUTES

Motion:

that the minutes of the Open Session portion of the meeting held on December 9, 2015 be approved as circulated

Approved by Consent

III BUSINESS ARISING

a. Report From the Committee on By-laws (Appendix A)

i. Proposed Revisions to the Faculty of Humanities By-laws

Motion:

that the Senate give final approval to revisions to the Faculty of Humanities By-Laws, as set out in Appendix A, effective January 13, 2016
Approved by Consent

REGULAR

IV ENQUIRIES

There were no enquiries.

V COMMUNICATIONS


Senate received this report for information.

VI REPORTS FROM COUNCILS

a. Graduate Council (Appendix C)

i. Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology Program

Dr. Welch explained that Graduate Council was recommending approval of a new course-based Master of Science program in Speech-Language Pathology, to be offered by the School of Rehabilitation Science beginning in September 2017.

The proposed program would align strongly with McMaster’s mission and academic plan and areas of existing strength. The program would prepare students for professional careers in clinical speech-language pathology, which addressed the first two areas of existing strength in the University’s Strategic Mandate Agreement, medical education and research and health and society. In addition, the focus would be consistent with the University’s goal to provide increased emphasis on professional and practice-focused graduate degrees that prepare graduates for professional licensure and to assume clinical positions that meet societal needs.

The program would also provide for even greater collaboration between members of Rehabilitation Science and those faculty teaching in the Cognitive Science of Language program in the Faculty of Humanities. Given the anticipated increased demand for Speech-Language Pathologists, and the limited number of such programs available in Canada, there was likely to be strong student interest in this program.

The proposal for the new program had been reviewed and approved by the University Planning Committee.

It was duly moved and seconded,
“that the Senate approve the establishment of the Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology program, to commence in September 2017, as outlined in Appendix C.”

The motion was carried.

ii. Change to Specializations for the Master of Business Administration

Dr. Welch reported that Graduate Council approved a proposal from the Faculty of Business to eliminate two of the specializations in the MBA program, Information Systems and Management of Innovation and New Technology. The changes reflected recommendations arising from an Institutional Quality Assurance Process review and would address challenges related to administering a high number of specializations.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the elimination of the Information Systems and Management of Innovation and New Technology specializations in the Master of Business Administration program, effective for the 2016-17 Graduate Calendar, as recommended by Graduate Council.”

The motion was carried.

iii. Addition of 16-Month Program Option for the Master of Finance

Dr. Welch explained that the Faculty of Business had proposed the introduction of a 16-month program option for the Master of Finance Program, which would allow students to take courses in the fall and winter terms with a break for the summer term during which they could obtain work experience. Students would then return to complete the program in the following fall term. The Faculty believed that the insight gained and the networks developed during the work term would enhance the learning experience of the students in their final term. Graduate Council was recommending approval of this initiative.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the addition of a 16-month program option for the Master of Finance Program, effective for the 2016-17 academic year, as recommended by Graduate Council.”

A member asked if students would be able to get help finding a work placement, and Dean Waverman confirmed that they would. The member then asked what would happen if a student was unable to find work experience for that summer. Dr. Waverman said that the 12-month option would still be available.

Another member inquired whether students would be able to work outside of Canada as their summer work term. Dr. Waverman confirmed that they could. Dr. Welch noted that
international students would normally have to leave the country for work, but for this program, in order to satisfy Citizenship and Immigration Canada rules, the work term was being defined as part of the curriculum.

The motion was then voted on and carried.

iv. Accelerated Option for the M.A.Sc. in Engineering Physics

The Faculty of Engineering was proposing that those students who take an undergraduate program in the Department of Engineering Physics (and who have achieved a minimum overall average of B at application) be offered the option of an accelerated program. This option would allow for completion of the degree in 12 to 16 months of full-time study and would require students to complete at least one term of their thesis-related project with a supervisor from the Department prior to completion of their undergraduate degree. Students taking the accelerated option would also be required to complete a 600-level course offered by the Department in the final undergraduate year. Application for the accelerated option would occur in the final year of the undergraduate program.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the addition of an accelerated option for the Master of Applied Science Program in the Department of Engineering Physics, effective for the 2016-17 academic year, as recommended by Graduate Council."

The motion was carried.

v. Advanced Credit Option for the M.A.Sc. and M.Eng. in Engineering Physics

The Department of Engineering Physics was also seeking approval for an advanced credit option (separate from the accelerated option) that would allow an M.A.Sc. or M.Eng. student to count one M.A.Sc. or two M.Eng. 600-level courses taken in the final undergraduate year toward the master’s degree requirements.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the addition of an advanced credit option for the Master of Applied Science program and the Master of Engineering program in the Department of Engineering Physics, effective for the 2016-17 academic year, as recommended by Graduate Council."

A member asked for further clarification on how the courses would be noted on the transcript for the two different degrees. Dr. Welch explained that the course numbers would be changed on the transcript as a student moved on to the master’s program. The member then wondered if a student would have to make up the courses to receive the undergraduate degree if he or
she did not go on to the master’s. Dr. Welch said they would not; the credits would still stand for the undergraduate degree.

The motion was then voted on and carried.

vi. Cancellation of Course-Based M.Sc. and M.Eng. Degrees in Computational Science and Engineering

Dr. Welch explained that changes were being proposed to the graduate programs offered by the School of Computational Science and Engineering whereby the course-based M.Sc. and M.Eng. degrees would be cancelled. The proposal reflected the recommendations of a recent IQAP review and responded to a declining demand.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the cancellation of the course-based M.Sc. and M.Eng. degrees in Computational Science and Engineering, effective for the 2016-17 Graduate Calendar, as recommended by Graduate Council.”

The motion was carried.

vii. New Research and Clinical Training Stream for the PhD in Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour

Graduate Council had approved and was now recommending to Senate the addition of a PhD stream in the Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour. The new stream, Research and Clinical Training, was intended to train clinician-scientists and would include a full-time clinical placement. It was expected that inclusion of this stream in the PhD program would qualify graduates for licensing in psychology in Ontario.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the addition of Research and Clinical Training as a stream in the PhD program in the Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour, effective for the 2016-17 Graduate Calendar, as recommended by Graduate Council.”

The motion was carried.

viii. Change to Comprehensive Exam Procedure for the PhD in Electrical and Computer Engineering
ix. Change to Course Requirements for the M.A.Sc. and M.Eng. in Engineering Physics
x. Change to Course Requirements for the PhD in Engineering Physics
xi. Addition of Thesis Proposal Requirement for the PhD in Engineering Physics
xii. Removal of Part II of the Comprehensive Exam for the PhD in Engineering Physics

xiii. Changes to Course Requirements for the M.A.Sc. and M.Sc. in Computational Science and Engineering

Senate received the above-listed reports for information.

b. Undergraduate Council (Appendix D)

i. Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities Program

Dr. Searls Giroux explained that Undergraduate Council was recommending the establishment of a new Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities program. The melding of Business education and Humanities courses would create a unique program focused on training responsible leaders and citizens. The program would offer a strong experiential component, would take a global approach to leadership and management, and would place a high priority on community engagement and sustainable business practices.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the establishment of the Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities program, for inclusion in the 2017-18 Undergraduate Calendar, as outlined in Appendix D."

A member said it was not clear to him how this program would fit into the rest of the University’s offerings. It seemed to be for “high-end” students, and the higher tuition fee indicated that it was probably intended to be a money-making program. Some of the course descriptions made them sound like remedial programs -- for example, one first-year course was titled “Sentence and Communication Structure in Modern English.” The member wondered whether the program was going to be taught by research faculty, and, if so, where would they be coming from? It also seemed odd to the member that the program did not allow for elective courses.

Dr. Searls Giroux invited Dr. Mohammad, one of the champions of the program, to comment.

Dr. Mohammad said that the program would be using teaching-stream faculty for much of the instruction, and added that there was nothing “remedial” about any of the courses. The “Sentence and Communication Structure in Modern English” course had been developed for this program after extensive discussion among the planners, and would be a sophisticated examination of language structure taught by an Associate Dean.

The tuition fee would be about 40 per cent higher than regular programs because the planners were told it would have to be self-supporting program, and it was desirable that class sizes be
kept as small as possible. There was a formula for calculating a tuition fee for programs like this.

In terms of its “fit” within the University, Dr. Mohammad said the B.Comm. in Integrated Business and Humanities was not unlike the Arts and Science program, a pioneering program for which McMaster had become renowned.

Dr. Waverman commented that the proposed program was very much in line with the tenets of Forward With Integrity. He personally believed that this program would be the way business would be taught in 15 years. When he took his own undergraduate degree, many years ago, it was standard for students to take courses in philosophy and communication and other “humanities” disciplines. That approach had declined in recent years but there was an appetite for this type of training for modern business leaders. Dr. Waverman said there would probably be 80 students a year in the program, and they would work on team projects from Day One, a concept completely different from typical undergraduate business programs. He felt this pioneering approach was a hallmark of McMaster programs in many ways.

In response to a member’s question about whether there would be a co-op option in this program, Dr. Mohammad said there would not be.

The motion was then voted on and carried.

ii. 2016-17 Sessional Dates
iii. Curriculum Revisions for Inclusion in the 2016-17 Undergraduate Calendar
iv. Terms of Award
v. Business Essentials Program New Course
vi. New Certificate of Completion Program
vii. New Certificate of Attendance Program
viii. Closure of the Web Design and Development Program

Senate received the above-listed reports for information.

VII REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

a. University Planning Committee (Appendix E)

i. Proposal to Terminate the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology and to Establish a School of Engineering Practice and Technology

Dr. Wilkinson provided some background on the two Engineering schools that were being “terminated” in order to merge and become one school of engineering practice and technology.
The School for Engineering Practice was established in 2004 to provide interdisciplinary education initiatives in the areas of engineering and public policy, engineering entrepreneurship and innovation, and engineering design. Educational programs were oriented toward experiential learning by integrating classroom teaching with application to a thesis project.

The School of Engineering Technology was established in 2012 as the home Department for the Bachelor of Technology programs offered in partnership with Mohawk College.

Given the shared approaches of the two schools, including a focus on the development of professional skills and teaching and learning using an experiential learning pedagogy, it now seemed appropriate to the Faculty to merge the two entities into one school. In order to meet the requirements of the University governance processes, which do not provide for such mergers, it was being proposed that the two existing schools be terminated and that a new school be established, as detailed in Appendix E.

The Arcelor-Mittal Dofasco Centre for Engineering and Public Policy, the GM Centre for Engineering Design, and the Xerox Centre for Engineering Entrepreneurship and Innovation, which are part of the School for Engineering Practice, would be transferred to the new school. The Planning Committee considered this proposal at its December meeting and was supportive of this initiative.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the termination of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology, effective June 30, 2016 in both cases, and the establishment of a School of Engineering Practice and Technology, the precise name to be determined by the Board of Governors at a later date, effective July 1, 2016, as outlined in Appendix E.”

A member asked if there was any concern about the name for the new school, given the qualification in the motion. Ms Ayre explained that it was fully expected that the Board of Governors would approve the new school as the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology, and the donors supported the change. The qualification in the motion was simply in observance of process: only the Board of Governors could approve the official names of University enterprises.

The motion was then voted on and carried.

ii. Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities Program

Dr. Wilkinson noted that the University Planning Committee reviewed and approved the above-listed program, which had received Senate approval earlier in the meeting during the presentation of the report from Undergraduate Council (agenda item VI.b.i, above).
iii. Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology Program

Dr. Wilkinson noted that the University Planning Committee reviewed and approved the above-listed program, which had received Senate approval earlier in the meeting during the presentation of the report from Graduate Council (agenda item VI.a.i, above).

b. Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia (Appendix F)

i. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Flying the Flag

Dr. Davidson explained that, when Senate approved the establishment of the McMaster Flag in May 2015, it was on the understanding that a protocol for flying the flag would be developed and brought back to Senate for approval. The Committee on Ceremonials and Insignia was now presenting that protocol, which was, in effect, a re-write of the current Policy on Flying the Flag, incorporating the criteria for flying the Canadian and Ontario flags as well as the new ceremonial flag, and providing the criteria for determining when the flags should be lowered.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve revisions to and the re-naming of the Policy on Flying the Flag as set out in Attachment I.i of Appendix F."

The motion was carried.

ii. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on the Deferral of Attendance at Convocation

On recommendation of the University Registrar, the Ceremonials Committee was proposing minor housekeeping revisions to the policy on Deferral of Attendance at Convocation. These changes were highlighted in Appendix F.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve revisions to the policy on Deferral of Attendance at Convocation as set out in Attachment I.ii of Appendix F."

The motion was carried.

iii. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Issuing Diplomas in Advance of Convocation

Also on recommendation of the University Registrar, the Committee was proposing more substantive revisions to the Policy on Issuing Diplomas in Advance of Convocation. The
current policy provided for students who were leaving the country for employment purposes and who needed proof of their credentials to receive their diploma in advance of Convocation. Those students who remained in Canada and required verification of their degree received a letter from the Registrar attesting to their status.

However, it was increasingly the case that employers and professional licensing bodies were not satisfied with a letter and were requiring a student to be in possession of the diploma. The Committee was proposing, therefore, that the option of applying for early release of the diploma be broadened to apply to all students.

All applications for early release of diplomas would continue to be brought to Senate for approval.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve revisions to the Policy on Issuing Diplomas in Advance of Convocation as set out in Attachment Liii of Appendix F.”

The motion was carried.

iv. Recommendation to Allow for Additional Convocation Ceremonies

The Committee also heard from the University Registrar that the increase in the numbers of graduands attending has the potential to turn some convocation ceremonies into endurance tests for all involved. In particular, the Spring Business Convocation and one of the Fall Convocations (Business, Arts and Science, Engineering and Social Sciences) were becoming so long that it was having a detrimental effect on the experience of graduands and their families.

Larger numbers also meant fewer tickets for guests and required students and their guests to be in the venue for up to four hours.

The Committee agreed that the Registrar should be given the authority to monitor potential numbers for Convocation ceremonies and to adjust the number and timing of ceremonies as required.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate, on recommendation of the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia, approve the adjustment of the number and timing of Convocation ceremonies based on the number of graduands at a given ceremony and as determined by the University Registrar.”

The motion was carried.
v. Proposed Degree Designation, Abbreviation and Hood for the Master of Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization

Also at its December meeting, the Committee considered recommendations for a degree designation and hood for the recently approved Master of Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the abbreviation M.B.D.C. for the Master of Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization degree, with the hood to be the same as the hood for the Master of Health Sciences (M.H.Sc.): Black silk, lined with crimson, bound on the anterior side with old gold silk and bound on the posterior side with crimson silk, as set out in Attachment III of the report from the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia.

The motion was carried.

c. Committee on Academic Integrity (Appendix G)

i. Proposed Revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy

Dr. Thabane explained that the Committee on Academic Integrity was proposing revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy, the bulk of which were intended to align the policy with the recently revised Research Integrity Policy. Other changes included a provision for inclusion of a general transcript notation with an “end date” (a time at which the notation would be automatically removed); a process for removing a letter related to academic dishonesty from a graduate student’s academic file; a sample list of unauthorized aids; and an option whereby a student may submit penalty suggestions to a Faculty Adjudicator in the event of a finding of academic dishonesty.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy as set out in Attachment I of Appendix C/K."

A member noted that clause 26 made a general statement about instructor-imposed first offences that did not make it clear that this applied only to undergraduate students. Ms Thyret-Kidd suggested that the qualifying phrase “in the case of undergraduate students” be added to the statement, and members agreed this would be a friendly amendment.

Another member commented that the statement in clause 3 defining the jurisdiction of the Academic Integrity Policy relative to the Research Integrity Policy was not clear. She pointed out that, for a graduate student, a course-based thesis was both course work and the kind of research that might fall under the jurisdiction of the Research Integrity Policy.
Members agreed that it would be difficult to compose more appropriate wording on the Senate floor and that this issue should be referred back to the Committee on Academic Integrity for further deliberations.

The vote on the motion was therefore deferred to a future meeting.

ii. Annual Reports of the Office of Academic Integrity for 2013-14 and 2014-15

Senate received this report for information.

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business in Open Session.

In Closed Session, Senate:

a. approved the Closed Session portion of the minutes of the meeting of December 9, 2015;

b. approved, on recommendation of the Committee for Nominating a Chancellor, the re-appointment of the Chancellor of McMaster University for a three-year term, effective September 1, 2016;

c. approved, on recommendation of the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia, the appointment of a Pro-Bedel; and

d. approved two requests for early graduation.
REPORT TO SENATE

FROM THE

COMMITTEE ON BY-LAWS

At the December 9, 2015 meeting, Senate gave approval in principle to a revision to the Faculty of Humanities by-laws as set out in the attached.

The Committee on By-Laws reviewed this change by e-mail on December 17, 2015 and had no questions or concerns about the substance of the change.

The Committee on By-laws therefore recommends,

“that the Senate give final approval to revisions to the Faculty of Humanities By-Laws as set out in the attached, effective January 13, 2016.”

Senate: January 13, 2016
For Final Approval
(v) Undergraduate Essay Prize Committee

Functions:
To evaluate undergraduate submissions for the Humanities Essay Prize competitions (in January and in May) and to adjudicate the results and submit them to the Associate Dean of the Faculty. The Chair will determine the number of faculty members needed to judge the submissions. Normally the Chair will perform a coordinating function and may participate in the process at his/her discretion.

Composition:

Chair: To be appointed annually by the Nominating Committee, from among the members of the Committee

Ex Officio: President
Provost
Dean of the Faculty

Faculty: Eight faculty members, including the Chair, appointed by the Nominating Committee for staggered three-year terms

Consultant: Associate Dean
(non-voting)

(vi) Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee

Functions:
To make recommendations to the Faculty on matters of graduate policy, on curriculum changes arising from consideration of departmental proposals and from the curriculum policies adopted by the Faculty, and on new programs and fields of study, arising from departmental proposals; and to deal with matters referred to it by the Graduate Admissions and Study Committee. To report to the General Faculty and Graduate Council at least annually. To review and update its operating procedures on a regular basis and to file a copy of these procedures with the Office of the Dean and with the Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies.

Composition:

Chair: Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Ex Officio: President
Provost
Deans of the Faculty
Annual Report
September 1, 2014 – August 31, 2015

McMaster University
Office of Human Rights & Equity Services
McMaster University embodies these values:
Respect - Collaboration - Diversity

1. A Respectful Community is one where freedom of expression, belief, and diversity of knowledge occur in a framework of dignity, respect, and public engagement.

2. A Collaborative Community is one where participants jointly move the academic vision forward in respectful and non-confrontational ways, having regard for personal and collective safety and well-being.

3. A Diverse Community is one that enables us to learn from our differences and that affirms our shared accountability for achieving access, equity, and meaningful inclusion of under-represented groups at all levels of the campus community.

Source: McMaster University’s Statement on Building an Inclusive Community with a Shared Purpose
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INTRODUCTION

The Office of Human Rights & Equity Services (HRES) is pleased to release its 2014-2015 Annual Report, which outlines its activities during the past academic year and identifies the successes and challenges of building an inclusive community with a shared purpose at McMaster University.

We are pleased to highlight how HRES has contributed to fostering an inclusive community through three program areas. Our Equity Services Program offers a series of education and awareness activities to address diversity and inclusion on campus. Our Human Rights Program offers a means to address human rights concerns and engage in confidential resolution of disputes. Our Accessibility Program (AccessMAC) works with the campus community to identify and remove barriers to inclusion, particularly among persons with disabilities. We also participated this year in the launch of a new Sexual Violence Response Protocol that offers support and resources to survivors of gender-based violence.

In 2014 the University underwent a review of our human rights policy and processes, culminating in the adoption of the new Policy on Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response, which took effect on July 1, 2015. The new Policy merges the former Anti-Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Policies, and broadens the responsibility for addressing human rights concerns among senior administrators and persons in authority at the University.

HRES also participated in the development of the new Policy on Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous and Spiritual Observances (RISO), in collaboration with the Interfaith Issues Working Group of the President's Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community, the University Ombuds and the University Chaplaincy. RISO provides guidance to students on the process for receiving appropriate accommodation when academic requirements conflict with their sincerely held beliefs and observances.

We have also been involved in promoting the "Perspectives on Peace" initiative, in conjunction with the President's Office and Dr. Nancy Doubleday of the Centre for Peace Studies. The initiative is intended to foster a campus-wide discourse on peace and conflict transformation as a means to create awareness of global issues. Students have been very active in advancing global concerns and have engaged Perspectives on Peace as a viable platform for the discussion of complex disputes. As this initiative continues to grow, it will allow greater opportunities to consider how global concerns can be examined from a scholarly lens in our academic context.

Our activities to date have allowed us to offer subject matter expertise on human rights, accessibility and equity issues. We look forward to continuing to work with our various campus partners to ensure that McMaster University is a welcoming and inclusive community.

Milé Komlen, Director
OUR TEAM

Milié Komlen, Director

Vilma Rossi, Senior Program Manager

Pilar Michaud, Senior Human Rights Officer

Glenn Walsh, Complaint Resolution & Equity Specialist

*Tomee Sojourner, Complaint Resolution & Equity Specialist

Rahanna Hirji-Khalfan, Accessibility Specialist

*Ayshia Musleh, Accessibility Specialist

Meaghan Ross, Sexual Violence Response Coordinator

Khadijah Rakie, Human Rights Specialist

Michelle Poirier, Human Rights Specialist (On Leave)

*Ayshia Musleh and Tomee Sojourner, both on contract, left HRES during the 2014-2015 reporting year. We thank them for their work and contributions towards creating a welcoming and inclusive community.
2014-2015 MAJOR HUMAN RIGHTS INITIATIVES ON CAMPUS

PRESIDENT’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BUILDING AN INCLUSIVE COMMUNITY

The Office of Human Rights & Equity Services works closely with the President’s Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community (PACBIC) to identify and anticipate issues affecting equity-seeking communities both within the University and relevant to those seeking access to the University, and to advise the President on such issues. PACBIC provides reports and makes recommendations for action to the President, the University Planning Committee (UPC) and other relevant University bodies in order to channel advice through the University structure and thus sustain a University culture that advances equity and inclusion.

POLICY ON DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT: PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

The new Policy on Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response became effective on July 1, 2015. HRES has participated in developing forms and guidance documents to help members of the University community understand their rights and bring forward concerns or complaints about discrimination, harassment and sexual harassment. The University community will be trained on the provisions of the new policy, including their responsibilities in maintaining a campus community that upholds human rights principles and that seeks to prevent discrimination and harassment from happening on our campus.

It is anticipated that the new policy will provide greater guidance to the campus community on the importance of maintaining human rights principles and in addressing violations and disputes in a timely and effective manner.

POLICY ON ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATION FOR RELIGIOUS, INDIGENOUS AND SPIRITUAL OBSERVANCES (RISO)

PACBIC’s Interfaith Issues Working Group worked with an ad hoc committee comprised of staff, faculty and students to develop a Policy on Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous and Spiritual Observances (RISO). The Policy took effect on September 1, 2015.
RESPONDING TO VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN/GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

For the last two years, HRES participated with other members of the campus community in a review of responses to sexual violence on campus. As part of a federally funded program, the YWCA and the Sexual Assault Centre of Hamilton and Area (SACHA) collaborated to conduct a campus safety audit and review McMaster’s policies and practices in relation to responses to sexual assault and gender-based violence. The collaboration resulted in the “It’s Time to End Violence Against Women on Campus” Report.

The Report resulted in a series of recommendations being adopted by the University President. Among them was the development of a Sexual Violence Response Protocol to allow members of the University community to effectively provide support when receiving disclosures of sexual violence and other forms of gender-based violence. The University’s response also included recruitment for the position of the Sexual Violence Response Coordinator.

Meaghan Ross joined the Office of Human Rights & Equity Services on August 17, 2015 as the University’s new Sexual Violence Response Coordinator.

In this role, Meaghan will coordinate a comprehensive survivor-centred response protocol to disclosures of sexual and gender-based violence.

She will also respond to individual disclosures of sexual, intimate relationship and family violence, and will work closely with the campus community to implement a wide-range of campus-based education and prevention initiatives.

A working group has also been struck to develop a new Sexual Violence Policy as required by the provincial government’s “It’s Never Ok” initiative, which requires all universities report publicly on incidence of sexual as well as initiatives to prevent and address sexual violence and harassment.

PERSPECTIVES ON PEACE

As an initiative of McMaster’s President, Dr. Patrick Deane, and the President of the McMaster Students Union, Teddy Saull, “Perspectives on Peace” was launched during the 2014-2015 academic year as a campaign aimed at fostering creative dialogues around global issues with an emphasis on peace and conflict resolution. It specifically focused on root causes of conflict and productive strategies towards transformation.

There are inherent complexities in bringing together different voices with unequal power and ensuring that marginalized voices are heard and validated. By sharing stories, we share an opportunity to transform our understanding, enlarge our vision of hope for the future, and challenge ourselves as we look toward transforming our worldview.

This year’s campaign featured a variety of activities consistent with the theme of engaging in scholarly discussions with those interested in advancing discourses around peace. Within a framework of scholarly programming and interdisciplinary learning opportunities, members of the campus community will be encouraged to engage with one another to consider the root causes of conflicts and productive strategies towards their resolution, in a spirit of conciliation and inclusion.
OFFICE PROGRAMS

1. HUMAN RIGHTS PROGRAM

The Human Rights Program addresses discrimination, sexual harassment and general harassment complaints. Our processes are complainant driven, confidential and available to all members of the McMaster community. As a neutral office, HRES maintains a duty of fairness to all parties involved in the complaint process and provides a safe space for disclosure.

The intake and complaint resolution processes of the Program underwent a significant revision and are now guided by the University's new policy on Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response, which took effect on July 1, 2015. Although the data presented below only includes the HRES caseload under the old and new policies, it is anticipated that HRES will have an expanded role in reporting all cases of discrimination, harassment and sexual harassment across the University system as mandated by the new Policy.

The Human Rights Program is often engaged in the informal resolution of complaints between parties with a view to resolving matters informally. In cases where matters cannot be resolved through informal processes, the matter may be referred to formal processes such as an investigation or to the University’s internal Human Rights Tribunal. Alternatively, complainants may choose to bring their concerns to the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal or other forums.

Where appropriate, HRES occasionally works in collaboration with other offices of the University to provide guidance and support to participants in broad-based dispute resolution efforts. The objective is to provide a wide variety of options to participants in resolving disputes at the informal stage, rather than proceeding with more formal mechanisms.

CASES – CONSULTATIONS AND COMPLAINTS

The Program maintains numerical data on the cases it handles each year. A case may consist of a consultation or a complaint. A consultation may involve a simple request or inquiry about procedural or substantive human rights issues, or may require a detailed analysis of a particular issue with a view to providing guidance and advice to members of the University community. A complaint may involve a verbal or written complaint regarding allegations that the University’s human rights policies have been violated.

Figure 1 provides the number of complaints and consultations that were handled through our Office. There were a total of 104 complaints and 376 consultations, resulting in a total caseload of 480 cases.

Of the 480 cases that the Program handled this year, none of them were referred to the formal complaint stage at the University’s internal Human Rights Tribunal, and only one proceeded to the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal. Only other formal complaint, which had not been previously handled by the Program, was initiated at the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal. In addition, one matter was referred for judicial review to the Ontario Divisional Court, namely, the decision of the University’s internal Human Rights Tribunal in the matter concerning the DeGroote School of Business.
Figure 1: Cases – Consultations and Complaints 2014-2015
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Cases by Ground

During the intake process, participants are asked to identify whether their concerns are the result of discrimination or harassment on the basis of one (or more) of the prohibited grounds under the University's human rights policies. These grounds include personal identity characteristics such as age, sex, religion, sexual orientation, etc. McMaster's human rights policies include a list of prohibited grounds that exceeds the protections contained in the Ontario Human Rights Code, such as language or dialect, membership in an employee group, and political affiliation.

Figure 2 illustrates how cases were categorized according to the prohibited grounds under the University's human rights policies. As the Figure shows, disability continued to be the area of concern with the highest number of cases. Complaints on the basis of this ground typically arise in the context of accessibility and accommodation in the learning environment or workplace context.

The second highest number of cases was with regard to personal harassment and/or bullying. There was also an increase in the number of matters dealing with discrimination on the basis of sex and issues of sexual harassment. A slight increase in issues concerning religion was also noted this year. (In some cases, participants reported the intersection of one or more prohibited grounds, which accounts for a greater number of grounds than cases reported.)

The Human Rights Program also provides consultation and advice on issues related to academic freedom, particularly in cases where balancing of human rights is required. There were a total of 50 cases this year that were more appropriately dealt with as academic freedom matters. For instance, individuals might raise concerns about the content of posted materials or public lectures, or may claim to be offended by behaviour that affronts their identity. Where the matter did not proceed as a complaint of discrimination or harassment, the matter was often classified as having been resolved on the basis of academic freedom.
A notable number of cases involved matters falling outside of the University’s human rights policies and were typically either resolved through informal processes or were referred to another appropriate office. It is not unusual for individuals to approach HRES for guidance on complex matters, particularly when the appropriate policy response may be unclear.

**PARTICIPANT TYPE**

The identity of participants (or their standing in the University context) is usually ascertained at the intake stage. The University’s human rights policies continue to be available to all members of the University community. Faculty and staff continue to be the highest users of the Human Rights Program, followed by graduate and undergraduate students, and other members of the community, as shown in Figure 3.

The increased number of cases arising among external participants signals greater numbers of inquiries about McMaster’s human rights initiatives and are reflective of community-building efforts to raise awareness of discrimination and harassment issues among internal and external partners.

HRES staff is often asked to provide feedback and expertise on human rights matters at other institutions, as well as on matters arising in the local Hamilton community. Although these matters may fall outside the scope of the University’s policies, matters are either responded to or referred elsewhere as appropriate.
CONSTITUENCY AREA

At the intake stage, HRES tracks the constituency area in which matters arise. As Figure 4 demonstrates, the greatest number of cases involve concerns around the academic context (40%), followed by cases that arise in the broader McMaster community. This may include visitors to campus, external observers who may disagree with programming at the University, or other stakeholders who have a vested interest in participating in the campus community.

The number of cases in McMaster’s residences has remained relatively low, although disputes in residence tend to involve complex issues around discrimination and harassment, or interpersonal disputes. Employment issues also form a sizeable number of the cases that are raised with HRES and are reflected in other areas of the Office’s work.
Case Closures

The timely and effective resolution of cases is among the measures of success of the Office. Given the high volume of cases, it is important to ensure that matters are processed and that participants are given effective options to address their matter promptly.

Through our ongoing informal resolution efforts and occasional referral to other resources, the program was able to close 432 cases during the reporting period, as shown in Figure 5. At the end of the reporting period, 22 cases remained open or unresolved, while 26 were abandoned.

While every effort is made to bring a fair resolution and conclusion to each case, there are some instances where a matter may be abandoned by participants, either because a resolution is not possible or because participants have left the University. In some cases, participants may lose contact with HRES staff or may pursue their matter elsewhere without advising the Office.

As Figure 5 demonstrates, the Office has been able to successfully resolve and/or close matters during the 2014-2015 reporting year at a rate of 90%.
“Resolved” cases refers to complaints that have been resolved (i.e. informal resolution efforts were successful) or a consultation has been responded to.

“Abandoned” matters are cases that were withdrawn, or situations where participants elected to pursue an alternative recourse outside of HRES.

“Unresolved” cases are matters that are pending or ongoing, or where informal resolution efforts have not been successful. When the latter occurs, complainants are advised of such and made aware of the alternate recourses available to them, including formal resolution.

**FORMAL ADJUDICATION (TRIBUNALS)**

The ongoing objective of the Human Rights Program is to attempt to resolve matters informally through a variety of informal resolution processes and to provide effective, timely, and restorative outcomes in order to ensure that a safe learning and working environment exists for everyone at the University.

Although most participants prefer to attempt informal resolution to resolve their issues, matters are occasionally referred to formal adjudication either to the University’s internal Human Rights Tribunal or to the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal.

During the 2014-2015 reporting year, two matters proceeded to formal adjudication. In both matters, individual students brought applications to the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal alleging discrimination (one on the basis of disability, and the other on the basis of national or ethnic origin). Only one of the matters had previously been processed through HRES. There were no cases this year that were heard before the University’s internal Human Rights Tribunal.
Figure 6: Formal Adjudication (Tribunals) 2014-2015
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2. **EQUITY SERVICES PROGRAM**

The Equity Services Program (ESP) partners with members of the University community to advance a culture of accessibility, equity and human rights, through the provision of education including Positive Space training, new member orientation anti-oppression workshops and special events. ESP also researches "promising practices" that are informed by equity-seeking groups. We then share them with campus members who strive to organize accessible and inclusive campus events.

![Diagram of Equity Consultations, Workshops, and Workshop Participants]

**EQUITY CONSULTATIONS**

Equity consultations may involve one meeting or a series of meetings spread over several months. They may be related to food and faith, prayer space or discussions about how to plan and deliver inclusive course curricula that reflects the diverse student body. Equity consultations may also involve discussions with student activists about reproductive choice, issues in the Middle East, queer and trans rights and inclusion, violence against women and gender-based violence, student sanctions and concerns related to reducing barriers to the full participation of historically marginalized individuals and groups.

**WORKSHOPS**

ESP delivers a range of workshops covering topics as diverse as Human Rights 101, Positive Space, Trans 101, Anti-Oppression Training, Inclusive Leadership in a Diverse Context and Sexual Harassment: Know The Line, and more.

**VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN/GENDER BASED VIOLENCE**

In April 2012, the Sexual Assault Centre (Hamilton & Area) (SACHA) and the YWCA Hamilton initiated a project at McMaster University focused on engaging students in the prevention of violence against young women on campus. Funded by Status of Women Canada, this work was guided by an on-campus Advisory Committee consisting of students, staff and faculty representation from diverse areas of campus life.

The project gathered information and developed an analysis and many strategies for institutional and cultural changes aimed at preventing violence against young women.
In June 2014, the “It’s Time” Project presented eight recommendations to McMaster University, three of which Mac moved quickly to implement:

**Recommendation #1:** The establishment of the Violence Against Women Working Group of the President’s Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community. McMaster University responded by establishing PACBIC’s Violence Against Women/Gender-Based Violence Working Group.

**Recommendation #3**
The appointment of a Sexual, Domestic, and Family Violence Response Coordinator. Mac responded by hiring Meaghan Ross into the new role as Sexual Violence Response Coordinator housed in the Office of Human Rights & Equity Services.

**Recommendation #8**
The initiation of an annual, campus-wide education and awareness campaign engaging all aspects of the McMaster community on issues of violence against women and gender based violence. Mac responded by supporting efforts to launch a #Consent campaign during Welcome Week and building education and training into Meaghan Ross’s new job description. In fulfilling this responsibility, Meaghan will work closely with feminist anti-racist service providers, on and off campus.

Disclosures (August 17 - August 31) 
2

Consultations (August 17 - August 31) 
8

2014-2015
Events

Throughout the year, ESP worked closely with a wide range of partners to organize events to commemorate important dates or to bring campus and community members together in celebration and conversation.

City Hall & the Struggle Against Racism: Possibilities and Opportunities.

On November 10, 2014 Council Chambers was transformed into a site of political discussion as local politicians, academics, community organizers and activists converged to debate if and how City Hall could be engaged in the ongoing struggle against racism. To a packed house, participants engaged in lively and relevant debate and discussion following Hamilton City Hall's decision to defer an anti-racism resource centre pilot project. ESP worked with partners to organize and host this important event on campus.

All That Glitters Jewellery and Handbag Sale

Students from the Gender Studies & Feminist Research Program, School of Social Work, the Health Aging and Society Association and the McMaster Campus Ministries Council worked alongside the Anti-Violence Network to gather, clean, arrange and sell donated jewellery and handbags to raise over $1600 to benefit the local Native Women's Centre and Atzin Mexico - a local women's cooperative.

National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women

This year marked the 25th Anniversary of the tragic events that occurred on December 6, 1989 at École Polytechnique in Montreal. During the event that has come to be known as the "Montreal Massacre", 14 young women in the Faculty of Engineering were murdered. In commemoration, the Government of Canada responded to calls to introduce the National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women. More and more, the day also invites community members to remember and take action on behalf of Indigenous women who have either gone missing or have been murdered in Canada. This year, McMaster University staff, students and faculty members were engaged in discussion about the complexities of calling for a national inquiry on missing and murdered Indigenous women - whose numbers continue to grow dramatically and alarmingly.
We Should Know Each Other 2 – Family Ties

Vivek Shraya and Casey Mecija presented their highly acclaimed short films about being queer diasporic people of colour, and the complexities of negotiating parent-child relationships. Feedback was extremely positive and the event provided the opportunity to strengthen ties with many campus offices and student groups including: School of Graduate Studies, MSU Women & Gender Equity Network and the MSU Queer Student Community Centre. The event was made possible with financial contributions from many groups. The importance of such highly-visible events for campus members who identify as LGBTQ+ and MOGAI is immeasurable.

Canadian Association for the Prevention of Discrimination & Harassment in Higher Education (CAPDHHE)

Perhaps this year more than others, HRES team members shared their expertise and analysis with colleagues across the country at the CAPDHHE 2015 Conference held May 20 - 22 in Toronto.

- Director, Milé Komlen spoke on an "Employment Equity: Strategies for Action" panel.
- Complaint Resolution & Equity Specialist, Glenn Welsh, co-presented a "What's Next For Positive Space" workshop.
- Senior Program Manager, Vilma Rossi, co-facilitated an open discussion on "Navigating Student Activism on the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict" on university campuses

HRES's Vilma Rossi (left of centre) alongside CAPDHHE colleagues and keynote speaker, Angela Davis
Accommodating Religious, Indigenous and Spiritual Observances

Dr. Remi Warner, Senior Policy Analyst with the Ontario Human Rights Commission was invited to speak on the Principles and Practicalities of Religious Accommodation on Wednesday, April 29th, 2015, in order to draw attention to the work of the Religious Indigenous Spiritual Observance Policy Development Committee and to begin the process of education with regard to religious, Indigenous and spiritual observances at Mac.

GOT CONSENT!

For the past year, ESP and the Student Wellness Centre led the development of an annual, campus wide Education and Awareness Campaign intended to engage the McMaster community on issues of violence against women and gender-based violence. With much appreciated support from the Anti-Violence Network, the Women and Gender Equity Network, the Student Health and Education Centre and many interested students, the first component of the campaign launched as McMaster welcomed the first year class during Welcome Week with #Consent buttons, banners and brightly coloured posters distributed across campus.
3. ACCESSIBILITY PROGRAM (ACCESSMAC)

In May 2015, HRES welcomed back Raihanna Hirji-Khalfan, Accessibility Specialist, from parental leave and said thank you to Ayshia Musleh for her dedication and hard work while Raihanna was away.

In the summer of 2015, the Accessibility Program was rebranded to AccessMAC, forming deliberate and strategic partnerships with faculty, staff and students in order to create and maintain a culture of accessibility and inclusion on campus. Its mandate includes:

- Ensuring that the University is meeting its compliance obligations under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA).
- Advising and working collaboratively to create accessible and inclusive programs, services, classrooms and workplaces.
- Providing workshops and training opportunities on accessibility, the duty to accommodate, McMaster University’s Accessibility Policy and the AODA.

As part of its ongoing work to provide resources on accessibility, AccessMAC updated the Accessibility Checklist, which is a tool to assist event organizers plan accessible events and programs at McMaster.
ACCESSIBILITY CONSULTATIONS

Accessibility consultations continue to be sought out by faculty, staff and student leaders on a range of accessibility matters including compliance with the AODA, 2005.

ACCESSIBILITY TRAINING

The majority of the mandatory AODA Customer Service Training is undertaken online by individual users; however, there remains a significant amount of administrative work involved as indicated by the increasing number of AODA online training inquiries. A process for revising the module is currently being discussed at the McMaster Accessibility Council (MAC), which should reduce the administrative support required for this training.
EVENTS

MENTAL HEALTH AND THE IMPACT OF COLONIALISM

This year, in commemoration of the UN International Day of Persons with Disabilities, the Office of Human Rights and Equity Services’ Accessibility Program hosted a public lecture delivered by Amell Joseph, Assistant Professor in McMaster’s School of Social Work. Joseph’s lecture, entitled “Violent Interventions: Neo-colonization in contemporary forensic mental health and the (re)production of difference,” explored the impact and legacy of colonial history on institutions such as the mental health system.

The lecture was part of the Accessibility Program’s ongoing commitment to expanding the conversation around disability and to explore and create a platform for more complex and intersectional conversations around the experiences of persons with disabilities in Canada.

DISABILITY JUSTICE AND PEACE

On March 19, 2015, the Accessibility Program partnered with PACBIC, MAC, OPIRG and others to bring in Korean-American Disability Justice Activist, Mia Mingus, for a lecture and panel discussion.

Lecture: Disability activists are forwarding a political framework through which disability and ableism can be understood and connected to other forms of oppression and violence. In this lecture, Mingus discussed the meaning of Disability Justice, the necessity of an intersectional analysis and what solidarity is in this ever-evolving practice we call “liberation.”

Panel: Many grassroots activists with disabilities have moved beyond individualized rights models to a disability justice movement that recognizes the interconnectedness and interdependence of all people, with or without disabilities, at the intersections of privilege and oppression. The panel explored self-determination in terms of community building and disability culture and considered how this changing discourse reimagines the experiences of students with disabilities in Western contexts.
CONCLUSION

HRES continues to serve a crucial function to the University community in helping to address and resolve human rights matters, as well as advancing a welcoming and inclusive community through education and awareness initiatives. Accessibility continues to be a prime focus as the University community strives to remove barriers to participation for persons with disabilities.

The adoption of several new policy instruments have helped to guide the mandate and work of HRES, with senior leadership and different offices sharing greater responsibility for addressing human rights concerns. With these programs and processes in place, it is anticipated that the University will take a more holistic approach to recognizing that discrimination and harassment affect everybody.

HRES continues to be involved in fostering campus-wide dialogues on global concerns through the Presidents’ “Perspectives on Peace” initiative, which allows members of the campus community to engage in scholarly discourse on issues of global concern with a view to achieving peace and conflict transformation. These efforts will help shape the campus climate and position McMaster University as an institution truly committed to peace.

With the ongoing collaborative partnerships that HRES engages in among many University constituencies, the work of building an inclusive community with a shared purpose continues. The commitment to building a truly inclusive campus is demonstrated by the active participation of the President’s Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community, where there is a strong passion among campus members for advancing diversity and inclusion at McMaster.
At its meetings on November 17th, December 8th and via e-ballot on November 23rd, 2015, Graduate Council approved the following for recommendation to Senate:

For Approval:

1. **New Program Proposal – M.Sc. in Speech Language Pathology** (attachment)
   Speech Language Pathologists are health professionals who have the skills to treat communication and swallowing disorders. The standard for entry-level practice in this profession is a course-based program. The proposed M.Sc. in Speech Language Pathology is similar in structure to other programs within the School of Rehabilitation Sciences. The new program aligns with McMaster’s Strategic Mandate Agreement in areas of both growth and strength. The program will be relatively small; maximum enrollment will be 32 students. The curriculum involves problem-based learning, which is unique in North America, and is two years in length. A lot of demand is expected for the proposed program as speech language pathology programs are extremely popular across the country. In developing the proposal they engaged in broad consultation with the clinical community. The proposed program launch is September 2017.

2. **Faculty of Business**
   **Master of Business Administration**
   **Change to Specializations**
   The program proposed eliminating two of the specializations (Information Systems and Management of Innovation & New Technology) as an option in the M.B.A. program, in part due to recommendations made from the IQAP review of the program and in part due to the challenges of administering the number of specializations the program currently offers. Additionally, many students struggle to complete the requirements of some specializations due to the infrequency with which second year courses are offered and some classes being cancelled due to small enrollments.

   **Master of Finance**
   **Addition of 16 Month Program Option**
   The program proposed the addition of a 16 month program option where students take courses in the fall and winter terms with a break for the summer term in order to obtain work experience.
Students utilizing this option would come back to finish their coursework in the fall term of the following academic year. The rationale for this change is that it would be beneficial to Master of Finance students (particularly those with no prior finance-related background) to gain some work experience before they graduate. The insight gained and networks developed from the work will enhance the learning experience of students in their final term.

3. Faculty of Engineering
   Engineering Physics
   Accelerated Option – M.A.Sc.
   The program proposed an Accelerated Option to be available to students currently enrolled at McMaster as undergraduate students in the Engineering Physics Department (with an overall average of at least B at the time they apply for the option) whereby the M.A.Sc. degree may be completed in 12-16 months of full-time study. Application for entry into the Accelerated Option would occur in the final year of undergraduate studies. The option would require students to complete at least one term of their thesis related project with a supervisor from the department prior to completion of their undergraduate degree. A 600-level course offered by the department is required under the Accelerated Option in the final undergraduate year for advanced graduate credit.

   Advanced Credit Option – M.A.Sc. & M.Eng
   The proposed option would allow an M.A.Sc. student (not allowed to be used in conjunction with the above-noted Accelerated Option) or M.Eng. student to count one (M.A.Sc.) or two (M.Eng.) 600 level courses taken during their final undergraduate year to could toward their Masters degree requirements.

4. Faculty of Science
   Computational Science and Engineering
   Cancellation of Course-Based M.Sc. and M.Eng Degrees
   The programs that the School proposed cancelling have been inactive for a number of years due to a lack of uptake. This change is also proposed to address recommendations made during the IQAP review of the program.

   Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour
   New Stream – Research and Clinical Training (Ph.D.)
   The program proposed a new stream in their Ph.D. program which is intended to train clinician-scientists and speaks to a program goal identified in their most recent program review. The course of study will include full-time clinical placements. Following completion of this Ph.D. stream it is expected that learners will have met the requirements for licensing in psychology in Ontario. Previously the program has had students complete additional courses at other universities in order to fill the clinical skills requirement for licensing in Ontario as an add-on to their work at McMaster. The intent with the new stream is to formalize this option and make it possible for students to complete all necessary requirements at McMaster.
For Information:

5. Faculty of Engineering
   Electrical and Computer Engineering
   Change to Comprehensive Exam Procedure
   The proposed changes arose in part as a result of the program’s most recent IQAP review. The existing procedure for the comprehensive examination in the Department has been in place for more than 30 years. It provided a highly effective method for examining the breadth of a student’s knowledge but was less effective in examining the student’s ability to integrate ideas. The proposed change to the procedure is designed to enable the program to examine the student’s ability to integrate ideas while maintaining aspects of effective procedures for examining the breadth of a student’s knowledge. The new format will involve an oral examination on two graduate courses and a research project consisting of a report and presentation on a specific problem involving the integration of ideas related to (but not the same as the student’s thesis topic) specified by the examination committee.

   Engineering Physics
   Change to Course Requirements – M.A.Sc. and M.Eng
   The Department proposed allowing M.A.Sc. students to take one non-technical course at the 600- or 700-level among their three required half-courses, and M.Eng. students to take one non-technical course at the 600- or 700-level among their four required half-courses with approval of the Associate Chair (Graduate).

   Change to Course Requirements – Ph.D.
   In part to assist with declining enrollment and time-to-completion issues (as identified in the program’s IQAP review) the program proposed reducing the course requirements for a student entering the Ph.D. program from directly from a Baccalaureate degree or transferring into the Ph.D. program without being required to complete the Master’s degree will be required to take a total of two half-courses at the 700-level rather than the six previously required.

   Addition of Thesis Proposal Requirement – Ph.D.
   The program proposed the introduction of a thesis proposal, to be introduced into a supervisory committee meeting within one year of entry into the Ph.D. The thesis proposal will encourage the early planning of research that will be a substantial contribution to knowledge and is expected to help with a student’s career planning as well as time-to-completion.

   Removal of Part II of Comprehensive Exam
   The program proposed streamlining its Comprehensive Exam requirements by eliminating Part II. Part II previously focused on the candidate’s research topic – this will now be covered by the addition of the thesis proposal requirement.

6. Faculty of Science
   Computational Science and Engineering
   Changes in Course Requirements M.A.Sc. and M.Sc.
   The program cancelled one of their core courses and has adjusted their course requirements accordingly. Students will now have the option two take one of two advanced courses (in place of
the cancelled course) which will allow them to broaden their area of expertise in relevant and rapidly evolving areas.

The program also proposed an 'escape clause' in their program requirements which would allow a student who can demonstrate adequate training to replace a core course with a different (more advanced) course. This solution will be applied in exceptional cases only and the decision will be made by the Program Director after consulting with the student's supervisor.
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1.1 PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs) are autonomous rehabilitation health professionals with specialized knowledge, skills, and clinical training in the prevention, screening, identification, assessment, and management of congenital and acquired communication and swallowing disorders (http://sac-oac.ca/public/what-do-speech-language-pathologists-do). Service is provided to individuals of all ages in a variety of health care, education, and private settings. SLPs are in demand due to changing demographics, in particular due to increased needs among children and seniors (http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/gc/job_futures/statistics/3141.shtml). In children, an increased awareness of the importance of communication to positive academic, social, and vocational outcomes has fostered a rise in demand for SLPs in both health and education sectors. In seniors, a rise in life expectancy has meant an increased need to manage speech, language, and swallowing problems in older adults that are associated with aphasia, brain injury and other neurological insults. Indeed, the Canadian Occupational Projection system indicates that there is likely to be a shortage of SLPs between 2013 - 2022 (http://occupations.esdc.gc.ca) and SLPs are listed on Canada’s Department of Citizenship and Immigration website as an eligible occupation in the Federal Skilled Worker Program and express entry to Canada (http://www.immigration.ca/en/fast-track-high-demand-occupations.html).

With respect to professional training, SLPs in Canada are educated through professional course-based Master’s programs. A Speech-Language Pathology Master’s Program within the School of Rehabilitation Sciences (SRS) at McMaster University will complement the existing professional rehabilitation programs in Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy and add to the interprofessional mix of health care disciplines within the Faculty of Health Sciences. The SRS is internationally renowned for its innovative educational programs. With its problem-based learning curriculum, the proposed SLP Program will be unique within Canada.

Specifically, the SLP Program will consist of five Units of full-time study disbursed over 24-months. Units 1 and 2 will focus on the core fundamental knowledge and skills required for clinical practice. Units II through V will gradually introduce students to increasingly complex clinical content while following a lifespan approach. Each unit will consist of an academic component followed by an integrated, community-based practicum. Each academic unit will consist of four integrated courses: 1) a problem-based tutorial course; 2) a clinical and professional skills course; 3) a seminar course; and 4) In Units I – III a course focused on foundational concepts and knowledge in SLP; In Units IV – V, an evidence-based practice course focused on developing life-long skills needed to seek out, critically appraise, and integrate research knowledge into client/patient management. Consistent with a problem-based learning approach, self-directed learning will be supported throughout the program via online e-learning resources that will be provided to supplement and reinforce knowledge and skills. Across the entire program, there will be a total of 29 full-time clinical practicum weeks. Students will be provided with a 2-week practicum in Unit 1, a 5-week practicum following Unit 2, a 6-week practicum following Unit 3, a 6-week practicum following Unit 4 and a final 10-week practicum following Unit 5.
1.2 PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND CONSULTATION PROCESS

A Community Advisory Committee (CAC) consisting of SLP leaders within the Hamilton area was established during the initial stages of program development. At its inaugural meeting, the CAC generated a vision of the ideal qualities and attributes of speech-language pathologists of the future. This vision had an important role in guiding the program's curriculum development. The CAC will continue to meet during the development of the program and beyond as a means of advising the program and building partnerships with the community. In addition to consultation with our CAC, we have engaged the Hamilton Regional Speech and Language Pathology and Audiology Council (HRSLAC) to share information about the proposed SLP program, solicit further community input, and to assess local capacity for clinical practica. Great enthusiasm was expressed regarding the support available offered by the SRS to support the clinical preceptor role. Letters on behalf of our clinical community members are appended to the document. Information gleaned from the initial meeting of the HRSLAC was used to further inform our program proposal.

In addition to building relationships within the local SLP community, our proposal preparation also has involved forging new relationships between the Cognitive Science of Language program in the Faculty of Humanities and the School of Rehabilitation Science in the Faculty of Health Sciences. From the outset, the Associate Dean of Humanities and the Chair of the Cognitive Science of Language program have been involved in discussing the proposal for a new SLP Program and the valued opportunities that this would present to both Faculties. The availability of a SLP Program at McMaster will attract additional students to the Cognitive Science of Language program where there is existing capacity for expansion. While housed and funded within the SRS, the SLP Program allows the development of synergies in research and teaching areas within Humanities that complement interests in the School of Rehabilitation Science related to clinical linguistics, childhood disability, aging, and brain injury including concussion.

Specifically, we expect that existing faculty in the Department of Linguistics and Languages, who currently support Master’s and Doctoral students in the Cognitive Science of Language program, would value the opportunity to support students with an SLP background who wish to pursue a research degree. Similarly, the addition of SLP faculty in the SRS would provide support to the Cognitive Science of Language graduate programs. The SRS currently has a small number of SLPs enrolled in its PhD Program in Rehabilitation Sciences; however, with enhanced collaboration between the SRS and the Cognitive Science of Language program, it is anticipated that additional students would be attracted to both of these programs. Thus, we see the SLP Program as an exciting opportunity to build capacity across Faculties in the University. Letters of support are included in Appendix I.

Given that the SLP Program will require resources from several programs and departments, we have begun to consult with members of the McMaster community who are currently involved in supporting health professional students. Consultations with Dr. Bruce Wainman, the Director of the Educational Program in Anatomy, have identified the need for additional anatomical specimens to support the learning needs of the SLP students (letter of support in appendix I). Much of the anatomy and other basic science foundational content will be delivered through online learning modules, which will require time to initially develop; however these will serve as resources for future classes. These costs have been included in the development budget under sessional costs. The Health
Sciences Library is doing an assessment of existing holdings. The librarian has indicated that the library will be able to meet the needs of the SLP students. There are some resources that will need to be purchased initially and the costs have been included in the development budget.

With respect to existing SLP programs, the Associate Dean of the SRS has contacted the Chairs of all SLP Programs in Ontario to inform them of McMaster's intent to develop a new program. We are mindful of the need to share clinical resources in an equitable way that does not burden the clinical community and have been transparent about our intent from the outset. We invited programs to share their timetables for clinical practica as well as any affiliations and use of clinical sites within Hamilton so that we can consider this in our curriculum development.

To ensure that the program will meet professional accreditation standards and that graduates will meet standards for speech-language pathology professional practice in Ontario, we consulted with staff of the College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario (CASLPO), the Council for Accreditation of University Programs in Speech-Language Pathology (CACUP), and Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Canada (SAC).

1.3 CONSISTENCY WITH MCMaster’S MISSION AND ACADEMIC PLAN

i. McMaster's Strategic Mandate Agreement

Existing Strengths

- Medical education and research
- Health and society
- Engineering and sustainability
- Science and discovery
- Digital economy
- Materials and manufacturing — from technology to policy
- Business and economics
- Policy and ethics in a globalized world
- Human behaviour, culture, and society
- The Arts and Creative Expression

The MSc program aligns strongly with McMaster's mission and academic plan and areas of existing strength. The program prepares students for a professional career in clinical speech-language pathology, which addresses the first two areas of existing strength in the Strategic Mandate Agreement (i.e., medical education and research; health and society). In addition, the focus is consistent with the University's goal to provide increased emphasis on professional and practice-focused graduate degrees that prepare graduates for professional licensure and to assume clinical positions that meet societal needs. Students participate and collaborate in an ongoing research project under the supervision of a faculty member or clinician, which addresses the university's strengths in science and discovery. Speech-language pathologists specialize in the study of human communication in the social and cultural contexts in which it occurs, thereby addressing institutional strengths in human behaviour, culture, and society.
Priorities for Growth

- Health Sciences and the broad determinants of health
- Fostering robust societies
- Business and Economics
- Science and Engineering
- Communications and Culture

With respect to priorities for areas of growth as outlined in McMaster’s SMA, a new professional Master’s program in SLP will contribute to institutional capacity in the health sciences and the broad determinants of health. The SLP Program incorporating McMaster’s signature pedagogies in the health sciences will be unique within Canada and one of a handful of problem-based learning programs internationally. The curriculum aims to foster self-directed learners who are flexible and able to collaborate with diverse clients and stakeholders, skills which are required in today’s rapidly changing health and social service environments. The interprofessional culture within the Faculty of Health Sciences, in which students learn how to collaborate and learn with other health professional students, will be enhanced through the inclusion of the SLP Program.

Additionally, the SLP Program will contribute to enhancing robust societies. SLPs are in demand due to changing demographics; in particular, there are increased needs among children and seniors. In children, an increased awareness of the importance of being able to communicate has fostered a rise in demand for SLPs in both health and education sectors. With the rise in life expectancy, there is an increased demand to manage speech and language problems associated with aphasia, brain injury and other neurological insults. There also is a growing need for SLPs who are prepared to work with culturally and linguistically diverse populations, which is particularly important and relevant given the high immigrant population in Hamilton and Ontario.

Finally, the SLP program is aligned with the priority area of “Communications and Culture” as graduates will be health professionals who specialize in communication. An exciting area for development relates to a focus on SLPs who are prepared to work with culturally and linguistically diverse populations, especially with respect to being able to distinguish normal variation in language acquisition associated with bi- and multi-lingualism from problems that would indicate the presence of language delay and/or disorder. The collective expertise between faculty in the Department of Linguistics and Languages and those in the School of Rehabilitation Science will promote capacity building in this new area of study.

ii. McMaster’s Current Priorities

Alignment with Forward with Integrity

a) The Student Experience
b) Community Engagement
c) Research
d) Internationalization

The new SLP Program aligns well with the vision for McMaster University as encompassed by Forward with Integrity (FWI).
The Student Experience

Interdisciplinary and interprofessional education are core to the mission of the SRS and FHS. Health professionals must be proficient in collaboration and team skills to succeed in the workplace; therefore, development of these skills will be embedded in both academic and community settings. Students will learn with, from, and about each other through learning activities with students in the SRS’s PT and OT programs as well as via activities with other professional programs within the Faculty of Health Sciences. The value of collaboration will be reinforced and role modeled through the faculty complement who will be from a variety of disciplines and health care professions. As noted previously, the new SLP Program also will have a unique partnership with faculty in the Humanities’ Department of Linguistics and Languages, which will further support the program’s interdisciplinary.

The proposed SLP program also builds upon institutional strengths in self-directed and experiential learning. McMaster University is recognized internationally for its signature pedagogies and educational innovation. The SLP Program will be the only Canadian program with a PBL curriculum and one of a handful of programs internationally. Experiential learning in the form of integrated community-based practica is an integral and key component of the program’s curriculum. Students will be introduced to clinical practice in the first unit of study with subsequent community-based-experiences integrated throughout the curriculum. Similar to the other professional programs within the SRS, there will be one teaching-stream faculty member who will be hired to serve as the Director of Clinical Education. He or she will be responsible for building partnerships with clinicians and clinical sites throughout the community as well as facilitating student learning within the clinical education component of the curriculum.

Community Engagement

The SRS encompasses community engagement throughout its teaching and research initiatives. These values will be similarly integrated in the SLP Program. Both the academic and experiential components of the curriculum will engage many community partners. Examples include incorporating “patient educators” in teaching, providing clinical placements through our Mach2ope community clinic, supporting clinicians to serve as tutors in problem-based learning tutorials, inviting clinicians to contribute clinical “dilemmas” to an evidence-based practice seminar, or involving the clinical community in conducting multiple mini-interviews as part of the admissions process. Community engagement also is evident in our establishment of a Community Advisory Committee and engagement of the local SLP community.

Research

The SRS is known internationally for its research on childhood disability through the CanChild Center for Childhood Disability Research and has increasingly developed research expertise in older adults. Research areas related to SLP will complement those within the SRS and add to the interdisciplinary richness to existing research in the School.

The SLP program also provides a foundation on which to forge new and unique research relationships between the School of Rehabilitation Science and the Department of Linguistics and Languages. Associate faculty appointments between the SRS and Humanities will allow for the development of synergies in research areas within.
Humanities that complement interests in the School of Rehabilitation Science related to childhood disability, aging, and brain injury, including concussion. We currently have SLP students in our doctoral program in Rehabilitation Sciences and anticipate growth in this area and increased interaction between faculty in the SRS and the Department of Linguistics and Languages.

Internationalization

Students will be exposed to concepts of internationalization through their integrated community-based practical experiences throughout their program of study. Hamilton provides a rich multicultural context for learners in which students will need to collaborate with clients with different cultures and languages. Indeed, there is a growing need for SLPs who are prepared to work with culturally and linguistically diverse populations, especially with respect to being able to distinguish normal variation in language acquisition associated with bi- and multi-lingualism from problems that would indicate the presence of language delay and/or disorder (http://www.asha.org/policy/KS2004-00215/). Two faculty members within McMaster’s Department of Linguistics and Languages currently specialize in this very area of inquiry (Dr. Anna Moro and Dr. Magda Stroinska), which further highlights the potential synergies and enhanced student experience that will be obtained by developing a new SLP program that brings together health sciences with the humanities.

1.4 PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

The following statements reflect the competencies with which students from the MSc program will graduate. The successful MSc graduate:

a. Has a systematic understanding of human communication and its disorders across the lifespan, including key theoretical approaches and concepts that inform our understanding of human communication in health and disease.
b. Understands the influence of health, economic, educational, social, and cultural factors on communication across the lifespan and in health and disease.
c. Demonstrates knowledge of and critically evaluates published qualitative and quantitative research, and identifies gaps in knowledge and research methods to address those gaps.
d. Applies knowledge, critical thinking, and problem solving skills to solve complex clinical problems.
e. Engages in evidence-informed practice to provide efficient and effective client and patient care.
f. Communicates effectively with patients, families, other health providers, community organization, and colleagues; as a leading member of a team, collaborator, advocate, and representative of the profession.
g. Understands the limitations of his or her own knowledge and recognizes the value of other perspectives, methods, and disciplines.
h. Is a self-directed learner and reflective practitioner: identifies areas for personal growth in knowledge and skills and develops plans to achieve that growth.
i. Can work autonomously and collaboratively across practice settings. Is flexible and adaptable in changing healthcare contexts.
j. Meets professional standards for integrity and ethical conduct.
### 1.5 CONSISTENCY WITH DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GRADUATE DLEs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Limits of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy and Professional Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below illustrates the alignment of our Program Learning Outcomes with the Graduate Degree Level Expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs)</th>
<th>MASTER'S DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS (DLEs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY THE END OF THE PROGRAM, STUDENTS GRADUATING WITH A MASTERS DEGREE WILL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>FOR EACH PLO, IDENTIFY WHICH DLE(s) IT ALIGNS WITH BELOW.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a systematic understanding of human communication and its disorders across the lifespan, including key theoretical approaches and concepts that inform our understanding of human communication in health and disease.</td>
<td>Depth and Breadth of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the influence of health, economic, educational, social, and cultural factors on communication across the lifespan and in health and disease.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of and critically evaluate published qualitative and quantitative research, and identify gaps in knowledge and research methods to address those gaps.</td>
<td>Research and Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge, critical thinking, and problem solving skills to solve complex clinical problems.</td>
<td>Application of Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in evidence-informed practice to provide efficient and effective client and patient care.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the knowledge and skills to work autonomously and collaboratively across practice settings.</td>
<td>Autonomy and Professional Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be flexible and adaptable in changing healthcare contexts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet professional standards for integrity and ethical conduct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 DEMAND FOR PROGRAM

i. Evidence of Societal/Labour Market Need

Speech-language pathologists (SLPs) are health professionals that are in demand due to changing demographics; in particular, there is an increased need for SLP services among children and seniors. In children, the ability to communicate is increasingly recognized as essential to positive outcomes at home, at school, and in the community. For example, Ontario has recently unveiled a new “Special Needs Strategy” in which the Ministries of Children and Youth Services, Community and Social Services, Education, and Health and Long-Term Care are working across sectors to improve the delivery of rehabilitation services, including speech-language therapy, to children with special needs from birth to the end of their schooling. With the launch of this new strategy, health professionals are being challenged to seek out new, community-based approaches to providing pediatric services and to more effectively collaborate with each other and with families. Similar initiatives have been launched elsewhere in Canada, which suggests a strong need for graduates who have the characteristics and qualities outlined in the Proposed Learning Objectives (see Section 1.4). Our Letter of Support from the Ontario Ministry of Education further substantiates this need (included in appendix i).

In addition to new trends in service delivery for children with speech and language needs, there is a growing need for clinical services at the other end of the age spectrum. The Canadian population is aging. According to statistics from Employment and Social Development Canada, the median age of Canadians has increased by more than 10 years in the past four decades. Seniors are the fastest-growing age group in Canada, and the number of adults over age 65 is expected to double in the next 25 years. With longer life comes a higher risk for health problems that can affect communication, including dementia and stroke. Aging also presents new challenges for individuals with developmental disorders - such as cerebral palsy - and those with neurological injuries acquired earlier in life. Adults are not only living longer, they are more engaged in their communities and more likely to be working than ever in our history. These factors have resulted in a growing demand for SLPs with knowledge and skills needed to work with older adults.

At present, the province of Ontario has rated the employment prospects for SLPs as “average” relative to other occupations through to the end of 2017 (https://www.app.tcu.gov.on.ca/eng/labourmarket/gi/Profile.asp?NOC_CD=3141). This means that positions may be more difficult to find over the next two years and wage growth has slowed relative to past growth; that being said, this rating reflects projections to 2017 and includes only province of Ontario. Job prospects for SLPs across Canada are quite positive. For example, SLPs are eligible for express entry to Canada via the Federal Skilled Worker Program and the Canadian Occupational Projection system indicates that there is likely to be a shortage of SLPs between 2013 and 2022. Over the 2013 - 2022 time frame, the number of job openings for Therapy and Assessment Professionals, which includes SLPs, is expected to keep pace with the number of job seekers. Job openings are projected to arise primarily from expansion demand. As the Canadian population ages, the demand for health services and, consequently, the need for health care professionals is expected to increase. The average annual growth rate for the SLP profession in Canada is expected to be 4.9% between 2013 and 2017. In keeping with other SLP programs across the country, we have engaged the Council for
Accreditation of Canadian University Programs in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology to ensure that SLP program will meet the standards for national accreditation, thus ensuring that our graduates are eligible for employment in Ontario and across Canada (see section 1.2 for details). One metric of employment is a review of popular job websites. A recent review of job advertisements from salient websites is summarized below.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Number of Jobs Posted on SAC ~ September 25th</th>
<th>Number of Jobs Posted on indeed.com ~ September 25th</th>
<th>Number of Jobs Posted on Workopolis.com ~ September 25th</th>
<th>Number of Jobs Posted on Service Canada ~ September 29th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ii. Evidence of Student Demand**

SLPs are rehabilitation professionals that have roots in both humanities and health sciences. A new Master's in SLP Program within the School of Rehabilitation Science at McMaster will provide an opportunity to form a unique partnership with Humanities in the Department of Linguistics and Languages. Currently, the Cognitive Science of Language Program is a "feeder" undergraduate program to SLP Programs across Canada. The
availability of a SLP Program at McMaster will attract additional students to the Cognitive Science of Language Program and there is capacity for expansion. Students graduating from this program will provide a robust applicant pool to the new SLP program. Faculty in the Department of Linguistics and Languages have cultivated a community of SLP clinicians who currently support these undergraduate students and are eager to support a health professional program through providing clinical placements.

A survey of the Cognitive Science of Language students at McMaster was conducted to gauge the interest in a SLP program at McMaster. The results of the survey have been included below. Of the students who responded as ‘No’ or ‘Undecided’ to a question of whether they would apply to a SLP program at McMaster, a large number indicated that they were uncertain about pursuing a career in SLP as their reason for not.

**Cognitive Science of Language Student Survey**

*Are you considering a career as a Speech Language Pathologist?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>392</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Would you apply to a SLP program at McMaster?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>367</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs in Speech Language Pathology are in high demand in Ontario. The following table provides the application numbers to program in Ontario from the Ontario Rehabilitation Sciences Programs Application Service from 2010 to 2014.
iii. Justifiable Duplication

There are many unique features of the proposed program. Building on our international reputation and expertise in innovative rehabilitation sciences curricula, the SLP program at McMaster would be the only problem-based program in North America, which is a highly unique feature of our proposed program that is considered of value to the local community and to the province. The Hamilton Regional Speech and Language Pathology and Audiology Council (HRSLAC) endorses the Program’s focus on the need for graduates who are flexible and able to respond to the rapidly changing health and education environments. Additionally, development of management and business acumen through the “Professional Transitions” focus in the final unit of study will prepare students for private practice and emerging clinical roles. Our linkages with Humanities will support the graduation of SLPs who are prepared to work with culturally and linguistically diverse populations, especially with respect to being able to distinguish normal variation in language acquisition associated with bi- and multilingualism from problems that would indicate the presence of language delay and/or disorder. This skill is particularly important and relevant to the high immigration population in Hamilton and Ontario.

In Canada, SLPs are educated through professional, course-based Master’s level graduate programs. There are 10 universities in the country that offer graduate degrees in speech-language pathology: 4 of those programs are in Ontario (Western University, University of Toronto, University of Ottawa, and Laurentian University) and 2 of these are Francophone programs (University of Ottawa and Laurentian University). Admissions are very competitive with many more applications than available spots. In 2014, 816 applicants applied for 110 positions in three programs in Ontario through the Ontario Rehabilitation Sciences Programs Application Service (ORPAS). A survey of current students in the Cognitive Science of Language Program in the Faculty of Humanities revealed a very high degree of interest in the program with 302 of 367 students stating they would apply to an SLP Program at McMaster University. While we did not survey students from other programs or universities, we anticipate there will be very high demand for this program externally. The demand is supported by the 2014 College of Audiologists and Speech Language Pathologists of Ontario (CASLPO) Annual Report indicating that 26% of applicants for Ontario registration were trained in the U.S. The
McMaster program will increase capacity for training high-quality personnel who can respond to the unique cultural and social contexts of practice in Canada.

The demand for SLPs is expected to increase due to changing demographics; in particular, the increased need for SLP services among children and seniors. New strategies within the Province of Ontario, such as the Special Needs Strategy will foster an ongoing demand for SLPs to support the integration of children into the educational system. In addition, the longevity increase means there will be a higher risk for health problems that can affect communication, including dementia and stroke. Nationally, the shortage is such that SLPs are eligible for express entry to Canada via the Federal Skilled Worker Program and the Canadian Occupational Projection system indicates that there is likely to be a shortage of SLPs between 2013 and 2022. Over the 2013 - 2022 time frame, the number of job openings for Therapy and Assessment Professionals, which includes SLPs, is expected to keep pace with the number of job seekers. Within the province of Ontario the employment prospects for SLPs are rated as “average” relative to other occupations through to the end of 2017. This means that positions may be more difficult to find over the next two years and wage growth has slowed relative to past growth; that being said, this rating reflects projections to 2017 and includes only the province of Ontario. Job prospects for SLPs across Canada are positive and the changing demographics support the need for professionals with expertise in communication disorders.

The availability of sufficient numbers of clinical placements is an important consideration for any health professional program. There are a large number of untapped resources in the McMaster University catchment area to support our new program. For example, according to the College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario there are 142 licensed SLPs in the Hamilton area alone with an additional 349 practicing in surrounding areas. Feedback from the Hamilton Regional Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Council suggests that those clinicians who have not recently supervised students will need to participate in continuing education programs to support their involvement in our program. The School of Rehabilitation Science has a robust clinical preceptor development program (both online and in-person workshops), which will be expanded to support SLP clinicians in the community to meet this need. One of the faculty positions for the program will be a teaching-stream position designated as the Director of Clinical Education who will be responsible for ongoing community development. Currently, there are a handful of students from outside the Hamilton area who complete some of their clinical training in our catchment area. We have aligned our clinical placements so that the timing of these is staggered between our two classes allowing for some capacity for students from other institutions.

1.7 DEGREE NOMENCLATURE
The Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology is the most appropriate nomenclature for the proposed program. This degree designation will be consistent with the cognate rehabilitation professional programs in the SRS [i.e., MSc(PT) and MSc(OT)]. In Canada, a Master’s degree is the entry-level requirement for licensure for SLPs. Thus, the nomenclature will meet the academic program accreditation requirements.
2.1 ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

The admissions selection process will consider academic achievement and personal qualities and experience that will be evaluated during the Multiple Mini Interview (MMI).

In order to be eligible for admission, students must have a four year undergraduate degree or equivalent, and have achieved a minimum B average (equivalent to 8 on the 12 point McMaster scale, or a 3.0/4.0) over the last 2 years of academic study or equivalent (i.e. 60 credits). These requirements are consistent with the University requirements for admission to graduate studies. The small group, problem-based format of the program values diversity in academic background; thus, the degree could be in any discipline.

There will be 4 pre-requisite courses. Applicants will require a minimum of one linguistics course at any level with a grade of B or higher; a minimum of one relevant course in psychology at a second year level or higher (e.g., childhood development, developmental psychology, aging and perception, cognition) with a grade of B or higher; a minimum of one science course at any level with a grade of B or higher; and a minimum of one research methods or statistics course at any level with a grade of B or higher.

Applicants whose first language is not English and who did not attend an English-speaking university for their undergraduate degree must achieve at least a score of 600 (written) or 250 (computer) or 92 (iBT) (reading-22, speaking-24, listening-24, writing-22) on the TOEFL.

Applicants who are academically eligible will be ranked on the basis of their pre-admission GPA. The top-ranked 125 applicants will be invited to participate in a mini-multiple interview (MMI). The MMI is similar to the Objective Structured Clinical Examination commonly used to assess students’ clinical skills in health sciences programs. The MMI provides an opportunity for the interviewers to assess each applicant’s suitability for the Speech-Language Pathology Program. The MMI involves each applicant rotating through seven different 8-minute interview stations (2 minutes to read scenario and 6 minutes to address the questions/tasks). Thus, the applicant will meet 7 different interviewers in 7 different stations to discuss the scenarios provided.

Final offers of admission will be based on pre-admission GPA (50%) and MMI interview score (50%).

In 2002, McMaster University Senate approved the policy Admission of Aboriginal Students to the Health Science Education Programs to formally reflect the desire at the national, provincial, and local university levels to increase aboriginal enrolment in health professional programs. Applicants with Aboriginal ancestry are required to meet the same minimum academic requirements as other domestic applicants (e.g., GPA, prerequisites); however, any applicant with Aboriginal ancestry who meets these minimum criteria is automatically offered an interview. In contrast, non-Aboriginal applicants are rank-ordered such that the criteria that they must meet to be offered an
interview may exceed the minimum requirements (depending on the number and qualifications of applicants in any given year). Once an Aboriginal applicant is offered an interview, he/she then goes into the pool for selection using the same process and procedures as non-Aboriginal domestic students.

2.2 ENROLMENT PLANNING AND ALLOCATIONS

The SLP program will accept a smaller number of students initially so that we can continue to build capacity within the university and our local clinical community. At maturation, our goal is to enroll 64 students across both years of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 ALTERNATIVE REQUIREMENTS

There are no alternative admission requirements beyond those listed above.
3.1 ADMINISTRATIVE, GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNICATION

Similar to the other health professional programs within the FHS, the MSc(SLP) Program will have an Assistant Dean who will take overall responsibility for activities related to the delivery of the program. The Assistant Dean will have a dual reporting role to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies (Health Sciences) and to the Associate Dean and Director of the School of Rehabilitation Science.

Within the SRS, the Assistant Dean will be a member of the leadership team and sit on the SRS Faculty Council. Within the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Assistant Dean (SLP) will be a voting member of the Graduate Programs Curriculum Committee, which is a committee that deals with matters related to policies and curriculum affecting graduate programs in the Faculty of Health Sciences.

The Assistant Dean will Chair the SLP Curriculum Committee, which will be the governing body to approve all major policy and procedures and curriculum changes before they are referred to other SRS, SGS, FHS, and University committees for approval. The Assistant Dean will also Chair the Program Academic Study Committee and be a member of the Admissions Committee.

3.2 STRUCTURE AND REGULATION

i. Structure

The MSc in Speech-Language Pathology will be a course-based, full-time program that is 24-months in duration. This is in keeping with other SLP Programs in the province of Ontario. The curriculum is based on the principles of problem-based, small group, self-directed learning. All courses are required and follow sequentially over 5 units of study. The program consists of a total of 99 units. There are no electives. The academic portion of the proposed units varies in duration from 10-14 weeks according to learner outcomes. Clinical placements will follow each academic unit and vary in length from 2 weeks following Unit I to 10 weeks following Unit 5. Placements will occur in multiple settings (e.g., hospital, community, rehabilitation centre) and practice areas (e.g., speech, language, cognition, voice, swallowing; children and adults). Each unit includes: 1) a problem-based tutorial course; 2) a clinical skills course; 3) a foundational course (Units I-III) or an evidence-based practice course (Units IV-V); 4) a seminar course; and 5) a practicum experience. In Year 1, the Foundations of SLP Practice course will incorporate online learning modules for self-directed study to provide foundational knowledge in speech, language, and hearing. Modules will provide a means for students with diverse preparation to learn basic concepts, terminology, and methods that will be used throughout the curriculum, and will serve as an ongoing resource for students. Year 2 includes a full course on evidence-based practice and clinical research.

This table provides the thematic title of each unit with the corresponding weeks of academic and clinical study. A figure portraying the timetabling of the curriculum over a two-year period is included in the appendix li.
### ii. Curriculum Overview

The table in Section 3.2 provides an overview of the curriculum sequence and timing.

The curriculum is organized around four central themes: 1) **foundational knowledge and skills** for evidence-based practice; 2) **communication across the lifespan**, from intervention for very young children to intervention for older adults; and 3) **clinical practice in context**, in which students learn about different practice settings and influences of culture, social and economic factors; and 4) **complexity** of the communication disorder and the personal, financial, social, and cultural context in which intervention occurs. These four themes are most transparently reflected in the curricular units, but also are reiterated within each unit in classroom, clinical, and community activities.

Curricular units correspond to the Foundations of Clinical Practice in Speech-Language Pathology specified by the national professional organization, Speech-Language and Audiology Canada (SAC). The table included in Appendix iii shows when students first will be introduced to each knowledge and skill area; however, the curriculum is iterative: students will revisit each knowledge and skill area in different practice settings and with progressively more complex communication disorders and intervention contexts. The curriculum is organized to meet requirements for an initial certificate of registration with the College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario, and begin the Initial Practice Period required prior to registration as a speech-language pathologist.

**Unit 1: Fundamentals of Clinical Practice I: Principles, Knowledge, and Skills for Clinical Practice**

The aim of this unit is to provide students with foundational knowledge related to communication and communication disorders across the lifespan as well as basic skills in clinical practice. Principles include professional ethics, models of disability, inter-
professional practice, and evidence-based practice. Knowledge outcomes include anatomy and physiology; psychology and linguistics in the context of communication across the lifespan; and basic constructs in articulation, phonology, and language development. Students develop a framework and basic skills for assessment, intervention, and professional conduct. Within Unit 1, students will complete simulated clinical practicum experiences and a 2-week off-site clinical practicum focused on observation.

**Unit 2: Fundamentals of Clinical Practice II: Roles and Practice Settings Across the Lifespan**

The aim of this unit is to further develop students' foundational knowledge and skills and to introduce them to varied contexts of speech-language pathology practice. Knowledge and skill outcomes address professional performance as a direct service provider, consultant, collaborator and team member, manager and supervisor, and advocate. Settings include children’s treatment centers, early childhood centers, schools, hospitals, rehabilitation centers, home healthcare, long-term care facilities, and private community-based practice. Within Unit 2, students will continue to learn via simulated clinical experiences. Then, following the academic portion of Unit 2, students will complete a 5-week off-site clinical practicum focused on evidence-based practice. Knowledge outcomes include fundamentals of counseling, speech perception and acoustics, and instrumentation.

In Unit 2, students will obtain the first 10 of their 20 required clinical hours in Audiology, with the goal of gaining an appreciation of audiology and aural rehabilitation. Hours will be obtained in part through development and implementation of free hearing screenings in the community, under the supervision of a licensed Audiologist. This experience will introduce students to hearing assessment and referral, and communication strategies for individuals with hearing loss and their communication partners. Knowledge outcomes include assessment and intervention related to hearing disorders, as well as strategies for prevention of hearing loss.

**Unit 3: Clinical Practice with Children, Youth, & Young Adults**

The aim of this unit is to introduce students to developmental communication disorders. Knowledge outcomes relate to developmental articulation, phonological, and language disorders; speech and language impairments associated with cognitive disabilities, and voice and fluency disorders. Students also will build on knowledge outcomes related to hearing disorders, this time in the context of young children, and will explore genetic influences on communication. Key themes of Unit 3 are family-centered service, service delivery models for children, and transition to adulthood. Following Unit 3, students will complete a 6-week off-site clinical practicum that may be in a school, community, hospital, rehabilitation, or role-emerging setting (i.e., a setting in which there is potential to promote community engagement and develop SLP services in a non-traditional venue).

**Unit 4: Clinical Practice with Adults and Older Adults**

This unit emphasizes assessment and treatment of individuals with acquired communication disorders, with a special emphasis on problems of older adults. Knowledge outcomes relate to acquired speech, language, and cognitive disorders, with a focus on neurologically based communication disorders; dysphagia in adults; and
normal aging of speech, hearing, and language. Students will build further on knowledge outcomes related to hearing disorders and aural rehabilitation, this time in contexts relevant to older adults. Following Unit 4, students will complete a 6-week off-site clinical practicum that may be in a community, hospital, rehabilitation, or role-emerging setting.

**Unit 5: Complex Practice and Professional Transition**

The aim of this unit is to prepare students for the transition to professional practice. This advanced unit provides students with knowledge and skills to assume current and emergent health care roles in the community, with an emphasis on complex conditions across the lifespan. With respect to children, knowledge outcomes relate to populations with multiple or complex disabilities, advanced hearing technology (e.g., cochlear implants) and aural rehabilitation, augmentative and alternative communication, and pediatric dysphagia. With respect to adults, key themes of Unit 5 are client-centered service, end-of-life decisions, chronic health conditions and aging with a communication disorder, and communication partner training. Medical intervention and pharmacology will be considered for both children and adults. Following Unit 5, students will complete a 10-week off-site clinical practicum that may be in a community, hospital, rehabilitation, or role-emerging setting.

There is a total of 24 courses. Courses in the first year will be 600-level courses. Courses in second year will be 700-level courses. As this is a professional program, all courses are required and there are no elective courses. Students will be required to complete 29 weeks of full-time clinical practice over the 2 years.

### 3.3 PROGRAM LENGTH & PROGRESSION

The program is a 24-month professional course-based Masters. The curriculum progresses from simple concepts to more complex over the 2-year period commencing with 2 units of study that focus on the fundamentals of practice and culminating in a unit which focuses on complex practice and professional transitions. This length of program is consistent with SLP Programs throughout Ontario and is necessary for students to acquire the skills for professional licensure and for the program to receive accreditation. Please see the proposed McMaster SLP Program Credit Hours map in Appendix iv.
4.1 PROGRAM CONTENT

The emphasis on evidence-based practice in all components of the curriculum will help ensure that students stay current on new and emerging research and issues in SLP. For example, in the problem-based tutorial courses, students are expected to generate key learning issues that they need to research and apply to the problem they are studying. They search the literature and are expected to search for the best level of evidence, critique the evidence, and integrate this information into their discussions of how to best assess and manage clients/patients. Library literacy skills will be taught in the first unit of study. Evidence-based practice skills will be introduced and reinforced through all courses in the curriculum. In addition, clinical currency is ensured by the involvement of community clinicians in the program as tutors in problem-based learning courses and in other components of the program.

As stated in section 2, Curriculum Overview, a fundamental principle of problem-based education is that learning is iterative, as content is revisited at progressively more complex levels throughout the curriculum. This is particularly true for Problem-based Tutorials and Clinical Skills courses. Thus, the following descriptions list content areas introduced in each course, but do not reflect the full content in each course.

Course Descriptions
Please refer to Appendix iv, McMaster SLP Program, Credit Hours Map.

Unit I
611/Fundamentals of Clinical Practice in Speech-Language Pathology/Problem-based Tutorial I
This Unit I tutorial course will introduce students to fundamental knowledge related to communication and communication disorders across the lifespan as well as basic skills in clinical practice. Psychosocial, cultural, and ethical influences on clinical practice will be addressed.

612/Speech-Language Pathology Clinical Skills I
This Unit I clinical skills course develops basic skills for screening and assessment of speech and language, and professional conduct. Clinical reasoning and technical skill development are integrated with relevant research evidence and theory. The course includes simulated clinical interactions and a 2-week off-site experience focused on observation.

613/Foundational Knowledge for Speech-Language Pathology
This first year course will address foundational knowledge for the speech-language pathologist. Topics include anatomy and physiology; neuroanatomy and neurophysiology; development of articulation, phonology, and language; and psychology and linguistics in the context of communication.

614/Inquiry Seminar I
This course will provide a forum for considering topics related to the principles that underlie clinical practice, including models of disability, professionalism, and ethics, inter-professional practice, and evidence-based practice.
Unit II
621/Fundamentals of Clinical Practice in Speech-Language Pathology/Problem-based Tutorial II
This Unit II tutorial course will further develop students' fundamental knowledge and skills and provide an overview of roles and contexts relevant to speech-language pathology practice in diverse settings and across the lifespan.

622/Speech-Language Pathology Clinical Skills II
This Unit II clinical skills course further develops skills in screening and assessment, including hearing screening and hearing conservation, and introduces skills in outcome evaluation and reporting. Simulated clinical experiences will provide a context for learning fundamentals of counseling. Clinical reasoning and technical skill development are integrated with relevant research evidence and theory.

623/Foundational Knowledge for Speech-Language Pathology II
This Unit II course will address foundational knowledge related to speech perception and acoustics, and instrumentation related to assessment and intervention.

624/Inquiry Seminars II
This course will provide a forum for considering topics related to clinical practice in diverse settings, with a focus on inter-professional practice and evidence-based practice.

625/Speech Language Pathology Clinical Practice I
Students will complete a 5-week clinical practicum experience focused on evidence-based practice.

Unit III
631/Clinical Practice with Children, Youth and Young Adults/Problem-based Tutorial III
This Unit III tutorial course will introduce students to screening, assessment, and treatment issues related to developmental communication disorders, including speech, language, voice, fluency, hearing, and cognitive-communication disorders in children, youth, and young adults.

632/Speech Language Pathology Clinical Skills III
This Unit III clinical skills course will provide students with the clinical problem solving skills to assess and treat children with communication disorders, including developing skills needed to differentiate language differences associated with multilingualism from language disorders associated with underlying impairments. Students will use appropriate assessment tools and clinical processes to set goals for intervention. Clinical reasoning and technical skill development are integrated with relevant research evidence and theory.

633/Foundational Knowledge for Speech Language Pathology III
This first year course will address foundational knowledge for the speech-language pathologist. Topics will build on those addressed in 613 and 623 and will include foundations of genetics in relation to communication disorders.

634/Inquiry Seminars III
This course will provide a forum for considering topics related to the clinical practice with children, including family-centered service, service delivery models, and transition to adulthood.
635 /Speech Language Pathology Clinical Practice II
Students will complete a 6-week clinical practicum experience in a school, community, hospital, rehabilitation, or role-emerging setting.

**Unit IV**
711/Clinical Practice with Adults and Older Adults Problem-based Tutorial IV
This Unit IV tutorial course will introduce students to screening, assessment, and treatment issues related to adults, with a special emphasis on acquired speech, language, voice, swallowing, or hearing disorders, and aging with a communication disorder.

712/ Speech Language Pathology Clinical Skills IV
This Unit IV clinical skills course will provide students with opportunities to develop advanced clinical reasoning skills necessary to assess and treat individuals with acquired communication or swallowing disorders, with a focus on neurological disorders and differentiating communication disorders from normal aging. Students will use appropriate assessment tools and clinical processes to set goals for intervention. Clinical reasoning and technical skill development are integrated with relevant research evidence and theory.

713 /Evidence-Based Practice and Clinical Research
This 2nd year course over two terms will enable students to critically analyze the literature and collaborate on a research project relevant to speech-language pathology. During the first term of this course, students will be provided with information on study design, data acquisition, and data analysis. They will acquire skills in searching the literature, analyzing and interpreting data, presenting results and making clinical decisions that incorporate best evidence, patient values and clinical expertise. During the second term of the course, students will work in teams to participate in an ongoing research project under the supervision of a faculty member or clinician.

714/Inquiry Seminars IV
This course will provide a forum for considering topics related to clinical practice with adults, such as client-centered service, caregiver training, end-of-life services, and innovative service delivery models for older adults.

715/ Speech Language Pathology Clinical Practice III
Students will complete a 6-week clinical practicum experience in a community, hospital, rehabilitation, or role-emerging setting.

**Unit V**
721/Complex Practice and Professional Transitions - Problem-based V
This Unit V tutorial course will provide students the opportunity to explore clinical practice with clients of all ages who have complex health conditions for which multiple systems and a range of health care issues are likely to be involved. Knowledge outcomes include frameworks for medical intervention, and foundations in pharmacology. Students are expected to use both previous and new knowledge when planning assessment and intervention.

722/ Speech Language Pathology Clinical Laboratory V
This Unit V clinical laboratory course will provide students with advanced skills that will enable them to assume traditional and emerging roles in clinical practice. Students will acquire the skills needed to assess and manage clients with complex health conditions.
that involve multiple systems and a range of health care issues, including skills related to Augmentative and Alternative Communication, advanced hearing technology, aural rehabilitation, assessment and treatment of swallowing in children with complex medical conditions, and assessment and treatment of children with resonance disorders.

724/Inquiry Seminars V
The focus of this course will be on providing students with the opportunity to examine current issues within the speech-language pathology profession, including the diverse roles of the SLP in the health and education systems, aging and end-of-life decisions, and living with a chronic health condition. Students will also learn management and business skills that will prepare them for the transition to practice upon graduation.

725/Speech Language Pathology Clinical Practice IV
Students will complete an 10-week clinical practicum experience in a community, hospital, rehabilitation, or role-emerging setting.

4.2 PROGRAM INNOVATION

The MSc (SLP) Program is innovative in that it will be the only problem-based curriculum in Canada and one of the very few worldwide in SLP. The educational philosophy of the MSc (SLP) Program emphasizes that the process of learning is equal in importance to the content, and is consistent with adult learning theory. Thus, the MSc (SLP) curriculum integrates and is reflective of three key educational principles: self-directed, problem-based, and small group learning.

Self-Directed Learning. The philosophy of self-directed learning recognizes that with some guidance, adult learners should be able to take responsibility for their own learning. The more active students are in determining their own needs and learning goals, the more effective their learning is likely to be. Within broad guidelines, MSc SLP students are expected to determine: 1) their own learning needs; 2) how they will best set and achieve objectives to address those needs; 3) how to select learning resources; and 4) whether their learning needs have been met.

An overall goal of self-directed learning is to exercise the student’s capacity to think and discover during the process of gaining knowledge. The MSc (SLP) Program is designed to guide, stimulate, and challenge students in order to produce professionals who will make a difference in practice.

Although the MSc (SLP) Program emphasizes the importance of SDL, it is not a self-paced program. Attendance and participation in tutorials, clinical laboratories, and other courses is required. It is expected that MSc (SLP) students demonstrate that satisfactory progress has been achieved via self, peer, and faculty evaluation. While the MSc (SLP) Program is student-centred, it is the mutual role and responsibility of faculty and students to create an effective learning environment, to select appropriate learning resources, to effectively facilitate and support learning, and to evaluate the learning process.

Problem-based learning (PBL). PBL is an educational process in which learning is centered around problems, as opposed to discrete subject-related courses. It was originally developed in response to the observation that students entering the clinical setting could not incorporate previously acquired knowledge into patient care activities. Specifically, students did not retain or know how to apply basic science information.
learned in their clinical programs because they did not understand its relevance to clinical practice.

From a theoretical perspective, PBL contends that knowledge is best remembered in the context in which it is learned, and that acquisition and integration of new knowledge requires activation of prior knowledge. Throughout the MSc (SLP) Program, students are presented with a variety of problems carefully designed for each curriculum unit. The health care problems promote the exploration of the underlying foundational, clinical, and communication sciences in a context that resembles the future professional context as closely as possible. Students must incorporate evidence-based practice skills, self-directed learning skills, and clinical reasoning when engaged in problem-based learning.

Small-Group Learning. Small-group learning is a natural extension of problem-based learning. To maximize small-group learning, we believe it is important to bring students from various educational and work experience backgrounds together so that the heterogeneity of the group itself becomes a valuable learning resource. Transfer of knowledge is enhanced through the use of problems that encourage students to not only learn content, but also to develop strategies to recognize the ‘analogy’ or ‘principle’ that can then be transferred to new problems and contexts.

Admissions Process. Our admissions process is highly innovative as it uses a mini-multiple interview (MMI) format, which is a hallmark of many of the professional programs within the Faculty of Health Sciences. The MMI is discussed in detail in section 2.1. To our knowledge, this is the only SLP Program nationally or internationally that uses this methodology, which itself is highly relevant in a profession that relies so heavily on communication.

Community-Integrated Learning. Within the SRS, we have over 300 community faculty members who value the skills they learn through tutoring in our educational programs, being exposed to current evidence-based practices, and having the opportunity to collaborate with students and faculty members. The SLP Program will work closely with the community to develop activities that are mutually beneficial to the students and the community. Examples include developing collaborative research projects that help students to develop evidence-based practice skills while also helping meet community needs. Another example relates to assignments in which clinicians submit “clinical dilemmas” to the students and students are required to develop an evidence-informed approach to solving the dilemma and present this to the clinicians. While these kinds of community-integrated learning opportunities have been built over a number of years in existing SRS programs, we anticipate that similar relationships will be developed with our SLP community. We have begun our relationship building with the community through the establishment of our Community Advisory Committee and will use the expertise of this group as we move forward.

Focus on Remote Service Delivery Models. The SRS has had a long-standing relationship initially with Lakehead University and since 1990 with the Northern Ontario School of Medicine (NOSM) to deliver the Northern Studies Stream (NSS). Since the inception of the SRS, occupational therapy and physiotherapy students have had the opportunity to complete academic and/or clinical education in Northwestern Ontario and gain knowledge and skills related to rural and remote practice and aboriginal health. We plan to build upon our relationships and expertise that we have cultivated and offer students clinical education experiences to the SLP students. Due to the distances and resulting unmet need for services in northern Ontario SLP has taken a leadership role in telepractice both in 1:1 treatments and in providing group education (for example an educational program for parents of autistic children from across northern Ontario).
will be integrating the use of telepractice into the curriculum to allow students to gain experience in "virtual" clinical experiences.

Collaboration with the Faculty of Humanities The collaboration between the Department of Linguistics and Languages in the Faculty of Humanities is unique within Ontario. This relationship will allow us to incorporate strengths of faculty members who have expertise in communication issues related to non-native English speakers. There is a growing need for SLPs who are prepared to work with culturally and linguistically diverse populations, especially with respect to being able to distinguish normal variation in language acquisition associated with bi- and multi-lingualism from problems that would indicate the presence of language delay and/or disorder (http://www.asha.org/policy/KS2004-00215/). For example, students will learn to be sensitive to nuances in language and how to question whether the client or patient has a true language disorder or whether the issue is reflective of a different dialect or native language grammatical structure. This skill is particularly important and relevant to the high immigration population in Hamilton and Ontario.

Other potential collaborations we have also had preliminary discussions with an interdisciplinary research group with faculty from Psychology, Neurosciences and Behavior and Biomedical Engineering about their newly funded Hearing Technology Research Lab. The Lab has recently been funded by the CFI and is in the early stages of development. There is interest in having a clinic associated with the Lab. There is great potential for SLP students to complete some of their required audiology training in the Lab and other possibilities for students to complete their evidence-based practice research projects.

4.3 MODES OF DELIVERY

Problem-Based Tutorials (PBT). Problem-Based Tutorials will be central to the learning process in the MSc (SLP) program. Students, in small groups, meet the course objectives by exploring a variety of health and professional problems likely to be encountered in practice. The focus during PBT is on problem-based learning to gain knowledge, and on clinical reasoning to apply and integrate knowledge within a relevant context.

Clinical Skills Sessions. Clinical skills sessions provide students with the opportunity to acquire the skills needed to develop an intervention plan and implement an intervention for clients of all ages. The laboratory sessions complement the health problems encountered in the PBTs and facilitate the integration of theory and practice. The Clinical Skills instructors include the course coordinators and clinical experts drawn from the faculty and the community. Class discussion, demonstration of techniques, practice sessions, community experiences, observation of performance, and feedback to students are some of the strategies used to help students develop competence in core SLP skills.

Large Group Seminars. Large group seminars are most commonly used in the Inquiry Seminar courses. These sessions may include presentations by guest speakers, small group activities, small and large group discussion, and/or student presentations.

Interprofessional Education and Collaboration. Due to the collaborative and team-based nature of health care, MSc (SLP) students are expected to develop identified interprofessional education (IPE) competencies prior to graduation. Opportunities for IPE occur throughout the curriculum with the MSc (OT) and MSc (PT) Programs. Other events include health professional students in other programs in the Faculty of Health
Sciences (e.g., nursing, medicine, social work) or via special events with students within and beyond the McMaster community. The Faculty of Health Sciences Program for Interprofessional Education and Research (PIPER) is integral in supporting IPE activities (see letter of support from Director of PIPER in Appendix I). As well, interprofessional collaboration is a part of many of the clinical education placements.

Clinical Education. Students spend 29 weeks in clinical practice. Clinical education courses take place in a variety of facilities, including teaching hospitals, community hospitals, health care agencies, specialized centres, private clinics, home care, schools, and other community facilities. During clinical placements, students practice under the supervision of clinical preceptors, who are primarily registered SLPs, but may also include other health care providers. The School of Rehabilitation Science also has considerable expertise in development of role-emerging placements. Role-emerging placements involve working with community partners to develop rehabilitation services in areas that are non-traditional and in which there is no established role of the SLP. An example of this is our Mach2ope Clinic which is in partnership with the YMCA in downtown Hamilton. Here, students provide rehabilitation services to clients who do not have access to publicly funded programs or extended health insurance coverage.

E-learning Modules. In self-directed programs, it is important to develop resources that support course-learning objectives and reinforce learning. The SLP Program will develop e-learning modules to complement other course formats and act as ongoing resources throughout the program. Examples of these include head and neck anatomy, acoustics, phonetics, aural rehabilitation, and audiology. These will comprise a major component of the Foundations of SLP Practice courses that are in Terms 1, 2 and 3 and provide an important resource that the students use throughout the program.

4.4 EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

a. Experiential learning in the form of clinical placements is a critical component of health professional education training. There will be a total of 29 full-time weeks of clinical placements. These will commence in Unit 1 with a 2-week placement at the end of the unit that will be a component of the SLP Clinical Skills Course. There will be placements ranging from 5 to 10 weeks at the completion of the academic component of each of the remaining 4 Units of study (i.e., Units II - V); all of these are 3 unit courses.

b. The introductory 2-week clinical placement will primarily be observational and be in any area of clinical practice. The first 2 units of study in the program are foundational and introduce students to basic assessment and treatment skills across the lifespan and in a variety of settings. Hence, the students' second clinical placement will be in a variety of settings. Students will be required to track their clinical hours and experiences over time. The Director of Clinical Education will work closely with each student to ensure that he or she gets a balanced clinical education experience that includes a variety of placement sites and clinical populations.

c. Due to the important role that the integrated community-based practica have in the overall curriculum, one of the five approved faculty hires will be designated as a teaching-stream position for a Director of Clinical Education (DCE). The DCE role is a teaching-stream position comprised of scholarship, teaching, and service, in addition to administrative activities. Responsibilities include developing, planning, coordinating, facilitating, monitoring, and evaluating clinical education and related activities on behalf of the academic program, and in coordination with academic and clinical faculty. In addition, the individual will serve as a liaison and build partnerships between the
MSc(SLP) program and clinical community. As this is an innovative problem-based program that will be unfamiliar to many practicing clinicians, the role of the DCE will be very important in providing orientation and training for clinical preceptors, particularly in the developmental and initial phases of the program.

d. We are sensitive to the existing relationships that many of the Hamilton-based clinicians have with other educational institutions. Our survey of Hamilton and adjacent clinical catchment areas show that there is tremendous potential for providing experiential learning placements. According to the registry of the College of Audiologists and Speech Language Pathologists of Ontario there are 142 licensed SLPs in the Hamilton area alone. An additional 349 SLPs are practicing in geographical areas that are deemed to be in the Hamilton catchment area. As an example, one of the large employers of SLPs in the area is Hamilton Health Sciences, which has 41 SLPs employed and hosts 8-10 SLP students per year. We recognize that clinicians and practices that have not taken students in the past will require training and support to provide excellent training opportunities and are committed to working with the clinical community to provide these. During our consultation with the HRS/SLAC great enthusiasm was expressed regarding the training offered by the SRS to support the clinical preceptor role (refer to letter of support in Appendix I).

4.5 ACCESSIBILITY

Standards set by the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities (AODA) will be adopted in the development of new course materials and resources. Individual students with specific accommodation requests will be supported in disclosing their needs through formal channels.

4.6 RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS

This is a professional program with a course-based Master's so there is no thesis requirement. However, students will complete a full 6-unit course on Evidence-Based Practice and Clinical Research in year 2. Within this course students will acquire skills in searching the literature, analyzing and interpreting data, presenting results and making clinical decisions that incorporate best evidence, patient values and clinical expertise. As part of the course students will be required to work in teams on an evidence-based practice project, under the supervision of a faculty member. This will provide the students with practical research experience and expose them to the complexities of designing, conducting, and writing up components of research. Knowledge and understanding of the research process will be gained through the role that each student negotiates within a research project and by working in collaboration with other researchers on the project. Using personal initiative, taking on specific responsibilities, finding appropriate resources, critically appraising research issues, and self-evaluating one's performance will increase the student's appreciation of the research process.

Students work in teams of 3 to 5 to participate and collaborate in an ongoing research project under the supervision of a faculty member or clinician, possibly including other co-investigators in the process. Student teams may undertake some research activities before Unit V begins (e.g., conducting literature reviews, securing ethical approval if necessary).
Examples of skills that the student will develop in the course include: formulating a research question; describing the research objectives and methods; carrying out data collection and/or data analysis; writing a scholarly paper (on which the students must be primary authors); and presenting a summary of the research through an oral presentation to peers, clinicians, and faculty.
ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING

5.1 METHODS FOR ASSESSING STUDENTS

Student performance will be evaluated on a regular basis throughout the MSc(SLP) Program using various methods and tools, many of which directly align with the basic principles of problem-based and self-directed learning. One of the benefits of problem-based learning is the focus on evaluation, both peer and self-evaluation. Tutorial performance of the group as a whole and of each of its members (including the tutor) is evaluated on a regular basis throughout each Unit. Other evaluations will include:

- Written examinations (multiple choice questions, short answer questions) to assess knowledge
- Written assignments (e.g., position papers, referral letters, critical appraisal literature reviews) to assess knowledge, critical appraisal skills, critical thinking, analysis, and synthesis skills.
- Direct Observation to evaluate technical behavioural skills.
- Objective and Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) - an objective evaluation measure used to assess components of clinical competence, and a wide range of knowledge and clinical skills
- Presentations
- Evaluation of students' performances in their clinical placements

5.2 CURRICULUM MAP

Please see Curriculum Map included in Appendix ii.

5.3 DEMONSTRATING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Students' achievement of graduate degree level expectations will be demonstrated via two culminating activities during the second year of study. First, students will undertake a clinically relevant evidence-based research project in which they will work in small teams with a faculty member and, in some cases, a clinician from the community. This will provide the students with some “hands on” practical research experience and expose them to the complexities of designing, conducting, and writing up components of research. The research experience will culminate in a daylong Evidence-Based Research Symposium in which students present their work in poster or oral format to their fellow students, faculty members, and the local clinical community. Second, students will undertake a final 10-week clinical placement at the end of the academic portion of Unit 5. In this placement, they will be expected to integrate and apply knowledge and skills from across all of the previous Units and clinical placements as they make the transition to professional practice. Evaluations from their clinical preceptors from this final placement should indicate that by the end of this final placement, students are ready to assume their role as an independent health professional.
6.1 GRADUATE PROGRAMS

i. ADMINISTRATIVE, PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The MSc (SLP) Program will require classrooms that accommodate 32 students and tutorial rooms that will accommodate 8 students. The Institute for Applied Health Sciences has dedicated SRS class and tutorial rooms that will meet these needs. Current space is tight and we will be strategic about scheduling in order to maximize use of tutorial rooms and clinical skills laboratories (for example, by extending the hours of classes beyond a typical 9 am to 5 pm schedule). Current sessional and clinical faculty offices that support the OT and PT Programs within the SRS will be consolidated to increase faculty office capacity. Office/carrel space is not normally provided to graduate students pursuing course-based programs.

The program will be funded through the BIU grant from the Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities (MTCU) and student tuition as set by the Program with approval from the Faculty of Health Sciences and the University. The salaries and benefits for five new full-time faculty members, sessional instructors, and 1.5 FTE administrative support will be generated by the program itself. As is the model in the School of Rehabilitation Science, the teaching will be supported by the clinical community and clinicians will receive a small stipend for their participation as tutors and skills instructors in the curriculum.

ii. LIBRARY, TECHNOLOGY, AND LABORATORY RESOURCES

The Health Sciences Library is doing an assessment of existing holdings as resources relevant to SLP are also housed in the Mills Library. The librarian has indicated that the library will be able to meet the needs of the SLP students (pers. comm., Jennifer McKinney). There are some resources that will need to be purchased initially and the costs have been included in the development budget.

Faculty and students will connect to existing FHS/McMaster IT systems with no noticeable impact on capacity.

The SLP students will not require access to costly laboratory or technological equipment. There will be assessment tools that will be one-time only costs that are included in the development budget.

iii. FACULTY

Within Canada, the number of full-time faculty in SLP Programs ranges from 5 to 13. We will hire 5 full-time faculty to support the program. In addition to the 5 new faculty, existing faculty within the SRS will provide expertise in related areas such as research methods and anatomy and physiology. In a problem-based curriculum there are no subject related courses and scientific and clinical content is integrated within the courses. Thus, while faculty from the Linguistics and Languages Department in the Faculty of Humanities Sessional faculty will not be involved in development and delivery
of specific courses, we anticipate that they will contribute to developing content for foundational learning modules (e.g., phonetics) and in delivery of guest seminars (see commitments outlined in the letter of Support from Dr.Cruikshank and Dr.Moro in appendix i). We have accounted for these contributions in the budget under sessional costs. Community tutors will enrich the full-time faculty complement and provide specific clinical content expertise. Within the other professional programs, the commitment and contributions of part-time clinical faculty has been highlighted as a strength of our School by accreditors, students, and the community. Our plan is to cultivate our community partners and similarly involve them in the SLP Program. As clinicians may be unfamiliar with PBL and some of the unique pedagogies, we will offer periodic faculty development workshops as long as there is a demand. The SRS offers stipends to clinicians involved in the educational programs in significant tutoring and clinical course roles.

The priority is to hire an Assistant Dean for the SLP Program who will lead the detailed curriculum development and the goal is to have the incumbent in place by July 1, 2016. Additionally, a Director of Clinical Education who is responsible for the development, support, and growth of the experiential component of the curriculum will be filled early so that he or she can work with clinical sites and build capacity for the program in the community. Similar to the other professional programs in the School of Rehabilitation Science, this position will be a teaching-stream position - which highlights the importance of this role within the program. Hiring for the other full-time faculty roles will be staggered and be completed by July 1 of the second year of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Home Department</th>
<th>Degree &amp; University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vickie Galea</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>PhD McMaster University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Solomon</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>PhD University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenonah Campbell</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>PhD Western University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Willem Gorter</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>SRS/Pediatrics</td>
<td>MD, PhD University of Amsterdam (MD) Utrecht University (PhD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Connolly</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Chair</td>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Languages</td>
<td>PhD King's College, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivona Kucerova</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Languages</td>
<td>PhD Massachusetts Institute of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Kuperman</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Languages</td>
<td>PhD Radboud University Nijmegen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Moro</td>
<td>Associate Professor &amp; Associate Dean (Humanities)</td>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Languages</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Pape</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Languages</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabet Service</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Languages</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### iv. STUDENT FINANCIAL SUPPORT

As in other professional masters programs there is a scholarship allocation of $1000 per student per year. In the School of Rehabilitation Science each Assistant Dean of a professional program can determine the most strategic allocation of their scholarship dollars (e.g. entrance scholarships, academic achievement after first year, etc.). However, in the initial year of the program the scholarship dollars will be awarded as entrance scholarships.
QUALITY AND OTHER INDICATORS

7.1 ACADEMIC QUALITY OF THE PROGRAM

We will engage in an ongoing program evaluation that includes both formative and summative data. The following indicators will be evaluated on an ongoing basis. These will provide feedback on the academic quality of the program and also contribute to the outcome evaluations that are expected in the professional accreditation process.

i) Formative or annual feedback that informs the day-to-day delivery of the program:
- Student evaluations of faculty, courses, and units
- Feedback from the Community Advisory Committee and part-time faculty
- Feedback from clinical preceptors in the clinical settings

ii) Summative feedback
- Graduate surveys
- Employer surveys
- Application numbers and completion rates
- Rates of employment
- External reviews - accreditation

7.2 INTELLECTUAL QUALITY OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

The small group problem-based component is a hallmark of the MSc(SLP) Program and is exceptional in promoting student-faculty interaction. In groups of 8, students will spend time with a faculty tutor who facilitates learning and problem-solving, supports the development of group learning and feedback skills, and models professional behaviours. Students will also be involved in group learning activities in other educational venues, such as learning clinical skills and participating in an evidence-based practice project. Interprofessional education activities that promote cooperative learning among students from different professions will be provided through activities within SRS and through the Program for Interprofessional Practice, Education and Research (PIPER). Interdisciplinary learning, which is characteristic of problem-based learning, encourages students to integrate content and skills across disciplinary fields and promotes a high quality intellectual experience.
APPENDICES

Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology
MSc(SLP)

Date: October 2015
Appendix I

Letters of Support
August 21, 2015

Dr. Patty Solomon, PhD
Professor and Associate Dean
School of Rehabilitation Science
Institute of Applied Health Sciences
1400 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario L8S 1C7

Dear Dr. Solomon

As the Director for the Program for Interprofessional Practice, Education and Research (PIPER) in the Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS) at McMaster University, I am delighted to provide my support to you and your team in the development of the new Speech Language Pathology (SLP) Program in the School of Rehabilitation.

The goal of PIPHER is to serve as an organizational program to foster a culture of interprofessional education and collaboration at McMaster University through the development of curricular activities for students and faculty. Since PIPHER was established in 2007, we have brought together students from different health professional training programs: nursing, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, midwifery, physician assistant, medicine, child life, social work and pharmacy. The inclusion of SLP will be a welcomed addition and will certainly enhance interprofessionalism in the FHS. I anticipate that the SLP students will be fully integrated into PIPHER activities where they can learn about and appreciate other health care professional students' roles in the provision of health care services.

Once of the key pillars of PIPHER is “collaboration” and as such, I look forward to and am prepared to work with the representatives from the SLP Program to ensure that IPE activities are integrated in the curriculum and to facilitate research initiatives relevant to IPE.

Sincerely,

Bonny Jung

Dr. Bonny Jung, PhD, MEd, OT Reg. (Ont.)
Director, Program for Interprofessional Practice, Education, and Research
Dear Dr. Solomon:

Please accept this letter of support for the new Master in Speech-Language Pathology to be housed within the School of Rehabilitation Science. I understand that there will be a need for additional resources from the Education Program in Anatomy to mount the program and that you will be developing online modules to support ongoing delivery. The Education Program in Anatomy cannot fund these developments but will continue to work closely with the School of Rehabilitation Science to provide services for your existing programs and I am committed to working with you to develop the financial model to support the educational needs of the SLP Program.

Bruce C. Wainman, PhD
Director, Education Program in Anatomy
McMaster University, HSC 1R1G
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
Canada
L8S 4K1
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO:       PATTY SOLOMON, ASSOCIATE DEAN, SCHOOL OF REHABILITATION SCIENCE
           INSTITUTE OF APPLIED HEALTH SCIENCES

FROM:     KEN CROOKSHANK, DEAN
           ANNA MORO, ASSOCIATE DEAN

SUBJECT:  RE: PROPOSED MSc IN SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY

DATE:     SEPTEMBER 21, 2015

CC:        SUSAN DENBURG, ACTING PROVOST

It is with great pleasure that we write to support the proposed graduate program in Rehabilitation Science at McMaster. Both as a member of the Department of Linguistics & Languages (Moro), and as members of the Dean’s Office, Faculty of Humanities, we are very enthusiastic for our many undergraduates who wish to pursue clinical language interests, and who would like to do so at McMaster. And we share the excitement of our colleagues in linguistics, whose areas of research have much to contribute to the study and treatment of language disorder. In fact, the Department of Linguistics & Languages hoped for an SLP program at McMaster when it first introduced the Cognitive Science of Language undergraduate program (2006) and graduate programs (MSc and PhD, 2008). The Department has cultivated partnerships with clinicians in the Hamilton area since 2006, and has run a successful fourth-year placement (pacticum) with SLPs from healthcare institutions and school boards since 2007. The Hamilton clinicians are very supportive of the proposed professional program.

Many elements of the proposed Speech Language Pathology program in Rehabilitation Science make it unique and highly desirable. First, it is our understanding that the McMaster program will be the only problem-based SLP program in North America. Second, connections at various levels with linguistics and the Cognitive Science of Language programs will provide opportunities for innovative research, for innovative interdisciplinary clinical preparation, and national and international outreach. We will address each of these factors in sequence.

The Department of Linguistics & Languages has been working for the past few years towards the establishment of a new research centre, the Centre for Advanced Research in Experimental and Applied Linguistics (ARIELX), currently under review, whose main purpose is to foster collaboration across theoretical and applied disciplines, by bringing together researchers versed in experimental and applied methods, and in behavioural and neuropsychological approaches to language and cognition. The members of the Centre will engage with a comprehensive view of language, particularly language learning, language loss and language recovery. Opportunities for collaborations with clinical faculty, both in research and in the training of graduate students in the Rehabilitation Science thesis-based masters and doctoral programs, will create fertile ground for a more profound understanding of form and function in natural language, language disorder, and difference. Distinguishing difference (stemming from bilingualism/multilingualism, limited literacy and proficiency) from disorder is of critical importance in clinical contexts, but is not typical of graduate training in SLP. The anticipated collaborations between clinical, theoretical and applied researchers can transform how pure language research informs clinical practice, and how clinical
practice can redefine and shape the research questions we ask. Students in the proposed program will have access to research opportunities in the new laboratory spaces planned for ARiEAL, in part CH-funded, in the Wilson Building. The ARiEAL spaces include multiple EEG units, eye-tracking units, soundproof phonetics lab; meeting rooms; and a flexible lab space, designed for the study of language across the lifespan, suitable for vulnerable populations.

Not only will students in the proposed program have the opportunity for research with experimental, applied and theoretical linguists through ARiEAL, but they will also engage in modules guided by experts in relevant linguistic areas, in particular in speech production and perception. The most obvious link between speech pathology and linguistics is phonetics, the study of the acoustic, articulatory and auditory properties of human speech (and the equivalent properties of sign language). The Faculty of Humanities obtained approval (Strategic Alignment Fund) to hire a phonetician with expertise in experimental phonetics (speech analysis, palatography), who will primarily strengthen the undergraduate and graduate programs in the Cognitive Science of Language, but who will also contribute meaningfully to the SLP program.

Finally, the connections between Humanities and Health Sciences will result in innumerable possibilities for national and international outreach. Several researchers in Linguistics & Languages already have connections with healthcare institutions and school boards for research purposes for the study of: reading and literacy, dyslexia, traumatic brain injury, bilingual aphasia. In addition, a central objective of the research centre is to foster new research collaborations with academic institutions in specific countries, largely developing countries (Brazil, Cuba, Ghana, Jamaica, Nigeria), with a view to expanding the methods and tools available for the study of language order and disorder to new social and linguistic contexts. These existing and planned partnerships will be immeasurably strengthened by the cross-fertilization of clinical and linguistic faculty and students, and the anticipated outcomes will converge in clinical applications that can have an impact at both the national and international levels.

The undergraduate Cognitive Science of Language program attracts many students who wish to pursue graduate degrees in speech and language pathology; it has been ‘feeding’ students to the eleven SLP program in the country since its inception, as has the linguistics program at McMaster. There is no doubt that the availability of an SLP program at McMaster, bolstered by the reputation and innovation for which our Health Sciences programs are known, will only attract more students to our undergraduate programs.
Dear Dr. Solomon:

Re: Support for Speech Language Pathology Program at McMaster University

The Hamilton Regional Speech and Language Pathology and Audiology Council (HRSLAC) is pleased to offer its support to the proposed Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology Program at McMaster University. The HRSLAC is a unique council with representation from the diverse settings in which speech-language pathologists (SLPs) are employed within the Hamilton area. The mandate of the Council, which has been in existence for 30 years, is to work collaboratively across sectors to enhance the quality and delivery of SLP and Audiology services within our community (please see attached Terms of Reference).

The problem-based program that McMaster is proposing will be the only one of its kind in the country. Its unique curriculum promises to graduate highly skilled clinicians who are self-directed innovators, prepared to succeed in Ontario’s rapidly changing health and education sectors. The program’s emphasis on interprofessional practice and collaborative team skills is particularly important for current models of service delivery. In addition, the program will prepare students for emerging clinical roles and non-traditional practice settings, which is essential to meeting the current and future need for SLP services within the province.

As a Council, we are excited about the engagement and involvement of the clinical community in the new program and feel that this will advance practice in our region and build capacity in the profession as a whole. As representatives of the broader community, we are committed to working with McMaster University to provide clinical placements and support delivery of the program.

We appreciated the opportunity to learn about the details of this innovative new program and provide feedback during the early stages of development. Drs. Solomon and Campbell have agreed to present an update on the SLP Program to the broader community during Speech and Hearing Awareness month in May 2016. We look forward to further dialogue on advancing the profession in our community and beyond.

Dianne Parr
Dianne Parr, Reg CASLPO Reg OCT
Manager, Communication Services
Hamilton Wentworth District School Board

On behalf of:
Kathleen Dekker, M.H.Sc., S-LP (C), Reg. CASLPO
Speech-Language Pathologist
Preschool Communication Service
McMaster Children’s Hospital - Chedoke Site - Hamilton Health Sciences
Vivienne Epstein  
Speech Language Pathologist  
Professional Development Lead - SLP  
Saint Elizabeth

Justine Hamilton, M.Cl.Sc., M.B.A.  
Owner / Speech-Language Pathologist  
Lear Communication

Linda Hollingham B.Sc., MA, CASPLO, AUD (C), CCC/A  
Manager and Professional Practice Leader, Audiology Department; Acting Manager for Speech-Language Pathology Department

Barbra Kubilius, MA, BA, Reg. CASLPO  
Speech-Language Pathologist  
St. Peter’s Hospital - Hamilton Health Sciences

Diana Paprica, M.Cl.Sc.  
Senior Speech-Language Pathologist  
Early Words - ASCY

Bonnie Reaburn-Jones, MSc, Reg. CASLPO  
Senior Speech Language Pathologist and Interim Professional Practice Lead Speech-Language Pathology  
St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton

Michelle Torsney, M.A. Reg. CASLPO  
Manager of Speech, Language + Hearing Services  
Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board
September 2, 2015

Re: Letter of Support for new program proposal for Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology MSc (SLP) within the School of Rehabilitation Science at McMaster University

To Whom It May Concern,

As the Director of CanChild, it is my pleasure to write a strong letter of support for the School of Rehabilitation Science’s newly proposed Master’s program in speech-language pathology. Housed within the School of Rehabilitation Science at McMaster University, CanChild is an internationally recognized research and educational centre that is focused on improving the lives of children and youth with disabilities and their families. Specifically, we take a leadership role in identifying emerging issues for research, practice, policy, and education; conduct high-quality community-driven research; effectively transfer knowledge into practice at clinical and health system levels; educate families and service providers; and mentor students to build capacity for future generations of researchers. In 2014 alone, CanChild researchers published over 220 articles in peer-reviewed journals in the areas of child health, childhood disability, measurement, and knowledge translation. In that same year, a total of 69 grants were funded to CanChild members (as either Principal or Co-Investigator) netting more than $9 million dollars in new grant funding.

Since CanChild’s inception in 1989, we have embraced an interdisciplinary approach to research and education with team members from pediatrics, rehabilitation medicine (physiatry), allied health, kinesiology, social psychology, epidemiology, and biostatistics. Our goals in CanChild’s Strategic Plan include building research capacity. Therefore, our centre is very excited about the possibility of increasing our team’s capacity in the area of speech-language pathology as the addition of a new professional Master’s program would bring both new faculty and students to McMaster. In particular, six existing faculty members from the School of Rehabilitation Science are core Scientists with CanChild, only one of whom has a background in speech-language pathology; these faculty often involve students from the existing professional programs in our centre’s research projects via experiential learning in evidence-based practice.

Given that several of the ongoing research projects at CanChild are of relevance to the speech-language pathology community, we see great potential for growth and new partnerships should this proposal for a new Master’s of Science program in Speech-Language Pathology receive approval.
Thank you again for the opportunity to support this exciting development at McMaster. Should you require further information please feel free to contact me by email at: gorter@mcmaster.ca or telephone at 905-525-9140 ext. 26855.

Sincerely,

Jan Willem GORTER, MD, PhD, FRCPC
Director of CanChild
Scotiabank Chair in Child Health Research
Professor of Pediatrics | School of Rehabilitation Science
Faculty of Health Sciences | McMaster University | McMaster Children's Hospital
September 8, 2015

Patty Solomon PhD
Professor and
Associate Dean
School of Rehabilitation Science
McMaster University
Institute of Applied Health Sciences
1400 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario L8S 1C7

Dear Dr. Solomon:

As Director and Chair, Professional Advisory Committee, St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton, President, St. Joseph’s Home Care, and a Speech-Language Pathologist I am delighted to write a letter of support for the development of a Speech-Language Pathology Program in the School of Rehabilitation Science at McMaster University.

We have a longstanding mutually beneficial relationship with the School of Rehabilitation Sciences and are excited by the potential of the new Speech-Language Pathology Program. I strongly believe that the self-directed, problem-based approach that is foundational to the education of health professionals at McMaster University will make a significant contribution to training future speech-language pathologists who are prepared to be life-long learners in an environment where health care and professional scopes of practice are ever-changing.

We are committed to providing exceptional clinical learning opportunities to students from this program and exploring other potential roles of Speech-Language Pathologists at St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton.

Sincerely,

Jane Loncke,
Clinical Director, Complex Care, Rehabilitation, Therapeutics, Community Partnerships, Corporate Alternate Level of Care, Health Links, and Corporate Seniors Strategy
Chair, Professional Advisory Committee

Chariton Avenue Campus
2920 Cannon St. E
Hamilton, ON, Canada L9C 3Z8
905-522-5086

King Street Campus
300 King St. W
Hamilton, ON, Canada L8S 1G9
905-522-5200

West 5th Street Campus
300 West 5th St
Hamilton, ON, Canada L8S 1C7
905-522-5200

www.stjoes.ca
September 30, 2015

Dr. Doug Welch
Dean, Graduate Studies
GH 212

Dear Dr. Welch:

RE: Support for a Speech-Language Pathology Program in the School of Rehabilitation Science

I am pleased to provide a letter of support for a new Speech-Language Pathology Program within the Faculty of Health Sciences. The development of a Speech-Language Pathology Program aligns with McMaster’s Strategic Mandate Agreement strengths in health sciences education and research, and health and society. Building on our international reputation and expertise in innovative rehabilitation sciences curricula, the Speech-Language Pathology program at McMaster will be the only problem-based program in Canada.

The Speech-Language Pathology program will also provide a foundation on which to forge new and unique research relationships between the School of Rehabilitation Science and the Department of Linguistics and Languages. While housed and funded within the School of Rehabilitation Science, a Speech-Language Pathology Program allows the development of synergies in research areas within Humanities that complement interests in the School of Rehabilitation Science related to childhood disability, aging, and brain injury including concussion.

I am pleased to confirm that we are committed to hiring an Assistant Dean for the new Speech-Language Pathology Program by July 1, 2016. This hiring will be partially supported through the Strategic Alignment Funding provided by the Provost. I can also confirm the commitment to support four additional faculty members who will be required to successfully mount an accredited SLP Program.

The new Speech-Language Pathology Program has the strong support of the Faculty of Health Sciences. If you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

John G. Kelton, M.D.
Dean and Vice-President
September 3, 2015

To Whom It May Concern,

Re: Letter of Support for new program proposal for Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology MSc (SLP)

I am the Director of the Special Education Policy and Programs Branch (SEPPB) of the Ontario Ministry of Education. It is my pleasure to write a letter of support for the School of Rehabilitation Science’s newly proposed Master’s program in speech-language pathology at McMaster University.

Our Branch has worked closely with faculty from the School of Rehabilitation Science through our involvement with CanChild’s “Partnering for Change” research project. In this project, CanChild researchers have been studying a tiered model for delivering rehabilitation services to school-age children with special needs. This innovative service model emphasizes collaboration among educators, parents, and clinicians to support students in the school context. The focus to date has been on occupational therapists, but the model is highly relevant to other health professionals, including speech-language pathologists.

The Partnering for Change project has been of interest to our branch in light of Ontario’s new Special Needs Strategy (SNS). The SNS aims to reorganize existing rehabilitation services so that children with special needs are identified sooner and seamlessly get the help that they need at the right time and in the right place from birth through the school years.

As these changes unfold across Ontario, there will be a need for speech-language pathologists who are self-directed, innovative, skilled in collaboration and able to flexibly adapt to new service models and service delivery contexts. These qualities are hallmarks of the problem-based learning programs for which McMaster University is world renowned. A new professional Master’s program that instills such attributes and skills in the next generation of speech-language pathologists would be a valuable asset to the province of Ontario.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Louise Sirisko,
Director
Special Education Policy and Programs Branch
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Unit 1 – 12 weeks academic</td>
<td>Clinical (2 weeks)</td>
<td>Break (2 weeks)</td>
<td>Unit 2 – 12 weeks academic</td>
<td>Clinical (5 weeks)</td>
<td>Break (1 week)</td>
<td>Unit 3 – 10 weeks academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td>Break (4 weeks)</td>
<td>Clinical (6 weeks)</td>
<td>Unit 4 – 10 weeks academic</td>
<td>Break (2 weeks)</td>
<td>Clinical (6 weeks)</td>
<td>Unit 5 – 14 weeks academic</td>
<td>Break (2 weeks)</td>
<td>Clinical (10 weeks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2 Continued</strong></td>
<td>Clinical (10 weeks; continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Clinical Weeks: 29
Total Academic Weeks: 58
Total Break Weeks: 11
### Appendix iii
Alignment of SAC Foundations of Clinical Practice with Curricular Units

Students are first introduced to each foundation in the units indicated below, and revisit foundational knowledge in progressively more complex contexts across the curriculum. Students are expected to achieve mastery required for beginning clinical practice by the end of their graduate program, across all foundational areas, consistent with expectations for registration for speech-language pathology practice in Ontario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAC Foundations of Clinical Practice for Speech-Language Pathology</th>
<th>Unit 1: Fundamentals of Clinical Practice I: Principles, Knowledge, and Skills for Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Unit 2: Fundamentals of Clinical Practice II: Roles and Practice Settings Across the Lifespan</th>
<th>Unit 3: Clinical Practice with Children, Youth, &amp; Young Adults</th>
<th>Unit 4: Clinical Practice with Adults and Older Adults</th>
<th>Unit 5: Complex Practice and Professional Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit One: Basic Requirements</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Anatomy and Physiology</td>
<td>1.4 Counselling and Applied Psychology</td>
<td>1.3 Genetics</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 Pharmacology and Other Medical Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Neuroanatomy and Neurophysiology</td>
<td>1.6 Speech Perception and Acoustics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Human Development</td>
<td>1.7 Instrumentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Psycholinguistics and Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9 Research Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Two: Principles of Clinical Practice and Professional Practice Issues</strong></td>
<td>2.2 Evaluation</td>
<td>2.1 Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Client Management</td>
<td>2.4 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Professional Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Three: Developmental Articulation/Phonological Disorders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Four: Neurologically Based Speech Disorders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Five: Developmental Language Disorders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix iii
Alignment of SAC Foundations of Clinical Practice with Curricular Units

| Unit Six: Acquired Language Disorders |  |  | 6.1 Nature  
6.2 Assessment  
6.3 Intervention |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Unit Seven: Voice Disorders          |  | 7.1 Nature  
7.2 Assessment  
7.3 Intervention | |
| Unit Eight: Resonance Disorders      |  |  | 8.1 Nature  
8.2 Assessment  
8.3 Intervention |
| Unit Nine: Fluency Disorders         |  | 9.1 Nature  
9.2 Assessment  
9.3 Intervention | |
| Unit Ten: Augmentative and Alternative Communication |  | 10.1 Nature  
10.2 Assessment  
10.3 Intervention | |
| Unit Eleven: Hearing Disorders and Related Speech-Language Disorders | 11.1 Nature  
11.2 Assessment  
11.3 Intervention |  |  |
| Unit Twelve: Dysphagia                |  |  | 12.1 Nature  
12.2 Assessment  
12.3 Intervention |
## Appendix iv
### McMaster SLP Credit Hours Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Term 1 (12 weeks)</th>
<th>Term 2 (12 weeks)</th>
<th>Term 3 (10 weeks)</th>
<th>Term 4 (10 weeks)</th>
<th>Term 5 (14 weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PBT</strong></td>
<td>5 hours / week =65 hours 6 Units</td>
<td>5 hours/week =65 hours 6 Units</td>
<td>5 hours/week =50 hours 6 Units</td>
<td>5 hours/week =50 hours 6 Units</td>
<td>3 hours/week =36 hours 3 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLP Clinical Skills</strong></td>
<td>5 hours / week =65 hours (+2 weeks of clinical placement) 6 Units</td>
<td>5 hours/week =60 hours 6 Units</td>
<td>5 hours/week =50 hours 6 Units</td>
<td>5 hours/week =70 hours 6 Units</td>
<td>5 hours/week =60 hours 6 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundation of SLP Practice</strong></td>
<td>3 hours/week =39 hours 3 Units</td>
<td>3 hours/week =30 hours 3 Units</td>
<td>3 hours/week =36 hours 3 Units</td>
<td>NA 3 Units</td>
<td>NA 3 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inquiry Seminars</strong></td>
<td>3 hours/week =36 hours 3 Units</td>
<td>3 hours/week =36 hours 3 Units</td>
<td>3 hours/week =30 hours 3 Units</td>
<td>3 hours/week =30 hours 3 Units</td>
<td>3 hours/week =36 hours 3 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBP &amp; Clinical Research</strong></td>
<td>NA 3 Units</td>
<td>NA 3 Units</td>
<td>NA 3 Units</td>
<td>3 hours/week (over 2 Units) 6 Units</td>
<td>6 Units &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical Practice</strong></td>
<td>2 weeks' (included as a component of clinical skills) 3 Units</td>
<td>4 weeks 3 Units</td>
<td>6 weeks 3 Units</td>
<td>6 weeks 3 Units</td>
<td>10 weeks 3 Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total UNITS**              | 18 Units | 21 Units | 21 Units | 24 Units | 15 Units |
| **Total HOURS**              | 208 Hours 16 hours/week | 160 Hours 16 hours/week | 192 Hours 16 hours/week | 224 Hours 16 hours/week | 168 Hours 14 hours/week |
Appendix iv
McMaster SLP Credit Hours Map

Total Program Units: 99 Units

Total Academic Weeks: 58 weeks
Total Clinical Weeks: 29 weeks
Total Weeks: 87 weeks
I Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities
At its meeting of December 8, 2015, Undergraduate Council approved, for recommendation to Senate, the establishment of a Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities program. The proposed program combines Business education offered by the Faculty of Business with the robust education offered by the Faculty of Humanities, to create a unique undergraduate program that is focused on training responsible leaders and citizens. The program includes strong experiential learning components, takes a global approach to leadership and management, and places high priority on community engagement and sustainable business practices.

that Senate approve the establishment of a Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities program, for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as set out in Attachment I.

For Information:

II Sessional Dates (Attachment II)
At its meeting of December 8, 2015, Undergraduate Council approved the 2016-17 Sessional Dates, as set out in Attachment II. The deferred examination periods for Winter term courses and courses that span the Fall and Winter terms will be determined early in the new year.

III Curriculum Revisions for Inclusion in the 2016-2017 Undergraduate Calendar
At its meeting of December 8, 2015, Undergraduate Council approved curriculum revisions in the Arts & Science Program, and in the Faculty of Business, Faculty of Engineering, Faculty of Health Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, Faculty of Science, and Faculty of Social Sciences, for inclusion in the 2016-2017 Undergraduate Calendar.

IV Terms of Award
At the same meeting, the Undergraduate Council approved: i) terms of award for thirteen new awards; ii) changes to nine terms of award; iii) thirteen new bursaries, and iv) changes to one terms of bursary.

(i) Terms of Award for New Awards
The Class of 1966 50th Anniversary Scholarship
The Josh and Jane Hunter Scholarship
The Air Liquide Canada Bachelor of Engineering Scholarship
The Air Liquide Canada Bachelor of Technology Scholarship
The Philip F. Connell Scholarship
The Alice and Walter Day Scholarship
The James R. (Jamie) Greilich Memorial Scholarship
The Robert J. Kulperger Scholarship
The Social Sciences Scholarship for Leadership in Diversity
The WalterFedy Engineering Scholarship
The Jones Family Opportunity for Education Academic Grant
The Dr. John Warkentin Academic Grant
The Michael Kamin Hart Memorial Scholarship*

(ii) Changes to Terms of Award
The Dundas Scholarships
The Leone Betty Blackwell Memorial Book Prize
The William D.G. Hunter Prize
The Internetco Limited Scholarship
The Burton R. James Memorial Prize
The Agnes and John MacNeill Memorial Prize
The Mark John Stojicic Scholarships
The Robert Taylor Scholarship in Commerce
The Jim Waddington Prize in Physics and Astronomy

(iii) New Bursaries
The Eleanor Enkin Midwifery Bursary
The Murray Enkin Midwifery Bursary
The Loucks Family Bachelor of Health Sciences Bursary
The Midwifery Bursary
The Ruth Murray Memorial Bachelor of Health Sciences Bursary
The Queen Elizabeth II International Travel Bursary
The Soroptimist International of Hamilton - Burlington Midwifery Bursary
The Ivana Baldelli Bursary
The Dr. Keyna Bracken Bursary
The Canadian Medical Foundation (CMF) Bursary
The Mary Thomas Bursary
The Department of Biochemistry & Biomedical Sciences Bursary*
The Department of Medicine Bursary*

(iv) Changes to Terms of Bursary
The Dundas Bursary (Original)

* These Awards/Bursaries were previously established by and were administered by the Faculty of Health Sciences, and are now being transferred to the Office of Student Financial Aid and Scholarships and will be included in the Undergraduate Calendar.

V Award Name Changes
At the same meeting, Undergraduate Council received, for information, one award name change.

VI Award Value Changes
At the same meeting, Undergraduate Council received, for information, six award value changes.
VII Awards Removed from the Undergraduate Calendar
At the same meeting, Undergraduate Council received, for information, one award removed from the Undergraduate Calendar.

VIII Business Essentials Program – New Course
At its meeting of December 8, 2015, Undergraduate Council approved establishment of a new course, ESS 819 Intrapreneurship: The Innovator Within, for the Business Essentials Program offered by the Centre for Continuing Education.

IX New Certificate of Completion
At the same meeting, Undergraduate Council received, for information, information regarding the establishment of a Certificate of Completion program, Business Alignment Program for Senior IT Leaders in partnership with Global Knowledge.

X New Certificate of Attendance
At the same meeting, Undergraduate Council received, for information, information regarding the establishment of a Certificate of Attendance program, Leadership on the Inside, a custom corporate training program for the City of Hamilton.

XI Closure of the Web Design and Development Program
At the same meeting, Undergraduate Council received, for information, plans for the Centre for Continuing Education to wind down and close the Web Design and Development Program. A new replacement program proposal is under development.

Documents detailing items for information are available for review on the Undergraduate Council Meeting Materials Page: [http://www.mcmaster.ca/univsee/agendas/agendaUGC.cfm](http://www.mcmaster.ca/univsee/agendas/agendaUGC.cfm)

Senate: January 13, 2016
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL FOR
Bachelors of Integrated Business
and Humanities (Honours)

Date: November 2015
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PROGRAM

1.1 PROGRAM DESCRIPTION
The B. Com. Integrated Business and Humanities (IBH) recognizes the learning needs of future leaders who will face increasingly complex and multi-dimensional problems that require comprehensive and multi-disciplinary knowledge and skills. Capitalizing on the competencies of McMaster University as a comprehensive higher education institution, while acknowledging the exceptional demands of the current business environment, the proposed program augments Business education offered by the Faculty of Business with the robust education offered at the Faculty of Humanities, to create a unique undergraduate program that is focused on training responsible leaders and citizens. Approximately 63 percent of the content is offered by the faculty of Business, 35 percent is provided by the faculty of Humanities, and the remaining two percent is selected from other university courses to fulfill the learning outcomes of the program. B. Com. IBH also contains strong experiential learning components, takes a global approach to leadership and management, and places high priority on community engagement and sustainable business practices.

1.1.1 Program Objectives
B. Com. IBH aims to integrate principles and courses from the faculties of Business and Humanities to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Train collaborative, mindful and passionate leaders that can envision, inspire, and lead sustainable organizations. These will be individuals who will seize upon opportunities for social change that creates value for stakeholders.

2. Prepare students to become global citizens that are both emotionally and culturally intelligent and are deeply engaged with their communities.

3. Educate future business leaders that are not only equipped with cutting-edge expertise and knowledge but are also independent thinkers and life-long learners.

4. Cultivate students’ unique individual virtues and competencies, including leadership behaviors framed by empathy, sensitivity to societal value and legacy impact of decisions.

5. Provide students with an exceptional curriculum in combination with crucial and applicable skills, such as critical thinking and collaborative problem solving, and with a focus on the global marketplace.

To accomplish the above objectives, the program will emphasize leadership development, community engagement, a global perspective, and entrepreneurship, with an emphasis on social entrepreneurship.
1.2 PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND CONSULTATION PROCESS

The idea of the program was conceived within the Faculty of Business in the summer of 2013. The Associate Dean (Academic) struck an ad-hoc committee to respond to the IQAP review of the commerce program in 2012. In the course of discussions, the idea of an interdisciplinary degree in business and the liberal arts was proposed. After extensive consultation with different stakeholders within the School of Business (Academic Programs Office, Centre for Business Career Development and Advancement, and library), the Dean approved the idea in principle and the Associate Dean (Academic) was given the task of developing a formal proposal for the new program. In the course of consultation within the Faculty of Business, we invited Dr. Jean Wilson, Director of the Arts and Science Program, to a meeting to learn more about interdisciplinary programs.

After the program idea was accepted in principle at the Faculty of Business, we identified the Faculty of Humanities as a potential partner. Shortly thereafter, the Dean and the Associate Dean (Academic) met with their counterparts at the faculty of Humanities, who agreed to this partnership. Later, the Deans and Associate Deans (Academic) of both faculties met with the Provost, who also approved the idea in principle. Moreover, the President was also made aware of the two faculties' plan to introduce a new interdisciplinary program.

The McMaster Institute for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (MIIETL) was consulted extensively throughout the development of this proposal. First, the Associate Dean (Academic) met a few times with Ahmad Arshad, AVP for Teaching and Learning, to refine the proposal. Second, MIIETL educational consultants were instrumental in helping to articulate program learning outcomes and to relate the outcomes to degree level expectations. Finally, the Associate Dean (Academic) presented the idea to different stakeholders who found the idea to be innovative, and who affirmed that the proposed program fills a gap in the market where there is a demand for business graduates who are well-rounded and possess leadership skills.

1.3 CONSISTENCY WITH MCMASTER'S MISSION AND ACADEMIC PLAN

1.3.1 Consistency with the Strategic Mandate Agreement

In March 2014, McMaster University and the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) signed a Strategic Mandate Agreement (SMA) for the period April 1, 2014 to March 31, 2017.¹ The purpose of the SMA is to identify the University's existing institutional strengths; to support the current vision, mission, and mandate of the University within the context of the University's governing legislation and outline how the University's priorities align with Ontario's

vision and Differentiation Policy Framework; and to inform Ministry decision making through
greater alignment of Ministry policies and processes to further support and guide the
University’s areas of strength.\(^2\) In the SMA, McMaster identifies “Business and Economics” as
one of the ten areas of Institutional Strength, and as one of the five program areas for growth.

With a robust demand for Business education, the B. Com. IBH program clearly capitalizes on
the institutional strengths of McMaster University in addition to contributing to its growth.
Moreover, the SMA recognizes as a key area of differentiation McMaster’s “signature
pedagogies which include problem-based learning and inquiry, and its distinctively collaborative
culture (which) has fostered strong interdisciplinary programs and partnerships.” The B. Com.
IBH is an interdisciplinary program that will be a unique differentiator of McMaster University
and has one of the SMA’s areas of growth and differentiation as its primary focus.

The “Teaching and Learning” section of the SMA captures institutional strength in program
delivery methods that expand learning options for students, and improve the learning
experience and career preparedness. This may include, but is not limited to, experiential
learning, online learning, entrepreneurial learning, work integrated learning, and
international exchange opportunities.”\(^3\) The B. Com. IBH program emphasizes student
learning in that spirit. In Section 4 of the proposal, we detail the learning experience for
students in the program. For example, experiential learning will be emphasized throughout the
program, with a special focus on community-based experiential learning. In 2014, the School of
Business introduced online learning in its B. Com. program through courses that are offered
completely online or via the flipped classroom model. The Learning Portfolio (electronic
portfolio) was also introduced in 2014, and currently there are seven undergraduate courses
that require students to make entries in the LP to document and reflect on their learning. We
intend to capitalize on our recent expertise in online learning and the LP in the B. Com. IBH
program. Entrepreneurial learning is also emphasized in the B. Com. IBH program as
entrepreneurship is one of the three pillars of the new program. Integrated learning will be
achieved in the program through integrating Humanities education into Business courses, and
will culminate in the three fourth year integrative capstone courses that will be taught in teams of
faculty from the Faculties of Business and Humanities. Finally, students in the B. Com. IBH will
gain a global perspective through emphasis on international issues in many individual courses;
through the integrative fourth year capstone course “Global Perspective and Community

\(^2\) Strategic Mandate Agreement, p. 2
\(^3\) Ibid, p. 5
Engagement"; and they will have access to the well-established BizX program at the DeGroote School of Business.

### 1.3.2 Alignment with McMaster’s Current Strategic Priorities

President Patrick Deane’s letter *Forward with Integrity* sets the strategic priorities of the University. According to FWI, McMaster University identifies the following four areas as strategic priorities: (1) student experience, (2) community engagement, (3) research, and (4) internationalization. McMaster’s reputation as an institution of invention and reinvention is demonstrated in its flagship interdisciplinary programs, such as Engineering and Management, Arts and Science, and Integrated Sciences. Under the heading “Student Experience” in FWI, President Deane states that that the success of these programs is the result of a determination to create an extremely high-quality learning experience for a limited student constituency. The B. Com. IBH will extend this type of high-quality learning to more students. To offer a rich and transformative learning experience, new programs should integrate the following three elements: experiential learning, self-directed learning, and interdisciplinarity.

The B. Com. IBH is well-aligned and advances the strategic priority of the student experience as described in FWI. Designed as an interdisciplinary program, the B. Com. IBH will be among other McMaster flagship interdisciplinary programs. Also, the B. Com. IBH is designed to offer students a high-quality learning experience as detailed in sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. Some of the program features that contribute to high-quality learning experience include experiential learning, community-partnered learning, and interdisciplinary teaching strategies.

In addition to the student experience, the other strategic priorities are met in the B. Com. IBH. For example, community-learning features of the program as detailed in section 4 answer the President’s call for greater community engagement. Moreover, the strategic priority on internalization is met through an emphasis on a global perspective throughout the program (e.g. Program Learning Outcome # 4), and through establishing unique partnerships with liberal arts schools and business schools that support the vision of the program. This can be arranged as an exchange term or a faculty led global classroom (minimum two week study trip). Such an experience will help foster an international perspective in these future leaders, and develop their cultural sensitivity. Finally, research will be an integral part of the new program as students gain knowledge of the common research practices used in generating Business and Humanities knowledge, including various quantitative and qualitative techniques. Research methods that students will learn include survey studies, field research, simulation, meta-analysis, systematic reviews, historical methodology, philosophical inquiry, issues in ethnographic data collection, interviewing techniques for qualitative data collection.
1.4 PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Prior to graduating from the B. Com. IBH, each student will:

1. Develop skills to lead self and others using effective leadership strategies (Leadership)
2. Conduct research, and identify and exploit new opportunities; experience setbacks and reflect on critical incidents in order to identify learning opportunities; and conduct organizational problem solving and undergo experiential learning through the implementation of new routines and practices (Entrepreneurship)
3. Understand the characteristics (e.g., structure and dynamics) of communities, and act as change agents who are capable of identifying and addressing community needs and opportunities (Community Engagement)
4. Recognize opportunities and understand the challenges of running a business in a global environment (Global Perspective)
5. Understand and apply professional standards, theory, and research to address business problems (Disciplinary Business Knowledge)
6. Recognize and identify the ethical dimensions of decision making in a business context; understand how ethical reasoning applies to business decisions, and assess ethically-responsible options relative to the needs and interests of relevant stakeholders to address issues and challenges in a business context (Ethical Reasoning)
7. Recognize, identify, and consider the relevance and implications of historical, social and cultural issues (including linguistic matters) when leading organizations. (Historical and Multicultural Perspective)

1.5 CONSISTENCY WITH DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOs</th>
<th>DLEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTREPRENEURSHIP</td>
<td>1,3,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>1,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE</td>
<td>1,2,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCIPLINARY BUSINESS KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHICAL REASONING</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORICAL AND MULTICULTURAL PERSPECTIVE</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.1 Meeting DLEs
1.5.1.1 Depth and Breadth of Knowledge

The breadth of knowledge is accomplished through the offering of Business courses that cover all functional business areas, and Humanities courses that cover a variety of disciplines such as history, linguistics, philosophy, ethics, and peace studies. The depth of knowledge is achieved through scaffolding courses along a path that introduces students to basic knowledge of the three pillars of the program (Leadership, Entrepreneurship, and Community Engagement and Global Perspective) early on and builds on that knowledge as students progress through the program.

The Leadership pillar in the program is built on IBH 1BA3 (Organizational Behaviour) in the second term of the first year. This preliminary course is where students are introduced to such basics as human perception processes; behavior impacts of personality, values, and attitudes; communication; motivation; decision-making; stress management; time management; change management; power; politics; group and organizational dynamics. Also, in the first year, students are required to take three courses in Humanities to build foundations in communication skills, language knowledge and ethics: IBH 1BB3 (Insight and Inquiry: Questions to change the world), IBH 1AC3 (Sentence & Communication Structure in Modern English), and IBH 1BC3 (Introduction to Ethics). In the second year, students proceed to IBH 2AC3 (Human Resource Management) where they extend these foundations into human resource management applications. To complement the areas of Conscious Leadership and Analysis-Centered Leadership, students are required to take three courses in Humanities: IBH 2AE3 (Critical Thinking) and IBH 2BD3 (Moral Issues), and IBH 2BE3 (Introduction to Sociolinguistics). Aside from developing moral and ethical reasoning, and critical thinking skills, students are introduced to key topics in language and society: bilingualism/multilingualism, language in the context of migration and globalization; minority languages; language policy; language and politics; language and gender; sociolinguistic variation; World Englishes. To build on communication skills, students are required to take IBH 3BDE3 (Interpersonal Communication) in the second year, and IBH 3AD3 (Cross-Cultural Communication) in the third year.

In third year, students proceed to IBH 3AA3 (Management Skills Development) where they develop critical skills in areas such as multi-level communication; multi-layer decision-making; conflict management; mentoring and coaching; and team building. This journey culminates in an integrated learning experience course IBH 4AA6 (Leadership) where students develop and practice at a higher level in the areas of Conscious Leadership; Analysis-Centered Leadership; Solutions-Focused Leadership; and Team-Based Leadership. This six-unit course will be taught in a team consisting of a faculty member from each Faculty.
The Entrepreneurship pillar begins with a foundation course, IBH 3AB3, examining the importance of institutional structures, support, and regulation vis-à-vis a variety of organizational forms, including the history and comparative nature of different economic systems and environments. The course then develops examining the unique properties and requirements associated with organizational emergence. Students will work in teams using simulations that challenge their ability to conduct team work, to solve emergent unforeseeable problems, and to examine the ethical and practical consequences of their decision making, as well as the learning outcomes that result from less than successful activities (e.g. failure). They will diarize their experiences over the semester and provide reflective summaries of their learning challenges, failures, and accomplishments, concluding with proposals to better exploit the future entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial opportunities that they face.

The final six-unit capstone entrepreneurship course, IBH 4AB6, will feature experiential learning anchored primarily in team-based learning. Students will be organized around existing entrepreneurial or intrapreneurial project problems, and will work intensively with their project mentor, under faculty direction, toward solving or advancing an important organizational goal. The project will necessitate the demonstration of advanced research skills, as well as the application of leadership and managerial processes learning in previous required courses. The final project will consist of a written document as well as a team based publically presented “solution” to the assigned semester long task. The course will be taught by interdisciplinary team from both Faculties. In addition to the Humanities courses on communication skills, ethics, critical thinking, and moral issues, that will support the pillar of entrepreneurship, students are required to take IBH 1BD3 (Introduction to Peace Studies), IBH 3BC3 (Poverty, Privilege and Protest in Canadian History), and IBH 3AC3 (Business History).

The Community Engagement and Global Perspectives pillar is built upon an introductory course CMTYENGA 2AO3 Community Engagement. Students will take this foundational course in Year 1 and it will help them develop an understanding of structure, power, politics and processes in communities. This knowledge will help prepare students for effective and ethical participation as leaders. In the following year students will be working in teams to identify a community business for which they can undertake a review of current business / marketing practices and develop a new road map to help the business achieve its goals. Students will be encouraged to work with the not-for-profit sector so as to gain an appreciation of the challenges faced by community development organizations in delivering services. This experience should allow ample opportunity for decision making given resource constraints, learning from differing perspectives in a team setting and developing solutions to often ambiguous problems. In third year students will undertake a global mobility experience either as a study term on exchange or
as a study trip supervised by faculty. These culturally immersive experiences will be
transformative in creating sensitivity to cultures, refine the interpersonal skills and the leadership
/persuasion and influence skills of our students. Depending on the experience and location
they will develop a perspective on needs of marginalized communities. Students will also learn
how to influence the creation and spread of wealth through collaborative effort. The capstone
course, IBH 4AC6, in the final year will embed a thought process of shared wins and help us
build future business leaders with character and integrity. This pillar will become key to
application of principles being learnt in the Leadership pillar, and will offer abundant opportunity
for students to ask difficult questions, reflect and develop a personal road map on their journey
as change agents within their spheres of influence.

At the introductory level assessment takes the form of multiple choice exams, small essay
assignments (collaborative and individual), and Learning Portfolio (LP) submissions. Students’
learning will also be assessed through argumentation and historiographic essays, reflective
writing, and oral presentations. At the intermediate level, students are assessed for their
performance in individual and group projects, research proposals, classroom and tutorial
participation, experiential exercises, and more in-depth LP submissions. At the advanced level,
students are required to complete self-assessment, transformative learning experiences,
reflective learning, case studies based on real world business problems, and higher-level LP
submissions.

1.5.1.2 Knowledge of Methodologies

Students gain knowledge of the common research practices used in generating Business and
Humanities knowledge including various quantitative and qualitative techniques. Quantitative
methods that students are learning about are survey studies, field research, simulation, meta-
analysis, and systematic reviews. Qualitative methods included in courses are interviews,
content analysis, case studies and so forth. For example in 1BA3 (Organizational Behaviour)
students learn about how experiments are conducted, how different variables are measured,
and how results are interpreted. They also learn about the differences between results of single
studies versus meta-studies. In IBH 3AB3 (Applied Marketing Management) students apply
field study and business knowledge by solving real business problems for local businesses. In
Humanities courses students are introduced to various research methods. For example through
History courses students will gain facility with wide range of historical research techniques. They
will also be able to frame historical questions and identify appropriate research methods.

Assessment of the methodologies taught in introductory courses takes the form of multiple
choice exam questions. In intermediate courses, using field studies, students are assessed
based on the quality of solutions and presentations. In advanced courses, students' knowledge of research methods is assessed through individual assignments and group projects.

1.5.1.3 Application of Knowledge

Students apply their business knowledge through individual assignments, group projects, case analysis, and field projects. In capstone courses in particular students will integrate and apply the knowledge acquired throughout the program. For example through group projects students apply effective teamwork practices and leadership principles and they will be assessed on how successfully they have applied their knowledge. In IBH 4AA6 students will be given the opportunity to do an in-depth self-analysis around leadership strengths and weaknesses, and based on their findings they design and implement key action steps for thinking and behavioral improvements going forward as they enter the workforce. Students will also be required to participate in various community related projects in which they apply their knowledge in order to solve a community based business problem. The program will also require student to write a business model for a start-up in which they will apply various skills and knowledge they have acquired throughout the program.

Students' application of knowledge is assessed by evaluating the quality of various projects and real world business problem-solving. Typical evaluations will include oral presentations, writing, and the learning portfolio.

1.5.1.4 Communication Skills

Communication skills will be emphasized throughout the program. First, some courses in the program are entirely about communication skills such as IBH 1AC3 (Sentence & Communication Structure in Modern English), IBH 3BD3 (Interpersonal Communication) and IBH 3AD3 (Cross-Cultural Communication). Generally, the linguistics courses will provide opportunities to develop the skills of analytical reasoning, critical thinking, and argumentation. Students will also acquire scientific writing skills and learn how to formulate testable hypotheses, generate predictions, make arguments and draw conclusions, and communicate findings in a clear and concise manner. Moreover, students will develop skills to find and organize linguistic data, and support findings with empirical evidence. Philosophy courses will also enhance students' communication skills by developing their argumentation and valid reasoning abilities, organized thinking skills, and oral and written communication skills.

Second, due to the small intake of students into this program, the majority of the courses will provide the opportunity for class participation and written assignments. Additionally, advanced
courses, which integrate knowledge and have field studies, will require students to communicate with various external stakeholders. The assessment will be based on quality of classroom participation, the quality of written submissions, and the quality of presentations.

1.5.1.5 Awareness of Limits of Knowledge

The limitations of research methods and social sciences in general are taught throughout the program. For example, students learn about the limitations of different psychometric scales, judgment biases, and managerial limitations in making rational decisions. In addition, students are taught the limitations of models in social sciences in general and in business in particular in making predictions. For example, students learn that behaviors (e.g., managerial behaviors or consumer behaviors) are not always consistent with theories. This stands in stark contrast to theories and models in hard sciences (e.g. Physics and Math). For example, we know from physics that water evaporated when boiled under certain circumstances. Contrast that with the models of group dynamics. The sequential linear models predict groups to go through developmental stages of forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. While the punctuated equilibrium model suggests that groups will go through a crisis around the midpoint of their allocated time and will only perform afterwards. These complementing and sometimes contradicting models will inform students of the limitations of social and business knowledge.

1.5.1.6 Autonomy and Professional Capacity

Since the program entails strong experiential learning components, students are provided with opportunities to apply their knowledge in real world settings. For example, in their community engagement capstone course students will have the opportunity to conduct field studies on real world businesses from the local community. Through these experiential learning opportunities students will exercise personal responsibility and decision making skills and how to effectively work with others. Graduates of this program will be able to pursue graduate studies in business or take additional courses to qualify for professional designations such as CHRP, CPA, and CFA.

Through a combination on Business and Humanities courses students will also develop critical thinking skills and ability to identify, evaluate and effectively act in face of ethical and moral issues in their professional capacity. Students will gain understanding of big questions regarding truth, knowledge, reality, a critical understanding of self and the world, critical issues for leadership (e.g. justice, morality, and values), and relevant moral issues.

This program will implement learning portfolio in order to assess acquiring autonomy and professional capacity. Learning portfolio will enable students to document evidence of their
learning experiences and reflect on how these experiences will contribute to their future professional endeavors.

1.6 DEMAND FOR PROGRAM

1.6.1 Evidence of Societal/Labour Market Need

According to the Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities (MTCU), degrees offered by universities should reflect the changes in the nature of the jobs available in near future. In particular, the growing economy results in expansion into international trade and increasing demand for a workforce that is sensitive to the needs of customers in different countries and cultures and familiar with the international business tools and skills. Also, the makeup of the workforce in Canada, and Ontario in particular, is highly diverse with regards to age, gender and cultural background. Therefore, employers are increasingly looking for graduates who can demonstrate leadership and communication skills required for effective performance in this context.

It is apparent from the above that there is demand for skills that are not normally covered in full in a traditional B. Com. program. The Faculty of Business identified the Faculty of Humanities as a partner in delivering such program because the skills that Humanities students acquire are in demand in the marketplace. The Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) prepared an interactive graphic, EduData, which is based on the Canadian National Household Survey to explore where bachelor’s degree graduates work in Ontario. According to the graphic, 19 percent of Ontario undergraduates study business, and about two-thirds of them finds careers in business-related areas. Of Humanities graduates, about 60 percent have business-related areas. Such high placement of Humanities graduates in business-related jobs suggests that the skills that these graduates possess are in demand in business. The B. Com. IBH responds to this demand by offering courses and content that help students to recognize and understand opportunities and challenges of running business in global environment, and apply learned skills in a global context.

Moreover, Ontario Ministry of research and innovation’s agenda emphasizes the importance of developing commerce skills in the future workforce and “supports the development and teaching

---


of commerce skills across sectors and disciplines". This report also calls for expanding on the ways through which students in Ontario develop commerce skills by combining business training with other programs of study. In particular, this report recognizes that knowledge of humanities and social sciences are vital for boosting an innovative economy. The B. Com. IBH responds to these demands in the labour market by combining essential business and humanities courses that will equip its graduates with a broad understanding of business, culture, history, and important social issues that will enable them to become innovative problem solvers and leaders.

In designing this program we have also consulted the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International) that emphasizes globalization as “one of the most significant forces of change for business”7. In particular the AACSB points out the importance of business education that focuses on sustained economic growth in emerging markets and increasing demand for trained managers. Having a global perspective is essential for commerce graduates in G7 counties (including Canada) where businesses are looking to expand into those emerging markets of ASEAN-5 (composed of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam) and the Newly Industrialized Asian Economies (composed of Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong SAR, Singapore, and South Korea).8 The AACSB International recommends collaborative and multi-disciplinary business degrees as means to provide commerce students with a global perspective. More specifically the AACSB recommends several approaches for instilling globalization in business education based on the Pyramid Model9 through increasing global awareness, understanding, and competency, essential business knowledge, cultural awareness, and fluency in a second modern language. These approaches have also been implemented in the design of the B. Com. IBH.

---


This program helps student to develop transferable skills which can feed into different professions. In addition to traditional careers in Business, we anticipate the graduates of this program to pursue the following potential careers:

1. Entrepreneurial start-ups, with a focus on the arts and music.
2. Community based event organization (e.g. art crawl and supercrawl, historical associations, holiday and community fare organization such as cactus festival, Locke Street Faire, etc...).
3. Community NGO director or administrator.
4. Local government positions.
5. Working for small businesses looking for individuals with community and virtual networking experience.
6. Immigrant Settlement organizations.
7. The arts community, positions in museums, community event development.
8. Senior living facilities looking for individuals capable of community engagement.
9. Provincial and national organizations, looking for staff members who develop and maintain community engagement.
10. Political parties (local, regional, national) looking for individuals capable of membership maintenance and enhancement (including those interested in a political career).
11. Virtual community networking specialists working for non-profits or for-profit industries: Individuals who know how to use virtual media to establish and develop communities of interest.

1.6.2 Evidence of Student Demand

Demand for business education is robust as evident by increased applications to the business program at McMaster University. According to the 2011 Canadian National Household Survey, 19 percent of undergraduate students in Ontario are enrolled in Business. At McMaster University, that ratio is about 12 percent. The program is designed to attract top students who are potentially future leaders. The centrality of business in society, the great number of undergraduates who choose business as their field of study, and the even greater numbers who will be employed in business for their working lives demand that higher education do more than just help students acquire tools for advancing their personal careers in business. In order to ensure that its graduates develop the breadth of outlook and conceptual agility for living in a global century, higher education also needs to ensure that students understand the relation of business to the larger world and can ac on that understanding as business professionals and as citizens.
1.6.3 Justifiable Duplication
The B. Com. IBH is unique because it integrates business education with humanities education. There are only two programs in the province that come close to integrating business with humanities and liberal arts. First, Brock University offers a bachelor of Business Administration Program that combines business courses with studies from other faculties including Social Sciences, Humanities, Mathematics, and Science. This program uses a variety of teaching methods and delivery techniques with the goal of helping students to develop business skills as well as communication, ethical, analytical, and problem solving skills. While some of the learning outcomes of our B. Com. IBH overlap with those of this program at Brock University, our program incorporates learning outcomes by instilling global and historical perspective, community engagement values, and leadership skills.

The other program is at the University of Western Ontario, which offers a combined program between the faculty of Arts and Sciences and Honors Business Administration (HBA) program. This program takes five years in which commerce students enrol in an Honors Specialization at the Faculty of Arts and Humanities in the second year after achieving a minimum average of 78% in the first year in HBA. Our B. Com. IBH is different because we admit students into the program directly from high school. Unlike the program at the University of Western Ontario, the B. Com. IBH is planned based on the three pillars of leadership, entrepreneurship, and community engagement and global perspective.

1.7 DEGREE NOMENCLATURE
The proposed degree name is Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities (Honours). This nomenclature is commensurate with the primary focus and the content of the B. Com. IBH. It is a bachelor's honours degree that is designed to meet Degree Level Expectation at the Bachelor's Honours level.

ADMISSION & ENROLMENT
2.1 ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Candidates are required to complete a mandatory Supplementary Application Form. The information provided enters into the selection process. Only applicants with high academic standing will be selected. Successful candidates must present a minimum average in the low 90's.

The following are the minimum Grade 12 U and M requirements:
1. English U
2. Calculus and Vectors U
3. Data Management U
4. Completion of additional U or M courses to total six courses

The requirement of English and Calculus is supported by an analysis that found English to be the best predictor of students' success in our Commerce program. The Calculus is required to ensure that students have strong quantitative and analytical skills. The purpose of the supplementary application is to seek more information about the candidates' potential to be successful in this program. An admission committee will decide on the qualities and variables that are predictive of candidates' performance in the program.

### 2.2 ENROLMENT PLANNING AND ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Entry</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STRUCTURE

#### 3.1 ADMINISTRATIVE, GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNICATION

Since B. Com. IBH is an interdisciplinary program, the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Faculty of Business and the Faculty of Humanities articulates administrative and governance structure of the program. This section of the proposal provides an overview of the program administrative and governance structure, and the details are articulated in the MOA.
The program is overseen by a Director and is supported by an Administrative Assistant. A standing Integrated Business and Humanities Operating Committee has responsibility for curriculum development recommendations for the Integrated Business and Humanities program to the Undergraduate and Curriculum Policy of the Faculty of Business and the Faculty of Humanities, where appropriate. The Operating Committee would also elect a subcommittee for admissions consisting of the program director and one faculty member from each faculty. The composition of the IBH Operating Committee is as follows:

Chair: Director, Integrated Business and Humanities

Ex Officio: President

Provost

Dean, Faculty of Business

Dean, Faculty of Humanities

Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Business

Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Humanities

Faculty: Five faculty members, three from the Faculty of Business and two from the Faculty of Humanities, to be appointed by their respective Deans on the recommendations of their department or area chairs, for staggered three-year terms

Students: One undergraduate student, registered in the IBH program, to be appointed by both Deans, for a one-year term

Consultants Manager, Academic Programs Office at the Faculty of Business (non-voting): Assistant Dean (Studies), Faculty of Humanities Resource Staff, as appropriate

Secretary: Administrative Assistant, IBH program (non-voting)

The Program Director will be selected by a committee co-chaired by the Deans (or their delegates) from the Faculties of Business and Humanities. The normal term
appointment for the Program Director shall be five years, with the possibility of renewal. Every effort will be made to rotate the Directorship of the program between Business and Humanities depending on the interest and qualifications of the faculty members. The Program Director will be accountable to the program’s Executive Committee (see below) and will report jointly to the Deans of Business and Humanities. Remuneration for the Program Director (e.g., stipend, course releases,) will be provided by the Program. Terms of Reference for the Program Director position are attached to the MOA.

3.2 STRUCTURE AND REGULATION

3.2.1 Structure and Program Learning Outcomes

The governance of the program is structured to achieve program learning outcomes. The program will have a dedicated director whose main responsibility is to guarantee that the curriculum and any proposed changes to curriculum will contribute to the program learning outcomes. The IBH Operating Committee will meet at least twice annually to review proposals to curriculum changes that might enhance program learning outcomes. The composition of the operating committee assures that the interdisciplinary nature of the program remains intact. It is important that each Faculty has a say in any program changes.

3.2.2 Breakdown of Curriculum

The program is a niche program that emphasizes the importance of Humanities in Business education. Therefore, the program has very little room for electives. IBH is a four-year program, with a total of 120 university credit units. All the courses in the program are three credit units, with the exception of three fourth-year courses which are six credit units each. The fourth-year courses are integrated and taught in interdisciplinary teams. Below is the breakdown of curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 120 credit units
3.3 PROGRAM LENGTH & PROGRESSION

The detailed program curriculum is as follows:

| Year 1 | | Year 2 | | Year 3 | | Year 4 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Fall   | Winter | Fall   | Winter | Fall   | Winter | Fall   | Winter |
| IBH 1AA3 | IBH 1BA3 | IBH 2AA3 | IBH 2BA3 | IBH 3AA3 | IBH 3BA3 | IBH 4AA6-A | IBH 4AA6-B |
| IBH 1AB3 | ECON 1BB3 | IBH 2AB3 | IBH 2BB3 | IBH 3AB3 | IBH 3BB3 | IBH 4AB6-A | IBH 4AB6-B |
| ECON 1B03 | IBH 1BB3 | IBH 2AC3 | IBH 2BC3 | IBH 3AC3 | IBH 3BC3 | IBH 4AC6-A | IBH 4AC6-B |
| IBH 1AC3 | IBH 1BC3 | IBH 2AD3 | IBH 2BD3 | IBH 3AD3 | IBH 3BD3 | Commerce Elective | Commerce Elective |
| CMTYENGA 2A03 | IBH 1BD3 | IBH 2AE3 | IBH 2BE3 | Commerce Elective | Commerce Elective | Commerce Elective | Commerce Elective |

**Year 1**

**Fall**
- IBH 1AA3
- IBH 1AB3
- ECON 1B03
- IBH 1AC3
- CMTYENGA 2A03

**Winter**
- IBH 1BA3
- ECON 1BB3
- IBH 1BB3
- IBH 1BC3
- IBH 1BD3

**Year 2**

**Fall**
- IBH 2AA3
- IBH 2AB3
- IBH 2AC3
- IBH 2AD3
- IBH 2AE3

**Winter**
- IBH 2BA3
- IBH 2BB3
- IBH 2BC3
- IBH 2BD3
- IBH 2BE3

**Year 3**

**Fall**
- IBH 3AA3
- IBH 3AB3
- IBH 3AC3
- IBH 3AD3

**Year 4**

**Fall**
- IBH 4AA6-A
- IBH 4AA6-B
- IBH 4AB6-A
- IBH 4AB6-B
- IBH 4AC6-A
- IBH 4AC6-B

Courses:
- Financial Accounting
- Business Environment and Organization
- Introductory Microeconomics
- Sentence & Communication Structure in Modern English
- Foundations of Community Engagement
- Organizational Behavior
- Introductory Macroeconomics
- Insight and Inquiry: Questions to Change the World
- Introduction to Ethics
- Introduction to Peace Studies
- Introduction to Marketing
- Information Systems in Management
- Human Resource Management
- Applied Statistics for Business
- Critical Thinking
- Managerial Accounting
- Introduction to Finance
- Production and Operations Management
- Moral Issues
- Introduction to Sociolinguistics
- Management Skills Development
- Applied Marketing Management
- Business History
- Cross-Cultural Communication
Commerce Elective

Winter
IBH 3BA3
IBH 3BB3
IBH 3BC3
IBH 3BD3

Commerce Elective
Year 4
Fall
IBH 4AA6-A
IBH 4AB6-A
IBH 4AC6-A

Commerce Elective
Winter
IBH 4AA6-B
IBH 4AB6-B
IBH 4AC6-B

Third Year UG Entrepreneurship
Strategic Philanthropy and Leadership
Poverty, Privilege and Protest in Canadian History
Interpersonal Communication

Leadership- Six-unit
Entrepreneurship/Social Entrepreneurship- Six-unit
Global Perspective and Community Engagement

Leadership- Six-unit
Entrepreneurship/Social Entrepreneurship- Six-unit
Global Perspective and Community Engagement

CURRICULUM AND TEACHING

4.1 PROGRAM CONTENT
The curriculum for the B.Com. IBH program is designed to achieve the program’s overall objective of training responsible leaders. To this end, the curriculum entails strong experiential learning components, takes a globalized approach to leadership and management, and places high priority on community engagement and sustainable business practices. To achieve these goals, the program rests on three pillars: leadership development, entrepreneurship (with emphasis on social entrepreneurship), and community engagement and global perspective.

4.2 PROGRAM INNOVATION
The core of innovation within this program is reflective of the subject matter being taught and the overarching goal of producing ‘responsible leaders’. As the late philosopher Charles Frankel once said, it is through the humanities that a civilized society talks to itself about things that matter most. Hence the innovation will be defined around the cohort – ‘talking to itself’. Below are the methods the program will employ to effect this emphasis.

4.2.1 Community- and Industry- Partnered Learning
All students will complete one course each academic year which is delivered in partnership with a community organization (industry, publicly funded institution, NGO, etc.). Within the senior years one of these courses, IBH 4AC6, will be in a global setting (Ten Thousand Mile Classroom in partnership with Me to We).
4.2.2 Participation in Conferences and Forums

Each senior student will be required to and nominated to attend a 'community issues' or 'global issues conference' so as to gain exposure to variations in thinking, interaction with diverse groups and to develop a motivation/passion to participate in and cause change. Conferences must approved by the program director.

4.2.3 Managed Expressions

To help develop critical thinking, writing and analytical abilities all students will be required to (each year) publish one of their works online. Blogs or other interactive forums that produce informed opinion and seek to cause debate around the published work will be moderated by a faculty member who will also audit work prior to posting.

4.2.4 Interdisciplinary teaching strategies

To integrate Business and Humanities courses and concepts, the fourth year (six-unit) courses will be delivered through close cooperation of faculty members from both Faculties. For example the entrepreneurship fourth year course requires students to carryout team projects. While the principal instructor of this course will be from the faculty of business, based on the needs of these projects, students will be advised to choose a Humanities sub-discipline (e.g. History, Peace, Art, etc.). An instructor from the faculty of Humanities will deliver the relevant content to the students in order to successfully conclude the project.

All four of the above innovations will be unique to this program given that these will affect each student and will be institutionally managed for this degree program.

4.3 MODE(S) OF DELIVERY

To enhance student experience, and to ensure that program learning outcomes are accomplished, the program will employ different modes of delivery as elaborated below.

4.3.1 Blended Learning

The content for each of the courses designed for this program must integrate the use of technology to manage the long term cost (for example - reduce cost of tutorial hours / TA hours) and offer a better experience to students. This will also allow us to facilitate dialogue within the cohort so that peer to peer learning is emphasized and dependence reduced on faculty as 'sage on stage'. This will also allow for student life-long learning abilities to develop.

4.3.2 Team-Based Community Learning

For each of the community based courses the program will designate a community mentor as learning lead. This community or industry mentor will work closely with the faculty member of the required course to ensure learning outcomes are met.

4.3.3 Independent Study
As part of the fourth year integrative courses (i.e., IBH 4AA6, IBH 4AB6, and IBH 4AC6), students will be required to complete an independent study. This will help embed research and analytical skills, critical thinking, writing skills, argumentation ability, and presentation skills beyond developing their abilities as leaders to make evidence based informed choices and consider how they influence and persuade others.

4.4 EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

The school will invest in and create the required resources to facilitate experiential learning throughout this degree program. Experiential learning consists of the following:

4.4.1 Community Projects

These will be managed by the Experiential Learning Office to ensure each student gains a perspective on issues of sustainability, culture, philanthropy, citizenship, and marginalized communities so that students encounter novel and unpredictable situations that support new learning. The goals will be to ensure that (1) learners are engaged intellectually, emotionally, socially, and/or physically, which produces an experience that is authentic; (2) relationships are developed and nurtured: learner to self, learner to others, and learner to the world at large.

4.4.2 Reflective Observation

All students will be required to and nominated to attend conferences and forums both within and outside the university. Such participation will cause reflection in consultation with peers and often challenge previous understanding.

4.4.3 Active Experience

Students will be nominated to represent themselves and the school at local, national and international case competitions. Each student will receive a minimum of one nomination over the four years. These experiences will help hone the abilities of the students to work under pressure, seek collaboration and learn how to persuade and/or influence others.

4.5 ACCESSIBILITY

The courses that will be offered in this program will address areas of accessibility as outlined in McMaster’s accessibility website: http://accessibility.mcmaster.ca/. The areas of accessibilities considered are teaching accessibility, creating accessible websites and media, and accommodations.

4.5.1 Teaching Accessibility

Teaching accessibility means that teaching will be conducted in a manner that is accessible to everyone. This will entail courses that are designed and delivered with a diversity of learning styles in mind by identifying and removing barriers to teaching and learning. We will also use ensure that online delivery will have features that will
enhance accessibility. Course and lecture materials will be made available to student via podcasting and accessible documentation. All in all, we will make sure that will utilize the resources available under http://accessibility.mcmaster.ca/teaching-accessibly in designing and delivering new courses.

4.5.2 Creating Accessible Websites and Media

While using multimedia and digital resources enhances learning experience, it might create accessibility problems to some students. For example, podcast will not be accessible for students hard of hearing. In this instance, an alternate format such as text transcription of the recording will be made available upon request. In general, we will utilize the resources available under http://accessibility.mcmaster.ca/creating-accessible-content if we have accessibility issues with multimedia content and digital resources.

4.5.3 Accommodations

We acknowledge that some accommodation might be required for students with accessibility issues. Students with physical disabilities or mental health disorders will be counselled by the office of the Student Accessibility Services, which makes recommendations for accommodations that will be implemented by the program. In addition, Faith and Spirituality Day Calendar will be consulted to accommodate students who want to observe religious and other faith-based obligations.

ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING

5.1 METHODS FOR ASSESSING STUDENTS

This program uses various assessment practices and techniques based on the course content and levels. These practices include multiple choice exams, creative essay writing, oral presentations, and learning portfolios. Instructors are not limited to these evaluation practices and are encouraged to use effective and creative assessment methods based on the requirements of their courses.

Multiple choice exams will enable instructors to assess a wide range of knowledge, skills, and abilities. This program will take advantage of multiple-choice exams in evaluating how students can identify and recall concepts as well as their higher order cognitive skills such as application of course material in practical scenarios, problem solving, and so forth. The multiple choice exams will also enable instructors to measure class learning level and identify challenges.

Creative essay writing, as a more traditional method of assessment, will also be used throughout this program. Students will be asked to address a question or topic, assigned by their instructors, through an essay. This practice evaluates students' ability to construct and sustain a written argument.
In order to assess students’ learning in both individual and group projects, several courses use oral presentation for assessment. Students will be evaluated by their peers, course instructors, or external project stakeholders. The evaluation will be based on organization, depth and accuracy of the content, effectiveness of the communication aids, and research and execution efforts.

5.2 CURRICULUM MAP

The curriculum map maps Program Learning Outcomes into the IBH courses. For each learning outcome, the curriculum map shows the extent to which the learning outcome is being taught, and how it is being assessed. Although learning outcomes are covered to varying extent in many of the IBH courses, the curriculum map shows three levels of coverage: introductory, intermediate, and advanced. Please see appendix 1.

5.3 DEMONSTRATING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Each student will be required to maintain a Learning Portfolio throughout the program to document and demonstrate acquiring competencies implied by the program learning outcomes.

Whereas assessments in courses are used to cover separate competencies based on program learning outcomes, the Learning Portfolio will be used by students to demonstrate their ability to integrate competencies acquired in different courses. Students will be able to showcase learning achieved through multimedia evidence. Each student will have access to an electronic portfolio to exhibit a collection of self-selected work or artifacts to demonstrate competencies, evidence that learning has occurred and learning outcomes have been met. Portfolios provide a platform that can contain text documents, presentation slides, hyperlinks to webpages, graphs and data spreadsheets, photos, audio, videos and so forth.

Success in this program will be demonstrated when students engage in experiential learning and contributing to the community by applying the competencies acquired along the program pillars of leadership, entrepreneurship, and global perspective and community engagement.

RESOURCES

6.1 ADMINISTRATIVE, PHYSICAL, AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The administrative resources for the program consist of a program director, a full-time administrative assistant, a half-time academic adviser, and a full-time experiential education administrator. The physical resources required for the program consist of classroom space. There are no special requirements for labs or other physical spaces. The financial resources of this program are limited to tuition, fees, and provincial funding for domestic students.
6.2 LIBRARY, TECHNOLOGY, AND LABORATORY RESOURCES

The program budget uses the budget template of undergraduate programs which properly compensates the library and the UTS for the usage of their resources. We do not anticipate that students in the program will require such resources beyond the normal usage.

6.3 FACULTY

The program budget assumes full costing, where the cost of instruction is based on the average cost of faculty in both faculties. The budget makes conservative assumptions for the cost of instruction as we do not allow for sessional instructors or faculty on the teaching track. Service teaching is based on the formula in the budget template.

6.4 ANTICIPATED CLASS SIZE

In the steady state, the target enrolment for first year is 80 students, and students will be enrolled in classes as a cohort.

QUALITY AND OTHER INDICATORS

7.1 ACADEMIC QUALITY OF THE PROGRAM

Once the program is full established, the following will be used to demonstrate the quality of the B. Com. IBH:

1. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in order to indicate student engagement as one of the key determinants program quality. The NSSE measures student engagement by providing survey results for ten engagement indicators. The survey is conducted annually for students in their first and last year of the program. We anticipate that students in the program will score highly on academic challenges indicators, such as higher-order learning and reflective and integrative learning. Ideally, we would like the program to be one of the top five programs at McMaster along all quality indicators.

2. The Classroom Survey of Student Engagement (CLASSE), which is a classroom-level adaptation of NSSE, will be used to obtain a better picture of student engagement at the course level. CLASSE is composed of two instruments: CLASSEStudent asks students how frequently they engage in various educational practices within a specific course; CLASSEFaculty asks the instructor of that course how important the various educational practices are in facilitating student success. Student and faculty outcomes are then contrasted to
identify important and valued educational practices that are occurring less frequently than desired or expected.\(^{10}\) Although CLASSE scores cannot be benchmarked because there are no summaries provided for CLASSE scores, the scores will shed on the NSSE scores.

3. We will also conduct annual In-Program Student Satisfaction Survey. Moreover, an Alumni Satisfaction and Perception will be conducted after the first group of students graduate from this program.

4. Students' grades and course averages will also provide insight into the quality of the program.

5. After the first cohort graduates, employability data in terms of starting salary, employment rate, and unemployment period after degree completion will be used to demonstrate the quality of the program.

6. Retention rates will also be used as an indicator of the quality of the B. Com. IBH.

7.2 INTELLECTUAL QUALITY OF THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

The curriculum design allows for a high intellectual quality of student experience. First, the limited intake of the program and the selection criteria and process will ensure the admission of students with great potential to succeed in the program. Having a cohort of high quality students will create an environment where students will strive to excel in healthy competitive environment. Second, program features will allow for greater interactions between students and faculty, thus enhancing the intellectual quality of the student experience. For example, students will be working on many projects throughout the program under the direct supervision of a faculty member. Finally, students are required to either participate in internal and external case competition and/or to attend conferences. Such experiences will allow students to build networks within and outside the university, to apply knowledge acquired in classroom, and to be informed of new developments in their fields on interest

McMASTER UNIVERSITY: SESSIONAL DATES 2016-2017

Week long break, balanced teaching days, start on Tuesday after Labour day, 1 “buffer” day between end of fall term and exams, start on Wednesday in January, compressed 12 day final exam period in Fall.

IMPORTANT NOTE:
The sessional dates for 2016-2017 include two recess periods (Fall, Winter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall and Winter Terms 2016-2017</th>
<th>Fall Term (62 days)</th>
<th>Winter Term (62 days)</th>
<th>Courses Spanning both Terms (124 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration begins</td>
<td>To be announced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 6</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 4</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for registration and changes in registration</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 14</td>
<td>Thursday, January 12</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term recess</td>
<td>Monday, October 10</td>
<td>Monday, February 20 to Sunday, February 26</td>
<td>Monday, October 10 to Sunday, October 16 and, Monday, February 20 to Sunday, February 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for cancelling courses without failure by default</td>
<td>Friday, November 4</td>
<td>Friday, March 10</td>
<td>Friday, March 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test and Examination Ban (no tests or exams may be held during this period)</td>
<td>Thursday, December 1 to Thursday, December 9</td>
<td>Friday March 31 to Sunday April 9</td>
<td>Friday March 31 to Sunday April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Friday: No classes or examinations</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Friday, April 14</td>
<td>Friday, April 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
<td>Wednesday, December 7</td>
<td>Thursday April 6</td>
<td>Thursday April 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Tests Level (I)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Friday, December 9 to Thursday, December 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examinations</td>
<td>Friday, December 9 to Thursday, December 22 (12 days)</td>
<td>Monday April 10 to Wednesday, April 26</td>
<td>Monday April 10 to Wednesday, April 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred examinations</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 21 to Saturday, February 25</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2017 Spring/Summer Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>SESSION 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>SESSION 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>FULL-TERM COURSES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(34 days)</td>
<td>(34 days)</td>
<td>(68 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classes begin</strong></td>
<td>Monday, May 1</td>
<td>Monday, June 19</td>
<td>Monday, May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last day for registration and changes in registration</strong></td>
<td>Friday, May 5</td>
<td>Friday, June 23</td>
<td>Friday, May 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria Day: No classes</strong></td>
<td>Monday, May 22</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, May 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada Day Observation: No classes</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, July 3</td>
<td>Monday, July 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last day for cancelling courses without failure by default</strong></td>
<td>Wednesday, May 31</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 19</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Holiday: No classes</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, August 7</td>
<td>Monday, August 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classes end</strong></td>
<td>Friday, June 16</td>
<td>Friday, August 4</td>
<td>Friday, August 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Examinations</strong></td>
<td>As arranged by instructor in class time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deferred Examinations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017 Fall Recess Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT TO THE SENATE FROM THE UNIVERSITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

(i) Proposal to Terminate the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology

(ii) Proposal to Establish a School of Engineering Practice and Technology

At its meeting of December 16, 2015, the University Planning Committee approved a proposal to terminate the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology, and to establish a School of Engineering Practice and Technology, the precise name to be determined by the Board of Governors at a later date. The two existing Schools are small teaching units and the establishment of a new School to bring them together will increase the visibility of the programs and will afford the development of programming for both undergraduate and graduate students.

The University Planning Committee now recommends,

that Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the termination of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology, effective June 30, 2016, and the establishment of a School of Engineering Practice and Technology the precise name to be determined by the Board of Governors at a later date, effective July 1, 2016, as outlined in the attached.

For Information

(iii) Proposal to Establish an Honours Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities Program

At its meeting on December 16, 2015, the University Planning Committee approved a proposal for the establishment of an Honours Bachelor of Commerce in Integrated Business and Humanities program. The proposed program combines Business education offered by the Faculty of Business with the robust education offered by the Faculty of Humanities, to create a unique undergraduate program that is focused on training responsible leaders and citizens. The program includes strong experiential learning components, takes a global approach to leadership and management, and places high priority on community engagement and sustainable business practices.

(iv) Proposal to Establish a Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology Program

At the same meeting, the University Planning Committee approved a proposal for the establishment of a Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology program. The proposed program is unique in Canada because of the focus on a problem-based curriculum.

Senate: January 13, 2016
Date: December 7, 2015

To: Members of the University Planning Committee

From: Ishwar Puri, Dean and Professor

CC: Mary Williams, Vice President, University Advancement
    Susan Denburg, Acting Provost
    Roger Couldrey, Vice President, Administration

Re: Proposed Closure of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology and the Establishment of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology

The Faculty of Engineering established the SEP-SET Merger Committee in April 2015. This Committee discussed the terms of the proposed merger between the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice (SEP) and the School of Engineering Technology (SET), including how the rights and privileges afforded to existing faculty and staff members will be respected. It also explored synergies between existing programs and how these would be leveraged to create new programs as well as strengthen existing programs.

This committee prepared an interim report in July 2015. This interim report included background and historical information on both SEP and SET. It also discussed the primary reasons for the proposed merger with regard to students, faculty/staff, community partners, Mohawk College (because of its role in the McMaster-Mohawk Bachelor of Technology Partnership), and the Faculty of Engineering. The report identified several challenges which would need to be met in the merger, but no significant barriers.

Given that the development and implementation of new M.Eng. programs was seen as an important dimension of the proposed merger, the interim report summarized and discussed the first phase of the work of parallel task force which had been struck to develop such new programs. That task force is continuing its work.

The interim report also discussed possible organizational and governance arrangements of a merged School and resource implications.

The Merger Committee organized a half-day retreat (on Sept. 1, 2015) to discuss the proposed merger with faculty/staff of SEP and SET; a number of other interested stakeholders also participated in the retreat. Based on the discussions at the retreat, the committee began the process of developing a vision for the merged School. Faculty and staff of both SEP and SET participated in a merger forum on October 13, 2015, at which

Confidential
further information was provided, including the preliminary themes of the vision. Based on that forum, full-time faculty and staff in both SEP and SET were polled by secret ballot on the proposed merger; over 80% voted in favor of the merger. Dean Puri then established a Transition Committee which developed specific recommendations on the name of the new School and on its governance.

This final report of the Merger Committee includes the full interim report plus conclusions and the recommendations on the name and governance.

**Recommendations**

**School Closures**

It is recommended that the Walter G. Booth School for Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology be closed.

**New School Establishment**

It is recommended that a new School be established that would form the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology. This new School will include the current resources of the Walter G. Booth School for Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology.

**Name:**

It is recommended that the new school be named the "**Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology**". This naming recognizes the role of Walter G. Booth in the establishment of both of the merging entities. It also acknowledges the educational context of the merging organizations with the words "Practice" and "Technology".

**Governance:**

It is recommended that the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology be led by a Director reporting to the Dean of Engineering. The Director will be a 5 year term appointment made by the Senate.

It is recommended that there be three Associate Directors reporting to the Director:  
Associate Director, Graduate Programs  
Associate Director, Undergraduate Degree Completion Programs  
Associate Director, Undergraduate Four-Year Programs  
Associate Director Appointments will be 3-year appointments made by the Director of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology in consultation with the Dean of Engineering and recommendations for these appointments will be forwarded to Senate Committee on Appointments for approval.
Faculty Approvals

The merger of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and the School of Engineering Technology was approved unanimously at the Faculty Dean’s Council meeting on Tuesday, October 27th, 2015 and at the general meeting of the Faculty on Thursday, November 12th, 2015.

Enclosed for your review is the final merger report.
Report of SEP-SET Merger Committee
November 16, 2015

Executive Summary

The SEP-SET Merger Committee, established by Dean Ishwar Puri in April 2015, discussed the terms of the proposed merger between the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice (SEP) and the School of Engineering Technology (SET), including how the rights and privileges afforded to existing faculty and staff members will be respected. It also explored synergies between existing programs and how these would be leveraged to create new programs as well as strengthen existing programs.

This committee prepared an interim report in July 2015. This interim report included background and historical information on both SEP and SET. It also discussed the primary reasons for the proposed merger with regard to students, faculty/staff, community partners, Mohawk College (because of its role in the McMaster-Mohawk Bachelor of Technology Partnership), and the Faculty of Engineering. The report identified several challenges, which would need to be met in the merger, but no significant barriers.

Given that the development and implementation of new M.Eng. programs was seen as an important dimension of the proposed merger, the interim report summarized and discussed the first phase of the work of the parallel task force which had been struck to develop such new programs. That task force is continuing its work.

The interim report also discussed possible organizational and governance arrangements of a merged School and resource implications.

The Merger Committee organized a half-day retreat (on September 1, 2015) to discuss the proposed merger with faculty/staff of SEP and SET; a number of other interested stakeholders also participated in the retreat. Based on the discussions at the retreat, the committee began the process of developing a vision for the merged School. Faculty and staff of both SEP and SET participated in a merger forum on October 13, 2015, at which further information was provided, including the preliminary themes of the vision. Based on that forum, full-time faculty and staff in both SEP and SET were polled by secret ballot on the proposed merger; over 80% voted in favour of the merger. Dean Puri then established a Transition Committee, which developed specific recommendations on the name of the new School and on its governance.

This final report of the Merger Committee includes the full interim report plus conclusions and the recommendations on the name and governance.
Recommendations

Name:
It is recommended that the new school be named the "Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology". This naming recognizes the role of Walter G. Booth in the establishment of both of the merging entities. It also acknowledges the educational context of the merging organizations with the words “Practice” and “Technology”.

Governance:
It is recommended that the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology be led by a Director reporting to the Dean of Engineering. The Director will be a 5-year term appointment made by the Senate.

It is recommended that there be three Associate Directors reporting to the Director:
- Associate Director, Graduate Programs
- Associate Director, Undergraduate Degree Completion Programs
- Associate Director, Undergraduate Four-Year Programs

Associate Director appointments will be 3-year appointments made by the Director of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology in consultation with the Dean of Engineering.

1.0 Introduction

During the fall of 2014, the Director of the School of Engineering Practice (SEP), Art Heidebrecht and the Director of the School of Engineering Technology (SET), Alan Murray had several preliminary discussions concerning collaboration between SEP and SET, including the possible advantages of merging the two Schools. This led to a discussion about the pros and cons of a potential merger with Dean Puri in early 2015. Based on that discussion, both Alan and Art were asked to have informal discussions with their respective faculty and staff colleagues. These informal discussions, while identifying some challenges, indicated significant support for moving forward on the merger idea; both the rationale for such a merger and the challenges identified are discussed in the next section of this report.

Based on feedback from Alan and Art, Dean Puri subsequently established a merger committee with the following composition:

- Alan Murray and Art Heidebrecht to serve as Co-Chairs
- One elected faculty member from each of SEP and SET; David Potter and Dan Centea were elected.
- One additional faculty member from each of SEP and SET appointed by Dean Puri on the recommendation of Alan and Art; Robert Fleisig and Mike Justason were appointed.
- One staff member from each of SEP and SET appointed by Dean Puri on the recommendation of Alan and Art; Yvonne Maidment and Leslie Kocsis were appointed.
• Mike Thompson, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, was appointed as Dean Puri’s representative on the committee.
• Nancy Balfoort was added to facilitate consideration of the administrative and financial aspects of the merger.

The terms of reference for the merger committee, as set out by Dean Puri, specifically asked the committee to:

a) Discuss the terms of the merger, including how the rights and privileges afforded to existing faculty and staff members will be respected.

b) Explore synergies between existing programs and how these will be leveraged to create new M.Eng. programs as well as strengthen existing programs.

c) Understand that there will be no reduction in the existing faculty or staff member cohort in the merged school.

The SEP-SET merger committee held its first meeting on Monday April 13th and has met weekly from then until the completion of this report. The committee began its work by sharing background information on both SEP and SET, much of which is described and discussed in the following section. Subsequent meetings were devoted to particular aspects, more or less along the lines of the sections of this report. In particular, a considerable amount of time was spent examining the reasons why such a merger is desirable and, also, challenges associated with a merger.

Early in the discussions between Alan and Art, the matter of developing new M.Eng. programs was perceived as a key dimension of a potential merger; this was referenced specifically in the terms of reference for the merger committee, as noted above. Given the significance of that dimension and the amount of work needed to investigate it, Alan and Art appointed an M.Eng. Task Force, which, for practical purposes, has functioned as a sub-committee of the Merger Committee. The first stage report of that task force was completed in June 2015 and is referenced in section 4 of this report. The merger committee was made aware of the main thrusts of the task force but the task force report is a stand-alone report.

2.0 Background

Each of SEP and SET provided the Merger Committee with background information to help members become more familiar with the people and programs in the two organizations. The information which was shared is attached as Appendix A (SET) and Appendix B (SEP). Additional information can be found on the following links:

SET: http://www.eng.mcmaster.ca/btech.html

SEP: http://wbooth.mcmaster.ca
For the purpose of this report, the following subsections identify some key features of the two organizations.

2.1 School of Engineering Technology (SET)

The McMaster School of Engineering Technology (SET) was established several years ago to function as the academic administrative unit at McMaster which houses the Bachelor of Technology (B.Tech.) programs; these programs are operated under the jurisdiction of the McMaster-Mohawk Bachelor of Technology Partnership (B.Tech. Partnership). The current roles of SET are the operation of the B.Tech. programs, and tenure and promotion for the B.Tech. faculty.

The initial B.Tech. program at McMaster was in Manufacturing Engineering Technology; this program was developed as a McMaster degree in 1997 and was designed primarily as a degree completion program (DCP) for Mohawk College diploma graduates. In 2005, the McMaster Dean of Engineering and the Mohawk Dean of Engineering Technology agreed that it would be desirable to develop additional DCPs and to begin four-year B.Tech. programs which would enroll students directly from high school. Two additional DCPs (Civil Engineering Infrastructure Technology and Computing & Information Technology) were started in 2006; a fourth DCP (Energy Engineering Technologies) was started in 2008. All courses for the DCPs are offered during evenings and on Saturdays to facilitate part-time studies.

Three four-year programs (Process Automation Technology\(^1\), Biotechnology and Automotive and Vehicle Technology) enrolled their first students in September 2008. Graduates of the four-year programs receive both the McMaster B.Tech. degree and a Mohawk College advanced technology diploma. All four-year programs require that students have at least 12 months of co-op experience prior to graduation.

A key feature of all of the B.Tech. programs (DCP and four-year) is the inclusion of a stream of management courses (labeled Gen Tech in the programs); these courses are included with the objective of ensuring that graduates are prepared to function effectively in business and industrial environments and to be able to take on management and leadership roles as part of their career progress. As of 2015/16, graduates of both the DCP and four-year programs also receive a Business Management Certificate from Mohawk College.

Some Mohawk labs are used in the delivery of the four-year programs; while the DCP programs are delivered primarily at McMaster (with only a few occasional exceptions). The majority of SET Faculty hold McMaster appointments. Both the four-year and DCP programs rely on sessional lecturers.

The B.Tech. four-year programs provide an important pathway into technical careers for high-school students better suited to ‘learning-by-doing’, and the three program streams

---

\(^{1}\) The Process Automation Technology program was actually transferred from Mohawk College.
reflect areas of immediate importance to the Ontario economy. The four DCP program streams were also chosen based on industry-demand, and provide a pathway to a Bachelor’s Degree for College graduates who would otherwise need to put their careers on-hold to complete an Engineering Degree. While neither the four-year nor the DCP programs are accredited by the CEAB, the DCP programs provide a ‘shortened’ pathway for college graduates to the P.Eng designation because a reduced number of qualifying technical exams are required by PEO.

The B.Tech. programs are among the fastest growing programs offered at McMaster.

2.2 School for Engineering Practice (SEP)

The McMaster School of Engineering Practice (SEP) was founded in 2004 to provide “interdisciplinary education initiatives in three areas of engineering practice: engineering and public policy, engineering entrepreneurship and innovation, and engineering design.” The pedagogical principle, summarized by the phrase “learn by doing” has been a guiding principle of the school since its inception. Educational programs are oriented towards experiential learning by integrating classroom teaching with application to a thesis project.

The initial educational programs developed within SEP were:
- Master of Engineering and Public Policy (MEPP)
- Master of Engineering Entrepreneurship and Innovation (MEEI)
- Master of Engineering Design (MED)

In order to make entrepreneurship and innovation graduate studies available to students without a background in engineering or science, the Master of Technology Entrepreneurship and Innovation (MTEI) was established in 2011. This program is a parallel to MEEI, with essentially the same program structure.

Leadership, Innovation, Sustainability and Community Engagement, are focal points for all of the Walter G. Booth educational programs.

Walter G. Booth School graduates are expected to lead societal change through innovation and Walter G. Booth School Master’s programs share a focus on leadership development early in the program. A leadership style that enables innovation is a key element of this focus. Students are encouraged to develop their personal capacity to deliver role model leadership in the service of stakeholders who are committed to achieving common change outcomes.

Innovation Studio is a unique learning experience offered to the students of the Walter G. Booth School in which leadership skills are developed and practiced. The students’ goal in Innovation Studio is to identify a broad issue or problem important to one of the School’s local or global communities, learn about the needs of that community, explore new ideas, identify levers of change, design meaningful solutions and implementation, and obtain buy-in from the community. The community benefits from the exploration of
new ideas and outcomes of student work. Solutions range from new policy proposals to new products/services and new enterprises. Projects focus on innovations in areas as broad as perioperative child anxiety, truck driver fatigue, and sustainable development of the local harbour front. Meeting on a regular basis in Innovation Studio students learn from one another and the invited community collaborators in a safe and familiar environment.

The Master of Engineering in Manufacturing Engineering (MEME) is also administered by SEP.

Several years ago, in recognition of the role of SEP’s major benefactor, Walter Booth, SEP was renamed the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice. With Walter Booth’s permission, the School was recently rebranded to the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice.

3.0 SEP-SET Merger Rationale and Challenges

3.1 Primary Rationale for Merger

The B.Tech. Degree programs offered by the School of Engineering Technology were established in response to the needs of today’s innovation-based organizations. The programs were designed to develop business skills in a technology context. "Hands on" projects are the vehicle by which student learning occurs.

The Mission of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice is to develop “leaders through an innovation-based, interdisciplinary, student-centred, learning experience where students engage local or global communities in developing sustainable solutions to real world problems”. Master’s Degree programs in the school share a focus on leadership development, innovation, and project-based experiential learning. Graduates experience the dynamics of leading change through innovation during their progression through their degree project.

Commonalities that are shared by the two organizations include a focus on the development of professional skills, particularly those that are innovation related, and teaching and learning using an experiential learning pedagogy. These commonalities, along with other characteristics of the two organizations and programs, lead to significant potential synergies in a merged organization. The rest of this section considers these synergies from the perspectives of stakeholders.

Students:

A merged organization offers a continuum of professional skills development from the undergraduate to the graduate level. One of the key synergies enabled through a merger is the establishment of an educational "pathway" to progressive skills development. The B.Tech. Degree delivers professional development coupled within the context of technological subject matter. B.Tech. and DCP graduates, looking for graduate education
that would serve to further develop professional skills in a technological context, have limited choices available from various educational institutions. A merger that strengthens the ties between the School of Engineering Technology and the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice would serve to clearly delineate this path at McMaster for existing programs, and offer opportunities to enhance offerings through the development of additional programs that deliver the professional development-technology mix.

A merger also offers the opportunity to enhance the student learning experience by fostering integration across the undergraduate-graduate programs. For example, analogs of graduate program courses are already offered to undergraduates at the Walter G. Booth School. Such courses and experiences offer undergraduates the opportunity to connect with graduate students and to participate in the graduate learning environment. They also offer a temporal and budgetary benefit for undergraduates who are in pursuit of graduate education, by offering transferable credit.

In a merged organization, enhanced communication between faculty and staff members should allow for coordination of opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to perform coordinated project work. For example, graduate students focused on the delivery of solutions that involve technical activities such as software coding, might be matched with undergraduate B.Tech. students performing complementary project work. Significant benefits can be realized by both groups of students in this type of exchange.

Interaction between graduate and undergraduate students can also be mutually beneficial through the formation of mentor relationships. These are not likely to develop independent of faculty direction and facilitation and the enhanced communication between program faculty in a merged organization would lend itself to the needed coordination.

Students in the Walter G. Booth School would have access to a greater number of potential faculty advisors in a merged organization. From the perspective of programming in the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice, the School of Engineering Technology offers both, high quality technical mentors, as well as high quality faculty advisors.

There is also opportunity for Walter G. Booth School graduate students to serve as teaching assistants and lab instructors. This would not only provide interaction that is favourable to creating awareness of graduate programming, but also serve to provide the School of Engineering Technology with a source of aligned resources, as well as needed income for Walter G. Booth School graduate students.

Enhanced community engagement is another synergy that might accrue from a merger. Some of the stakeholders engaged in Walter G. Booth School Innovation Challenges might be potential employers for School of Engineering Technology students and graduates. Also, industry that currently interacts with SET might be the source of challenges for SEP students, and a source of projects and practicums for emerging graduates programs.
Faculty/Staff:

The merged organization has the potential to become larger than any of the current departments in the Faculty of Engineering. This offers faculty members increased visibility within the Faculty of Engineering community, as well as within the University at large. The increased visibility offers more opportunity for interaction and engagement with other units within the university environment. This synergy should facilitate scholarship which could include but is not limited to collaborative applied research, innovative teaching, and pedagogical research.

Current SET faculty would value the opportunity to teach graduate students, which should expand their career path opportunities. The teaching opportunity here could include conventional course load, as well as the opportunity to mentor graduate students. An additional benefit of this outcome is the opportunity to engage graduate students with a more diverse faculty complement and to spread the resourcing load.

Some benefit may also be realized by using economies of scale to make more effective use of human resources across the merged organization.

Community Partners:

A merged organization potentially offers a richer level of engagement for community partners. This would be especially true when there is alignment between undergraduate and graduate learning objectives and the deliverables for a client. For example, current SEP students could use design thinking to progress to a definition of a project that might require a technical skill set for implementation. B.Tech. students might be the ideal resource to execute on the technical skill set. This would offer undergraduate students a level of professional experience, as well as the opportunity to put some technical skills to work.

Community partners would have the benefit of working with a broader spectrum of potential hires that they have “prescreened” through project engagement. This would benefit both undergraduate and graduate students.

There are also synergies to be realized in terms of Innovation Challenge and project sourcing since community members engaging either of the current organizations might also engage the other.

Mohawk College:

Mohawk College would gain a competitive advantage compared to other four year college programs since it would be able to advertise the B.Tech. Partnership as a pathway to graduate education as a result of the merger. This feature should result in a significant improvement in recruiting outcomes.
The Faculty of Engineering:

A merger presents many potential benefits to the Faculty of Engineering. The new merged School is expected to become an effective arm of the Faculty of Engineering which is concerned primarily with engineering practice, complementing the applied science and research focus of the Departments.

Furthermore, there is the opportunity to effectively leverage professional development courses at the graduate and undergraduate level in order to provide programming that is not currently offered by the departments in the Faculty of Engineering. Such interactions should ultimately lead to greater opportunity for collaboration with the Departments in areas of strength for the merged unit. In fact, faculty of the merged unit would be uniquely positioned to provide undergraduate and graduate related collaboration with the departments around the technical theme areas of the B.Tech. programs, teaching of leadership development and innovation subject matter, and insights from pedagogical research and methods of teaching/learning engagement.

Administratively, the merged unit would possess enough critical mass to effectively execute processes related to the development of teaching skills and to the decision-making apparatus related to decisions around permanence, tenure, and promotion.

3.2 Challenges

An analysis of the impact of a merger between SEP and SET identified challenges, as described below, but no significant barriers.

1. Naming — Finding a name for the new School that honours Walter G. Booth’s philanthropy and satisfies the expectations of faculty, management, and stakeholders.
2. Marketing — Maintaining the identities of the two existing Schools and ensuring that SEP will be perceived as a viable option for both B.Tech. and B.Eng. graduates.
3. Finances & Resources — Keeping separate all financial activities and resources that are part of the Bachelor of Technology Partnership between McMaster and Mohawk.
4. Cultural Inertia — Differences in attitudes and ways of doing things that could lead to friction. Operating separately as in the past unless a concerted effort is made to act on potential synergies.

4.0 Vision for new M.Eng. Programs

4.1 Background

As noted in section 1, the development and implementation of new M.Eng. programs was seen as an important dimension of the potential merger of SEP and SET. Dean Puri included exploration of new programs in the terms of the merger committee. Because of the magnitude and significance of such an initiative, Alan Murray and Art Heidebrecht established an M.Eng. Task Force with the purpose of planning and developing new
M.Eng. program(s). Members of the task force are: Allan MacKenzie (chair), Nafia AlMutawaly, Faiez Alani, Lotfi Belkhir, Vladimir Mahalec and Mike Thompson (ex-officio, in his capacity as Associate Dean for Graduate Studies).

The task force was asked to base its work on the following principles/objectives (not necessarily in order of importance):


2. Enabling accelerated pathways for McMaster B.Eng. and B.Tech. graduates

3. Including a significant component of professional development (e.g. leadership and innovation)

4. Including a significant experiential component, engaging with external community partners

5. Facilitating part-time studies, i.e. evening and weekend courses

6. Flexibility in instructional modalities (e.g. online, workshop and short courses as well as traditional course format)

7. Program to complement the current set of SEP Master’s programs in engineering design, engineering and public policy, and entrepreneurship

8. Desirable to include current MEME program as part of the program framework.

9. Program designed to expand the capabilities of graduates working in industry

The task force was asked to conduct its work in two phases:
   - Phase 1 - development of a structural framework
   - Phase 2 - development and fleshing out of an implementation plan in sufficient detail to be used for internal McMaster approvals en route to provincial approval.

They were asked to complete Phase 1 prior to the originally scheduled June 15, 2015 merger retreat such that internal and external stakeholders could provide feedback on the direction being proposed. The merger committee was provided with an interim report of the task force on May 20, 2015.

4.2 M.Eng. Task Force Phase 1 Report

Since the work of the Task Force has been conducted independent from that of the merger committee, its written report is being distributed as a separate document. The following is a summary of the key points of what is being proposed by the task force:
1. A single new degree with the name Master of Engineering Innovation (MEI)²

2. Program framework which is 25% professional development courses, 25% disciplinary technical courses, 25%, multidisciplinary theme-based technical courses and 25% project

3. Courses in the program would include: a) current 700 level courses, e.g. disciplinary technical courses offered by Engineering Departments, b) new 700 level courses offered by the new School, e.g. theme-based technical courses and c) 4/6 level courses offered by the new School, e.g. professional development courses which are currently taken in the B.Tech. programs


5. Program completion time to be 12 month for full-time students and normally 24 months for part-time students

6. Courses to be delivered evenings and Saturdays, using face-to-face, online and blended formats

7. Program to be multi-disciplinary with real-world projects

8. Leadership, innovation and sustainability be embedded within the program, primarily through projects rather than through explicit courses

4.3 Merger Committee Comments

While the merger committee has not formally reviewed and reached any conclusions on what the M.Eng. Task Force is proposing, the following comments are relevant:

1. The general framework which is being proposed is visionary, charting a new direction for professional Master's degree programs in the Faculty of Engineering. This program framework has the potential to develop advanced professional skills and technical competencies needed both by industry and engineering/technology graduates.

2. The proposed name, Master of Engineering Innovation, needs further consideration; in the view of some members of the merger committee, it may be better to use the well-known Master of Engineering (M.Eng.) name and incorporate the innovation dimension in the design and marketing of the program rather than in the name.

² The task force discussed the possibility of "converting" some existing M.Eng. programs and reached the conclusion that it would be better to develop a new program, even though the formal approval process may take longer.
3. The concept of a single degree with flexibility through specific themes would be beneficial; however, the specific themes which are to be included need further investigation.

4. The significant component of professional development (25% of the program) is consistent with industrial and graduate needs. At the same time, the majority of the program provides advanced technical content, which differentiates from the current SEP programs which are primarily oriented towards leadership and innovation skill development in specific contexts (i.e. entrepreneurship, design and public policy).

5. The proposal is very much in line with the principles and objectives which were provided to the task force; however, further work is needed on some of those areas, e.g. accelerated pathways and incorporating the current MEME program.

6. The offering of the program would be very much facilitated by the merger of the two units, as described and discussed in section 3, for example, leveraging the professional development capacity and existing courses in SET’s Gen Tech group.

In summary, the proposed framework is a welcome and positive development which can be used as the basis for developing a strong program. The development, implementation and operation of such a program would be facilitated by the merger of SEP and SET.

5.0 Organization and Governance

5.1 Organizational Concept

The concept of organizing the proposed new School is to facilitate operations while retaining identities and branding of current programs, i.e. the merger is primarily an internal organizational arrangement and not one which should affect how the programs are branded and marketed. Accordingly, it is anticipated that the proposed merger of the School of Engineering Technology with the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice will have very low ‘outward’ visibility. It is the intention that none of the current ‘brand-equity’ of either School will be lost, and that each School will retain the advantages of their current identities. The marketing of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice will remain essentially unchanged. The B.Tech. programs within the School of Engineering Technology will also retain their current branding (together with Mohawk). However, the B.Tech. programs will now include a clear pathway to an M.Eng. under the ‘larger-brand’ of the post-merger School.

The ‘internal’ organization of the post-merger School will be designed to facilitate operations and capitalize on the potential for synergy (the areas of opportunity are described in Section 3 of this Report).

Staffing: As directed by the Dean, the merger of the two Schools will not result in any reduction of staff. In the short-term, the organizational-structure as it relates to staffing will remain largely unchanged; the only immediate changes are proposed for the more
senior leadership positions (as outlined in Section 5.3 of this Report). In the future, as new opportunities for synergy emerge, some potential re-organization of staff responsibilities may be undertaken at the discretion of the Director in consultation with staff.

Faculty: As discussed in Section 3 of this Report, the proposed merger will have the greatest impact on the faculty of both Schools. This will be reflected in the organization and management of the various Programs, as well as the new faculty ‘accountabilities’ (as outlined in Section 5.3). The merger will also create the potential for greater autonomy in the areas of Tenure & Promotion and Appointments (apart from those appointments requiring consultation with Mohawk). In areas related to the management of Faculty, it is the intention that the post-merger School will function like a traditional department within the Faculty of Engineering.

Students: The proposed merger will provide benefits to students in both Schools as outlined in Section 3. With approximately a quarter of all Engineering Students, the post-merger School will form a very significant part of the Faculty of Engineering.

5.2 Proposed Name

The committee considered a number of possible names for the new school. The three possibilities which seem to be most suitable are:

1) Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice

2) Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology

3) Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Technology and Practice

The committee agreed that the new School should be named for Walter Booth, in honour of his philanthropy and long-term interest in both engineering practice and technology education at McMaster.

The second and third choices highlight the importance of technology within the new combined school while continuing to honour Walter Booth. This inclusion was considered to be important by several faculty members within the existing School of Engineering Technology.

However, members of the committee are reluctant to specify a preference for one of the three names and would appreciate suggestions/advice from the Dean of Engineering as to how to proceed. One option would be to choose one of the names and indicate reasons for the preference; another option would be to list all three names and ask for feedback at the retreat on September 1, 2015 (recognizing that feedback would need to be informal and advisory only). There may well be other options.
5.3 Governance

5.3.1 Director

It is proposed that the overall leadership for the new School be the responsibility of the Director. This will be a Senate appointment with a selection process and appointment conditions (e.g., term of office) similar to those for a Department Chair. Given the major role of the McMaster-Mohawk Bachelor of Technology Partnership (B.Tech. Partnership), the Director of the School would also hold the position of Executive Director of the B.Tech. Partnership.

5.3.2 Associate Directors

It is proposed that there be three Associate Directors: a) Graduate programs, b) 4yr B.Tech. programs, and c) B.Tech. Degree completion programs (DCP). The responsibilities of each of the Associate Directors would, for their program domain, be primarily concerned with ongoing program operation and management. For the undergraduate B.Tech. programs, the need for Associate Directors arises largely from the growth of those programs; even without the prospect of this merger, the Director of SET would require this additional high level support in order for those programs to function effectively. For the graduate programs, the Associate Director would have the operational responsibilities which currently rest with the Director of SEP. Depending upon skills and workload, certain School-wide responsibilities may be delegated to an Associate Director by the Director. Associate Directors would also be Senate appointments, with selection processes and appointment conditions (e.g. term of office) similar to those for Associate Chairs of Departments.

5.3.3 Program Chairs

As noted in the description of the operation of SET in section 2.1, each of the undergraduate programs is managed by a Program Chair; there are also “General Technology” Program Chairs for the 4-year and DCP B.Tech. programs. These positions would continue and would report in each case to the appropriate Associate Director. It is proposed that there be one Program Chair responsible for the current SEP graduate programs (i.e. MEEI, MTEI, MEPP and MED) and that there be a Program Chair responsible for the new M.Eng. programs described in section 4. Program Chairs would be internal appointments made by the Director in consultation with the Dean of Engineering. Depending upon skills and workload, an Associate Director may also take on the responsibilities of being a Program Chair.

5.3.4 Faculty Accountabilities

All current faculty members in SEP and SET would be accountable to the Director. The Director, in consultation with the Associate Directors, would be responsible for allocating teaching responsibilities. Given that faculty members who have been hired through SEP have expectations of teaching at the graduate level, current SEP faculty would have the
right not to teach undergraduate courses. The allocation of teaching responsibilities for current SET faculty may include both undergraduate and graduate level instruction. Future faculty appointees may be expected to teach at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

5.3.5 T&P and Appointments

The new School would have a single Tenure and Promotions Committee and a single Appointments committee, both chaired by the Director. Committee member selection and processes would parallel those for committees at the departmental level in the Faculty of Engineering.

5.3.6 Staff Accountabilities

All staff members in the School will be accountable to the Director, who may choose to delegate reporting responsibilities as appropriate for effective operation.

5.3.7 B.Tech. Partnership with Mohawk College

All of the Bachelor of Technology Programs offered by McMaster University’s School of Engineering Technology are governed by the terms of McMaster-Mohawk Bachelor of Technology Partnership, a partnership between McMaster University’s Faculty of Engineering and Mohawk College’s School of Engineering Technology. The ongoing governance of the partnership is delegated to the Steering Committee according to the terms of the partnership’s Memorandum of Understanding. The Steering Committee directs the planning and development of the B.Tech. programs, directs the management and finances within the B.Tech. programs, addresses issues of enrollment management, and addresses issues of mutual concern to both partners. Responsibility for the ongoing day-to-day administration of the partnership and its programs, in accordance with decisions, directions, guidelines and policies determined by the Steering Committee, is delegated to the Executive Director of the McMaster-Mohawk Bachelor of Technology Partnership, who is also the Director of SET.

6.0 Resource Implications

6.1 Governance Structure

Section 5.0 described the governance structure for the new School. The need for an Associate Director within SET is driven by the growth and need for sustainability of those programs; even without the prospect of this merger. Adjustments in the governance structure within SEP are also expected to be largely cost-neutral.
6.2 Administrative Support

Currently the administrative support for each of the Schools consists of the following positions:

SEP’s administrative support is comprised of the Enterprise Development Manager, the Administrator, the Marketing and Communications Strategist, the Graduate Administrative Assistant and the Administrative Assistant (part-time).

The SET administrative support is comprised of the Business Manager, The DCP Program Administrator, the Four-Year Program Administrator, the Recruiting and Promotion Coordinator, the Accounting Assistant, The Academic Advisor, the Facility Manager, The Biotechnology Lab Technician, and the Energy Lab Technician. The SET Business Manager is currently undertaking an administrative staffing analysis to determine the present and future administrative needs for the unit based on current and anticipated program requirements.

With a merger of the two Schools, there are opportunities to share best practices, administrative templates and processes between the administrative groups. SEP and SET have piloted an interchange of facility and computer support with the corresponding financial cost recovery. While we recommend no immediate change to the administrative structure of the new organization, we believe as the enterprise grows and develops, synergies and efficiencies may be found through the merging of the responsibility for overall administrative leadership of the entire school. At this time such a move would not be necessary nor appropriate. Staffing models will be explored at an opportune point as the enterprise grows and the benefits of further integration become apparent.

6.3 Financial Management

Budgets for the new merged school will need to continue to be set separate for the B.Tech. Partnership programs. The two entities will continue to maintain separate accounting streams to facilitate clear and transparent reporting on the Bachelor of Technology Partnership with Mohawk College. It will be desirable to take advantage of opportunities to share costs where savings can be achieved, recognizing the requirement to separate B.Tech. revenue and costs.

6.4 Facilities

There are opportunities for sharing of facilities between SEP and SET that the merger would facilitate. These would include classrooms, laboratories, meeting rooms, faculty offices, and student work spaces. The costs of facility use will be appropriately allocated between the B.Tech. Partnership and the other programs within the merged school.

6.5 Faculty and Sessional Instructors

The newly merged School would offer faculty members opportunities to teach in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Full-time faculty may teach courses currently
taught by Sessional Instructors, either as part of their normal workload or on an overload basis. This would increase the stability and quality of the programs and would at the same time increase the development opportunities for faculty. The merger is expected to increase the demand for the B.Tech. undergraduate programs by establishing clear pathways to graduate studies while at the same time increasing the demand for the graduate programs. The resulting growth would increase the need for both full-time faculty and Sessional Instructors. Another possible advantage of the merger would be to have graduate students assisting and earning income within the undergraduate program. Opportunities would exist for these students to provide teaching assistance or to be hired as Sessional Instructors for undergraduate labs.

6.6 Scholarship

Given the unique nature of both SEP and SET it is desirable for faculty in both schools to be active in a diversity of scholarship (i.e., discovery, teaching, integration and application\(^3\)) as befitting a combined School with an interdisciplinary focus on both the practice and teaching of engineering/technology. The merger would provide the opportunity for an expanded community with respect to scholarship, especially within the graduate programs that faculty in SET could participate in.

7.0 Conclusions

7.0 Summary and Conclusions

Prior to the September 1\(^{st}\) Retreat, the SEP-SET Merger Committee circulated an interim version of this report to the faculty and staff in both SEP and SET. This was intended to provide the necessary background information for Retreat participants.

The Faculty Retreat was held during the morning of September 1, 2015, and was well attended by Faculty and Staff from both SEP and SET, as well as other selected stakeholders. These 'outside' stakeholders included; Department Chairs from the Faculty of Engineering, Faculty and Staff representing various administration offices within the Faculty of Engineering, and stakeholders from Mohawk College. Approximately 50 individuals participated in the Retreat.

On September 9, 2015 the Merger Committee met to review the feedback received during the Retreat. Several points were apparent, these included:

- movement towards a merger of the two units should continue
- the merger needs to be based on a common defining vision
- questions and concerns regarding the merger process were voiced
- the faculty and staff showed a desire for 'innovation' in the proposed new M.Eng. programs, as well as the management of the new Merged School

most Faculty and Staff had minimal knowledge or understanding of the 'other' School
the proposed new M.Eng. programs seemed to distract the participants from topics related to the merger itself

As a result of these observations, the Merger Committee took the following actions:

1. Recommended that the Dean of Engineering and Dean’s Council give approval-in-principle for the merger of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice (SEP) and the School of Engineering Technology (SET) into a new School.

2. The Merger Committee formed three sub-committees to explore/define a new vision for the Merged School. The sub-committees focused on the following themes (identified by the Committee after reviewing the feedback from the Retreat):
   a) innovative teaching and learning approaches, both in current and new programs, with an emphasis on experiential learning
   b) innovative educational programming which would combine undergraduate and graduate level learning
   c) defining “the scholarship of engineering practice”

3. Recommended that the Dean of Engineering develop a leadership plan for both SEP and SET, and for the new combined School after the actual merger has taken place, and

4. Recommended that the Director of SEP and the Acting Director of SET, in consultation with the Dean of Engineering, develop a detailed transition plan for the actual implementation of the merger.

Based on the above recommendations, the Dean of Engineering expressed a desire to quantify Faculty and Staff support for the Merger. While the topic of the proposed merger had been discussed in several Faculty and Staff meetings held since the Retreat, the Merger Committee still had concerns regarding the completeness and overall effectiveness of the communications surrounding the proposed merger. As a result, the Merger Committee decided to hold a ‘SEP-SET Merger Forum’ on October 13, 2015 (open to faculty and staff of both Schools) during which the Merger Committee presented:
   • Simplified overviews of both SEP and SET Programs
   • Progress of the Merger sub-Committees on the development shared Vision for the new School
   • Overview of the opportunities and challenges of the proposed merger

The goal of this Forum was to better communicate the main messages of the interim report and to answer any questions or concerns. Attendance at the Forum was approximately 40, comprising a large proportion of the total faculty and staff of both Schools.
Shortly after the ‘Merger Forum’, the Merger Committee conducted a vote which was open to all full-time Faculty and Staff of both Schools (closing on October 21, 2015). The vote was a secret ballot (conducted online), with only the voters’ School identified. The results of the vote were as follows (where ‘Yes’ indicated support for the Merger; ‘No’ indicated opposition):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEP</td>
<td>8 72.73%</td>
<td>3 27.27%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>27 84.38%</td>
<td>5 15.63%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35 81.40%</td>
<td>8 18.60%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the vote indicated strong support for the proposed merger.

With the Faculty and Staff support demonstrated, under the direction of the Dean a new Transition Committee was formed to make recommendations regarding the merger process and to recommend a structure for the governance of the new Merged School. The recommendations of this Committee have been communicated to the Dean of Engineering, and are summarized in the following section of this report.

The Merger Committee also resolved to complete the original Merger Report (this Report) for the purposes of: a) documenting the process, and b) for circulation among approving bodies within the University.

The M.Eng. Task Force continues its work in an attempt to incorporate more of the new shared vision into the proposed M.Eng. programs.

A second Retreat is tentatively planned for the Winter of 2016.

7.1 Key Recommendations

7.1.1 Naming of the New School

It is recommended that the new school be named the “Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology”. This naming recognizes the role of Walter G. Booth in the establishment of both of the merging entities. It also acknowledges the educational context of the merging organizations with the words “Practice” and “Technology”.

The Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology is a division of the Faculty of Engineering with a focus on technology as it relates to the practice of engineering.
7.1.2 Governance

The recommended governance model is shown in the diagram below:

The Director of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology will report to the Dean of Engineering. This appointment will be a 5-year term appointment by the Senate. The process of selecting the Director will follow the standard McMaster University processes for the selection of similar positions such as Department Chairs, Associate Deans, and Deans. The Terms of Reference for this appointment will be the same as “The Terms of Reference for Department Chairs”, McMaster University Policies and Procedures, and will include all of the obligations and responsibilities contained therein.

It is recommended that three Associate Directors report to the Director as follows:

i. The Associate Director of Graduate Programs. This Associate Director has responsibility for the operation of the current graduate programs in the School of Engineering Practice.

ii. The Associate Director of Degree Completion Programs. This Associate Director has responsibility for the operation of the undergraduate Degree Completion Program (DCP) currently offered by the School of Engineering Technology, as well as for the continuing education components and the industry relations needed to execute this program.

iii. The Associate Director of Four-Year Programs. This Associate Director has responsibility for the operation of the four-year programs and associated co-op programs. This Associate Director is also responsible for managing operational relations with our Mohawk College Partner.

Associate Director appointments are made by the Director of the Walter G. Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology and are reviewed every 3 years. Appointments and reappointments are at the discretion of the Director in consultation with the Dean of Engineering.
Program Chairs for the undergraduate programs offered by the current School of Engineering Technology will continue in that role and report to the appropriate Associate Director. There are no immediate plans for Program Chairs at the graduate level.
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W Booth School of Engineering Practice
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Notes:
1) Sessional Lecturers and Adjunct Faculty teach in all programs
2) Chart does not fully represent time commitments to Booth School
3) Enterprise Development Manager supports all programs but primary role is with MMM-MTEI programs
Engineering Design

DEGREES: Master of Engineering Design
ENTRY DATES: September, January (limited)

The W Booth School of Engineering Practice Master of Engineering Design graduate degree program emphasizes the development of competencies in:

1. Leadership, collaboration, and management skills to lead diverse teams and deal with complex situations in the work environment
2. Design thinking and innovations methodologies
3. Engineering disciplines leading to breakthrough design and operation of systems in:
   - Sustainable community infrastructure (renewable energy systems, environmental systems, sustainable products and systems design, local economy)
   - Design and manufacturing of industrial and consumer products
   - Process industries and discrete manufacturing (i.e. refining, chemicals, specialty chemicals, pharmaceuticals, automotive)

THE PROGRAM

Candidates develop their leadership skills by taking a W Booth School Leadership course and by participating in the Innovation Studio. Through the Practitioner’s Forum, students are exposed to ideas and insights from experienced innovators. Engineering design students will be required to successfully complete six courses and an industry or society-focused project. The program includes:

- Interdisciplinary engineering courses in product design, project management, and risk management.
- Core technical courses that provide expert knowledge in targeted technical areas.
- Elective courses that allow students to acquire broader expertise in the technical areas which are at the center of their studies.

In addition to the general requirements for entry into a graduate program, students must hold a four-year engineering, technology or related discipline. Prospective applicants lacking the required standing in their undergraduate degree, but who have at least four years of relevant work experience may be considered.

wbooth.mcmaster.ca

Admissions Criteria
Masters (M.Eng.Design):
The minimum academic requirement for admission is normally an average of B- in the last year of an applicant’s undergraduate program.

Length
Full time – 12 months
Part time – 24 months

Application Deadlines
For SEPTEMBER 2015
International – June 1, 2015
Domestic – August 1, 2015

For JANUARY 2016
Process & Production Systems ONLY
International – November 15, 2015
Domestic – December 1, 2015

Contact Information
Please visit our website at:
http://wbooth.mcmaster.ca
Email: wbooth@mcmaster.ca

Dulcie Amaral
Graduate Administrative Assistant
amarald@mcmaster.ca
(905) 525 -9140 ext. 26401
Engineering and Public Policy

DEGREES: Master of Engineering and Public Policy (M.E.P.P.)
ENTRY DATE: September, January

The W Booth School of Engineering Practice has the following objectives for the Master of Engineering and Public Policy (MEPP) graduate degree program:

- to provide a high quality educational experience to graduate engineers and scientists in the areas of engineering, science and public policy;
- to foster applied research in the areas of engineering, science and public policy through the successful completion and dissemination of a research paper;
- to develop viable working linkages between engineering, science and fields of study within social sciences and the humanities (public policy, economics, society)
- to produce graduates who will provide inspired leadership in the engineering, science and public policy areas within the public, private and NGO sectors.

THE PROGRAM

Candidates develop their leadership skills by successfully completing a W Booth School Leadership course and by participating in the Innovation Studio. Through the Practitioner’s Forum, students are exposed to ideas and insights from experienced innovators. The Engineering and Public Policy curriculum has four main components:

1. **Core courses** that provide the content and methodological skills necessary for understanding and analyzing societal issues for which engineering and science can contribute to public policy solutions;
2. **Focus elective courses** that allow students to deepen their knowledge of a range of engineering, science and social science applications;
3. The completion of a **substantive research paper** on a problem at the interface of engineering, science and public policy;
4. **Participation** in an intensive workshop/seminar on public policy.

In addition to general requirements for entry into a graduate program, students must hold a four-year undergraduate degree in engineering, technology, science or related discipline. Professional work experience is desirable but not essential. Applicants who did not attain the required standing in their undergraduate degree, but who have at least four (4) years of relevant work experience may be considered.

Admissions Criteria
The minimum academic requirement for admission is an average of B- in the last year of an applicant’s undergraduate program. Relevant work experience is an asset.

Length
Full time – 16 to 20 months
Part time – 28 months

Application Deadlines
September 2015
International – June 1, 2015
Domestic – August 1, 2015
January 2016
International – November 15, 2015
Domestic – December 1, 2015

Contact Information
Please visit our website at:
http://wbooth.mcmaster.ca
Email: wbooth@mcmaster.ca

Dulcie Amaral
Graduate Administrative Assistant
amarald@mcmaster.ca
(905) 525 -9140 ext. 26401
Entrepreneurship & Innovation

DEGREES:    Master of Engineering Entrepreneurship & Innovation (M.E.E.I.)
            Master of Technology Entrepreneurship & Innovation (M.T.E.I.)

ENTRY DATE:  September

The W Booth School of Engineering Practice Engineering Entrepreneurship and Innovation graduate degree program offers its students the experience, opportunity and resources necessary for aspiring entrepreneurs to lead change. This innovative program for engineers and technology-savvy students provides the essential knowledge and skills to facilitate a successful business startup.

Whether you would like to launch a technology-based business or have been assigned a market opportunity from within an existing company, the W Booth School provides an educational framework on which to build a business. Our faculty members and network of seasoned mentors provide students guidance in how to translate novel ideas into commercial innovation.

THE PROGRAM

Three core entrepreneurship and innovation modules are designed to empower students with the necessary skills to start a new business venture. Additionally, students must complete two graduate level elective courses relating to advanced engineering studies or professional development. The objective of the course work is to refine leadership and technological skills in order to apply them to the enterprise project. Those skills come to life and are demonstrated throughout a 'tollgate' process, facilitated by faculty advisors as well as business and technical mentors.

Candidates develop their leadership skills by successfully completing a W Booth School Leadership course and by participating in the Innovation Studio. Through the Practitioner’s Forum, students are exposed to ideas and insights from experienced innovators.

Applicants with an undergraduate engineering, technology or science degree who meet eligibility criteria may register in the M.E.E.I. degree program. While students in the M.T.E.I. program are not expected to have any engineering or scientific background, they are expected to embrace creativity and Innovation. Familiarity with technology is expected, but the required technological depth will depend on the project itself. Emphasis will be placed on team-based experiential learning through project work and innovation challenges in collaboration with community stakeholders.

wbooth.mcmaster.ca
Manufacturing has been identified as a strategic research and educational area because of its importance to Canadian industry. Graduates need to understand how their knowledge gained through undergraduate studies can be applied to a manufacturing environment.

Manufacturing has become much more broadly based, encompassing many different aspects of engineering (e.g. metals, polymers, composites, MEMS, metal cutting, and forming). The language of engineers must include lean manufacturing, six-sigma production, just-in-time, etc. Concepts such as waste, standardization, sustainability, and 'push' versus 'pull' implementation, require both teaching and hands-on practice.

The program is intended for McMaster students in either the B.Eng. or B.Tech. programs and begins during the final year of that degree. Throughout the program, students will gain industrial experience and intellectual flexibility. At the end of this program, McMaster students will graduate with a B.Eng. or B.Tech. in Engineering and an M.Eng. in Manufacturing Engineering.
McMaster University

W Booth
School of Engineering Practice

INSPIRING INNOVATIVE LEADERS THAT WILL TRANSFORM THE WORLD

"Our team often presents ideas on new technologies. I learned innovative business solutions. I used to think that you needed an idea you could sell. Through the W Booth School, I've discovered how important it is to validate ideas and to consider the possible value an idea could create."

Israel Gaspeta, M.Eng.

"When people can see outside the tech box, they understand what is really happening in the field. The engineering and public policy program develops students' technical expertise and policy understanding. My learning experience at W Booth School changed everything for me and led to an exciting career path."

Maria Topalovic, M.Eng. 2010

"This program has pushed me out of my comfort zone and enabled me to develop as a leader. Our presentations and group projects allowed me to practice and develop important transferable skills through leadership and team-building exercises. Students develop friendships and a sense of community in a very collaborative environment."

Catherine Barrows, M.Eng. Design

Contact Us

wbooth@mcmaster.ca
W Booth School of Engineering Practice
McMaster University - ETB - 509
Hamilton, ON, Canada (905) 525-9140 ext. 26401

@WBoothSchool
School of Engineering Technology

Degree Completion Program Academic Organization Chart

Director, SET
Executive Director, B.Tech.

Civil Engineering Infrastructure Technology Program Chair
Software Engineering Technology Program Chair
Energy Engineering Technologies Program Chair
Manufacturing Engineering Technology Program Chair
Management Program Chair

Energy Engineering Faculty Member (1)
Manufacturing Engineering Faculty Member (1)
School of Engineering Technology

Four-Year Program Academic Organization Chart

Director, SET
Executive Director, B.Tech.

Automotive & Vehicle Technology Program Chair

Biotechnology Program Chair

Process Automation Program Chair

Management Program Chair

Engineering Technology Faculty (Across all program streams)

Automotive & Vehicle Faculty Members (3)

Biotechnology Faculty Members (3)

Process Automation Faculty Members (3)

Communication Technology Faculty Member (1)

Mathematics & Programming Faculty Member (1)

Engineering Finance Faculty Member (1)

Mathematics Faculty Member (1)

Statistics Faculty Member (1)
About the Program

Learn about the construction, operation, design, and manufacturing of modern vehicles. Evaluate current and future automotive propulsion technologies, advanced combustion systems, hybrid powertrains, and alternative fuel vehicles. Use engineering fundamentals and state-of-the-art software to identify, formulate, analyze, and solve problems related to the machine components and assemblies used in the automotive industry.

Students travel to the new McMaster Automotive Resource Centre (MARC) after first year, to utilize state-of-the-art laboratories and classrooms. The $26 million facility officially opened in 2013 and allows students to participate in current research in automotive and hybrid technology.

Careers

Our graduates may work to develop new hybrid and green vehicle technologies, design power and control systems, engines, and bodies, perform complex analysis on mechanical components, assemblies, and systems, conduct crash tests and safety audits, or streamline production processes in plants.

Here's a sampling of what our Automotive & Vehicle Technology grads are doing now!

Junior Engineer
TEAM Associates

Management Associate
US Steel

Owner/Founder
2 Social/LXRY Magazine

CAD/CAM Programmer
John Crane

Design Engineer
TigerCat Industries

Logistics
Honda

Designer
TigerCat Industries

Engineering Technician
Rockwell Automation

Design Engineer
Honda Manufacturing

Engineering Assistant
Par-Pak Ltd.

Co-op

Top Co-op Employers:
Linamar Corporation • Magna • Chrysler

Our Automotive & Vehicle Technology students have worked at these companies for 4- and 6-month co-op work terms:

A. Raymond Tieneman
ASC Canada
AstraZeneca Canada Inc.
Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL)
Autoliv Electronics
B.C. Hydro
Bike Oak Energy
Bruce Power
Canadian Tire
Corporation Limited
Cardinal Supply Inc.
CIBC Technology & Operations
Emrich Inc.
Sears Canada Inc.
SFI Canada
General Motors of Canada (GMC)
GM Canada Assembly
Golf Canada
Hydro One Inc.
Imperial Oil/Exxon Mobil
John Deere Ltd.

NDI
Ontario Power Generation (OPG)
Par-Pak Ltd.
Pepel - OPG Canada Inc.
RBC Royal Bank
Brenick Systems Integration Inc.
Henderson Industrial
Specialties
Hendrickson Canada Ltd.
Honda Of Canada Manufacturing
Hydro One Inc.
IBM Canada Ltd.
IC Controls Ltd.
Magne Closures / Detec
Research in Motion (RIM)
RMTC Robotics Ltd.
Rockwell Automation
Schlumberger Oilfield Services
Service Plus Aquatics Inc.
Shell Canada Limited
Siemens Canada Limited

Graduate Programs

• MBA – McMaster University
• M.A.Sc. – Mechanical Engineering, McMaster University
Bachelor of 
T•E•C•H•N•O•L•O•G•Y

McMASTER-MOHAWK PARTNERSHIP

BIOTECHNOLOGY

About the Program

Biotechnology is an interdisciplinary field merging basic science, applied science, and engineering. Study genetic engineering, cell biology, molecular biology, and microbiology, analytical instrumentation, and bio processing. Learn about the latest research in immunology, virology, genomics, proteomics, and bioinformatics.

Co-op

Top Co-op Employers:
- Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada
- Environment Canada
- Sanofi Pasteur

Our Biotechnology students have worked at these companies for 4- and 8-month co-op work terms:

- Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada
- Air Liquide Canada Inc.
- ASCO Canada
- AstraZeneca Canada Inc.
- Bruce Power
- Canwest Corporation
- Centre for Drug Research and Development
- CF Crozier & Associates
- Chong Engineering
- CIBC Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce
- CIBC Technology & Operations
- Cowlam Engineering Ltd.
- Environment Canada
- Fido Media Inc.
- Fina Innovations
- Government of Canada
- Green and Clean Energy Company
- Horizon Legacy Energy Corp
- Hydro One Inc.
- Innovasa
- Mascoma Canada Inc.
- McMaster University
- National Research Council of Canada
- Naylor Group Inc.
- NeuroVim Inc.
- Nuttig
- Ontario Genomics Institute
- Princess Margaret Hospital
- Prower and Gamble
- RBC Financial Group
- Sanofi Pasteur Limited
- Schubert Ophthalmic Services
- Shell Canada Limited
- Siemens Canada Limited
- Synrocate Canada Ltd.
- Transurban Energy Inc.
- Tack Cominco Ltd./Tekk Metals Ltd.
- Vansche Performance Chemicals
- Wellton Clean Water Centre
- Xerox

Careers

Our graduates can work in the bioindustry (biofuel, food, and pharmaceutical industries) monitoring quality control and assurance of biomaterials. They may also specialize in areas such as bioinformatics, genetic and protein engineering, nanobiotechnology, and bioremediation, or apply forensic biology techniques in areas such as criminal forensics.

Here's a sampling of what our Biotechnology grads are doing now:

Research Technician
Public Health Ontario

Research Technician
Public Health Ontario

Quality Assurance Auditor
Maple Leaf Foods

Market Research Analyst
Roche

Pharmacy Assistant
Shoppers Drug Mart

Production Technician
Xagenic Inc.

Crew Supervisor
Culex Environmental

Graduate Programs

- M.Sc., Laboratory Medicine & Pathobiology - University of Toronto (OICR)
- Master's in Biotechnology - University of Toronto
Bachelor of Technology
McMaster-Mohawk Partnership

About the Program
Develop highly tuned analytical and design skills and gain specialized knowledge in sensors, instruments, actuators, industrial networks, process control and automation, SCADA, programming, statistical process control, internet technologies, and the integration of plant floor data with business systems. Take a multidisciplinary approach with subjects in chemical, mechanical, electrical, electronics and computer engineering.

Careers
Graduates use hardware and software to improve the efficiency of plants and labs in industries such as petrochemicals, power generation, pharmaceuticals, and primary steel. They may design control systems and assembly lines, develop and program robotics, or advise on safety policies and procedures for automated technologies.

Here’s a sampling of what our Process Automation Technology grads are doing now!

### Process Control Lead
- Weyerhaeuser

### Systems Integrator
- Zarpac Performance Index

### System Configuration Specialist
- Aon Hewitt

### Systems & Process Control Technician
- Hatch

### Commissioning Representative
- GE Water & Process Tech

### Engineering/Automation Support
- General Motors

### Technical Specialist, R&D
- Marlex Engineering Inc.

### Control Systems Designer
- Husky Molding Systems

### Integration Specialist
- Zarpac Performance Index

### SCADA Systems Technologist
- Novell

### Automation Specialist
- Opus Automation

### Owner/Technical Advisor
- Konrad Technical Services Inc.

### Contract Embedded Software Developer
- Marlex Engineering Inc.

### Lead Developer
- Highside Software & Systems

### Systems Integrator
- Jordan Engineering Inc.

### Jr. Controls and Systems Engineer
- Polycon

### Continuous Improvement Leader/Six Sigma
- Black Belt

### Mondelēz International

### Jr. Business Analyst
- Ontario Power Authority

### Account Manager
- Rockwell Automation

### Project Manager
- Opus Automation

### Manufacturing Engineer
- General Motors

### System Design Specialist:
- Process Automation Group
- Gerrie Electric Wholesale Ltd.

### Co-op
Top Co-op Employers:
- Rockwell Automation • General Motors • GE

Our Process Automation Technology students have worked at these companies for 4- and 8-month co-op work terms:

- ABB Limited
- AECOM Canada Ltd.
- Adeco Entertainment
- Apex Systems Integrators Inc.
- ArevaMittal Outokumpu
- ASCO Canada
- AstaZeneca Canada Inc.
- Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.
- ATS Automation Tooling Systems Inc.
- Bittorf Energy
- Bunge Canada
- Canadian Space Agency
- Chint Electric Systems Canada Ltd.
- CIRCE Technology & Operations
- Collett-Wright Controls
- Embedded Computing
- Electronic Arts Canada – EAC
- Enbridge/Husker Canada Ltd
- GE Canada
- Hydro One Inc.
- Libra d' Automation Inc.
- Linxer Corporation
- Lincoln Electric Company of Canada Limited
- Lockheed Martin Canada Ltd.
- Ingrapex Software Inc.
- Lakehead Process Controls Ltd.
- Meta Engineering Ltd.
- MGN Engineering Inc.
- Microsoft
- Ontario Power Generation (OPG)
- Opus Automation Inc.
- Research in Motion (RIM)
- Rockwell Automation
- Siemens Canada Ltd.
- Suncor Energy
- Sunwell Technologies Inc.
- Sybase Inc.
- Syncon Canada Ltd.
- The Woodbridge Group
- Yorkton Performance
- Chemicals

### Graduate Programs
- MBA - Wilfrid Laurier University
- M.A.Sc. Electrical & Computer Eng – McMaster University
REPORT TO THE SENATE

from the

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY CEREMONIALS AND INSIGNIA

I Policy Revisions (Attachment I)

At its meeting on December 8, 2015, the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia received recommendations on the following policy revisions.

i. Policy on Flying the Flag

Revisions to the Policy on Flying the Flag, as proposed by the President, follow from the approval of the McMaster University Flag on May 13, 2015. The revised Flag Policy and Protocol introduces new protocols for an Official University Flag Pole and a Ceremonial Flag Pole and for flying the new flag, and clarifies the protocol for lowering the flag.

The Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia now recommends,

that the Senate approve that the Policy on Flying the Flag be revised and renamed, as set out in Attachment I (i) of the report from the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia.

ii. Policy on the Deferral of Attendance at Convocation

The University Registrar provided recommendations for minor revisions to the Policy on the Deferral of Attendance at Convocation.

The Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia now recommends,

that the Senate approve that the Policy on the Deferral of Attendance at Convocation be revised, as set out in Attachment I (ii) of the report from the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia.

iii. Policy on Issuing Diplomas in Advance of Convocation

The University Registrar, also provided recommendations for revisions to the Policy on Issuing Diplomas in Advance of Convocation. It is common for students seeking entry into another country for employment to obtain confirmation of graduation prior to Convocation under the current Policy. For situations that do not fall under the Policy, such as for external government funding, application to further studies, or professional certification, students have been provided with a letter from the Registrar’s Office confirming that the student has completed the degree requirements for their program.
However, increasingly students are being asked to provide evidence of conferral of degrees, including producing their official diploma parchments, and letters are not being accepted.

The Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia now recommends,

that the Senate approve that the Policy on Issuing Diplomas in Advance of Convocation be revised, as set out in Attachment I (iii) of the report from the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia.

II Additional Convocation Ceremonies (Attachment II)

At the same meeting, the Committee received, from the University Registrar, recommendations regarding the potential requirement for additional Convocation ceremonies in the near future. In particular, the Spring Convocation ceremony for the Faculty of Business and the Fall Convocation ceremony for the Faculties of Business, Engineering, Humanities, Social Sciences and the Arts and Science program are nearing capacity and additional ceremonies may be required.

The Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia now recommends,

that the Senate approves the adjustment of the number of Convocation ceremonies based on the number of graduands at a given ceremony and as determined by the University Registrar, as set out in Attachment II of the report from the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia.

III New Degree Designation, Abbreviation and Hood (Attachment III)

At the same meeting, the Committee received recommendations on the degree designation, abbreviation and hood specification for the degree of Master of Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization. The proposed hood is the same as for the Master of Health Sciences degree.

The Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia now recommends,

that the Senate approve the abbreviation M.B.D.C. for the Master of Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization degree with the hood to be the same as the hood for the Master of Health Sciences (M.H.Sc.): Black silk, lined with crimson, bound on the anterior side with old gold silk and bound on the posterior side with crimson silk, as set out in Attachment III of the report from the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia.

For Approval
Senate: January 13, 2016
Policies, Procedures and Guidelines

Complete Policy Title: Policy on Flying the Flag Policy and Protocol
Policy Number (if applicable):

Approved by: Senate
Date of Most Recent Approval:
April 9, 2014

Date of Original Approval(s):
December 10, 2003
Supersedes/Amends Policy dated:

Responsible Executive:
University Secretary
Enquiries:
University Secretariat

DISCLAIMER: If there is a Discrepancy between this electronic policy and the written copy held by the policy owner, the written copy prevails.

4.1 The official flag poles at McMaster University are located in front of the Burke Science Building.

1.2 Only the Canadian flag and the flag of Ontario should be flown from the Official University flag poles, except when there is an official visit from a head of state, during which the flag of the visiting head of state's country may be flown provided that it is not flown higher than the Canadian flag. Such flags are flown in accordance with flag protocol as directed by the Ministry of Canadian Heritage.

1.2 Flags other than those recognised in section 1.2 above should not be flown from the University's Official flag poles.

2.1 Ceremonial Flag Pole

The McMaster University flag is approved by Senate on 14/04/2014, as part of the shares of the University's official name. McMaster written below in white with a black background can be used on all use of University Creative. The University flag may not be used for any other purpose.

The University flag may be flown to display as follows:
4.43 Lowering the Flags

The flags on all the University’s campuses shall be lowered to half mast for one day on the following occasions: on Remembrance Day in recognition of the fact that, in the Canadian community, it is an appropriate national day of mourning for the continuing state of violence in the world; on national days of remembrance and mourning as determined by the Parliament of Canada; upon the death of any current member of the faculty, the staff, the student body, the Senate, or the Board of Governors; or upon the death of any national or community figure. In addition, for cases not included in the above categories the flag is to be lowered at the discretion of the President.
University regulations state that students “must take the degree at the Convocation immediately following the completion of the appropriate degree work.” However, it is understood that, in extenuating circumstances, there will be times when a student cannot attend his/her convocation. While it will not be possible for students to defer the taking of the degree, the following is a process by which a student may request a deferral of attending Convocation in the year the student is scheduled to graduate.

Request for deferred attendance at convocation:

1. The student must make his/her request, in writing, to the University Registrar for a Convocation ceremony deferral.

2. The student’s request must state the extenuating circumstances (and, when requested, supply supporting documentation) that will prevent her/him from attending the Convocation immediately following the completion of his/her degree work.

3. The request must pre-date the student’s regularly scheduled Convocation ceremony and normally must be filed in the Office of the Registrar at least seven working days prior to the ceremony. (In certain circumstances, a request after the event will be considered if the cause is a compelling one, is beyond the student’s control, and is of a compassionate or health-related nature.)

4. Upon approval of the request for deferred attendance at Convocation, the student will receive a letter from the University Registrar approving his/her attendance in the appropriately affiliated ceremony in the next Convocation cycle. (That is, the University will not grant a deferral from, for example, a Tuesday to a Wednesday or from a morning to an afternoon ceremony, etc. Normally, deferrals will be approved from a Spring Convocation to a Fall Convocation; from a Fall Convocation to a Spring Convocation.)
If the request is approved:

5. As required by University regulation, the student’s name will go forward to Senate for approval in the normal time and fashion.

6. The student’s name will appear in the program for the ceremony s/he would normally have attended and the degree diploma will be printed.

7. On the presumption that the student did not actually attend the ceremony, her/his degree will be conferred in absentia by the Chancellor and the student’s name will appear on the Convocation roll.

8. The student will receive his/her diploma will be available by mail—approximately two weeks after Convocation. The student may pick-up the diploma in person or make arrangements for mailing by contacting the Registrar’s Office of the Registrar.

Attendance at the subsequent convocation:

9. At the time the deferral is granted, the student will be informed that, approximately one month prior to the subsequent Convocation, s/he will be required to register to attend the Convocation ceremony.

10. Upon verifying that the student will attend Convocation, the Office of the Registrar will make arrangements for the student to be included in the Convocation ceremony: gowning with other graduands, hooding on stage, photographed on stage by a Chappel Studio (Convocation) photographer, greeting by the Chancellor, and walking across stage.

11. As diplomas are received off-stage, the student will receive a blank diploma folder at this time.

12. The student will be permitted to take part in the other Convocation festivities, e.g., Faculty-sponsored Convocation receptions.
1. For McMaster students, including visa students, who are staying in Canada for employment—no early diploma should be issued. A "To Whom It May Concern" letter issued by the Office of the Registrar that explains when diplomas are issued is sufficient for employment purposes in Canada. This approach is consistent with information from Canadian Immigration and Citizenship. McMaster will consider a request for early release of a diploma where a student provides supporting documentation demonstrating the diploma is required (e.g., employment, professional registration, or further educational implications).

2. To make a formal request, for McMaster students who are seeking entry into another country for employment, the following information should be requested and sent directly to the University Registrar:

   - A signed letter/e-mail requesting the issuing of the student’s diploma before the applicable convocation.

   - The letter/e-mail must specify the reason(s) the diploma is needed in advance of the applicable convocation.

   Documentation confirming that the request is justified must be provided to the University Registrar by the student. The documentation must be specific to the student and not a general notice or information letter and must state that degree conferral or an original diploma is required by the student by a specified date.
Policy on Issuing Diplomas in Advance of Convocation
March 14, 2007

- Documentation must include, but is not limited to, a letter of appointment or a job-offer letter that states that an original diploma is required by the student, by a specified date, in order to complete the visa application process.

- The documentation must be specific to the student in question and not a general notice or information letter.

- The University Registrar will review the student's request and supporting documentation.

- If the request is approved, the University Registrar will submit the name of the student and the degree to be awarded to Senate.

- Following approval by Senate, the University Registrar will inform the student of the University's approval.

- In making arrangements for the diploma to be printed, the date at which Senate approved the student's degree will be the "degree-conferred date". This date will appear on the student's diploma and University record.
To: University Ceremonials Committee

From: Melissa Pool – University Registrar

Re: Additional Convocation Ceremonies

Date: November 11th, 2015

As McMaster University continues to grow its undergraduate and graduate populations, there is increasing pressure on convocation ceremonies due to time and venue limits. This has resulted in changes to ceremonies over the past few years and may mean additional ceremony changes are needed in upcoming years. The growth in two ceremonies in particular warrant further examination and potential ceremony additions: the Business Convocation in June and the Social Sciences, Business, Arts and Science, Humanities and Engineering Convocation in the fall. Increasing graduand numbers have two particular impacts on the experience of students and their guests. One, the number of guest seats available becomes more limited and two, the ceremony becomes increasingly long, whereby the time from when guests and graduands arrive, to the time when the ceremony is completed, could be as long as 3.5 to 4 hrs.

The Office of the Registrar would like to inform the committee that is proposing to work with the respective Faculties to understand enrolment and graduate projections. The Registrar will report back any changes to the committee as they arise.

Regards,

Melissa Pool
University Registrar
November 25, 2015

TO: Members of the Committee on University Ceremonials and Insignia

FROM: Melissa Pool
University Registrar

RE: Degree abbreviation and hood design for Master of Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization

In accordance with the Senate Policy on Academic Regalia, Hood Descriptions and Degree Abbreviations, I submit for your approval that,

i) the Master of Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization degree assume the degree abbreviation M.B.D.C. and that it adopts the following hood description:

Black silk, lined with crimson, bound on the anterior side with old gold silk and bound on the posterior side with crimson

Note: The aforementioned hood has also previously been approved for use by the Master of Health Sciences (M.H.Sc.) degree.
REPORT TO SENATE  

from the  

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY  

i) Revisions to Academic Integrity Policy  

At its meeting on December 2, 2015, the Committee on Academic Integrity reviewed proposed revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy. A number of changes are proposed in order to bring the Policy in line with the Research Integrity Policy. A general transcript notation is being added to the penalties listed in the Academic Integrity Policy; the transcript notation includes a date on which it will be removed. An option for students to submit penalty suggestions in writing has been added. Among the penalties available for academic integrity cases involving graduate students is placement of a letter in the student's file; a process for removal of those letters has been added to the Policy. A list of examples of unauthorised aids that are prohibited in examinations has been included.

The Committee on Academic Integrity now recommends,

that Senate approves the revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy as set out in Attachment I of the report from the Committee on Academic Integrity.

For Information

ii) Academic Integrity Reports

At the same meeting, the Committee on Academic Integrity reviewed the Academic Integrity Reports, September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014 and September 1, 2014 to August 31, 2015 presented by the Academic Integrity Officer. These reports are now presented to Senate for information (Attachment II and III).
Complete Policy Title: Academic Integrity Policy

Approved by: Senate

Date of Original Approval(s): March 13, 2002

Responsible Executive: Academic Integrity Officer

If there is a Discrepancy between this electronic policy and the written copy held by the policy owner, the written copy prevails.
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PREAMBLE

1. The main purpose of a university is to encourage and facilitate the pursuit of knowledge and scholarship. The attainment of this purpose requires the individual integrity of all members of the University community, including all graduate and undergraduate students. Scholars at McMaster demonstrate integrity in many ways, including the following:

   • Scholars practice intellectual honesty in the process of acquiring and extending knowledge. They do this by improving scholarly competence, and by exercising critical thinking and self-discipline.

   • Scholars show respect for and courtesy to others in free discussions on academic topics and recognize the right to free inquiry and opinion.

   • Scholars adhere to ethical requirements in their research.

   • Scholars acknowledge fully the work of others by providing appropriate references in papers, essays and the like and declaring the contributions of co-workers. Scholars do not take credit that is not earned.

   • Scholars strive to ensure that others are not put at a disadvantage in their pursuit of knowledge. They do not withhold material that should rightly be available to all.

The University states unequivocally that it demands scholarly integrity from all of its members. Academic dishonesty, in whatever form, is ultimately destructive to the values of the University; furthermore, it is unfair and discouraging to those students who pursue their studies honestly.

2. This Policy applies to all registered students, to students who have withdrawn or graduated if it is alleged that they committed academic dishonesty during the time they were registered students or in order to obtain admission or registration, and to students who have withdrawn from the University but who submit work for academic evaluation for the purpose of gaining readmission.

RELATED POLICIES

3. This document is to be read in conjunction with the following University policies and statements:

   a) Research Integrity Policy

      Cases of alleged research misconduct (as defined in the policy "Research Ethics at McMaster University") that involve research a student is doing outside of coursework and as part of his or her academic program shall be governed by the procedures contained in the "Academic Research Integrity Policy".

   b) Student Code of Conduct

      The Student Code of Conduct governs the non-academic behaviour of students, whereas this Policy governs academic behaviour. In some instances, a student’s behaviour may involve both academic and non-academic issues, in which case the student may, at the
discretion of the instructor or administrator involved, be subject to the procedures of either or both policies.

RESPONSIBILITIES

All Members of the University Community

4. All members of the University community (students, faculty, instructors, staff and invigilators) have responsibility for the maintenance of an atmosphere of academic integrity in all phases of academic life, including research, teaching, learning and administration.

5. All members of the University have the responsibility to:

   a) detect and report incidents of academic dishonesty, falsification of documents, etc., and
   b) provide assistance and co-operation in the prosecution of alleged offenders.

Office of Academic Integrity

6. The purpose of this office is to assist instructors, students and staff with issues of academic integrity. Responsibilities include:

   a) planning and coordinating academic integrity education and academic dishonesty prevention activities,
   b) assisting with instructor education and developing programs concerning integrity issues by serving as a resource and providing educational materials,
   c) providing advice to instructors, students, Faculties, the Office of the Registrar and so on with respect to individual case investigation, documentation and presentation,
   d) providing procedural advice to and administrative support for Faculty Adjudicators in the hearing of academic dishonesty charges,
   e) acting as a resource for Faculty Adjudicators with respect to sentencing practices and student history of dishonesty,
   f) storing all documentation on academic dishonesty cases that take place at the instructor and Faculty levels and providing an annual written report to the University Senate on activities and dishonesty cases on behalf of all Faculties,
   g) tracking complaints and making inquiries about suspected incidents of academic dishonesty that have not been pursued, and
   h) recommending to Senate, from time to time, guidelines with respect to appropriate sanctions for certain offences, such guidelines to be affixed to this Policy as Appendix 4.

Administration

7. The term “Administration”, as used in this Policy, refers to individuals and entities responsible for the University’s academic programs. They include: Department Chairs, Directors of Schools and Programs, Associate and Assistant Deans, Deans, the Associate Vice-President (Academic), the Provost, and the Senate. Administrators are responsible for developing and updating policies and procedures related to maintaining the academic integrity of the University community. In addition,
they are responsible for providing resources so that members of the University are able to function with integrity in their academic pursuits. These resources may include:

a) disseminating information about the expectations for academic integrity,
b) developing, or assisting instructors to develop, guidelines to be used by instructors in preparing course outlines that clearly articulate expectations,
c) providing testing environments, examination protocols (e.g., seating plans) and expectations for the review of examinations to make the opportunity for academic dishonesty more difficult, and
d) providing the resources to support an Office of Academic Integrity.

Office of the Registrar

8. The Office of the Registrar is responsible for developing policies and procedures to detect misrepresentation of credentials during the admissions process and to maintain academic integrity during the writing of Registrar-administered examinations. For graduate students, the Graduate Registrar of the School of Graduate Studies has the same responsibilities regarding the admissions process.

Faculty Adjudicators (see also Appendix 1)

9. Faculty Adjudicators are responsible for adjudicating allegations of academic dishonesty, including making sure that the case is heard in a timely manner, the penalty is appropriate for the circumstances and in the light of previous precedents and practice, and the results are communicated to all the relevant parties.

Instructors

10. Instructors are responsible for using educational strategies that encourage students to behave honestly. These may include:

a) clearly articulating expectations about appropriate academic behavior at the beginning of the course,
b) developing course outlines that clearly set out expectations for referencing sources of information, for group work and so on,
c) using mechanisms during testing that reduce or eliminate the opportunities for copying, e.g., test facilities and randomized seating,
d) regularly producing new tests/examinations, especially for deferred examinations,
e) producing new assignments (such as laboratories and essay and report topics) on a regular basis to discourage copying from previous years’ assignments, and
f) asking students to sign declarations that the work submitted is their own as a reminder of the necessity for academic integrity and the consequences of academic dishonesty.
Students (Undergraduate and Graduate)

11. Students are responsible for being aware of and demonstrating behaviour that is honest and ethical in their academic work. Such behaviour includes:

   a) following the expectations articulated by instructors for referencing sources of information and for group work,
   b) asking for clarification of expectations as necessary,
   c) identifying testing situations that may allow copying,
   d) preventing their work from being used by others, e.g., protecting access to computer files, and
   e) adhering to the principles of academic integrity when conducting and reporting research.

12. Students are responsible for their behaviour and may face penalties under this Policy, if they commit academic dishonesty.

Graduate Students

13. Graduate students, having been deemed admissible to higher studies, are expected to be competent in the acknowledgement of other peoples’ work, whether that work is in print or electronic media.

14. Graduate education concentrates on the formation of appropriate research skills and prepares students to undertake independent inquiry. All graduate students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the definitions of research integrity and research misconduct in the University policies. Graduate students are expected to understand the demands of ethical conduct of research and reporting research results. All graduate students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the definition of research misconduct in the University's policy, namely, "a researcher must be honest in proposing, seeking support for, conducting, and reporting research; a researcher must respect the rights of others in these activities."

Committee on Academic Integrity

15. The Committee on Academic Integrity is responsible for making recommendations to the Senate on policy and procedures relating to issues of academic integrity and on measures designed to reduce instances of academic dishonesty. Additionally, the committee reviews the annual report prepared by the Office of Academic Integrity prior to its presentation to the Senate.

ACADEMIC WORK

16. Academic work includes any academic paper, term test, proficiency test, essay, thesis, research report, evaluation, project, assignment or examination, whether oral, in writing, in other media or
otherwise and/or registration and participation in any course, program, seminar, workshop, conference or symposium offered by the University.¹

For graduate students, comprehensive/qualifying exams, any research work relating to a course, and thesis work (a thesis proposal, or thesis draft, or draft of one or more chapters) also constitute academic work and must adhere to standards of academic integrity.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Definition

17. Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage.

Wherever in this Policy an offence is described as depending on “knowingly”, the offence is deemed to have been committed if the person ought reasonably to have known.

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY OFFENCES

18. The following is a list of examples of academic dishonesty. It is not meant to be exhaustive. For fuller explanations of academic dishonesty, please refer to Appendix 3.

It shall be an offence knowingly to:

a) plagiarize, i.e. submit academic work that has been, entirely or in part, copied from or written by another person without proper acknowledgement, or, for which previous credit has been obtained (see Appendix 3),

b) submit the same academic work to more than one course (see Appendix 3),

c) submit academic work for assessment that was purchased or acquired from another source,

d) collaborate improperly on academic work (see Appendix 3),

e) aid or abet another student's academic dishonesty,

f) copy or use unauthorized aids (e.g., cheat sheets, cell phones, etc.) in tests, examinations or laboratory reports,

g) procure, distribute or receive an examination, test or course materials that are in preparation or storage for an academic assessment,

h) remove, without authorization, academic work (e.g. previous assignments or laboratories) submitted by other students to the instructor,

i) alter a grade on academic work after it has been marked and using the altered materials to have the recorded grade changed,

j) steal, destroy or tamper with another student's academic work,

k) prevent another student(s) from completing a task for academic assessment,

¹ The University of Toronto has a similar definition of academic work which it has shared with McMaster University for use in this policy.
fail to take reasonable precautions to protect academic work such as assignments, projects, laboratory reports or examinations from being used by other students,
m) misrepresent academic credentials from other institutions or submit false information for the purpose of gaining admission or credits,
n) submit false information or false medical documentation to gain a postponement or advantage for any academic work, e.g., a test or an examination,
o) forge, alter or fabricate McMaster University documents,
p) forge, alter or fabricate transcripts, letters of reference or other official documents,
q) impersonate another student either in person or electronically for the purpose of academic assessment,
r) provide a false signature for attendance at any class or assessment procedure or on any document related to the submission of material where the signature is used as proof of authenticity or participation in the academic assessment, and,
s) commit research misconduct (see Appendix 3), which shall include:
i) the misrepresentation, fabrication or falsification of research data,
ii) the abuse of confidentiality with regard to information and ideas taken from manuscripts, grant applications or discussions held in confidence,
iii) other kinds of misconduct, such as: the violation of the regulations of the granting bodies; the improper use of funded equipment, supplies, facilities, or other resources; the failure to respect University policies on the use of human subjects or animals.

PROCEDURES IN CASES OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

The Person Responsible for Bringing a Charge (The University Representative as identified in Sections 19-21)

19. a) The primary responsibility for bringing a charge of academic dishonesty involving academic work submitted for credit in a course rests with the instructor of the course.

Examples:

i. In the case of a take-home assignment (paper, essay, book review, etc.) the marker must bring the suspicion of academic dishonesty to the attention of the instructor.
ii. In an in-class test or examination, the invigilator must bring the suspicion of academic dishonesty to the attention of the instructor.
iii. In a University-administered examination, the invigilator must report his or her suspicion that academic dishonesty may have occurred to the Chief Presider. The Chief Presider shall give a full report, together with any confiscated material, to the Associate Registrar (Examinations and Schedules), who shall report the matter to the instructor.

b) The primary responsibility for bringing a charge against a graduate student suspected of academic dishonesty in a Master's project, thesis work or a thesis rests with the student's supervisor.
c) The primary responsibility for bringing a charge against a graduate student suspected of academic dishonesty in a comprehensive examination rests with the member(s) of the examining committee who detect(s) it.

d) The primary responsibility for bringing a charge against a graduate student suspected of research misconduct (as defined in the policy "Research Ethics at McMaster University") not included in any of the previous categories rests with the student's supervisor.

e) The primary responsibility for bringing a charge against a student suspected of falsifying and/or using falsified documents (e.g. transcripts, letters of reference, medical documentation) rests with the appropriate University Officer (e.g., the Registrar, the Graduate Registrar, an Associate Dean, etc.).

f) The primary responsibility for bringing a charge against a student suspected of academic dishonesty, of a nature that does not clearly fall within the preceding sections, shall rest with the appropriate instructor or University Officer. For example, if a student steals and/or is found to be in possession of stolen examination copy, the primary responsibility rests with the instructor responsible for the course.

20. When the person who bears the primary responsibility fails to bring a charge within a reasonable time, the Department Chair or School/Program Director may bring a charge. If the Chair or Director does not bring a charge within a reasonable time, then the appropriate Associate Dean (as identified by the Office of Academic Integrity) may do so.

21. Any person who believes that a student has committed academic dishonesty, including research misconduct, may submit a signed statement, including all relevant evidence, to the appropriate Associate Dean (as identified by the Office of Academic Integrity). The Associate Dean will conduct an investigation and, if appropriate, bring a charge.

Contacting the Student

22. The University Representative shall:

a) notify the student of the nature of the charge of academic dishonesty, the evidence against him/her, and the procedures to be followed,

b) provide the student a fair opportunity to answer the charge within two weeks after contacting the student, and

c) if the charge relates to a course in which the student is registered, inform the student, the Registrar, and the student's Associate Dean that, while under investigation for academic dishonesty, the student shall not be permitted to withdraw from the course concerned (see Section 39).

Determining that an Offence has been Committed

23. The University Representative shall determine, based on his/her discussion with the student and a review of all relevant evidence, whether an offence has been committed.

24. When the University Representative determines that there are no grounds for a charge or there is insufficient evidence with which to proceed, he/she shall so inform the student in writing (with a...
copy to the Registrar and the student's Associate Dean, if they were informed under the terms of
Section 22 (c) within 10 working days of his/her meeting with the student. This does not preclude
a University Representative from bringing a charge at a later date, should new evidence become
available.

Checking for Previous Offences

25. When the University Representative determines that an offence has taken place, and before
deciding on a penalty, he/she shall check with the Office of Academic Integrity to determine if it is a
first offence.

Instructor-Imposed Penalties for First Offences

26. If there is no previous offence on record, an instructor can impose penalties of:

   a) a reduction of the mark on the piece of academic work, or
   b) a mark of zero for the piece of academic work, or
   c) if the piece of academic work is worth less than 5% of the course grade, a course grade
      reduction of up to 5%.

The instructor shall notify the student, in writing, of the penalty and of the student's right of appeal
to the Faculty Adjudicator (through the Office of Academic Integrity) generally within 20 working
days after the instructor first contacts the student with a suspicion of academic dishonesty. The
instructor shall also report the penalty, and a brief description of the case, to the Office of
Academic Integrity and the student's Associate Dean. A penalty levied by an instructor takes place
immediately and shall not be stayed by an appeal.

Referral of First Offences

27. The University Representative also shall refer a case to the Office of Academic Integrity, if:

   a) he/she believes a penalty greater than zero for the piece of work concerned is warranted,
   b) there are multiple charges against the student,
   c) the student is a graduate student, and/or
   d) the alleged offence does not relate to the work in a course (e.g., presentation of falsified
documents).

When a University Representative refers a case to the Office of Academic Integrity, she/he shall
inform the student, the student's Associate Dean and the Registrar.
The Office of Academic Integrity will inform the appropriate Faculty Adjudicator\(^2\) and commence the procedures described in Sections 29 to 38 below.

**Referral of Second or Subsequent Offences**

28. If there is a previous offence on record, the University Representative shall refer the case to the Office of Academic Integrity and so inform the student, the student's Associate Dean and the Registrar. The Office of Academic Integrity will inform the appropriate Faculty Adjudicator\(^2\) and commence the procedures described in Sections 29 to 38 below.

**Adjudication Without a Hearing**

29. If the student charged with academic dishonesty admits guilt and the University representative, the student and the Faculty Adjudicator are all in agreement that a Hearing is not required to determine the penalty, the Faculty Adjudicator may make a decision regarding the penalty based on the written submissions of the complainant and the student.

**Hearing by Faculty Adjudicator**

30. In other cases referred to the Faculty Adjudicator, a Hearing shall be held in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix 2. The Hearing shall normally be held no later than one month after the date the Office of Academic Integrity receives the case. At the Hearing, it shall be the responsibility of the University Representative to provide evidence to the Faculty Adjudicator that the student committed academic dishonesty. Decisions of the Faculty Adjudicator with respect to the student's guilt or innocence shall be based on a preponderance of evidence, meaning the evidence shows it is more likely than not that the student committed academic dishonesty.

31. Only after the Faculty Adjudicator has determined that academic dishonesty has been committed, and before deciding on a penalty, shall he/she enquire of the Office of Academic Integrity whether there is a record of a previous offence in the student's file.

32. If the Hearing is for an appeal by a student of the decision of an instructor that the student committed academic dishonesty and/or of the penalty imposed by the instructor, it shall be the responsibility of the instructor to provide evidence of the student's guilt and of the appropriateness of the penalty.

33. The Faculty Adjudicator may take the following action:

---

\(^2\) Unless otherwise specified, the appropriate Faculty Adjudicator shall be:

a) in cases involving academic work submitted for credit in a course by an undergraduate student, the Faculty Adjudicator for the Faculty that received the academic work for assessment,

b) in all other cases involving undergraduate students, the Faculty Adjudicator of the Faculty in which the student was last registered,

c) for courses in interdisciplinary units or for students registered in programs that are not under the jurisdiction of a Faculty, a Faculty Adjudicator assigned by the Office of Academic Integrity, and

d) in all cases involving graduate students, the Faculty Adjudicator for the School of Graduate Studies.
a) dismiss the case, or  
b) make a finding of academic dishonesty and impose one or more penalties as described in Section 34 below.

Penalties

34. The following penalties may be imposed by the Faculty Adjudicator upon any student found to have committed academic dishonesty. Repeated and/or multiple violations will increase the severity of the penalty. Academic dishonesty committed by graduate students will have more serious consequences than that committed by undergraduate students. When there is a finding of academic dishonesty relating to a course, the student shall not be permitted to withdraw from the course in question. Penalties may be used independently or in combination for any single violation. Penalties include:

a) a letter reporting the academic dishonesty offence, sent to the student and copied to the Office of Academic Integrity, the student's Associate Dean, the Registrar and/or the Graduate Registrar,  
b) a reduction of the mark on the piece(s) of academic work,  
c) a mark of zero for the piece(s) of academic work,  
d) a reduction of the course grade,  
e) zero for the course with a transcript notation as provided in Section 47,  
f) denial of permission to use facilities of the University, including computer facilities and laboratories, for a designated period of time,  
g) denial of permission to register,  
h) cancellation of registration,  
i) suspension, i.e., the withdrawal by the University of all academic privileges for a specified period of time, after which the student is eligible to return,  
j) expulsion, i.e., the withdrawal by the University of all academic privileges for an indefinite period of time,  
k) a recommendation to Senate to rescind the student's degree, and  
l) such other penalties as may be appropriate in the circumstances.

For graduate students all of the above penalties may be assessed in addition to:

m) a letter reporting the academic dishonesty offence to be placed in the student's academic file at the School of Graduate Studies and in the student's program/department file,  

n) the grade of Unsatisfactory assigned on a supervisory committee meeting report.

Suspension and expulsion entail transcript notations as described in Sections 48 and 49. 46 and 47. Prohibiting a student from registering for a specified period of time does not entail a transcript notation.

Notification of Decision
35. The Faculty Adjudicator shall, within ten working days of the hearing, inform the student, the instructor, the University Representative (if other than the instructor), the Office of Academic Integrity, the Registrar, and the student's Associate Dean, in writing, of the decision/recommendation in each case.

36. When the Faculty Adjudicator decides that a student's degree should be rescinded, he/she shall forward that recommendation to Senate for approval, and the Secretary of the Senate shall inform the individuals listed in the previous Section of the Senate's decision.

37. When a student is found guilty of academic dishonesty and a penalty is levied by the Faculty Adjudicator and/or the Senate, the student shall also be informed of his or her right of appeal to the Senate Board for Student Appeals.

38. A penalty takes effect when specified by the Faculty Adjudicator and shall not be stayed by an appeal.

Student's Status: Transcripts and Registration

39. a) When a charge of academic dishonesty is made against a student, until the case has been resolved, the student will not be issued transcripts directly but, at the student's request, transcripts will be sent to institutions or potential employers. If the student is subsequently found guilty and the conviction results in a transcript notation, the recipients of any transcripts will be so informed by the Registrar.

   b) While under investigation for, or subsequent to being found guilty of, academic dishonesty in a course(s), a student shall not be permitted to withdraw formally from that course(s).

   c) While under investigation for academic dishonesty, a student shall not be permitted to withdraw formally from the University.

Right of Appeal

40. A decision and/or a penalty imposed under the above procedures may be appealed within three weeks after the student has been advised of the decision and/or penalty as follows:

   a) Decisions of the instructor may be appealed to the Faculty Adjudicator, by submitting a request in writing to the Office of Academic Integrity on a form prescribed by that Office.

   b) Decisions of a Faculty Adjudicator or of the Senate, (pursuant to Sections 36 and 37), may be appealed by the student to the Senate Board for Student Appeals.

Records of the Offence

41. The Office of Academic Integrity shall maintain a record of each finding of academic dishonesty against a student. The purpose of this record, which shall be kept separate from any other of the student's records, is to determine whether there has been a previous offence, before a penalty is levied. Such a record of offences shall not be used for any other purpose.
42. When the penalty does not involve a transcript notation, the student may petition the Office of Academic Integrity to destroy the record of the offence. Such a petition cannot be made for a period of two years subsequent to the date on which the student was charged. If the petition is granted, the record shall not, however, be destroyed before the student is clear to graduate.

43. When a penalty includes a letter being placed in a graduate student's academic file, the student may petition the Office of Academic Integrity to have the letters destroyed. Such a petition cannot be made for a period of two years subsequent to the date on which the student was charged. If the petition is granted, the record shall not, however, be destroyed before the student is clear to graduate.

44. When the penalty does involve a transcript notation, and the student's petition to delete the transcript notation has been granted by the Senate, the record of the offence shall be destroyed by the Office of Academic Integrity when the transcript notation is deleted (see Sections 45 and 46 below).

45. In the event that the case is dismissed, all records of the proceeding shall be removed from the student's file.

Transcript Notations

46. General Notation (for notations not associated with a grade of "F", suspension, expulsion or rescinded degrees)

When a Faculty Adjudicator determines a student is guilty of an academic dishonesty offence under the Policy that does not warrant a grade of "F", suspension, expulsion or a rescinded degree, they can assign a general notation that reads: "Student found guilty of Academic Dishonesty on ___ date here___. This notation will be automatically removed on ___ insert date here___."

No petition to Senate is required for removal of the General Notation. Such notations cannot be permanent and must include a removal date and year.

47. When a grade of "F" in a course has been levied against a student found guilty of academic dishonesty, the notation "Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty" shall appear on the student's transcript opposite the course. Provided there are no subsequent findings against the student, the notation will be removed, and the record of the offence destroyed, upon the shorter of:

1. five years after the effective date of the penalty; or
2. two years after graduation.

The Academic Integrity Officer will provide to the University Registrar, by the end of each term a list of notations to be removed. "Notations will be removed on either April 30, August 31, or December 31 following completion of the relevant time period noted above. The number of notations removed each year under this process must be included in the annual report to the University Senate referred to in clause 6.f of the Academic Integrity Policy."
4846. When a student is suspended, the notation will read: "Suspended by the Senate for academic dishonesty for ____ months effective (date suspension starts)." A student may petition Senate for removal of such a notation subject to the following conditions:

(a) If the student returned to McMaster University:

1. at least 2 years must have elapsed since the effective date of the suspension; and
2. the student must have been cleared to graduate.

(b) If the student did not resume studies at McMaster University:

1. at least 5 years must have elapsed since the effective date of the suspension.

4847. When a student is expelled, the notation will read: "Expelled by the Senate for academic dishonesty (effective date)."

If at some later date the student is reinstated, an additional notation will read: "Reinstated by the Senate (effective date)."

Such notations may be removed from a student's transcript on petition to Senate, but not before five years after the effective date of the expulsion.

4848. When a student’s degree is rescinded, the notation will read: "Degree rescinded by the Senate for academic dishonesty (effective date). Such notations are permanent."
APPENDIX 1: FACULTY ADJUDICATORS

Guidelines for Selection and Operation

1. The Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Deans and the Dean of Graduate Studies, shall make recommendations regarding the appointment of adjudicators to the Senate Committee on Appointments. Adjudicators shall be appointed by Senate for a renewable three year term, to a maximum of two terms. A Faculty and the School of Graduate Studies may choose to have more than one Faculty Adjudicator, but no more than three should be appointed within a Faculty or the School of Graduate Studies.

2. a) If a Faculty Adjudicator is not available to hear a case within a reasonable time, the Office of Academic Integrity may refer the case to another adjudicator in the same or a different Faculty.
   b) Cases involving graduate students shall be adjudicated by the Faculty Adjudicator(s) appointed for the School of Graduate Studies.
   c) The Office of Academic Integrity shall ensure that all Faculty Adjudicators receive appropriate training to discharge their responsibilities.
   d) In the event that a Faculty Adjudicator has any direct interest or prior involvement in a case under consideration, another Faculty Adjudicator from the same or a different Faculty shall be appointed to hear the case.
   e) The Faculty Adjudicators shall report to the Office of Academic Integrity by October 31st of each year, summarizing their work in the previous year and making recommendations regarding modifications to the policies and procedures under which they operate, for inclusion in the Office's annual report to Senate.
APPENDIX 2: PROCEDURAL RULES FOR A HEARING

All Hearings convened under this Policy shall follow the procedures detailed below.

Parties to a Hearing

1. Parties to a Hearing shall include the University Representative, and the student against whom the allegation of academic dishonesty has been made or who is appealing an Instructor's decision that he/she committed academic dishonesty and/or the instructor's penalty.

Notice of Hearing

2. The Parties shall be given reasonable, written notice of the hearing. In the case of the student, the notice shall be sent by registered mail to the student's last known address, as recorded in the Registrar's Office or School of Graduate Studies, and shall be deemed to be received one week after it was mailed.

Closed/Open Hearings

3. Hearings are normally open, but any Party to the proceeding may request a closed Hearing.

4. The Faculty Adjudicator shall determine in his/her sole discretion whether sufficient cause for closing exists. In the event that there is insufficient cause, the Hearing shall remain open.

Scheduling of Hearing

5. An attempt shall be made to schedule the Hearing at a time and place convenient for all Parties. However, if a Party, who has been notified of a Hearing date, is absent without contacting the Faculty Adjudicator with a satisfactory explanation, the Hearing may proceed in his/her absence.

Advisor

6. The student shall have the right to have an advisor present at the Hearing. Such advisor may consult with the student, but shall not be allowed to speak at the Hearing. Advisors shall not include legal counsel for the purposes of these Hearings.

Evidence

7. The student is entitled to receive, prior to the Hearing, reasonable particulars in writing of the allegation(s) against him/her.

8. Parties have the right to submit written and documentary evidence in support of their cases, prior to the Hearing, and to receive copies of any such evidence submitted by the other Party. All written and documentary evidence is to be provided to the opposing party not less than five days prior to the hearing.
9. Parties have the right to present evidence at the Hearing, including their own testimony and any further written and documentary evidence in support of their cases and to receive copies of any such evidence submitted by the other Party.

10. The Faculty Adjudicator may consider and grant a recess or an adjournment at the request of either party to allow them to review written or documentary evidence submitted at the Hearing.

11. The Faculty Adjudicator may require the production of written or documentary evidence by the Parties or by other sources. The Faculty Adjudicator has the power to call his/her own witnesses.

12. The Faculty Adjudicator must not hear evidence or receive representations regarding the substance of the case other than through the procedures described in this Policy.

13. The Faculty Adjudicator may admit as evidence at a Hearing any oral testimony and any document, written statement or other thing, relevant to the subject matter of the proceeding. The Faculty Adjudicator is not bound by the laws of evidence applicable to judicial proceedings.

Witnesses

14. Parties to the Hearing have the right to call, question and cross-examine witnesses. Parties are responsible for producing their own witnesses and paying for any costs associated with their appearance.

15. The Faculty Adjudicator may limit testimony and the questioning of witnesses where he/she is satisfied that the testimony and questioning has been sufficient to disclose fully and fairly all matters relevant to those matters he/she considers relevant to the disposition of the case.

16. The witnesses will stay in the Hearing only while they are testifying and responding to questions.

Similar Questions of Fact or Policy

17. If two or more proceedings before Faculty Adjudicator(s) involve the same or similar questions of fact or policy the Faculty Adjudicator(s) may:
   a) combine the proceedings or any part of them,
   b) hear the proceedings at the same time, or
   c) hear the proceedings one immediately after the other.

Recording

18. Although the hearing shall be audio-taped in order to obtain an accurate record of the proceedings, such recording is done for convenience purposes only and the malfunction of the recording device or subsequent loss of the recording shall not invalidate, in any way, the related hearing. The tape shall be held in confidence by the Office of Academic Integrity for a period of three years from the date of the hearing. Any party to the appeal may request access to the tape, and the reproduction thereof, upon reasonable notice and payment of the reasonable costs associated therewith.
Order of Proceedings

19. The order of the proceedings shall be as follows:

a) The University Representative shall present the charge, any supporting evidence and shall call any witnesses. The student and the Faculty Adjudicator shall be permitted to question each witness at the end of his/her testimony. The University Representative shall be permitted to clarify any new points arising from such questioning.

b) The student shall present his/her evidence and shall call any witnesses. The University Representative and the Faculty Adjudicator shall be permitted to question each witness at the end of his/her testimony. The student shall be permitted to clarify any new points arising from such questioning.

c) The University Representative may respond to any evidence presented by the student in (b) above.

d) The Parties will be permitted an opportunity to summarize their respective cases. The summary should address both the substance of the alleged offence and the appropriate penalty in the event that the allegation is determined to be valid. The student, if he or she wishes, may submit their penalty suggestions in writing to be read by the Faculty Adjudicator when deciding an appropriate penalty after concluding the allegation is valid.

Adjournment

20. The Faculty Adjudicator may grant an adjournment at any time during the Hearing to ensure a fair Hearing.

Appropriate Procedures

21. Where any procedural matter is not dealt with specifically in this Policy, the Faculty Adjudicator may, after hearing submissions from the Parties and considering the principles of fairness, establish an appropriate procedure.

22. Any procedural requirement contained in this Policy may be waived with the consent of the Faculty Adjudicator and of all Parties.
APPENDIX 3: ACADEMIC DISHONESTY EXPLANATIONS

Explanation

1. Academic dishonesty may occur in a variety of situations. This Appendix includes many examples, but is not an exhaustive list of examples of academic dishonesty.

Plagiarism

2. Plagiarism, which is the submission of material that has been, entirely or in part, copied from or written by another person, without proper acknowledgment, is probably the most common form of academic dishonesty. All material, including information from the internet, anonymous material, copywrited material, published and unpublished material and material used with permission, must be properly acknowledged. There are two aspects to using material from other sources of which students should be aware. In a direct quotation of text or material, it is important to distinguish the text or material that has been taken from the other source. Common methods of identification of directly quoted material include indentation, italics, quotation marks or some other formatting change to separate the quoted material from the student's own work. Indirectly quoted material involves expressing an idea, concept or interpretation that one has obtained from another source, in one's own words. Direct and indirectly quoted material requires a reference or footnote in the text and full citation in the references or bibliography, in accordance with the standards appropriate to the discipline.

Oral Presentations

3. In the case of oral presentations, the use of material that is not one's own, without proper acknowledgment or attribution, constitutes plagiarism and, hence, academic dishonesty.

Music

4. In Music, the imitation of style is an integral part of the student's work. In applied music, for example, a student may be required to model an interpretation of a piece around that of a particular performer, and in music theory courses it is a routine procedure to imitate the stylistic characteristics of particular periods and even of particular composers. Nevertheless, it is possible to draw certain lines. For example, it would obviously be improper for a student to submit as personally representative, a tape recording of someone else performing. It would also be wrong, just as it would be in the case of an essay, for a theory or composition student to hand in as personal work, material composed by another. Clearly, the imitation of style ceases to be legitimate when the student begins to draw upon actual notes or sounds attributable to another person. This would not preclude a professor from, say, giving the student material to work with from a pre-existent composition (for example, a figured bass, or a fugue subject) providing the sum and substance of the work from that point on were the student's own.
Studio Art

5. Students of studio art (painting, sculpture and print-making) may be guilty of plagiarism if they submit for evaluation as course assignments works executed in their entirety by someone else, or in part by someone other than the instructor. Similarly, copying works from sources not authorized by the instructor may be regarded as improper borrowing, which is analogous to plagiarism and is an act of academic dishonesty.

Computer Software

6. The improper use of the computer files and programs of others may constitute academic dishonesty. The instructor who is responsible for specifying the way in which the work is to be done determines the degree of permissible co-operation among students. Students who allow their computer files or assignments to be copied are as guilty of academic dishonesty as those who copy. Each student is responsible for protecting his or her computer file by keeping the password secret and changing it frequently.

Multiple Submissions of the Same Material

7. The submission of an assignment, report or essay, which has been submitted at an earlier date for a different course, is an act of academic dishonesty unless the instructor has specifically authorized it in advance. The submission of the same essay in each of two courses, which are being taken concurrently, is acceptable only if both instructors have given prior approval.

In Tests and Examinations

8. In all tests and examinations, including take-home examinations, students are expected to work strictly on their own, using only aids authorized for use in the examination or test area by instructors or invigilators, or when group work has been explicitly authorized by the instructor. Copying or using unauthorized aids constitutes academic dishonesty.

Inappropriate Collaboration

9. Collaborative learning is a valuable method of instruction that is utilized by many instructors at McMaster University. Students will often be encouraged to discuss ideas and concepts with one another to facilitate the learning process. A distinction must be drawn, however, between collaborative learning and collaboration on assignments. Assignments, projects, reports, etc. are required to be completed by an individual unless the instructor indicates some kind of collaboration is permissible.

10. Inappropriate collaboration occurs when students work together on an assignment that was intended as an individual assignment or when students work together in groups beyond the degree of permissible collaboration.

11. Instructors are expected to outline the appropriate level of collaboration on course outlines and/or on each assignment. When group work is acceptable, but not required, the instructor is
responsible for specifying the way in which the work is to be done and for determining the degree of permissible collaboration among the students.

12. Students are directed to assume all assignments are intended to be done individually unless otherwise directed by the instructor. Students are expected to ask questions and clarify the collaboration expectations for each assignment if they are unsure of the instructor’s expectations. Students are also expected to use standard citation rules to identify any part or section of their assignment that is not original.

Research Misconduct

13. The two principles underlying integrity in research in a University setting are these: a researcher must be honest in proposing, seeking support for, conducting, and reporting research; a researcher must respect the rights of others in these activities. Any departure from these principles will diminish the aegis of McMaster University. It is incumbent upon all members of the University community to practice and to promote ethical behaviour. (Please refer to the Research Integrity Policy “Research Ethics at McMaster University” policy for more details.)
APPENDIX 4: GENERAL PENALTY GUIDELINES

Explanation

1. Each case of academic dishonesty is investigated, heard and decided upon the merits of the case. The following penalty guidelines are general and can be adjusted by the Faculty Adjudicator hearing the case, according to the merits of the case to be harsher or more lenient.

Admissions Fraud

2. If a student is found to have gained admission to McMaster University through fraudulent means, the penalty is generally suspension or expulsion with a transcript notation.

Undergraduate Students

3. The first time an undergraduate student is found guilty of academic dishonesty, the penalty is generally either a letter or a grade reduction or a zero on the assignment in question, but is most often a zero.

4. The second time an undergraduate student is found guilty of academic dishonesty, the penalty is generally “F” in the course with a transcript notation.

5. The third time an undergraduate student is found guilty of academic dishonesty, the penalty is generally “F” in the course with a transcript notation and suspension or expulsion with a transcript notation.

Undergraduate Serious First Offences

6. If a student is found to have committed a serious first offence, the penalty is at the discretion of the Faculty Adjudicator and will be determined based on the merits of the case.

Graduate Students

Course Work

7. The first time a graduate student is found guilty of academic dishonesty or research misconduct in course work, the penalty is generally assigned within the parameters of the course, e.g., a zero on the assignment or “F” in the course with a transcript notation.

8. The second time a graduate student is found guilty of academic dishonesty or research misconduct in course work, the penalty is generally suspension or expulsion with a transcript notation.
Comprehensive/Qualifying Examinations

9. If a graduate student is found to have committed academic dishonesty on a draft of a comprehensive/qualifying exam or on a comprehensive/qualifying exam, the penalty can range from a letter in the student's academic files to a failing grade on the exam to suspension or expulsion.

Thesis Work or Research Work

10. If a graduate student is found to have committed academic dishonesty on thesis work or research work, the penalty can range from a letter in the student's academic files to an Unsatisfactory on the relevant supervisory committee meeting report to suspension with a transcript notation or expulsion with a transcript notation depending on the severity of the offence.

Thesis

11. If a graduate student is found to have committed academic dishonesty on a thesis submitted for defense the penalty is generally suspension with a transcript notation or expulsion with a transcript notation.*

* If the graduate student has a previous offence of academic dishonesty on their record, it will be considered as part of determining the appropriate penalty.

Consequences

12. Many penalties assigned for academic dishonesty will have academic consequences for students, e.g. a zero on an assignment combined with the student's other grades in course work results in an "F" in the course; an "F" in a course when combined with the student's other grades may result in the student being put on academic probation, etc. These consequences will not be considered when deciding a penalty for academic dishonesty; the penalty is decided based on the merits of the case.
Case Summary

Total Number of Cases = 363
Total Number of Students = 358
Number of Students involved in more than 1 case = 5*
Number of Cases resulting in a finding of guilt = 352
Number of Cases resulting in a finding of innocence = 11

* 5 students were charged twice and found guilty both times.

Cases By Registration Status:

- Continuing Education (CCE) students = 9
- Undergraduate students = 335
- Graduate students = 8
- Innocent CCE students = 0
- Innocent Undergraduate students = 11
- Innocent Graduate students = 0

Total = 363

Table 1: Cases by Year of Study at McMaster University*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth year and beyond</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on Student ID number and shows only students found guilty and duplicates have been removed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1 Faculty</th>
<th>Column 2 Full-Time headcount enrolment Nov. 1, 2013</th>
<th>Column 3 Number (Percentage) of reported students registered in Faculty</th>
<th>Column 4 Breakdown of Faculties that reported students in Column 3</th>
<th>Column 5 Number of cases reported by Faculty offering the course</th>
<th>Column 6 Number of Instructors in Faculty reporting cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>2 (0.73%)</td>
<td>Science = 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Business              | 2,178                                             | 17 (0.78%)                                                             | Business = 6  
Humanities = 1  
Social Science = 10 | 10                                                               | 5                                                        |
| Engineering           | 4,172                                             | 152 (3.64%)                                                            | Engineering = 121  
Science = 28  
Social Science = 3 | 123                                                              | 16                                                       |
| Grad. Studies         | 3,408                                             | 8 (0.23%)                                                              | Business = 2  
Engineering = 2  
Grad. Studies = 2  
Health Sciences = 1  
Science = 1 | 2                                                                | 2                                                        |
| Health Sciences       | 3,204                                             | 12 (0.37%)                                                             | Health Sciences = 12                                              | 15                                                               | 10                                                       |
| Humanities            | 2,285                                             | 36 (1.57%)                                                             | Humanities = 26  
Science = 1  
Social Science = 9 | 37                                                               | 21                                                       |
| Science               | 5,455                                             | 69 (1.26%)                                                             | Health Sciences = 2  
Humanities = 3  
Science = 58  
Social Science = 6 | 95                                                               | 22                                                       |
| Social Science        | 3,715                                             | 58 (1.56%)                                                             | Business = 2  
Humanities = 7  
Science = 5  
Social Science = 44 | 72                                                               | 22                                                       |
| Continuing Education  | 0                                                 | 9                                                                      | Continuing Education = 9                                          | 9                                                                | 7                                                        |
| Registrar             | 0                                                 | 0 (0%)                                                                 |                                                                 | 0                                                                | 0                                                        |
| Totals                | 24,689                                            | 363 (1.47%)                                                            | 363                                                               | 363                                                              | 105                                                      |
Chart #1: Percentage of Students Charged in Each Faculty

Chart #2: Comparison of Student's Faculty (dark green) and Faculty that Owns Course (light green)
Chart #3: Number of Instructors laying charges of Academic Dishonesty by Faculty

Table 3: Breakdown of Offences by Total and Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Spring Summer Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiding another Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of Transcript</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating on a Test/Exam</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Medical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsification of Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Collaboration</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishandling Academic Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresentation of Credentials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Submissions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting Other’s Work</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>363</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>212</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart #4: Offences

[Bar chart showing various categories of offences with their respective counts: Alteration of Grade = 11, Alteration of Transcript = 80, Cheating on a Test/Exam = 0, False Medical = 0, Falsification of Data = 0, Impersonation = 0, Improper Collaboration = 34, Misrep of Credentials = 0, Multiple Submissions = 0, Plagiarism = 153, Submitting Other's Work = 82, Other = 1.]

Chart #5: Offences by Term

[Bar chart showing the number of offences per term: Fall = 133, Winter = 212, Spring/Summer = 18.]
### Table 4: Penalty Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
<th>First Offences</th>
<th>Serious First Offences or Graduate Students</th>
<th>Second Offences</th>
<th>Third Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Reported Only</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Reduction</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark of Zero</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Grade Reduction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for Course – with no transcript notation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for Course – with transcript notation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter in File</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory on Supervisory Mtg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Cancelled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension under 1 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension over 1 Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>363</strong></td>
<td><strong>327</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart #6: Penalties

![Bar chart showing the distribution of penalties](chart.png)
Faculty Adjudicator Work:

Total number of hearings 58

Cases of possible academic dishonesty 38
Appeals of first offence decisions 20
  Denied 11
  Penalty modified 0
  Granted 9

Academic Integrity Cases appealed to Senate Board for Student Appeals:

Total number of cases 4
Withdrawn 0
Hearings scheduled 4
Decided 4
  Denied 3
  Summary dismissal 0
  Dismissed/Abandoned 1 *the appellant did not show up at the hearing
  Penalty modified 0
  Granted 0

Transcript Notation Removals*:

Number of "Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty" transcripts removed: 45
First year for this process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96/97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13,856</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>13,771</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13,797</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13,910</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14,042</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15,053</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16,720</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>18,283**</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>19,164</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>20,439</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>21,107</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>21,696</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>22,343</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>23,325</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>23,587</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>24,070</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>25,456</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>24,689</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2003-04 was the first year of the Academic Integrity Office and the first year MBA students were included in Graduate Studies numbers.

** Enrolment numbers do not include Interns/Residents or Divinity students who are exempt from policy.
Table #6: Academic Dishonesty Charges by Faculty the Student is Registered In - 2003-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>18,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>19,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>20,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>21,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>21,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>22,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>23,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>23,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>24,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>25,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>24,689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office of Academic Integrity: Annual Report

September 1, 2014 – August 31, 2015

Case Summary

Total Number of Cases = 289
Total Number of Students = 282
Number of Students involved in more than 1 case = 6*
Number of Cases resulting in a finding of guilt = 284
Number of Cases resulting in a finding of innocence = 5

* 4 students were charged twice and found guilty both times
1 student was charged twice and found innocent on appeal for 1 of the charges
1 student was charged three times and found guilty each time

Cases By Registration Status:

Continuing Education (CCE) students = 7
Undergraduate students = 269
Graduate students = 8
Innocent CCE students = 0
Innocent Undergraduate students = 4
Innocent Graduate students = 1
Total = 289

Table 1: Cases by Year of Study at McMaster University*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth year and beyond</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on Student ID number and shows only students found guilty and duplicates have been removed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1 Faculty</th>
<th>Column 2 Full-Time headcount Nov. 1, 2013</th>
<th>Column 3 Number (Percentage) of reported students registered in Faculty</th>
<th>Column 4 Breakdown of Faculties that reported students in Column 3</th>
<th>Column 5 Number of cases reported by Faculty offering the course</th>
<th>Column 6 Number of Instructors in Faculty reporting cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>Business = 22 Humanities = 3 Science = 1 Social Science = 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>31 (1.36%)</td>
<td>Engineering = 101 Science = 7 Social Science = 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>110 (2.57%)</td>
<td>Business = 3 Health Sciences = 2 Humanities = 3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Studies</td>
<td>3,519</td>
<td>8 (0.23%)</td>
<td>Business = 3 Health Sciences = 2 Humanities = 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>3,247</td>
<td>12 (0.37%)</td>
<td>Health Sciences = 12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td>47 (2.18%)</td>
<td>Humanities = 42 Science = 4 Social Science = 1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5,636</td>
<td>38 (0.67%)</td>
<td>Business = 1 Health Sciences = 1 Science = 34 Social Science = 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>36 (1.00%)</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Science = 1 Humanities = 9 Science = 4 Social Science = 22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continuing Education = 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,960</strong></td>
<td><strong>289 (1.16%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart #1: Percentage of Students Charged in Each Faculty

Chart #2: Comparison of Student's Faculty (dark orange) and Faculty that Owns Course (light orange)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Spring Summer Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiding another Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of Transcript</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating on a Test/Exam</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Medical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsification of Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Collaboration</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishandling Academic Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresentation of Credentials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Submissions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting Other’s Work</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart #4: Offences

Chart #5: Offences by Term

Academic Integrity Office Annual Report 2014-2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty</th>
<th>All Cases</th>
<th>First Offences</th>
<th>Serious First Offences or Graduate Students</th>
<th>Second Offences</th>
<th>Third Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Reported Only</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resubmit Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Reduction</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark of Zero</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Grade Reduction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for Course – with no transcript notation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F for Course – with transcript notation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter in File</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory on Supervisory Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of Registration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Cancelled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension under 1 Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension over 1 Year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Adjudicator Work:

Total number of hearings 50

Cases of possible academic dishonesty 42

Appeals of first offence decisions 8

Denied 3
Penalty modified 0
Granted 5

Academic Integrity Cases appealed to Senate Board for Student Appeals:

Total number of cases 4

Withdrawn 0

Hearings scheduled 3

Decided 2

Denied 2
Summary dismissal 0
Dismissed/Abandoned 0
Penalty modified 0
Granted 0

Transcript Notation Removals:

Number of "Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty" transcripts removed: 14
Table #5: Academic Dishonesty Cases by Faculty/Program Offering the Course 1996-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>A/Sc</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>H.Sci</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Sci</th>
<th>Sod/Sci</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Registrar</th>
<th>CCE</th>
<th>Othr</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Full-Time Enrolment</th>
<th>% of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96/97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>13,856</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>13,771</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13,797</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13,910</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14,042</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>15,053</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16,720</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14**</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>18,283**</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>19,164</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>20,439</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>21,107</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>21,696</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>22,343</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>23,325</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>23,557</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>24,070</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>25,456</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>24,689</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>24,960</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2003-04 was the first year of the Academic Integrity Office and the first year MBA students were included in Graduate Studies numbers.

** Enrolment numbers do not include Interns/Residents or Divinity students who are exempt from policy.

Chart #7: Percentage of Students Charged with Academic Dishonesty by Year
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A/Sc</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>H.Sc</th>
<th>Hum</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Soc/Sc</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>CCE</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Full-Time Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>18,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>19,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>20,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>21,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>21,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>22,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>23,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>23,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>24,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>25,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>24,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>24,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>