McMaster University

SENATE MINUTES

Wednesday, April 13, 2016 at 3:30 p.m.
In the Council Room (111), Gilmour Hall

PRESENT: Dr. Patrick Deane (Chair), Dr. Vishwanath Baba, Dr. Lee Beach, Dr. Patrick Bennett, Dr. Mark Boda, Dr. Narat Charupat, Mr. Ken Clarke, Mr. Roger Couldrey, Mr. Ian Cowan, Dr. Tim Davidson, Mr. Daniel Elbirt, Dr. Carlos Filipe, Mr. Peter Gardhouse, Dr. Don Goellnicht, Dr. Elzbieta Grodek, Dr. Sheila Harms, Dr. Alison Holloway, Dr. Janice Hladki, Dr. Jerry Hurley, Dr. Ivona Kúcerová, Dr. Colleen McKelvy, Dr. Paul McNicholas, Dr. Patricia McNiven, Mr. Sid Nath, Dr. Dorothy Pawluch, Dr. Christine Quail, Dr. Petra Rethmann, Dr. Carl Richards, Dr. Aaron Schat, Dr. Susan Sears Giroux, Dr. Allison Sekuler, Dr. Ravi Selvaganapathy, Dr. Chris Sinding, Ms Moira Taylor, Dr. Lehana Thabane, Mr. Peter Tice, Mr. Philip Tominac, Ms Veronica van der Vliet, Dr. Matt Valeriote, Dr. Brenda Vrkljan, Dr. Doug Welch, Dr. David Wilkinson, Dr. J.P. Xu, Ms Helen Ayre (Secretary of the Senate), Susan Welstead (Assistant University Secretary)

OBSERVERS: Ms Carolyn Brendon, Ms Esme Davies, Dr. Susan Denburg, Dr. Michelle Dion, Ms Andrea Farquhar, Dr. Jacy Lee, Dr. Anna Moro, Ms Melissa Pool, Mr. Sean Van Koughnett

BY INVITATION: Dr. Wayne Lewchuk, Dr. Mary O’Connor, Dr. Wil Waluchow, Dr. Gary Warner

REGRETS RECEIVED: Ms Leah Allan, Dr. Ken Cruikshank, Dr. James Dunn, Dr. Susan Fast, Dr. Shafiquil Huque, Ms Rebecca Jamieson, Dr. John Kelton, Ms Varda Khan, Dr. Suzanne Labarge, Dr. Graeme Luke, Prof. Bridget O’Shaughnessy, Dr. Ishwar Puri, Dr. Leonard Waverman, Ms Mary Williams, Dr. Jean Wilson

A. OPEN SESSION

OPENING REMARKS (Appendix A)

Dr. Deane noted that the March 22 federal budget mentioned McMaster professor Dr. Ali Emadi (Canada Excellence Research Chair in Hybrid Powertrain, Faculty of Engineering) as one of Canada’s world leaders in clean technology research. Dr. Emadi was described as “advancing Canada’s automotive research leadership in the critical area of electric powertrain technology.”

The budget included commitment to Tri-Council and research-related funding with an ongoing annual increase of $95 million for the Tri-Council agencies beginning in 2016-17. There were also a number of commitments to other research-related initiatives, including MITACS Globalink, Genome Canada, the Centre for Drug Research and Development and the Brain Canada Foundation. In addition, $20 million was proposed over eight years (starting
in 2018-19) to create two new Canada Excellence Research Chairs in fields related to clean and sustainable technology.

The federal budget also included a new Post-Secondary Institutions Strategic Investment Fund, with $2 billion in funding available over three years. The focus is to be on the modernization of research and commercialization facilities and on projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote environmental sustainability.

Up to $73 million will be allocated over four years, beginning in 2016, to Post-Secondary Industry Partnership and Cooperative Placement Initiative student placements. The fund is intended to support partnerships between industry and post-secondary institutions and will create new co-op placements, with a focus on the science, technology, engineering, math and business fields.

The government plans substantial investments in primary and secondary Indigenous education on reserves, totaling $2.6 billion over five years starting in 2016–17. The budget also signals a commitment to working with students, parents, educators and Indigenous groups to explore how best to ensure that Indigenous students wishing to pursue post-secondary studies have the resources and supports they need to be able to do so.

Turning to the McMaster budget, Dr. Deane noted that the Provost had announced a number of adjustments to the new budget model to promote equity among the Faculties and strengthen support for certain areas. Ongoing assessment of the impact of the new model would ensure support of the University’s mission and strategic priorities.

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 April 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 March 9, 2016 be approved as circulated
Approved by Consent

III COMMUNICATIONS

a. Report on the Spring 2016 Elections to Senate and to the University Planning Committee (Appendix B)

Senate received for information, by Consent, a report on the Spring 2016 elections to Senate and to the University Planning Committee.

REGULAR

IV BUSINESS ARISING

There was no business arising from the Open Session minutes.

V ENQUIRIES

There were no enquiries.

VI COMMUNICATIONS

a. Oral Report From the COU Colleague on the April 7, 2016 Meeting of the Council of Ontario Universities

Dr. Sekuler, the Council of Ontario Universities colleague, reported that the April 7 meeting opened with discussion of a message to government about post-secondary education, part of a sector-wide strategic communication plan in response to a 2015 COU Executive Heads Round Table that expressed concerns about negative perceptions of the value of universities.

Colleagues also discussed the possible outcomes of the tuition funding framework.

Dr. Deane added that the Executive Heads’ concerns about negative perceptions of universities arose from the observation that there had been an erosion in public understanding of the role of universities. Colleges had been saying for at least the past 10 years that they make students “job-ready,” and this had somehow created the impression that universities did not do this. It was important to re-inforce the message that universities foster knowledge discovery, innovation, experiential learning, creativity, critical thought, inquiry, and problem-solving. Research informs teaching, and inquiry supports life-long learning. Positive messaging that emphasizes the distinctive value of universities should be a COU focus.

VII REPORTS FROM COUNCILS

a. Graduate Council (Appendix C)
   i. Proposed Changes to the Admission Requirements for the MA in Classics
Dr. Welch explained that Graduate Council had approved revisions to the admission requirements for the MA in Classics that would reduce the requirement for Ancient Greek or Latin from 12 units of each to 12 units of one and six of the other. The additional units of Classical Civilization, Greek, Latin, Ancient History or other courses was being increased from 30 to 36 units. Additional changes were: the elimination of an "exceptional circumstance" clause for students with less than two years of undergraduate coursework in the ancient languages, and the removal of a minimum requirement for 24 units of Latin / Greek for some courses. Students will still be required to demonstrate sufficient background in these languages.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve changes to the admission requirements for the MA in Classics, as detailed in Appendix C, effective September 2016."

The motion was carried.

ii. New Calendar Copy for the EMBA Program
iii. Changes to Course Requirements and Calendar Copy for the MA in Classics
iv. Changes to Calendar Copy for the MA in French
v. Changes to Course Requirements and Calendar Copy for the PhD in French
vi. Change to the Comprehensive Exam Procedure for the PhD in History
vii. Changes to Calendar Copy for the Diploma in Gender Studies and Feminist Research
viii. Changes to Calendar Copy for the PhD in Philosophy
ix. New Graduate Scholarships

Senate received the above-listed reports for information.

b. Undergraduate Council (Appendix D)

i. Proposed Name Changes for the Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences Plus Program

Dr. Searls Giroux reminded Senate that it had approved new programs in Engineering and Health Sciences, with two degree pathways, at its meeting in February. The IQAP review process resulted in a recommendation for a change in the name of this program and of the five-year Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences in Health, Engineering and Entrepreneurship and its associated co-op option. The program reviewed this recommendation and was in agreement with the proposed change. This recommendation was subject to approval by Undergraduate Council at its meeting on April 12, 2016.

It was duly moved and seconded,
“that the Senate approve program name changes as follows: ‘Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences Plus’ to be changed to ‘Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences,’ and the names of the degrees Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences in Health, Engineering and Entrepreneurship, and Health, Engineering and Entrepreneurship Co-op, changed to Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences in Health, Engineering Science and Entrepreneurship, and Health, Engineering Science and Entrepreneurship Co-op, for inclusion in the 2017-18 Undergraduate Calendar, as set out in Appendix D.”

The motion was carried.

VIII REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

a. Committee on Appointments (Appendix E)

i. Proposed Revisions to the Distinguished University Professor Policy

Dr. Vrklijan reminded Senate members that the policy on awarding the title Distinguished University Professor was revised in late 2014. The previous version of the policy had involved the Faculty Dean and the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee in the nomination process. Nominations are now considered by the Distinguished Awards Committee, chaired by the Provost. An inadvertent result of this change was that the Faculty Deans might not become aware of nominations under consideration in their Faculty. The proposed revision allows for the Deans to be informed of any such nominations at an early stage in the process.

This year’s selection committee also recommended that, given the limits on titles available in any one year, there should be provision for some nominations to be carried over from one year to the next.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve revisions to the Distinguished University Professor Policy as set out in Appendix E.”

The motion was carried.

b. Committee on Student Affairs (Appendix F)

i. Proposed Revisions to the Residence Agreement / Contract

Mr. Van Koughnett explained that revisions to the 2016-17 Residence Agreement / Contract were being presented to Senate for approval. While most of the changes were editorial in nature, there were two new fees associated with room change requests and late submission of
documents being proposed. These fees were subject to approval by the Board of Governors at its June meeting.

Revisions to Sessional Dates for 2016-17, which would be considered by Undergraduate Council at its meeting on April 12, would, if approved, necessitate the adjustment of dates in this Agreement.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the revisions to the Residence Agreement / Contract for 2016-17, effective May 1, 2016, as detailed in Appendix F, and subject to any necessary revision of dates."

The motion was carried.

ii. Student Code of Conduct Annual Report for 2014-15

Senate received this report for information.

A member asked if there was any reason why there had been such a drop in the number of infractions over the year in question. Mr. Van Koughnett said the Committee on Student Affairs had also been struck by this change but could find no obvious reason.

IX OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion: Task Force Report on Future Directions for the Faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences and Science (Appendix G)

Dr. Wilkinson thanked the members of the Task Force, Drs. Warner, Eyles, Gupta, Lewchuk, Machiela, O’Connor and Waluchow, for their work in initiating a conversation about possible changes to pedagogical techniques in the three Faculties and possible ways to address arts and science programs. The topic had prompted a two-hour town-hall discussion the previous day and was clearly an issue of relevance to Senate.

Dr. Warner, who chaired the Task Force, said the members worked collaboratively to gather information and to consult with academic leaders in the three Faculties. The prime consideration, ahead of structural or budgetary issues, was academic excellence.

Science, Social Sciences and Humanities have much in common, in that students are not being trained for an accreditation, as in the professional Faculties, but are gaining core competencies that are valuable in a wide variety of careers. It became clear that all three Faculties could benefit from more intermingling, since there were antiquated barriers to creating programs attractive to prospective students. Literal amalgamation did not offer financial benefits, and there was debate over the benefits it might offer.
The Task Force would recommend a structural entity to foster the interdisciplinary developments possible -- an arts and science council made up of the three Faculties.

A member congratulated the Task Force for recognizing that interdisciplinary programs were the future, but wondered if the group had given any thought to how such students would be evaluated. Dr. Warner said it was not in the Task Force’s mandate to get into that level of student development; that would be the next phase of the process. However, he would say that the Task Force envisioned keeping the traditional discipline-based programs as they were as part of the many offerings of the University.

A member of the gallery commented that Science already had two elite interdisciplinary programs, Arts and Science and the iSci program. Did the Task Force look at what was learned in those smaller programs and scale up?

Dr. Lewchuk pointed out that the Task Force’s mandate was to focus on the three Faculties, but in discussions the members had agreed strongly that all the Faculties should be involved in such thinking. There was widespread concern that students were being asked to specialize too soon.

A member asked how the Task Force incorporated the student voice into its research. Dr. Lewchuk said there were a few student consultants to the committee who were former vice-presidents of the McMaster Students Union, and Task Force members had spoken to the Assistant Deans of Studies in the three Faculties, but there had been no formal survey of students.

A member of the gallery said he strongly supported the development of more interdisciplinary programs at McMaster and believed that the University was losing potential students for the lack of them now.

A member suggested that there was nothing preventing the three Deans from working out programs that would attract the student of the future and that financial incentives from the Provost could expedite the process. Dr. Lewchuk said it was evident that imposing amalgamation of any kind had risks.

Dr. Wilkinson said it was useful to question whether there was any structural reason why Humanities should not offer a Bachelor of Science degree. The barriers were internal ones -- there was nothing in the legislation to prevent it. Academic regulations tended to grow in an ad hoc manner, sometimes for reasons that had nothing to do with academic excellence, and McMaster’s regulations were certainly due for a full review, with an eye to making program development more flexible.

An observer spoke in favour of making it a priority to encourage an interdisciplinary student, pointing out that it was unfortunate at a university that a first or second-year student in Humanities could not take a science course, not even as an elective.
A student member of Senate said he was attracted to McMaster because of the open-ended first year.

Dr. O’Connor noted that McMaster had a number of pedagogical success stories, such as problem-based learning and self-directed learning, that could be built upon. While these approaches had been successful, they had not been accessible to all students.

Several members debated the pros and cons of imposing a formal structure, with some in support of amalgamation. It was agreed that the degree of formality necessary for moving ahead needed more discussion.

When there were no further questions, Dr. Wilkinson thanked Senators for their comments and said it was clear there was enthusiasm for holistic thinking and for offering more interdisciplinary programs and options. He felt that the next step was to consult with the three Faculty Deans and identify a general direction for going forward.

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 March 9, 2016;

b. received, for information, a report from the Executive Committee indicating that it had approved on behalf of Senate the nomination of an additional honorary degree candidate;

c. approved, on recommendation of the Committee on Appointments, the following appointments and re-appointments:

- a Chair of the Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour for a five-year term, effective July 1, 2016;
- a Director of the Michael G. DeGroote - Cochrane Canada Centre for the period April 1, 2016 to June 30, 2020;
- Canada Research Chair renewals for the April 2016 competition; and
- candidates for the title University Scholar;

d. received from the Committee on Appointments a decision made with respect to a recommendation for promotion to Professor and in the Faculty of Business, and nominated, through the President to the Board of Governors, the candidate for whom promotion had been approved by the Appointments Committee;

e. nominated, on recommendation of the Committee on Appointments, through the President to the Board of Governors, an Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of History, effective July 1, 2016;
received from the Committee on Appointments, for information, reports on the
decision of the Faculty of Science to appoint an Associate Chair (Undergraduate) in
the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology for the period August 1, 2015 to
June 30, 2016, and on the decision of the Faculty of Engineering to revise the start
date for the appointment of the Distinguished Engineering Executive-in-Residence
for a five-year term to January 1, 2016;

approved on recommendation of the Committee on Appointments, the composition of
a Selection Committee for a Dean of Science as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Wilkinson (Chair)</td>
<td>Provost and Vice-President (Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Allison Sekuler / Dr. Robert Baker</td>
<td>Vice-President (Research) (ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Laurel Trainor</td>
<td>Professor, Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bruce Gaulin</td>
<td>Professor, Physics and Astronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Megumi Harada</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Mathematics and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Stuart Phillips</td>
<td>Professor, Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Harald Stöver</td>
<td>Professor, Chemistry and Chemical Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ian Dworkin</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Carolyn Eyles</td>
<td>Professor, Interdisciplinary Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bruce Newbold</td>
<td>Professor, Geography and Earth Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chad Harvey</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Integrated Science Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Karen Mossman</td>
<td>Professor and Chair, Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rodrigo Narro Perez</td>
<td>Integrated Science Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Lauren Skelly</td>
<td>PhD candidate, Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Joanne Smith</td>
<td>Assistant Dean (Studies), Faculty of Science;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

received, for information, a list of acceptances from candidates who had been offered
honorary degrees.
1) FEDERAL BUDGET:

McMaster Mention – Dr. Ali Emadi (Canada Excellence Research Chair in Hybrid Powertrain, Faculty of Engineering) received a personal mention under the section on Canada’s world leaders in clean technology research. He is described as “advancing Canada’s automotive research leadership in the critical area of electric powertrain technology.”

Tri-Council and Research-Related Funding – The budget includes a commitment to “invest in discovery research through the granting councils” and includes an ongoing annual increase of $95M for the Tri-Council agencies, beginning in 2016-17. There are also a number of commitments to other research-related initiatives, including MITACS Globalink, Genome Canada, the Centre for Drug Research and Development and the Brain Canada Foundation. In addition, $20M is proposed over eight years (starting in 2018-19) to create two new Canada Excellence Research Chairs in fields related to clean and sustainable technology.

Review of Federal Support for Research – The Minister of Science plans to conduct a review of federal investments in fundamental science, which will focus on opportunities to increase the impact of federal support on Canada’s research excellence, bring greater coherence to the diverse range of federal research and development priorities, and ensure there is sufficient flexibility to enable Canada to respond to international collaborations and emerging research opportunities. The U15 will be monitoring this closely and seeking opportunities to participate in the review.

Infrastrucure – The budget includes a new Post-Secondary Institutions Strategic Investment Fund, with $2B of funding available over three years. The focus is on modernization of research and commercialization facilities and projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and environmental sustainability. The detailed criteria for the fund have just been announced and the administration is reviewing these to assess which projects are best placed to respond. The deadline is extremely short; submissions are due by May 9.

Student Placements – $73M will be allocated over four years, beginning in 2016, for the Post-Secondary Industry Partnership and Cooperative Placement Initiative. This is intended to support partnerships between industry and post-secondary institutions and will create new co-op placements, with a focus on the STEM and business fields.

Indigenous Education – The government plans substantial investments in primary and secondary Indigenous education on reserves, totaling $2.6B over five years starting in 2016-17. The budget also signals a commitment to working with students, parents, educators and Indigenous groups to explore
how best to ensure that Indigenous students wishing to pursue post-secondary studies have the resources and supports they need to be able to do so.

2) CFREF LOI:

As mentioned at the last meeting, our CFREF proposal, "Integrated Molecular Population Science: A New Frontier in Evidence-Based Medicine," was submitted on March 29. All submitted projects will now be reviewed and adjudicated, with the results being expected to be announced at some point during the summer.

3) McMaster Budget Model:

The Provost’s document outlining the adjustments being made to the Budget Model has now been released (available on the Daily News). A number of changes are being made to: promote equity among Faculties, replace the hold-harmless system with an annual Faculty supplement transfer, strengthen support for research, ensure compliance with the Tuition Set Aside requirements and increase the University Fund to allow for greater strategic reinvestment in Faculties and in initiatives that align with McMaster’s mission. The Provost’s ongoing monitoring and assessing of the impact of the model to ensure support for the University’s mission and strategic priorities are appreciated.

4) Key Initiatives:

a) Research Showcase - The final research showcase, “Climate Change and Environment: Navigating from Risk to Resilience,” runs April 18-22. This includes a Spring Water Forum hosted by the McMaster Water Network, a day-long event to explore the challenges cities are facing due to climate change hosted by the McMaster Centre for Climate Change, a bike tour, an Electric Mobility one-day conference, an Environmental Crawl around labs and research spaces on campus where environmental and climate change research is underway, and a panel discussion on the future of Hamilton’s waterfront. The Research Showcase has been successful in terms of raising the profile of McMaster researchers and research, forging connections with the City and local communities, and demonstrating the value of the work undertaken here in a variety of different fields and with application to a range of pressing local and global issues.

b) Perspectives on Peace – The formal Perspectives on Peace campaign wrapped up last week; the initiative was successful, particularly in terms of engaging students and encouraging conversations and discussions on a range of topics and issues, some of which will live beyond the one-year campaign, such as the McMaster Model UN and the Global Perspectives residence group).
Results of the Spring 2016 Elections to Senate and the University Planning Committee

The following representatives were elected to Senate and the University Planning Committee in the Spring 2016 elections. The term of office for each position is indicated.

**Senate:**

**Faculty Representatives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Business</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Narat Charupat</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Business Economics</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Patricia Wakefield</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Health Policy &amp; Management</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Engineering</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Spencer Smith</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Computing &amp; Software</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Health Sciences</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jonathan Schertzer</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brenda Vrkljan</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>School of Rehabilitation Science</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Humanities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Catherine Anderson</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Linguistics &amp; Languages</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Clark</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>English &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michele George</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Violetta Igneski</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Science</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sigal Balshine</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Psychology, Neuroscience &amp; Behaviour</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ana Campos</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Eam</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Social Sciences</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Philippa Carter</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Meridith Griffin</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Health, Aging &amp; Society</td>
<td>July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Undergraduate Student Representatives:

**Faculty of Business:**
- No nominations received.  
  - July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017

**Faculty of Engineering:**
- No nominations received.  
  - July 1, 2016-June 30, 2018

**Faculty of Science:**
- Ms Veronica van der Vliet  
  - Level 2  
  - Integrated Science  
  - July 1, 2016-June 30, 2018

**Graduate Student Representatives:**

**Faculty of Business:**
- Ms Mariam Munawar  
  - Year 1  
  - Ph.D., Information Systems  
  - July 1, 2016-June 30, 2018

**Faculty of Health Sciences:**
- Mr. Siddhartha Nath  
  - Year 3  
  - M.D./Ph.D.  
  - July 1, 2016-June 30, 2018

**Faculty of Humanities:**
- No nominations received.  
  - July 1, 2016-June 30, 2018

**Faculty of Science:**
- Mr. Alexander Nielsen  
  - Year 3  
  - Ph.D., Chemical Biology  
  - July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017

**Faculty of Social Sciences:**
- No nominations received.  
  - July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017

### University Planning Committee:

**Teaching Staff Representatives**
- Dr. Steven Hanna  
  - Faculty of Health Sciences  
  - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019
- Dr. Alison McQueen  
  - Faculty of Humanities  
  - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019

**Non-Teaching Staff Representative**
- Ms Lynne Serviss  
  - Librarian, Mills Memorial Library  
  - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018

**Undergraduate Student Representative**
- Mr. Ryan Deshpande  
  - Level 3  
  - Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization  
  - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018

**Graduate Student Representative**
- No nominations received.  
  - July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018

*By-elections will be held in the fall election period to fill the remaining vacancies.*
At its meeting on March 22nd and via e-ballot on March 29th Graduate Council approved the following for recommendation to Senate:

1. Faculty of Humanities
   Classics
   Change to Admission Requirements (M.A.)
   The program proposed changes to their admission requirements and to the wording around them. The first change proposed was to reduce the number of required units of Ancient Greek or Latin from 12 units for each to 12 units for one and 6 of the other. The second change proposed was to increase the additional units of Classical Civilization, Greek, Latin, Ancient History or other courses approved by the department from 30 units to 36 units. The third change proposed was the deletion of the ‘exceptional circumstance’ clause for students with less than two years of undergraduate coursework in the ancient languages. The final change proposed was the deletion of the minimum requirement of 24 units of Latin/Greek for some courses within the graduate program while maintaining the condition that the student must have the sufficient background in these languages. The changes were proposed to accommodate the shift in the level of Greek and Latin preparation that applicants to Classics programmes across Canada have. By the end of their degree students will meet the same standards as previous Classics graduates and the program has made some related changes to their course requirements to ensure this is the case. The proposed changes will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2016.

For Information:

1. Faculty of Business
   New Program Calendar Copy
   The EMBA program submitted the calendar copy for their new program, starting in September 2016, outlining program information, admission requirements, and degree requirements.

2. Faculty of Humanities
   Classics
Change to Course Requirements and Calendar Copy (M.A.)
The program proposed changing the course requirements for both the thesis-based and project-based students. For thesis students the number of required half-courses will go up from 8 to 10 and students are now explicitly required to select their courses in consultation with the Graduate Advisor. Students will also be required to complete an entrance exam in Ancient Greek and Latin. For project-based students the calendar description has been revised to clarify the method for student course selection and to also note that students are required to complete entrance exams in Ancient Greek and Latin. The changes are intended, in part, to complement the proposed changes to admission requirements. The changes will accommodate entrants with less language preparation and will ensure that by the end of the degree they will meet the existing standard for language training in the discipline. These changes will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2016.

French
Change to Calendar Copy (M.A.)
The program proposed changes to their calendar copy for their M.A. degree to make it clear that 705 is a required course for all students, to rename their ‘project’ a ‘Major Research Paper’ to help formalize the writing process, and to clarify what is required of their students with respect to departmental workshops These changes will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2016.

Change to Course Requirements and Calendar Copy (Ph.D.)
The program proposed a change to their course requirements to allow students the option of replacing their third language requirement with the EDU 750/751 (Principles and Practices of University Teaching). This is intended to provide students with more flexibility within their program. The program also proposed changes to their calendar copy to include the mandatory SGS 101 and 201 courses in their list of required courses. Additionally the program made changes to their calendar copy to clarify the option of writing an article as part of their comprehensive exam process; this was always part of the program but had not previously been articulated in their calendar copy. The final change the program proposed to the Ph.D. calendar copy was to add a ‘Timeline’ section to make the department’s expectations clear and transparent as the student moves through the program. These changes will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2016.

History
Change to Comprehensive Exam Procedure (Ph.D.)
The program proposed a change to their comprehensive exam procedure. The comprehensive will now be replaced by an examination of the student’s research proposal. Student’s will also write a mandatory examination within their specialized Major Field Reading course and take a Minor Field Reading course. The research proposal will be defended in an oral examination and in order to attain a passing mark, the proposal and its defence must demonstrate breadth of knowledge and the integration of key ideas and methods related to the student’s thesis area. The change will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2016.

Gender Studies and Feminist Research
Change to Calendar Copy (Diploma)
The program proposed a change to their calendar copy to clarify their existing requirements. The first change is intended to address to ensure students understand that the elective course required as part of the diploma course must be in addition to any courses they have taken as part of their Ph.D. The second change was to strengthen the language around participation in the department symposium to indicate
students are expected to attend all events. The final change proposed was to the language around their program requirements where the thesis is concerned, noting that a student’s statement of interest should clarify their interest and background in feminist and gender theory. This change is intended to ensure students understand that they have to enter program with a background in gender studies (although they don’t necessarily need a degree in such a program) and that that must be the clear focus of their dissertation research. These changes will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2016.

Philosophy
Change to Calendar Copy (Ph.D.)
The program proposed some additional headings to their calendar copy to clarifying existing requirements and added some text on the number of required courses for students. The proposed changes will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2016.

3. New Scholarships

The DeGroote EMBA in Digital Transformation Scholarship for Women in Leadership
Established in 2015 by the generous donors of the DeGroote School of Business. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies to a female student enrolled in the DeGroote School of Business, EMBA in Digital Transformation program who, in the judgement of the EMBA Admissions Committee and School of Graduate Studies, has demonstrated exceptional professional and community leadership.

The DeGroote EMBA in Digital Transformation Scholarship for Entrepreneurial Leadership
Established in 2015 by the generous donors of the DeGroote School of Business. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies to a student enrolled in the DeGroote School of Business, EMBA in Digital Transformation program who, in the judgement of the EMBA Admissions Committee and School of Graduate Studies, has successfully launched and operated their own business. Preference will be given to applicants in the technology sector.

The DeGroote EMBA in Digital Transformation Scholarship for Leaders in Healthcare
Established in 2015 by the generous donors of the DeGroote School of Business. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies to a student enrolled in the DeGroote School of Business, EMBA in Digital Transformation program who, in the judgement of the EMBA Admissions Committee and School of Graduate Studies, who has demonstrated outstanding leadership and managerial competency in the health care industry.

The DeGroote EMBA in Digital Transformation Scholarship for Leaders in Non-Profit Organizations
Established in 2015 by the generous donors of the DeGroote School of Business. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies to a student enrolled in the DeGroote School of Business, EMBA in Digital Transformation program who, in the judgement of the EMBA Admissions Committee and School of Graduate Studies, who has demonstrated outstanding leadership in the non-profit sector.

Stewart-Anthony Family Scholarship in Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization
Established in 2015 by the Stewart–Anthony family, to be awarded to a full-time graduate student in the Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization Program who demonstrates excellence in academic achievement. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies on the recommendation of a committee from the Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization Program.
Biogen Scholarship in Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization
Established in 2015 by Biogen Canada Inc. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies to a full-time student in the Masters of Biomedical Discovery and Commercialization Program who, in the judgement of a selection committee from the program, has demonstrated academic achievement.
REPORT TO SENATE
FROM
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

For Approval

I  Name Changes to Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences Plus (IBEHS+)
Program (attached)

Establishment of an Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences Plus (IBEHS+) program with two degree pathways and associated Co-op programs was approved by Undergraduate Council at its meeting of January 26, 2016 and by Senate at its meeting of February 10, 2016. During the subsequent IQAP review process, the reviewers suggested revisions to the name of the program and of the five-year Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences in Health, Engineering and Entrepreneurship and its associated Co-op option. The program has reviewed the recommendation and proposes to change the name of the Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences Plus (IBEHS+) to Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences (IBEHS). The name of the Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences in Health, Engineering and Entrepreneurship (HEE specialization) and its associated Co-op option is proposed to be changed to Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences in Health, Engineering Science and Entrepreneurship (HESE specialization). There are no program revisions associated with this change. The proposal to revise the program name and the name of the degree pathway will be reviewed by Undergraduate Council at its meeting of April 12, 2016.

Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the change to the name of the Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences Plus (IBEHS+) program to the Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences (IBEHS) program and the name of the degree pathway Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences in Health, Engineering and Entrepreneurship and Health, Engineering and Entrepreneurship Co-op to Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences in Health, Engineering Science and Entrepreneurship and Health, Engineering Science and Entrepreneurship Co-op, for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as set out in the attached and conditional on the approval of Undergraduate Council on April 12, 2016.

Senate: April 13, 2016
TO: Dr. Susan Searls Giroux  
Chair, Undergraduate Council  
Associate Vice-President (Faculty)

FROM: Dr. Ken Coley  
Professor and Associate Dean (Academic)  
Faculty of Engineering  

Dr. Delsworth Harnish  
Professor and Associate Dean (Undergraduate Education)  
Faculty of Health Sciences  

Dr. Colin McDonald  
Assistant Professor  
Faculty of Engineering  

April 4, 2016

A site visit for the proposed undergraduate program in Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences Plus was held on February 25-26, 2016. In their external reviewers report, the reviewers’ recommended that we reconsider the title of the overall initiative and the differentiated degree programs that comprise it. Their recommendations and our response is indicated below:

1. The reviewers felt that the ‘+’ is not sufficiently specific to merit inclusion in the title. We agree with the reviewers on this matter, and have decided to remove the ‘+’ from the program title. It will now be called the Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences program.

2. For the Health, Engineering and Entrepreneurship specialization, the reviewers were concerned that: 1) Students in the program might be misled to believe that they were receiving a type of “engineering degree”, and 2) The licensing bodies will almost certainly take issue with using the word ‘engineering’ in a non-CEAB (Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board) accredited degree. We agree with the reviewers that the provincial regulator is likely to object to the way that Engineering is used in the title of the Bachelor of Health Sciences stream. The B.H.Sc. specialization will therefore be renamed Health, Engineering Science and Entrepreneurship (HESE). We are confident that the change from Engineering to the more specific Engineering Science provides a more accurate description of the program content whilst also avoiding potential objections from the regulator.
REPORT TO SENATE

FROM THE

COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS

Open Session

At its meeting on March 21, 2016, the Committee on Appointments approved revisions to the Distinguished University Professor Policy recommended by the Provost. It was recognized by this year’s selection committee that the Faculty Deans needed to be involved earlier on in the process and that it would be useful to have some carry-over of nominees from year to year.

The Appointments Committee now recommends to the Senate:

“that the Senate approve revisions to the Distinguished University Professor Policy as set out in the attached.”

Senate: For Approval
April 13, 2016
1.0 POLICY

1.1 Rationale

Academic life involves achievements in many domains, including the discovery, communication and preservation of knowledge, excellence in education and pedagogy, as well as a commitment to the communities that we serve, from local to global. The ranks that are held by members of faculty represent an acknowledgement of the levels of achievement that each member of the community has attained in their academic life. High accomplishment is prized here; thus it is not surprising that our professoriate includes individuals whose achievements are extraordinary. It behooves us to recognize our most distinguished members by conferring upon them a title that represents the highest honour the University can bestow. To that end, McMaster University has established the title **Distinguished University Professor**, with the following terms, criteria, and nomination and selection procedures.

1.2 Title

The title of the category shall be Distinguished University Professor.

1.3 Terms

The title is awarded by the Senate only to full-time members of the faculty and is held for life, subject to Article XIV, clause 180 of the Senate By-laws.
1.4 Criteria

This title will be conferred only on faculty members who have demonstrated distinction and impact well beyond McMaster in one or more fields of endeavour, sustained over a period time, with a particular emphasis on success achieved while on faculty at the university. In keeping with McMaster’s position as a research-intensive university of global repute those holding the title of Distinguished University Professor must have demonstrated an outstanding and sustained research record that demonstrates international impact and recognition. However, this award is also meant to recognize the complete scholar. Thus, the ideal candidate will have additionally demonstrated a sustained record of excellence and/or innovation in teaching and learning, including the supervision of emerging scholars along with a demonstrated history of service that has had an impact on the community, whether within or without the university.

In assessing candidates the selection committee will strive to understand and incorporate how impact is determined and communicated in different domains and fields of scholarship.

1.5 Number of Distinguished University Professors

1.5. a The number of Distinguished University Professors shall be restricted to no more that 2% of all full-time members of faculty, including tenure-stream, teaching-stream, CAWAR and Special (with the latter stream counted using a weighting factor of 0.2). The maximum number of positions will be re-evaluated every three years. No more than five new titles will be conferred in any given year.

1.5. b A vacancy among the Distinguished University Professors shall occur when any retires.

1.5. c The title of Distinguished University Professor will continue to be held after retirement.

2.0 PROCEDURES

2.1 Nominations

The nomination procedures for Distinguished University Professors will take place on an annual cycle as follows:

2.1. a A Distinguished Awards Committee will be created, composed of outstanding scholars with as broad a membership as possible, taking into account the need for balance and inclusion, the composition being constituted as follows:
   The Provost or designate (chair)
   The Vice-President (Research) or designate
   The Associate Vice-President (Faculty)
   One senior scholar from another university, appointed by the Provost
   Five senior McMaster scholars, appointed by the Committee on Appointments upon the recommendation of Provost’s Council
2.1. b By October—the second Monday of September each year, the Provost shall
invite nominations to the rank of Distinguished University Professor from the
McMaster Community.

Anyone intending to nominate a colleague should inform the relevant Dean of
their intention to do so by October 1, or as soon thereafter as possible.

2.1. c The selection process shall occur in two phases. In the first phase nominations
shall consist of the following:

A letter of nomination (maximum 3 pages) signed by four individuals, at least
two of whom must be McMaster professors. (Self-nomination is not
acceptable). The letter should outline why the nominee is deemed to fit the
criteria for this title.

The nominee’s CV.

Nominations will be due on November 1.

2.1. d The selection committee (less the external member) will meet to select the most
suitable nominees to move forward to the final selection process. The
nominators of those candidates will then be asked to obtain at least 2 but up to 5
letters of reference attesting to the individual’s global impact and standing to
support the nomination. They will be due by February 1.

2.1. e The full selection committee will then meet to develop a slate of candidates to be
recommended to the Senate Committee on Appointments, no later than March 1.

Upon ratification by this body, the slate of candidates will be forwarded to the
Senate for final approval.

2.1. f In any given year when the number and calibre of candidates so warrants, the
selection committee can recommend to the Provost a list of unsuccessful
nominees whose names will be automatically included in the first phase of the
selection process for the next competition. At the appropriate time, the
nominators of any such individuals will be given an opportunity to update their
nomination package.

3.0 CONFERRING OF THE TITLE OF DISTINGUISHED UNIVERSITY
PROFESSOR

The title shall be conferred by the Chancellor at Convocation.

4.0 THE COLLEGIUM OF DISTINGUISHED UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

All Distinguished University Professors at McMaster including those who have retired
will constitute a collegium. The intent is to provide a forum that will enable
Distinguished University Professors to raise the level of academic discourse within the
institution, particularly amongst McMaster students. The collegium will be provided with
funding each year by the Provost to offer a symposium on a topic having both academic
and societal interest. It may also be called on from time to time to offer advice or support.
The operation and effectiveness of the collegium will be assessed after 5 years of
operation and its continuation will be at the discretion of the President upon the advice of
the Provost and the Vice-President (Research).
REPORT TO SENATE
FROM
THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS

For Approval

i. Revisions to the Residence Agreement/Contract (Attachment I)

At its meeting of March 24, 2016, the Committee on Student Affairs approved, for recommendation to Senate, revisions to the Residence Agreement/Contract. The majority of changes made are editorial and provide updates to dates and deadlines. The most significant change is the inclusion of two new fines associated with room change requests and late submission of documents. Both fees are pending the approval of the Board of Governors.

The Committee on Student Affairs now recommends,

that Senate approve the revisions to the Residence Agreement/Contract, effective May 1, 2016, as outlined in Attachment I.

For Information


At the same meeting, the Committee on Student Affairs received, for information, the 2014-2015 Student Code of Conduct Annual Report to Senate.

Senate: April 13, 2016
To: Senate Committee on Student Affairs

From: Jaimie Dickson, Manager, Residence Admissions and Marketing

Date: March 24, 2016.  
Revised March 29, 2016.

Re: 2016-2017 Residence Agreement/Contract

Please find attached the revised 2016-2017 Residence Agreement/Contract for review and consideration.

Changes noted are based on the Residence Admissions Consultation Committee (RACC) discussions and recommendations. This RACC is comprised of seven members: three student representatives (Vinay Padalia, Community Advisor, and Nisha Depa, IRC representative, and Lesley Wheat, student at large); one member of the Residence Life team (Michelle Treleaven, Residence Manager); one member of the Conference and Event Services team (Laurie Ham, Manager), two members of the Residence Admissions team (Lizzie Martin, Administrative Assistant, and myself, Manager of Residence Admissions and Marketing).

Changes to the 2016-17 Residence Agreement Contract include:

- **Housekeeping changes:**
  - Date ranges/Contract date – updated to reflect the next academic year based on sessional dates.
  - The word “sessional” average is replaced with “fall/winter” average to reflect the change in the definition of the sessional average by the University.
  - Academic course load total units changed from “twenty-four units” to “eighteen units”, and from “twelve units” to “nine units” for half term students, where applicable – updated to reflect the change in definition of full-time and part-time student by the University.
  - Web links – updated and inserted web URL’s, as needed to directly link students to appropriate policies, procedures and information at the University.
  - Reformatting of sections to itemize and group together – updated to be clearer and to provide quick access and reference points to information within the document.
o Section numbers were revised based on the reorganization, addition and deletions of some sections.
o Small changes and replacements of key wording to provide more clarity.

Revisions to review include:

- The "Residence Code of Conduct" is currently under review and changes/revisions may occur depending on the outcome.

- **Section 2, Page 1:**
  - (2a): 24 units replaced with 18 units to align with the University definition of an Undergraduate full-time student.
  - Addition of the statement "(nine units in the fall term between September to December, and nine units in the winter term between January to April)" – updated to clarify that the student must be enrolled in nine units per term and to define the months in each term.
  - (2d): Addition of the timeline “within 24 hours” to provide more clarity on expectations of students to notify Residence Admissions of a change in their status.

- **Section 3, Page 2:**
  - Addition of the definition of a Co-op/Exchange student to “Exchange students are defined as either an Incoming Exchange student being admitted from another University, or a current Upper Year/Returning student enrolled in an outgoing Exchange program” to provide more clarity on the category of the student.
  - Formatted to divide it by term based on the different application processes, fees difference for each term, and for quick reference.
  - Addition to point (i) and (ii) of “supporting documentation from the Faculty” and “supporting documentation to verify enrollment in a course load of at least nine units in the winter term” – added to distinguish between the appropriate documentation required for two different situations.
  - Addition of point (ii), (iii) and (3b) – added to distinguish between the difference in process and fee adjustments for the variation in student status.

- **Section 4, Page 2:**
  - (4b): Addition of the timeline “or within 24 hours as of the date the student withdraws from courses” to provide a clear and definite timeline for students to adhere to should they withdraw from all academic courses.

- **Section 7, Page 3:**
  - Changed to add in “Should an option be created to allow students to stay in residence over the December Break, for an additional fee, students will be notified and given the option to submit a request to Housing and
Conference Services” as a placeholder in the event we are able to deliver on a change in policy that is being considered and currently under review.

- Addition of “Student access cards to the building will be deactivated on their move-out date at 12 noon”.

**Section 8, Page 3:**
- (8a): Removed “The student agrees to pay the balance of his/her residence fees…” and combined it with an existing statement in Section 8b – updated to group like points together.
- (8b): Removed “withholding of academic transcripts” and replaced with “student being blocked from grade reports and/or further enrollment according to the terms set out by the Student Accounts Office” – to provide a clear understanding of the policy by Student Accounts.

**Section 9, Page 4:**
- (9a): Addition of the statement “…and are not permitted to make unauthorized room or roommate changes” – updated to make expectations clear to students.
- (9b) – (9f): Addition of a new policy effective 16/17: “As of August 30, 2016, room change requests are at the discretion of Housing and Conference Services staff…”. This new procedure is to be more flexible to student situations and provide an option to retain students currently living in residence. This is based on the number of requests for room changes received this year and in the past, student and staff feedback, historical data on the number of students who withdraw based on roommate issues that may or may not have been resolved by a room change, and to align with other University trends in Ontario.
- The Consultation Committee was in favour of this new procedure as it provides an option for students and the comments made were that they would be more willing to stay in residence than withdraw given a room change option. The administrative fee was also viewed as a fair and reasonable cost to process the room change.
- The administrative fee of $75 has gone through the appropriate channels of the Miscellaneous Fees committee for review.

**Section 10, Page 4:**
- Re-organization of all meal plan statements that existed within the document, but in separate sections – updated to group them together in one place, and with the addition of specific statements to clarify processes and appropriate contacts.

**Section 15, Page 5:**
- Changed to add in “…cancel their application before their scheduled move-in date, they must notify the Residence Admissions Office by completing the “Cancellation Step” on the online residence application, otherwise the withdrawal policy will apply as outlined in section 16”. This
is to distinguish between the differences of cancelling an application before move-in that must be done through the online residence application versus withdrawing from residence after the student has moved in. Students who withdraw do not cancel their application online; they must fill out the Residence Withdrawal paperwork with a staff member.

- Removed the statements, “...written notice of cancellation received in the Residence Admissions Office” and “In order to withdraw from residence, the student must notify...” located above the chart as the language was updated in the section above.

- **Section 16, Page 5:**
  - Removed the sentence “...required to give immediate written notice to Housing and Conference Services. To withdraw from residence, students” — deleted as it was ambiguous. The sentence is now straightforward to include the steps they need to take to complete the process - “…the student must complete the Residence Withdrawal paperwork with the Residence Admissions Office in Commons 101...”.
  - Changed the deadline for appeals from the last date of the academic term, May 1, to “within fifteen days as of the date the Residence Withdrawal paperwork is provided by the Residence Admissions Office”. The intent is to maintain a standard practice for submission of appeals; the number of days for a student to submit an appeal in the current version of the Residence Code of Conduct is 15 days.
  - Removed “Withdrawal from residence will affect the student’s meal plan...” and put this statement under the new Meal Plan Section 10, Page 4.

- **Section 17, Page 5:**
  - Addition of a new policy on Late Documents. Students who submit documents after specific deadlines will be charged $50. It is important to the business processes of the office to have documents in by certain deadlines. Students failing to meet these deadlines results in duplication of efforts, resources, and inefficiencies in business processes.
  - The Consultation Committee members understood the need for the new policy and commented that they expected it was already in place as their experience for missing academic, financial matters and/or document deadlines for other departments have the same or similar policies.
  - This is also in alignment with standard practices in other departments on campus including Student Accounts late payment and enrollment fees, University Registrar processing fees, Grad studies late documents fee etc.
• Section 18, Page 5:
  - Removed language related to RezPhone

• Previously Section 17, Page 6:
  - Removed this statement and moved to the new Meal Plan Section 10, Page 4.

• Section 19, Page 6:
  - Addition of “…or participate in and/or running an illegal gaming or gambling operation as outlined in the Residence Code of Conduct” – updated to provide clear expectations.

• Section 20, Page 6:
  - Removed “Students are strongly advised to obtain personal insurance against such losses. Housing and Conference Services does not purchase such protection for personal property. Students can often obtain coverage through a “rider” on the family’s tenant or homeowner insurance policy, which should include liability coverage for injury or damage caused by the student”
  - Replaced with the addition of “The student shall carry appropriate and adequate liability insurance coverage for fire, injury, or damaged caused by the student, property damage and personal/public liability over the duration of their residence agreement and any renewals or extensions thereof, at their own expense, and such policies shall be written on a comprehensive basis” – updated to be clear on the expectation that all students shall carry appropriate and adequate coverage.

• Section 21, Page 6:
  - New addition of a section on Pets to include “Residents are prohibited from having pets or animals of any kind in residence buildings. Special permission for approved service animals will be granted by Housing and Conference Services staff as defined by McMaster University policy” – updated to align with the new/revised policy as outlined by the University’s RMM.

• Section 23, Page 6:
  - Addition of “…and kept in a hygienic and safe state”.

• Section 24, Page 6:
  - Addition of “…or around…” – updated to be clear it includes property left around the buildings (i.e., bikes).

• Communal Living Responsibilities, Page 7
  - Addition of new opening paragraph to align with and reflect the current version of the Residence Code of Conduct.
• **Section 3, Page 7:**
  - Addition of "...theft, possession of University or personal property that is not one's own"
  - Addition of "...removing and/or misusing any University property. Prohibited items include, but are not limited to: possession or use of any weapon, explosive, pyrotechnic substance, or firearm, including toy replicas" – updated to provide clear expectations on behavioural responsibilities and prohibited items living within the residence community.

I look forward to the meeting on March 24th to answer any questions the Committee may have on the noted changes.

Sincerely,

__________________________
Jaimie Dickson
Manager, Residence Admissions and Marketing
E: jdkcso@mcmaster.ca
P: Ext.24070
PREAMBLE

Life in residence is governed by three key documents. The Residence Agreement/Contract outlines fundamental contractual obligations between the student and Housing and Conference Services. The online Residence Handbook [https://hcs.mcmaster.ca/ez15/docs/McMaster_Residence_Handbook_2015_16.pdf] further describes policies, procedures and community standards, including the Residence Code of Conduct (RCC)* [studentconduct.mcmaster.ca/residence_code_of_conduct.html], which clearly outlines the behavioural expectations of all residence students and possible sanctions for discipline violations outcomes.

McMASTER RESIDENCE STUDENT CODE OF HONOUR

It is assumed that the primary objective of all residents is the successful pursuit of academic studies. Residence life also creates the potential for many social and cultural benefits. Residents are jointly responsible for helping to make the residence community a comfortable, safe, and secure living environment conducive to achieving the key McMaster University objective: excellence in learning and discovery.

Students are expected to understand and appreciate that certain fundamental rules, expectations and regulations are necessary in any community and that ultimately discipline should come from within each person. The McMaster residence system believes and is founded on the principle that integral to the code of behaviour is an appreciation of the effect of one's personal behaviour on others and respect for their personal and property rights. McMaster appeals to each resident's sense of reason and responsibility and promotes the ideal that responsibilities are to be shared by all residents in order to maintain a high standard of cooperative living, tolerance, mutual respect and compromise.

By choosing to join the McMaster residence community, each member is required to accept and agree to and live by a code of behaviour, which values and promotes civility, inclusivity, good citizenship and productive behaviour.

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

1. The Residence Agreement/Contract becomes effective upon receipt by the University of the Student's Residence Application. The submission of the online application and acceptance of the accompanying terms and conditions shall be evidence that all of the terms and conditions of the Residence Agreement/Contract are fully understood and that the student agrees to be bound by the Residence Agreement/Contract and Residence Code of Conduct as a condition of applying to residence at McMaster University.

Qualifying for Residence

2. a) Undergraduate students taking courses equivalent of at least twenty-four (24) units, between September and April (nine units in the fall term between September to December, and nine units in the winter term between January to April), or enrolled in a full-time Co-op/Outgoing Exchange program, receive first priority for residence accommodation.

Residence accommodation is conditional upon registering and remaining in at least twenty-four (24) units during the academic year divided equally into nine units in the fall term (September to December) and nine units in the winter term (January to April). Students who are admitted in the winter term (January to April) must be enrolled and remain in a minimum of 42 units, nine units.

b) To allow more first year students the opportunity to spend their first year on campus, 85% of all spaces in McMaster University's residence buildings will be reserved for first year students entering directly from high school and 15% of all spaces will be allocated on the basis of merit and lottery to returning residents, Residence Life Staff, Inter-Residence Council members, off-campus undergraduate students, and other merit students, as determined by Residence Admissions, if space permits.

c) Residence Admissions will consider the following non-traditional students eligible for residence:

1) undergraduate students who will register at McMaster and are requesting accommodation before their term of study commences;

2) undergraduate students enrolled full-time at another post-secondary institution who choose to do their work placement in a McMaster University faculty or department;

3) students who are registered in a second Bachelor's degree at McMaster University, and who have lived in residence for a full four years during the completion of their first degree.

*The Residence Code of Conduct (RCC) is currently under review.
Admission will be granted to non-traditional students in the order of priority listed above, and only after all Undergraduate students enrolled in at least twenty-four eighteen units have been accommodated. Each case will be reviewed individually and admission will be granted at the discretion of Residence Admissions.

d) All students are responsible for notifying Residence Admissions within 24 hours of any change in their student status that may affect their eligibility for residence as outlined above.

e) Students wishing to live in residence beginning in the winter term, (January 2016 2017) can apply starting October 2, 2016 3, 2016. All applicants must complete the online application process by October 30, 2016 28, 2016. Spaces are limited and will be allocated by random lottery. Spaces are assigned based on the 85%/15% policy outlined in 2b.

Co-op/Exchange Students

3. Co-op/outgoing Exchange students are eligible to apply for residence accommodation in the same manner as undergraduate students enrolled in at least twenty-four eighteen units as outlined in section 2. Exchange students are defined as either an Incoming Exchange student being admitted from another University, or a current Upper Year/Returning student enrolled in an outgoing Exchange program. Co-op/Exchange Students in such a program must be enrolled in 42 nine units during the term in which they live on campus. The residence fee for four-month occupancy will be one half of the fee for eight month occupancy.

a) Fall Term (September to December): Co-op/Exchange students who live in residence for the first academic term only (September to December) will be charged an additional $300 as an administrative fee for filling the second term vacancy.

i) It is the responsibility of the student to notify Residence Admissions of their enrollment in a Co-op/outgoing Exchange program, prior to moving into residence. This notification must be in writing with supporting documentation from the Faculty and must be received in the Residence Admissions Office by 4:00 p.m. EST on November 2, 2015 1, 2016. Otherwise the full eight-month occupancy residence fees will be charged to the student's account.

ii) Students that applied for fall term only (September to December), decline their offer to a Co-op/outgoing Exchange program, and wish to be considered to remain in residence for the winter term (January to April), must notify Residence Admissions of their change in status. This notification must be in writing with supporting documentation to verify enrollment in a course load of at least nine units in the winter term by 4:00 p.m. EST on October 2, 2015 24, 2016. Otherwise the student will be required to vacate residence by 12 noon on their move-out date in December. If approved to remain in residence in the winter term, the remaining full year residence fees will be charged to the student's account.

b) Winter Term (January to April): Co-op/outgoing Exchange students who live in residence for the second academic term only (January to April) will be charged the residence fee for four-month occupancy which is one half of the fee for eight-month occupancy.

Academic Requirements

4. a) If a student is not able to maintain a course load of at least twenty-four eighteen units, as defined in section 2, the student will be required to withdraw from residence and to meet the financial responsibilities, as outlined in section 15. A student who cannot maintain a course load of at least twenty-four eighteen units for medical, family, academic or compassionate reasons must submit a written appeal with supporting documents to Residence Admissions to be considered for permission to remain in residence.

b) If a student withdraws from all of his/her academic courses, he/she is required to contact the Residence Admissions Office immediately or within 24 hours of the date the student withdraws from courses. Under normal circumstances, the student will be required to vacate residence within 24 hours.

5. Current residents wishing to return to residence must apply to residence each year, with acceptance determined by merit, academic, and/or lottery considerations. In addition, and without limitation, residence acceptance may be denied as a result of any previous breach of the Residence Agreement/Contract and/or Residence Code of Conduct. Returning students who are successful in the residence lottery are required to maintain a sessionsal-fall/winter average of 5.0(C) in at least 24 eighteen units in the most recent academic year in order to remain on the guaranteed list for residence. All other students will be placed on a waiting list and offered residence as bed spaces become available. A student who cannot meet this minimum academic average for medical, family, academic or compassionate reasons must submit a written appeal with supporting documents to Residence Admissions to be considered for acceptance to residence.

Contract Dates

6. Residence fees include accommodation from, Monday, August 31, 2015 or 12 noon on the day following the student's final first term exam in December 2015 or to 12 noon on closing day December 23, 2015, whichever is earlier, and from Monday, January 4, 2016 or 12 noon on the day following the student's final exam in April 2016, or to 3:00 p.m. on closing day April 30, 2016, whichever is earlier. In order to facilitate the large number of students, move-in times will be staggered and some students will be allowed to move in before August 31, 2015 or 12 noon.

All students will be notified by email in advance of their move-in date/time.
7. All residences are closed to all students, without exception, during the holiday break (12 noon December 23, 2016 to 7am January 4, 2017). All food, Service Centre, student life, custodial and maintenance services are suspended during this period. Should an option be created to allow students to stay in residence over the December Break, an additional fee will be charged and given the option to submit a request to Housing and Conference Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 30, August 30, 2016 August 27 and August 28, 2016</td>
<td>First-Year Move-in begins. Student will be notified in advance of their specific building/time move-in details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 2016 August 29, 2016</td>
<td>Upper-Year move-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10-15, 2016</td>
<td>Mid-term recess (Fall Break), buildings remain open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9-23, 2016 December 8-23, 2016</td>
<td>Exam move-out period Students are required to vacate residence by 12 noon the day following their last exam or to 12 noon on closing day December 23, 2016, whichever is earlier. Student access cards to the building will be deactivated on their move-out date at 12 noon. Students who do not move-out on their specific date/time are in violation of the Residence Code of Conduct and subject to a $50/day late move-out fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 23, 2016- December 23, 2016 at 12 noon</td>
<td>Residence buildings close for December Break at 12 noon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, January 2, 2017 January 4, 2016</td>
<td>Residence buildings re-open at 7am 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12-18, 2015 February 15-20, 2016 February 20-25, 2017</td>
<td>Mid-term recess (Reading Week), buildings remain open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 12-30, 2016 April 10-27, 2017</td>
<td>Exam move-out period Students are required to vacate residence by 3pm 3:00 p.m. the day following their last exam or to 3:00 p.m. on closing day April 27, 2017, whichever is earlier. Student access cards to the building will be deactivated on their move-out date at 3:00 p.m. Students who do not move-out on their specific date/time are in violation of the Residence Code of Conduct and subject to a $50/day late move-out fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2016 3pm April 27, 2017</td>
<td>Residence buildings close at 3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application Deadline and Deposit

8. a) All students applying to residence must submit an online residence application using the McMaster University Residence Portal (https://residence.mcmaster.ca) and will be required to make a $600 deposit by the applicable deadline in order to reserve their position for a guaranteed residence space. The deadline for the residence deposits to be received is February 26, 2016 at 4 p.m. EST; March 1, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. EST for upper year/returning students, and June 1, 2016 at 4 p.m. EST. June 1, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. EST for guaranteed first year students. The deposits for residence will be credited towards the full residence fee. The student agrees to pay the balance of his/her residence fee according to the terms set out by the Student Accounts Office subject to withdrawal from residence.

First year students applying to the waiting list are not required to make this deposit until they are requested to do so by Residence Admissions.

Applications and/or deposits received after the deadline, or applications that are deficient in any way, shall be placed at the bottom of the then existing waiting list.

b) The student agrees to pay the balance of his/her residence fees according to the terms set out by the Student Accounts Office (http://www.mcmaster.ca/bms/student/index.htm), subject to withdrawal from residence. All personal and residence fee accounts with the University must be settled promptly and if unpaid will result in the withholding of academic transcripts, student being blocked from grade reports and/or further enrollment according to terms set out by the Student Accounts Office (http://www.mcmaster.ca/bms/student/SAC_dates_deadlines.html).

c) Applicants who pay the deposit but never receive an offer of residence, or who request to be removed from the waiting list by August 27, 2016, will receive a full refund of their $600 deposit.
Room Assignments & Room Changes

9. a) Room assignments are made by Housing and Conference Services. Students are not guaranteed their choice of residence, room or roommate. Residence Admissions may consult with appropriate Residence Life staff to assign rooms and roommates in each building. Students are prohibited from subletting or delegating a person for the use or occupancy of their residence rooms and are not permitted to make unauthorized room or roommate changes. Incoming students are advised of their residence/room assignment in July. Room assignments are final; requests for room changes are not considered before August 30, 2016.

b) As of August 30, 2016, room change requests are at the discretion of Housing and Conference Services staff (i.e., Residence Manager) and are only considered, with the exception of the examination period:
   i) after all appropriate efforts have been exhausted (i.e., roommate mediation);
   ii) in priority of necessity and/or circumstance;
   iii) based on availability of specific room types

c) Documentation will be required for a room change request based on special accommodation.

d) If a room change is requested and approved, the student will be subject to an administrative fee of $75 per room change to cover costs associated with the room change process. Additionally, the student is held financially responsible for the pro-rated difference in cost of room types (if applicable) based on the date the new room is available. The administrative fee and pro-rated difference in cost of room type will be charged or credited to the student’s account.

e) Room changes, as a result of conduct issues will be subject to the terms set out in the Code of Student Rights & Responsibilities and subject to the administrative fee and pro-rated difference in cost of room types (if applicable). The administrative fee and pro-rated difference in cost of room type will be charged or credited to the student’s account.

f) In circumstances where Housing and Conference Services staff deem a room change necessary for the safety, security and/or the well-being of the student and/or community, the administrative fee will be waived at the discretion of Housing and Conference Services.

Meal Plan

10. Students living in all residences are required to purchase a meal as per Hospitality Services (http:// hospitality.mcmaster.ca/mealplan/residence/policy.html). Students will select a meal plan choice and agree to the McMaster University Residence Meal Plan Policy (http:// hospitality.mcmaster.ca/mealplan/residence/policy.html) as part of the online residence application process. It is the student’s responsibility to inquire with Hospitality Services about any meal plan related matters and to notify the Hospitality Services Mac Express Office of any change to their residence status (i.e., withdrawal, approved room change) that may affect their meal plan. For more information contact the Mac Express Office at express@mcmaster.ca or (905) 525-9140 ext.27448; or visit Hospitality Services website (http:// hospitality.mcmaster.ca/mealplan/students.html).

Authorized Access

40.1. Housing and Conference Services subscribes to the principle that residence students are entitled to enjoy a reasonable right to privacy in residence rooms. However, it reserves the right to have authorized staff enter rooms, apartments, and suites under the following conditions: to provide repair service or room maintenance inspections; to conduct periodic health and safety checks of room conditions, to conduct weekly or monthly fire inspection tests in apartments/suites; when there is reasonable cause to believe an emergency situation has arisen that requires entry; when a student vacates a room for a break period (e.g., December break); when there is reasonable cause to believe that university regulations are, and/or the law is being violated. Authorized staff is supplied with identification badges that are visible at all times.

Emergency Contact

41.2. Where behaviour, personal security or health issues are of serious concern, Housing and Conference Services reserves the right to notify the “emergency contact” name listed on the student’s residence application. In these circumstances and when the student is under 18 years of age, the parent or guardian will be notified rather than the “emergency contact.”

Termination of Contract/Relocation and Filling Vacancies

42.1. Housing and Conference Services reserves the right to terminate residence contracts, reassign students to another residence building and/or room on a temporary or permanent basis, and to effect other steps as may be required for the safety, security and/or the well-being of the residents and the residence program community.

43.1. Housing and Conference Services has a responsibility to reduce losses in revenue by filling vacancies which may occur throughout the year. Students in residence must be prepared to welcome a new roommate in the event that a vacancy occurs. Students remaining in the room are expected to remain in the space allocated to them and leave the vacated space readily available for incoming new roommate(s). Similarly, if vacancies remain unfilled, Housing and Conference Services may need to consolidate rooms. Housing
and Conference Services may effect consolidation when necessary by requiring a student to accept a new roommate or move to a new room. In some circumstances, and at the discretion of Housing and Conference Services, a student may be permitted to remain in their room for an additional fee. Advance notification will be given to those students affected.

Application Cancellation Deadlines and Refunds

4.4(1) Any student who submits a complete and accurate residence application, pays the deposit, and whose name is on the guaranteed residence list, is defined as being “in residence.” If this student in residence wishes to withdraw cancel their application before their scheduled move-in date, they must notify the Residence Admissions Office by completing the “Cancellation Step” on the online residence application; otherwise, the withdrawal policy will apply as outlined in section 16, from residence, he/she will forfeit all or part of the deposit on the date the written notice of cancellation is received in the Residence Admissions Office. “Cancellation Step” is completed on the online residence application. A forfeited deposit may not be applied to other outstanding accounts or transferred to the residence account of another student.

In order to withdraw from residence, the student must notify the Residence Admissions Office by completing the “Cancellation Step” on the online residence application. Questions may be directed to Residence Admissions at (905) 525-9140, ext. 24342.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Written of Cancellation Received</th>
<th>Deposit Refund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For September Admits: If cancellation received on or before 4 p.m. July 3, 2016 4:00 p.m. EST on July 4, 2016</td>
<td>Applicant receives refund of $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For September Admits: If cancellation received after 4 p.m. July 3, 2015 4:00 p.m. EST on July 4, 2016</td>
<td>Applicant receives NO REFUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For January Admits: If cancellation received on or before 4 p.m. November 27, 2016 4:00 p.m. EST on November 30, 2016</td>
<td>Applicant receives refund of $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For January Admits: If cancellation received after 4 p.m. November 27, 2016 4:00 p.m. EST on November 30, 2016</td>
<td>Applicant receives NO REFUND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Withdrawing from Residence

4.4(1) Students living in residence who plan to withdraw from residence for any reason whatsoever during the academic year are required to give immediate written notice to Housing and Conference Services. To withdraw from residence, students must complete the necessary Residence Withdrawal paperwork with the Residence Admissions Office in Commons 101, check out at their Service Centre, and return their residence keys/access card. Failure to do so will result in the student being charged as outlined in section 23.26. The date of withdrawal will be recorded as the date the Residence Withdrawal paperwork is completed and the residence keys/access card is returned, whichever is later.

The student is financially responsible for his/her full year’s fee and is placed on a refund waiting list in order of date of withdrawal. When a new student is admitted to residence, a refund is processed for the first student on the refund waiting list. This is not dependent upon filling the vacated room, rather it is based on filling the vacancy in the residence system created by the withdrawal. Eligible refunds of residence fees are calculated on a pro-rated daily basis, and are credited to the student’s university account, less a $300 administration fee. If the student has no outstanding university accounts, the residence refund will be issued to the student.

A student who is unable to continue to live in residence due to exceptional circumstances beyond his/her control may submit a written appeal with supporting documentation to Residence Admissions Housing and Conference Services in the Commons Building, Room 101. The deadline to submit an appeal for consideration is May 1st of the academic term in which the student has withdrawn within the fifteen days of the date the Residence Withdrawal paperwork is submitted by the Residence Admissions Office. If the appeal is successful, the student will receive a pro-rated refund of his/her residence fees as of the date of withdrawal. The date of withdrawal is the date the Residence Withdrawal paperwork is completed and the residence keys/access card is returned, whichever is later. This student remains responsible for the administrative fee.

Withdrawal from residence will affect the student's meal plan, as outlined in the McMaster University Residence Meal Plan Policy. All meal plan questions must be directed to Mac Express at express@mcmaster.ca or (905) 525-9140, ext. 27442.

Late Documents

17. Housing & Conference Services requires students to submit documentation related to the application and allocation process and matters related to living in residence by specific deadlines outlined by Housing and Conference Services. Deadlines are in place to ensure adequate time for review, assessment and execution of business processes. These documents include, but are not limited to, requests for: special accommodation, early/late arrival, move-out extension, co-op/exchange documentation, appeals for academic standing (below 5.0) and pro-rated residence fees. All documents submitted after the specified deadline will be subject to a $50 late documents fee.

RESIDENCE STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES
18. Each residence fee includes Internet access (RezNet-Wifi) and local telephone service. RezPhone is available if requested and is included in the residence fee. Each student is responsible for the use of the Internet and/or telephone, and is prohibited from using, or permitting them to be used for a purpose or in a manner that is contrary to the law, University policy, or could be considered annoying or offensive, harmful or disruptive under the Residence Code of Conduct. Abuse of the RezNet-Wifi and/or RezPhone systems may result in termination of the data service and/or telephone and may result in judicial or criminal charges being laid against the student. Refer to the RezNet-Wifi Usage policy (mcmaster.ca/uts/maconline/reznet.html), the RezPhone Usage Policy (mcmaster.ca/uts/maconline/termset.html) and the McMaster Code of Conduct for Computer and Network Users (mcmaster.ca/uts/policy/index.html).

17. Students in all residences are required to purchase a residence meal plan. For further information visit hospitality.mcmaster.ca/mealplan/residence.html.

18. Students are not permitted to engage in any commercial activity in residence rooms or common areas or participate in and/or running an illegal gaming or gambling operation as outlined in the Residence Code of Conduct.

Insurance

19. The University will not be liable, directly or indirectly, for loss or theft of personal property, including food, or for damage or destruction of property by fire, water or other causes (e.g. loss of utilities). Students are strongly advised to obtain personal insurance against such losses. Housing and Conference Services does not purchase such protection for personal property. Students can often obtain coverage through a "rider" on the family's tenant or homeowner insurance policy, which should include liability coverage for injury or damage caused by the student. The student shall carry appropriate and adequate liability insurance coverage for fire, injury, or damage caused by the student, property damage and personal/public liability over the duration of their residence agreement and any renewals or extensions thereof, at their own expense, and such policies shall be written on a comprehensive basis. Students must also take positive steps to ensure their safety by locking room doors and ensuring that only authorized persons enter their building.

Pets

20. Residents are prohibited from having pets or animals of any kind in residence buildings. Special permission for approved service animals will be granted by Housing and Conference Services staff as defined by McMaster University policy (http://www.workingatmcmaster.ca/med/document/RMM-409-Domestic-Animals-in-the-Workplace-Program-1-36.pdf).

Damages/Charges

20. All rooms or apartments/suites are inspected prior to the students' arrival for damage and the completed room inspection information is kept electronically on file. Students must report missing items or items in need of repair immediately through the online work order, accessed through the Residence Portal (https://residence.mcmaster.ca): corrective action will then be initiated. Students are financially responsible for any damage or losses to their room and/or its contents. Students will be charged for losses, damage, cleaning and/or repairs required during or at the end of their residence contract. Students assigned to apartments/suites are jointly responsible with the other occupant(s) of the apartment/suite, for damage or losses to the shared areas of the apartment/suite. All charges for damages to common areas in residence (e.g. laundry rooms, elevators, etc.) will be split equally among the occupants of the building or floor, provided that such damage cannot be traced to those directly responsible.

23. Students are responsible for cleaning and maintaining an orderly state in their own room/apartment/suite during the academic year and for ensuring their room/apartment/suite is clean and free of all refuse, and kept in a hygienic and safe state. Rooms will be inspected and at the determination of Housing and Conference Services students will be invoiced for all cleaning and/or repairs required during or at the end of their contract.

22. Students are required to remove all of their belongings; property left in or around residence longer than 48 hours after the student has vacated is considered to be abandoned and will be removed at a minimum cost of $25 to the student. Housing and Conference Services does not accept responsibility for the storage or safekeeping of any property abandoned in residence.

23. Students are required to vacate their residence room and return all residence keys/access cards no later than 3 p.m. on the day following their final exam in April, or by 3 p.m. on closing day April 30, 2016 April 27, 2017, whichever is earlier. Residence keys/access cards cannot be transferred, loaned or duplicated. Students who lose or do not return their residence keys/access cards at the end of their residence contract will be charged $160 for the required lock changes and $25 for each replacement key/access card.

Communal Living Responsibilities

Students living in residence are part of a unique and interconnected community on campus. As such, the following is intended to articulate the contextual expectations of residents (and their guests), which align with the Guiding Principles and the Residence Code of Conduct. Housing and Conference Services reserves the right to take any/all necessary and appropriate action to protect the safety and welfare of the residence community.
1. Every student living in residence is responsible for observing the terms and conditions of the online Residence Handbook and the Residence Code of Conduct (RCC) (mcmster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/Residence_Code_of_Conduct.pdf) which outline community standards and behavioural expectations for residents, and the types of sanctions outcomes levied when these standards expectations are breached. No resident student is exempt from the terms and conditions of the RCC for any reason.

2. Guests of residents are responsible for observing the terms and conditions of the online Residence Handbook and the RCC. Students living in residence are accountable for the behaviour of their guests and will be sanctioned if guests breach these standards.

3. Each student expressly agrees that he/she will not directly or indirectly cause, or fail to take reasonable steps which may prevent a breach of the RCC. These include, but are not limited to: damage, vandalism, theft, possession of University or personal property that is not one’s own, commission of a criminal offence or willful destruction to property within the residence, to the residence structure and/or to the grounds surrounding residence, removing and/or misusing any University property. Prohibited items include, but are not limited to: possession or use of any weapon, explosive, pyrotechnic substance, or firearm, including toy replicas.

4. Every student is expected to act in a responsible manner so as not to compromise his/her own safety or endanger the health and safety of others. The University reserves the right to determine what constitutes unsafe or unhygienic practices. These include but are not limited to: tampering with fixtures, building systems (including the wiring and fire prevention controls), fabricating or building structures, or impeding any means of egress from the building. Students may refer to the Residence Code of Conduct on-line at mcmster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/Residence_Code_of_Conduct.pdf.

The submission of an online Residence Application indicates the student has read and understood the conditions of the Residence Agreement/Contract and its related documents as a condition of applying to and, if accepted, living in residence at McMaster University. The student agrees that the terms and conditions of the Residence Agreement/Contract, online Residence Handbook and the Residence Code of Conduct are effective and binding legal obligations that are enforceable.

Please retain this copy of the Residence Agreement/Contract for future reference.

Pending Senate Approval
Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards


Contact Information:

Heidi Muller
124 Mary Keyes Residence
ext. 23845
hmuller@mcmaster.ca

Tim Cameron, Student Conduct Officer
206 Gilmour Hall
ext. 21190
tcamero@mcmaster.ca

Mission Statement:

The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards (SCCS) contributes to the work of Student Affairs by working to create and enhance the ethical environment of the campus community by addressing behavioural expectations for student civility and personal conduct. The SCCS office works collaboratively with students, student groups, staff, faculty and the broader University community to grow the character of McMaster students through the development of campus community standards and the implementation of fair and efficient Student Code of Conduct (SCC), Residence Code of Conduct (RCC) and Athletic Code of Conduct (ACC) processes. Working from a support, accountability and educative perspective the SCCS team contributes to student success by holding students accountable for their behavior and by supporting students as they grow and learn at McMaster.
Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards
2014-2015 Student Code of Conduct Statistics

General Statistics
Number of Students Processed Through the Student Code of Conduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
<th>Number of Students*</th>
<th>Number of Students in Violation</th>
<th>Number of Students Not in Violation</th>
<th>Number of Violations</th>
<th>Number of Violations per Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Total Violations</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Note: Some students were involved in more than one incident. This chart shows the number of students involved regardless of number of incidents or number of violations.

Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCC Hearings</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Conduct Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of Hearings</th>
<th>Peer Conduct Board</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Violation*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Violation**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Violations
#### Breakdown into Specific Major Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Violations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (Alcohol)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Drugs)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (Weapons)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Failure to Comply)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (Fraud)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Vandalism)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (Stealing)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H (Disruptive Behaviour)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I (Physical Violence)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J (Intimidating/Threatening Communication)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (Tampering with Fire/Emergency Equipment)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L (Unauthorized Fires)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Unauthorized use of the University)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (Trespassing)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O (Misuse of Keys)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Pornography)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q (Risk Management)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R (Failure to Complete a Major Sanction)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A breakdown of Minor violations not included in this annual report due to the absence of minor violations this year*
### Number of Violations per Year
#### 2006-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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><em>Major A (Alcohol)</em> Incidents</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Major A (Alcohol)</em> Violations</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major B (Drugs)</strong> Incidents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major B (Drugs)</strong> Violations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Majors and Minors</strong> Incidents</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Majors and Minors</strong> Violations</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Majors and Minors</strong> Students</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All of these incidents involved either drinking/intoxication in public or underage drinking. Of the 34 students involved, 29 received Provincial Offense Notices from Security of $125.**

**These incidents involved 1 or more students sharing a single source of narcotic (i.e. a joint)**

### Number of Graduate Students in Violation
#### 2006-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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><strong>Number of Grad Students</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Students in violation per Faculty

**Full-Time and Part-Time from all Seasonal Sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Students*</th>
<th>Number of Students that Violated the SCC</th>
<th>Percentage of Students that Violated the SCC</th>
<th>Number of Students that Violated the SCC more than Once</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5,133</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>6,062</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>4,609</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity College</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,227</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average = 0.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Institutional Research and Analysis*

### Number of Sanctions Assigned

**Breakdown of Sanctions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction</th>
<th>Number of Students Assigned</th>
<th>Number of Repeat Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Warning only</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Offense Notice (PON)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Sanction</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restitution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour Contract</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Privileges</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG – Persona Non Grata **</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Withdrawal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of repeat offenders total larger than in violations per faculty due to some students having a sanction assigned more than once

** PNG – Persona Non Grata is the designation given to an individual who is denied the privilege of entering specific parts of the University.
## Breakdown of Educational Sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Educational Sanction</th>
<th>Number of Students Referred</th>
<th>Number of Repeat Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Partner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making 1 on 1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making and Essay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Meetings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Management with Essay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management with Essay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay/Reflection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology Letter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Session</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Session</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol 101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC Quiz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate Educational Sanction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Referral Sources for 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referrer</th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Tutorial Assistants and Academic departments
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Prologue

The essence of the mandate given by the Provost to this Task Force, and articulated in the letter from the Deans of the Faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences and Science was to ensure that the three Faculties were well positioned to respond to the changing undergraduate, graduate and research demands of the twenty-first century (see Appendix 1). These three Faculties are contributors to the prominence that McMaster enjoys as one of the top 100 universities in the world according to the 2015 Shanghai Top 300 World Index of Universities, ranked 4th among Canadian universities on that index¹. The research and educational strengths of the three Faculties are therefore critical to sustaining the prominence of McMaster University as a high-ranking world-class university. These strengths underline the importance for the whole university of the mandate that has been entrusted to the Task Force.

McMaster has many strengths upon which to build in responding to the above mandate. As a leading research-intensive university we have an established track record in both highly specialized areas of research, and multidisciplinary research and institutes. We need to ensure that the financial and administrative supports and processes are in place to maintain the performance of the researchers and their teams who are the engines of this success. Regarding pedagogical models, we have been pioneers as demonstrated, for example, in the creation of approaches such as Problem Based Learning, and in the design and educational philosophy of the Arts and Science Program.

Dr. Suzanne Fortier, former president of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and current President of McGill University, recently remarked that the central mission of the university is “how to think, how to make leaps in knowledge, how to have imagination and rigour at the same time.” She further noted that universities will have to prepare students for multiple career changes and a longer working life, a situation that demands of students a “constant reinvention of themselves.” Consequently, Fortier suggests, “we need to prepare them for that world.”² Are we well positioned to facilitate the emergence of “leaps of knowledge” while, at the same time, preserving and reinvigorating ancient or traditional knowledge? Are we well positioned to prepare our students for the constant reinvention of themselves and multiple careers that lie ahead for them? These are questions we will address below, seeking to identify issues or barriers at McMaster that may stand in the way of achieving these objectives, while also highlighting opportunities and potential solutions to these barriers. We will then lay out scenarios of how different structural arrangements may affect the outcomes anticipated from the proposed solutions.

¹ http://www.shanghairanking.com/ARWU2015.html
While our mandate was to focus on the three Faculties, it has become clear that many of the issues and solutions identified in our report are of importance for the entire university.

What should we be offering students?

Student education, in particular undergraduate education, proved to be the most significant problem that emerged from our consultations. In order to best assess the challenges faced by students at McMaster due to structures and programs in our Faculties, along with the dynamic situation described above, the Task Force found it useful to ask what kinds of students we wish to graduate from Humanities, Social Sciences and Science. Which attributes should be cultivated, attributes that indicate whether a student’s time at McMaster has been a success? We believe that all our students should, in one way or another, have acquired certain core competencies, and have been exposed to multiple disciplines in a way that fosters an interdisciplinary awareness. Core competencies must include (but are not limited to) cultural literacy, numeracy, critical thinking skills, a student’s self-awareness of her or his place in our broader society and the world, and the ability to communicate effectively across a number of different media, including writing and speaking. More specifically, some of the qualities and abilities that we believe strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary programming at McMaster should aim to cultivate and instill in our students should include:

- Vibrant intellectual engagement and growth, prioritizing curiosity, creativity, imagination, discipline, and free play of the mind
- A well-rounded, holistic view of the world in its great complexity, and the student’s place in it
- Awareness of local and global communities, the global human condition, and the multiple pressures placed on the planet by natural processes and human practices
- The ability to reflect critically on human values, principles, and ethics from a framework committed to justice, human welfare, and a more equitable view of the world and its future
- Strong interpersonal working skills rooted in empathy and the ability to listen to others
- Strong communication skills
- Collaborative and leadership skills
- The ability to be self-directed when necessary
- Adaptability to multiple careers and roles in our society
- The ability to approach and critically evaluate problems from a variety of viewpoints
- The ability to grasp and assemble information and arguments from a variety of sources, combined with the capacity to engage this material in a critical, yet creative manner
- Firm grounding in a student’s chosen discipline, instilling the knowledge of concepts, approaches, applications, limitations and assumptions necessary to enter fruitfully into the discipline after leaving McMaster
In order to achieve success in graduating such students, the programs we offer must be flexible enough to allow students not only to delve deeply into one discipline, but also to engage a range of disciplines in a way that promotes the core competencies just mentioned, and allows students to explore areas of special interest to them. This requires increased institutional support and encouragement to cross disciplinary and Faculty borders.

Existing impediments to achieving the goals outlined above

The Task Force was charged with identifying structural and programmatic impediments to students achieving these goals while at McMaster, specifically as they exist between the Faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences and Science. Many of these impediments spring from a number of inter-related, systemic issues.

Since well before the activity-based New Budget Model (NBM) was instituted, arguably there has been excessive competition among Faculties, as the Task Force was made aware repeatedly in several interviews with people well positioned to speak on the matter. In one sense, this is entirely natural and to be expected in any environment with limited resources and many competing demands, as in our University. It is beyond the purview of the Task Force to explain the reasons for this excessive competition fully, leading to what many of late call disciplinary ‘silos’, but it surely includes the measurements of success for Faculties and departments established by the University administration in the past. Numbers are counted, spreadsheets are scoured, and this, too, is reasonable and to be expected. However, these metrics have clearly had some calcifying effect on Faculty (and department) structures over time, such that there are high levels of structural, programmatic, and, in the final analysis, individual resistance to collaboration among Faculties and even departments. The important point for our purposes is the many and various ways in which this basic impulse is made manifest to students. Faculties and departments want to hang on to students, who, unbeknownst to them, are seen as basic income units. In interviews with assistant deans, in particular, it became apparent that many small barriers have been set in place over several decades to impede students being able to explore their interests in the University. These barriers may make it difficult for McMaster to maintain its competitiveness at a time when the University is trying to strengthen and consolidate its image as a leading educational institution in Canada. Some of these barriers will be discussed further below.

Enter the NBM. The Task Force heard wildly different evaluations of the model, ranging from absolutely benign to patently malignant. Time will tell which opinion is the more correct, but it may be observed that the most resolute proponents of the model highlighted the way in which Faculties are now given greater encouragement to teach students from other Faculties, because of the 100% tuition payment received for having such students in the class. Consequently, the NBM can be seen as a positive move toward interdisciplinary possibilities for students. It does indeed fix one end of the problem, making a given Faculty keenly interested in getting students from other Faculties to take their courses. What it does not address is the other end of the problem, the fact that any given Faculty will just as decidedly not want to give up those students to the other
Faculties in the first place. Which of these different attitudes one takes toward the NBM might, therefore, depend upon which side of this motivational problem one is highlighting. Ideally, this would not be a problem if student flows were even in both directions, as there would be no significant advantage (or disadvantage) to any given Faculty. It may also be why some administrators are perplexed that more cross-Faculty teaching is not occurring as expected or hoped.

A closely-related issue, with a major impact on student choice and mobility between Faculties and departments, has been a slow creep of program and disciplinary requirements over the decades, and indeed, the very way in which a student’s education and experience at the University is cast within a rigidly disciplinary framework. This lack of freedom is mostly an issue at the undergraduate level but may also affect some graduate programs, especially those that are interdisciplinary in nature and require students to take courses in other Faculties. This lack of mobility appears from the very beginning of a student’s experience at the University, where at the application stage she or he is defined according to a designated Faculty and, in some cases, to a specific discipline. In the case of undergraduate students, the presumed reasoning for keeping them within a discipline/Faculty is the high number of core requirements (and various entry standards) for programs. The result, however, is distressingly a minimal number of inter- or multi-disciplinary course options for our students. Thus, the message to students is set early, and often reinforced along their journey at McMaster: The institution is structured to prevent, not promote, broad learning, cross-Faculty exposure, and the exploration of academic interests. The effect is that a student “belongs” to a tiny slice of the University, and has little – in some cases almost no – opportunity to discover the many wonders of the University while here. All of this actively stifles the necessary goals laid out above, in the first sections of our report.

The impact of Faculty (and department) structures, together with NBM, has also increased disciplinary resistance to creating new interdisciplinary graduate streams. Departments are committed to managing their programs as funds are based on student counts. The current environment provides no incentive in exploring financial costs/benefits for cross-Faculty collaborations, as units are discouraged from committing new resources that do not increase their revenue. All of this may have a negative impact on McMaster in the future, as the province is becoming more selective in supporting graduate programs that are of cutting-edge and innovative in nature.

There are concerns on the research front as well. Much of the research in Science and in some areas of Social Science is carried out by graduate students. With any decline in graduate numbers, which is a concern for the University, research productivity may be negatively impacted. Also, high-quality infrastructure is expensive and requires cost sharing among Faculties to keep them up-to-date and to operate.

A factor that clearly exacerbates the issues laid forth above is the chronic budget problems in all three of the Faculties (even if one is doing better than the other two at present). In the Task
Force’s deliberations, this issue was often connected with discussions of cross-subsidization across other parts of the University. The three Faculties are in an almost constant state of scrambling for sufficient funds, and this amidst a troubling, morale-deflating broader public narrative that views non-profitable disciplines – especially those concentrated in our three Faculties – as second-rate and expendable. It is to be expected, then, that these three Faculties will adopt a “bunker mentality” that seeks to hang on to every possible resource while any sharing of resources is actively discouraged. The predictable result is, again, that students will often be turned back inward to their Faculty when seeking to explore new areas, rather than encouraged to seek out such opportunities. Space is not created for such exploration, and doorways between Faculties, departments, and programs are, on the whole, kept shut or made difficult to pass through.

Proposed solutions

The impediments to the attainment of the qualities and abilities that we believe strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary programming in the three Faculties should aim to cultivate and instill in our students are not insurmountable. The Task Force discussed a number of potential solutions to the issues identified above. The proposed solutions are at the level of programming – developing courses and programs that cross the three Faculties; at the level of institutional structuring – notably in the financial accounting of interdisciplinary courses; and at the level of commitment to the core competencies and interdisciplinarity – on the part of the Provost, Dean(s), professors, and student advisors.

1. Firstly, there needs to be a mechanism to encourage the Faculties to advise or guide students to take courses outside of their home Faculty. This may mean:

   a. Removing the Faculties’ financial ‘penalty’ associated with this activity.

   b. Requiring students to take some courses in Faculties other than their home units to develop breadth and core competencies, e.g. digital or cultural literacy; an understanding of the global and the local.

   c. Lifting, or at the very least re-examining, the prerequisite requirements of many undergraduate courses in each Faculty. Many prerequisites have been introduced as a means of controlling student numbers in courses and not to ensure that students have a particular knowledge or skills base to succeed in the course. The current rigid prerequisite requirements are a serious barrier to interdisciplinary/interfaculty course selections.

2. At the level of undergraduate programming, we are proposing a broad multi-disciplinary first-year experience that crosses the three Faculties. Students would come into an Arts and Science first year, taking courses in each of the three Faculties.
At least some of these courses will have to be designed and taught with the aim of broad multi-disciplinarity in mind, and with an awareness that students enter first year with very different disciplinary backgrounds and abilities. This shared first-year experience is elaborated upon below.

3. In first year of undergraduate studies and beyond there should be a series of interdisciplinary courses that span Faculty interests and do not have specific prerequisites (e.g. Big Questions or thematic courses). These courses would be offered collaboratively among the three Faculties and would build on McMaster’s strong interdisciplinary programs and institutes.

4. Opportunities for interdisciplinary engagement would also be greatly enhanced by allowing students to take ‘Freedom Credit’ courses. This option would allow students to take a specified number of elective courses (outside of their core program) on a pass/fail basis and without an effect on their overall GPA. This would allow students to explore disciplinary areas they are not familiar with without penalty (see Appendix 2). There are a number of Canadian universities that already incorporate ‘Freedom Credits’ in their undergraduate programming (e.g. University of Toronto, McGill, UBC, and York).

5. Undergraduate students would greatly benefit from the introduction of additional ‘interdisciplinary’ programs that bridge all three Faculties and examine relevant and/or current issues of societal importance. These programs would have an interdisciplinary core and would be flexible enough to allow students to explore disciplinary areas of particular interest to them.

6. Another potentially attractive option is to allow students to create, with the assistance and approval of a faculty member or student advisor, a ‘personalized’ interdisciplinary program. With this option, students would identify topical ‘thematic areas’ or ‘threads’ and focus on addressing problems to be solved.

7. In order to allow students to achieve breadth in their programs, we are proposing that departments significantly reduce the number of required discipline-specific undergraduate courses their program students must take for their degrees.

8. At the level of graduate studies, we recommend that departments be offered incentives (monetary or otherwise) to encourage collaboration in student training, course offerings, as well as mounting new interdisciplinary programs including course-based master’s programs.

9. The McMaster website cites interdisciplinarity as a “hallmark of our research centres and institutes … McMaster is home to more than 70 research, centres, and institutes,
most of which are multi- and interdisciplinary in nature and involve faculty and students – both graduate and undergraduate – as they delve deep into research issues across the spectrum.” There needs to be a mechanism to cultivate new opportunities for collaboration among our researchers to live up to this statement. However, due to the highly decentralized nature of research across the university better infrastructure is needed to support interdisciplinary and collaborative research. Financial barriers between Faculties need to be removed to increase the scope for collaborative research.

10. Conscientious governance of the NBM, ensuring that budgeting is guided firmly by broader academic and philosophical goals, and that the budget model does not become ‘the tail wagging the dog’ is key to moving in the right direction. A necessary step may include use of the University Fund for cross-subsidization toward the goal of providing students a holistic, well-rounded education, and other budgetary means by which a Faculty is more amenable to seeing its students take some courses in other Faculties.

We have outlined above some specific scenarios that could help foster the collaborative, student-focused conditions desired among our three Faculties. One exciting possibility discussed at length by the Task Force and captured in item 2 above, namely a first-year program run jointly by the three Faculties, warrants further explanation. While much more work would need to be done on this idea, a common “Arts and Sciences” first year has the potential to create an exceptional first-year experience for students, while at the same time fostering a spirit of collaboration and solidarity among the three Faculties. We can imagine a first-year program that combines a broad introduction to topics of study in the three Faculties, focused especially on instilling core competencies. A student could conceivably come into the University simply as a part of this combined first year, during which they would choose the Faculty in which to specialize over the following three years. This open option would provide a buffering space for students to explore interests and figure out the area in which they would like to major (and/or minor), offering them a carefully-crafted array of courses in helping them toward that end. At the same time, it would not penalize students who are focused from the start; in this case, a student would simply get some needed broad exposure to other disciplines along with the aforementioned focus on core competencies to serve them throughout their time at the University, and before moving into their desired area of specialization in a more dedicated way.

Benefits of this approach would include a valuable opportunity for collaboration among the Faculties and a vision for undergraduate education that is more closely aligned, leading to a heightened sense that the three Faculties are “in something together.” While amalgamation of the three Faculties (see Scenario 2 below) currently presents a dramatic change, something like this common first-year program within the existing structure could provide a lower-stakes test case for possible further movements toward collaboration in the future. An initiative like this could also provide fertile ground for the coordination and combination of efforts among our Faculties in
the areas of student recruitment, promotion, and undergraduate advising in a way that would strengthen each Faculty, and the University. It may, for instance, include dedicating a floor of the new Wilson building to this common first year, with all of the offices just mentioned sharing a common space where students from all three Faculties are encouraged to mingle and find a sense of academic ‘home’. Such a program could add up to a distinctive and innovative first-year student experience that addresses students being ushered too quickly into a narrow educational track at McMaster. It would also serve as a conceptual ‘gateway’ to the three, individual Faculties and perhaps distinguish McMaster from other comparable universities.

Despite the attractiveness of the plan outlined above, there remain obvious challenges that would need to be surmounted. These include the different entrance standards in the three Faculties, the variety of requirements among different programs of study, some being governed by accrediting bodies, and other program differences, such as the level of commitment to the honours (four-year) degree versus the three-year undergraduate degree. To be sure, instituting a plan such as that offered here – or any other plan that calls for significant changes in the relationship among the three Faculties – will entail much further work, a process that may result in yet other exciting possibilities for collaboration.

**Structural considerations**

The vision of a more interdisciplinary collaborative student experience discussed above was strongly advocated by the senior administrators and faculty the Task Force consulted. Agreement on achieving these goals is not enough and will require structural changes. Two scenarios are discussed at some length. The first maintains the three Faculty structure, introduces a Joint Arts and Science Council to facilitate greater cross-Faculty co-operation and encourages the Deans to implement the suggestions listed in previous pages. The second involves a merger of the three Faculties into a single Faculty of Arts and Science. This is the more radical option and it is beyond the mandate of this committee to specify how such a Faculty would be organized or administered. The Task Force viewed the option of merging any two of the three Faculties as the least attractive alternative to the status quo.

The question of which departments are included in which Faculties is, to some extent, a matter of historical accident. For example, History could be viewed as no more at home in Humanities than it would be in Social Sciences; Cognitive Science of Language might be thought to be more naturally at home in the Science Faculty. Similarly, some departments could be organized quite differently in terms of the fields of study that they bring together under the same roof. This subject is evolving and will need to be dealt with regardless of the particular Faculty structure that emerges. It is an issue of relevance to all Faculties at the University and needs to be discussed in a broader mandate than that given to the Task Force.
Scenario 1: Retain the existing three Faculty structure

Given the significant barriers and costs (many of which are not financial) associated with institutional change as significant as the amalgamation of the three Faculties, a prudent approach would be to explore whether the goals and possible solutions outlined above can be achieved within the existing, three-Faculty structure. The main goals would then be to lessen considerably the excessive competition among Faculties (often driven by financial considerations), encourage a turn toward curricular flexibility, re-focus on a set of core competencies to the benefit of students, and generally foster a healthy, positive environment of working together toward common educational goals. In addition, identifying and problem-solving around these positive changes would be an excellent site for collaboration between the three Deans and the Provost. Based on our research, the changes should aim to arrive at a sustainable financial situation for each of the three Faculties, under which each can thrive while retaining the necessary mechanisms for financial accountability.

A motivation for maintaining the three-Faculty structure is the more manageable size of each of these Faculties, keeping intact the ease of collegial interaction thereby enabled and the particular culture and management style developed by each over the years. In contrast, the remoteness that characterizes large amalgamated Faculties is often cited by colleagues as a negative factor of amalgamation. The motivation above, of course, is of itself no reason for projecting immovability as the only future imaginable. The question then is: given the obstacles identified earlier, can the necessary reforms and adjustments take place effectively in the context of the existing structure?

One way of effecting these changes would be to create a Joint Arts and Science Council (JASC) composed of the three Deans plus the Provost. The first items on the agenda of the JASC would be to introduce freedom credits, to oversee the transition to a common first year of study for the three Faculties, and to implement the changes designed to create more course flexibility within all academic programs not constrained by an external certification process. The Provost providing financial incentives to encourage interdisciplinary undergraduate activity could facilitate the work of the JASC. This might include a funding pool that would provide resources to support courses that span more than one Faculty area. Each Faculty could submit proposals to the JASC, which would evaluate their merits and allocate resources from this fund.

Any significant move towards a better-working relationship among the Faculties – be it related to the plan offered here or any other scheme – should have a warming effect that naturally rebounds upon the domains of graduate education and research, in particular cross-Faculty research collaboration. In short, it will help the University create an environment more conducive to research partnerships developing among our three Faculties in a way that is not artificial and enforced from the top, but rather grows up out of common interests and faculty interaction.

Whether or not the move is made to create and empower JASC to deal with the problems and proposed solutions outlined above, it is clear that they do need to be addressed and that some
effective mechanism to address them must be put in place if the three Faculty structure is to remain. Otherwise, existing impediments, fueled by the NBM, will only serve to entrench existing barriers to a healthy environment for students and researchers, most notably the enhanced “silo-ing” we are currently experiencing at McMaster. Failure to adequately address these issues would send a strong signal that the structure is a significant part of the problem and needs to be changed.

Scenario 2: Single amalgamated Faculty of Arts and Science

Another way of achieving these goals is the more radical approach of merging the three Faculties into a single Faculty of Arts and Science\(^3\). What follows is an outline of the possible benefits and risks of an amalgamation of the Faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences and Science.

Benefits

- In an amalgamated Faculty, there will be one Dean who drives the desired changes. Without that single voice (and power), initiatives for change may compete with individual Faculty interests and replicate existing impediments. Instead of three competing Deans, understandably concerned to advance the individual interests of their own Faculties, a Faculty of Arts and Science would have a single administrative team (led by one Dean) with the resources and distributional powers necessary to facilitate and advance the interests of a single body, jointly committed to the educational goals outlined in this Report and with the capacities and powers necessary to drive the various changes we deem necessary for achieving those goals. This view emerged in our discussions with three Senior Administrators who had considerable experience working in combined Arts and Sciences Faculties.

- As would be the case in the previous scenario’s unified first year in Arts and Science, in the area of recruiting, there would no longer be 1) the competition of one Faculty against another; and 2) the confusion for students applying to McMaster over whether they should be in, for instance, a Humanities Faculty or a Social Sciences one. Rather, there would be joint efforts to win the students to McMaster.

- An amalgamated Faculty has the potential to reduce the challenges that exist with current joint programs and the formation of new ones. With barriers taken down between Faculties, students may have better access to courses and programs – and may have greater flexibility in course and program selection.

- An amalgamated Faculty could enhance the possibilities for interdisciplinary teaching. Current arrangements inhibit cross-Faculty teaching at both the undergraduate and

\(^3\)The relationship between the new Faculty of Arts and Science and the existing Arts and Science Program would have to be resolved.
graduate levels, to the detriment of students and instructors alike, and particularly to interdisciplinary programs.

- An amalgamated Faculty could make it easier to develop more effective (and specialized) administrative teams. There could be more consistency in procedures/processes and the quality of administrative support might improve.

- Though feasible within the context of the three-Faculties structure, it may be easier for an amalgamated Faculty to mobilize its legitimate share of Advancement resources in its service by identifying common themes for promotion.

- Having faculty members from a wider range of disciplines meeting together for routine committee work may encourage new collaborations, as they find out what is going on in another discipline. This currently happens not infrequently within individual Faculties as they are now constituted, and could well happen more frequently with even more disciplinary representatives within an amalgamated Faculty. Communication between faculty and staff members in the respective disciplinary areas could be greatly enhanced (through regular meetings, common initiatives etc.).

**The Risks**

As noted earlier, a significant risk of amalgamation is that the benefits of a smaller Faculty structure will be lost: that is, a strong sense of identity, the knowledge of one’s colleagues, access to one’s Dean, the existing morale, based on shared planning and programming (and in some cases, sacrificing). The danger is that the disruption of the change would be detrimental to morale and productivity at all levels. Barriers to a successful amalgamation are a diminished tradition of interdisciplinary education at McMaster and the different financial situation facing the three Faculties at the present time.

- An amalgamated Faculty could create a sense of distance or alienation between faculty members and Administrators, e.g., their Dean. The personal connections faculty members currently have with their Faculty administrators may be diminished or lost in a much larger unit, resulting in less chance for the kind of collegiality essential to the successful functioning of a Faculty. The increased distance and alienation may also extend to inter-Faculty relations.

- There is support for amalgamation in the Faculties of Humanities and Science, particularly at the senior level of administration. However, there is less support for such a move in the Faculty of Social Sciences. Without all three units on board with amalgamation, the dangers inherent in the move are likely to rise to the fore, undermining any hope of achieving the goals identified as essential in this Report.
• For amalgamation to be successful the existing three Faculties need to be placed on a similar sustainable financial footing. All three Faculties are dealing with significant debts and a merger would not resolve the ongoing burden of these debts under the NBM. It would only burden the new Faculty with a very large debt. The three Faculties are facing very different issues regarding the allocation of resources under the activity-based NBM, with two Faculties being held harmless. Any merger at this time could result in a mere transfer of resources among the three Faculties to manage existing funding shortfalls. If this were the case, it would create tension among academic units and could poison the environment for interdisciplinary co-operation.

• There are many differences among the three Faculties that would have to be attended to in any amalgamation: for instance, differing entrance requirements, different ways of assessing scholarship and productivity in CP/M and tenure and promotion cases, and so on. If these differences are not dealt with adequately in a move to amalgamation, the aforementioned tensions will almost certainly derail efforts to achieve the proposed solutions outlined above.

Amalgamation, by itself, is no panacea. Without careful planning and execution, it has the potential to replicate, perhaps even exacerbate, all the barriers to success we see in the current Faculty structures at McMaster. Amalgamation cannot be seen as a solution to either the NBM’s shortcomings, or the public’s limited view of the value of a non-STEM university education. In correspondence with other universities using activity-based budgeting and with a combined Faculty, questions are being raised regarding the application of this funding formula within a Faculty that spans units with significantly different funding needs. Therefore, the University must ensure that the NBM is not the driver of academic decisions.

Scenario 3: Merge two of the three Faculties

If one were to consider a merger of two of the three liberal arts Faculties, the combination that comes to mind most readily is the amalgamation of the Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences into a single Faculty of Arts. This would be a return to the structure that was in place in the late 1960s – some older current faculty will have been hired when Dr. E. Togo Salmon served as Vice-President, Faculty of Arts. The Task Force sensed no enthusiasm for a return to this structure emanating from either of these two Faculties.

Although there are programs such as Psychology that suggest an amalgamation of Science and Social Science would be beneficial, and research such as that conducted in Linguistics and Languages or Multi Media that suggest linking Humanities and Science would work, the Task Force did not consider either of these combinations of Faculties to be viable. Any combination of two Faculties would sacrifice the advantages of the present three Faculties with their established identities and collegial relationships enabled by their relatively small size on the one hand and the
potential advantages of better-coordinated Faculty, financial and administrative support resources of an amalgamated Faculty of Arts and Science on the other.

Conclusion

The Task Force envisages its report as part of the university's response to the challenge laid down in FWT: The Next Phase “to reimagine programs and processes, to reconsider pedagogical techniques, develop interdisciplinary partnerships and collaborations, and further extend McMaster’s connections with the local and global communities that we serve.” It has highlighted solutions and opportunities aimed at enhancing the learning environment for students and removing barriers, both perceived and real, to interdisciplinary and cross-Faculty collaboration in teaching, research and administrative services in the context of the three Faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences and Science.

The Task Force is aware that some of the issues it has identified, for example the crucial importance of ensuring that students graduate with both strong disciplinary knowledge and core competencies, the prioritizing of academically based decision making and university-wide cross-subsidization in the implementation of the NBM, or the strategic valorizing of the liberal arts in a public climate that devalorizes non-professional fields of study, transcend the three Faculties and involve the engagement of the university at large. It is also clear that structural or other changes to current practices may eventually have governance implications that come under Joint Agreements between the University Administration and MUFA.

The Task Force has sought input from key leaders and groups in developing its report (see Appendix 3). We believe that any change, if it is to be embraced, must engage those affected by the changes in debating the issues under consideration. A well-informed move toward any of the solutions proposed above will require further research and thoughtful deliberation, especially through further consultation with the relevant stakeholders across the University. It is in this spirit that we present our report in the hope that it will be subjected to scrutiny and that processes will be put in place for the implementation of those elements of the report that are found to effectively advance the McMaster Principles outlined by President Deane and the strategic goals of McMaster University.
May 11, 2015

Dear Members of the Communities of the Faculties of Humanities, Science, and Social Sciences

Changes in leadership within a particular Faculty often result in some reflection on the road ahead. That reflection understandably focuses on the opportunities and challenges facing that particular Faculty, albeit in the context of the university as a whole, and the community beyond. The Deans of the Faculties of Humanities, Science, and Social Sciences would like to take the opportunity to broaden the discussion, following the change in leadership that has taken place in the first two of those faculties, and the change that will be taking place in the third.

The twenty-first century already has generated a number of opportunities and challenges for the modern research university. New technologies and globalized practices have disrupted the ways in which ideas are created, tested, applied, reformulated and passed on to the next generation. Much research and innovation—and therefore teaching—is being generated through collaboration among faculty members coming from very different disciplinary perspectives. There are exciting new opportunities for growth, and as Deans we want to ensure that our Faculties are best positioned to seize those new opportunities and respond to the changing undergraduate, graduate and research demands of the twenty-first century.

The three Faculties in question share certain characteristics. Most of our undergraduate programs are not subject to accreditation and are not designed to prepare students for a particular professional designation. Instead, we equip our students with a body of knowledge and various capabilities designed to help them better understand and engage with the world around them. We help them develop transferable skills that give them the flexibility to thrive in a competitive job market, or move on to post-graduate or professional education programs. Wherever possible, we interweave the development of skills—whether they be analytical or communication skills—with topics and subjects that they readily embrace. For the most part, we invite our students to explore a range of disciplines and topics in their first year, so that they can find those areas that suit their particular interests and talents. Even as our students identify with particular disciplines in their upper years, our Faculties continue to emphasize the importance of a broad and comprehensive university education.

Our three Faculties contribute to McMaster’s mission by seeking to integrate research and teaching. We want our undergraduate and graduate students to encounter and learn from active researchers and scholars. We seek to expose students to leading edge developments and engage them in inquiry-based approaches to learning. Offering a comprehensive education, therefore, means sustaining a comprehensive research enterprise in our Faculties. We cannot support core areas of McMaster’s teaching without also being strong research units. We know the most valuable experiences for our students involve sharing in discovery with exceptional and active researchers.

In light of these and other common characteristics, the three Deans and the Provost have agreed to strike a small task force to review all three of our Faculties, to ensure that we have the institutional policies, practices and structures that will enable our faculty researchers and undergraduate and graduate students to thrive, and to engage in new and exciting research and educational collaborations.
Specifically, we would like the task force to consider the following challenges:

1. Are we well positioned to ensure that our students (whether undergraduate or graduate) are exposed to excellence in new fields of knowledge in a high quality, personalized, engaging and comprehensive educational experience? Are we providing our students with the best mix of transferrable skills?
2. Are we well positioned to cultivate new opportunities for collaboration among our researchers and among our students?
3. Are we well positioned to ensure that our resources are focused most effectively on sustaining our key research and educational goals?
4. Are there barriers – either perceived or real – to the ability of our faculty members to develop or our students to achieve our collective research and educational goals?

Where the task force concludes that we are not well positioned to meet some of our goals, or where there may be barriers to be overcome, we would invite them to consider the following questions:

1. Are there institutional policies or practices, either within or between the Faculties, or at the wider university that could be or need to be changed to achieve the above stated goals?
2. Are there institutional or organizational structures at the university that need to be significantly changed? Specifically, would we be better positioned to achieve our goals by reorganizing two or all three of our Faculties?
3. Are there other ways to support the development of new collaborative programs, courses or research units that transcend disciplines or Faculties?

We do not believe that any of these questions can be considered by one of our Faculties on its own, and that is why we have proposed the creation of a task force with representatives from all three Faculties. We encourage them to consult widely, with faculty, students, and staff, both within and outside the Faculties.

We believe that the recent or imminent changes in leadership in our three Faculties provides a good opportunity for wide ranging review of our institutional practices and structures, with a focus on ensuring that we are well positioned as a university to support the educational and research challenges of the twenty-first century.

Robert Baker
Dean, Faculty of Science

Ken Cruikshank
Dean, Faculty of Humanities

Charlotte Yates
Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
APPENDIX 2

FREEDOM CREDIT BRIEF
January 19, 2016

Prepared For:
Provost’s Task Force on Future Directions of Faculties - Humanities, Social Sciences and Science

The Freedom Credit allows undergraduate students to take an undergraduate elective course on a “Pass/Fail” basis. This model exists in many American and several Canadian universities as a means of promoting exploratory and interdisciplinary learning. Each institution implements this grading option in a manner that suits them; commonalities include:

i. Courses eligible for Freedom Credit are the equivalent of a 3-unit McMaster course;

ii. The Freedom Credit must be outside the student’s core program requirements;

iii. There are a maximum number of courses that may be taken throughout an undergraduate degree; it is often a maximum of four courses with term-based caps (ex. maximum one per term);

iv. Students may need to be in good academic standing (as determined by each institution);

v. Programs, departments, and Faculties are able to implement exceptions to this option;

vi. Students are always informed of the implications of having a course assessed on a pass/fail basis (ex. award/scholarship eligibility; graduate/professional school applications, etc).

Freedom Credit in Canada
Currently, variations of the Freedom Credit can be found at the University of Toronto, the University of British Columbia, York University and McGill University.

- The University of Toronto’s Faculty of Arts and Science have allowed their students to use a pass/fail option since 2008 - when this option started as pilot. Administration of the university have stated that this implementation was met with positive reviews from both faculty and students.

- The University of British Columbia implemented a ‘pass/fail’ option in 2010 following endorsements from both the students’ union and the university’s senate. Implementation was met with wide success.
• In September of 2014, the University of Prince Edward Island publicly announced that they would begin the process of investigating the implementation of “freedom credits” - a term coined during discussion on our [McMaster’s] campus.

All institutions that implement a ‘pass/fail’ grading option state that this option allows students to take an interdisciplinary approach to their education by broadening their course selection. For example:

• The University of Toronto’s registrar website states: “The pass/fail option was created to encourage you to expand your possible course choices to areas where you think you have interest, but may not be confident about how well you will do.”

• The University of British Columbia states: “The Credit/D/Fail (Cr/D/F) grading policy was created to 1) Encourage students’ exploration of subject matter outside their program of study 2) Emphasize learning and academic exploration of the new and unfamiliar 3) Expose students to a broader-based curriculum.”

**Recommendations**

i. Implement a pilot at McMaster to allow undergraduate students to take a Freedom Credit course (a suggested length could be two years, as this was done by the University of British Columbia)

ii. That this pilot start with the Faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences and Science as a means for students within these three Faculties to be exposed to new curriculum that they otherwise may never be exposed to and to better strengthen the interdisciplinary connections between the Arts and Sciences

iii. That a study be conducted during the pilot period to measure the value and experiences of both students and faculty. The resulting findings can be used to inform recommendations for more widespread/ permanent implementation of the Freedom Credit at McMaster; or withdrawal.

- by Brodka & Narro Perez, 2016
APPENDIX 3

In the course of its deliberations the Task Force or a subset of the taskforce consulted the following key leaders or groups on issues related to its mandate:

Charlotte Yates, then outgoing Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Roy Cain, then Acting Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Jeremiah Hurley, Incoming Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Ken Cruikshank, Dean, Faculty of Humanities
Robert Baker, Dean, Faculty of Science
Patrick Deane, President, McMaster University
Douglas Welch, Acting Associate Vice-President and Dean, School of Graduate Studies
Linda Coslovi, Executive Director, Finance and Planning (Academic)
Allison Sekuler, Acting Vice President, Research
Susan Searls Giroux, Associate Vice-President, Faculty
Alan Harrison, Provost, Queen’s University
Dean’s Advisory Council, Faculty of Humanities
Chairs & Directors, Faculty of Social Sciences
Humanities Faculty meeting
Assistant Deans, Faculties of Humanities, Social Sciences and Science
Jacob Brodka, Research Assistant & Rodrigo Narro Perez, former MSU Vice-Presidents
Representatives of OCUFA Committee on Activity Based Budgeting
Members of MUFA Executive Committee

Submissions also received from:

Education Advisory Board
5 Past MUFA Presidents