McMaster University

SENATE MINUTES

Wednesday, October 12, 2016 at 3:30 p.m.
In the Council Room (111), Gilmour Hall

PRESENT: Dr. Patrick Deane (Chair), Dr. Catherine Anderson, Dr. Vishwanath Baba, Dr. Mark Boda, Dr. Lorraine Carter, Dr. Philippa Carter, Dr. Narat Charupat, Mr. Roger Couldrey, Dr. Ken Cruikshank, Dr. Carlos Filipe, Dr. Michele George, Dr. Meridith Griffin, Mr. Mitchell Hajnal, Dr. Janice Hladki, Dr. Alison Holloway, Dr. Jerry Hurley, Ms Rebecca Jamieson, Ms Beth Manganelli Staite, Dr. Bruce Milliken, Mr. Sid Nath, Mr. Alexander Nielsen, Dr. Paul O’Byrne, Dr. Dorothy Pawluch, Dr. Stan Porter, Dr. Ishwar Puri, Dr. Christine Quail, Dr. Jonathan Schertzer, Dr. Spencer Smith, Dr. Lehana Thabane, Mr. Philip Tominac, Dr. Matt Valerio, Dr. Brenda Vrkljan, Dr. Patricia Wakefield, Dr. Doug Welch, Dr. David Wilkinson, Ms Mary Williams, Ms Helen Ayre (Secretary of the Senate), Susan Welstead (Assistant University Secretary)

OBSERVERS: Ms Carolyn Brendon, Ms Esme Davies, Ms Andrea Farquhar, Dr. Martin Horn, Mr. Justin Monaco-Barnes, Ms Melissa Pool, Mr. Sean Van Koughnett

REGRETS RECEIVED: Ms Leah Allan, Mr. Jacob Bailey, Dr. Robert Baker, Dr. Sigal Balshine, Dr. Lee Beach, Dr. Lori Campbell, Dr. David Clark, Mr. Ken Clarke, Dr. Susan Denburg, Dr. David Earn, Dr. Sheila Harms, Dr. Shafiqul Huque, Dr. Violetta Igeski, Dr. Suzanne Labarge, Dr. Jacy Lee, Dr. Colleen McKey, Dr. Petra Rethmann, Dr. Susan Searls Giroux, Dr. Ravi Selvaganapathy, Ms Moira Taylor, Mr. Peter Tice, Dr. Leonard Waverman, Dr. Jean Wilson

A. OPEN SESSION

OPENING REMARKS (Appendix A)

Dr. Deane noted that the next Senate meeting, on October 12, would feature a talk by Dr. Robert Baker, the Vice-President (Research), on his vision for the future of research at McMaster, which would start at 3 p.m. and would be open to all members of the University community in addition to Senators and observers. The regular meeting would then follow at 3:30 p.m.

After the meeting, there would be a reception for Senate members and observers in the Great Hall of the University Club as an opportunity to become better acquainted and also as a gesture of gratitude for their service.
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 October 12, 2016 and that items II to IV 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 September 14, 2016 be approved as circulated

Approved by Consent

III BUSINESS ARISING

a. Committee on Appointments (Appendix B)

i. Proposed Revisions to SPS C1, “Research Leave Policy -- Tenured and CAWAR Faculty,” and SPS C2, “Research Leave Policy – Permanent Faculty”

Motion:

that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, revisions to SPS C1, “Research Leave Policy -- Tenured and CAWAR Faculty,” and revisions to SPS C2, “Research Leave Policy -- Permanent Faculty,” as detailed in Appendix B

The motion was carried.

IV REPORTS FROM COUNCILS

a. Graduate Council (Appendix C)

i. New Bursaries and Scholarships
Senate received the above-listed report for information, by Consent.

b. Undergraduate Council (Appendix D)

i. Terms of Awards

Senate received the above-listed report for information, by Consent.

REGULAR

V ENQUIRIES

There were no enquiries.

VI COMMUNICATIONS

Senate had received no communications since the last meeting which were not dealt with elsewhere on the agenda.

VII REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

a. Executive Committee (Appendix E)

i. Annual Report on Petitions to Remove Transcript Notations

Senate received the above-listed report for information.


Because recent revisions to the Academic Integrity Policy resulted in a significant reduction in petitions to remove transcript notations, the Executive Committee was recommending that Senate dispense with the need for a report on this specific issue and instead have the number of petitions included in the annual report from the Academic Integrity Office.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the inclusion of a report on petitions to remove transcript notations in the annual report of the Office of Academic Integrity.”

The motion was carried.

iii. Recommendation to Terminate the Faculty of Theology

Dr. Deane reviewed for Senators the rationale for recommending the closure of the Faculty of Theology included in Appendix E.
It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the termination of the Faculty of Theology, effective December 31, 2016.”

Dr. Porter, the Principal of Divinity College, said he would like to speak against the motion in two ways, first in terms of the history of the University and the legacy of Senator McMaster, and second in terms of the procedural approach being taken.

Dr. Porter said it was true that Dr. Gilmour created the Faculty of Theology in 1956-57, but it was intended that it would have the same role as the Faculty of Divinity had had since the University’s beginning. He said the Faculty of Theology was the core and centre of what McMaster really was and represented the heart of what Senator McMaster intended with his endowment.

Dr. Porter then questioned the procedural approach being used to make this decision. There had been no consultation with members of the Faculty of Theology and, they, like the rest of the members of Senate, received notice that this closure was being proposed only at 5:30 p.m. the Thursday before the meeting, or, in other words, only two working days in advance of the Senate meeting. He asked Senators to imagine finding out that their Department or Faculty was facing closure in this manner.

Dr. Porter said he would like to make a motion to postpone a vote on the closure of the Faculty for three months, during which time a committee including members of the Faculty of Theology would be established to review this proposal.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate postpone action on the proposal to terminate the Faculty of Theology for three months, and that a committee which included members of the Faculty of Theology be established to review the proposal.”

Dr. Deane stepped out of the chair and asked Dr. Wilkinson, the Vice-Chair of Senate, to assume the chair.

Since the motion was not debatable, Dr. Wilkinson called the question.

The motion was defeated, with 11 votes in favour, 22 votes against, and 1 abstention.

Returning to the main motion, a member asked what relationship the members of the Faculty of Theology had with the University if they were appointed by the Senate but did not actually work for McMaster.

Dr. Deane explained that the original cohort for which the shell Faculty was created had long since retired. The people who were now appointed to the Faculty of Theology had those
appointments approved by the Senate, but the Senate otherwise had no oversight or involvement in their academic careers. Senate had nothing to do with the hiring of the individuals, did not review them for tenure or promotion, and was not able to extend to them the normal academic freedoms that were enjoyed by faculty members in other Faculties.

Dr. Deane further commented that the termination of the Faculty of Theology would have no impact on the current affiliation with Divinity College. As had been noted in the recommendation from the Executive Committee, the only practical effect would be the loss of the Faculty of Theology seat on the Senate, and the expiration of the three appointments to the Faculty.

Members then voted on the main motion, which was carried, with 27 votes in favour, 2 votes against, and 4 abstentions.

Dr. Deane then resumed the chair.

b. University Planning Committee (Appendix F)

i. Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference for the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging

Dr. Wilkinson explained that the University Planning Committee had approved a proposal to revise the structure and function of the Institute for Research on Aging. The most significant change was the development of the Institute as a structure that would oversee the work of a number of embedded research centres, along with the introduction of an Executive Committee, which was intended to provide insight and advice to the scientific and managing directors regarding operational and strategic priorities of the Institute and the associated centres that fell under the Institute's governance.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve revisions to the structure and function of the Institute for Research on Aging as set out in Attachment I (ii) of Appendix F."

The motion was carried.

ii. Proposal to Establish a Centre for Mobility in Aging

Dr. Wilkinson explained that the University Planning Committee had approved the establishment of a Centre for Mobility on Aging as the first centre to be created under the umbrella of the Institute for Research on Aging. This premier research and knowledge generation hub was intended to bring together researchers from all six Faculties to achieve integrated, human-centred solutions to mobility challenges of older people through a unique research platform.

It was duly moved and seconded,
“that the Senate approve the establishment of the Centre for Mobility in Aging as set out in Attachment I (iii) of Appendix F.”

The motion was carried.

c. Committee on Appointments (Appendix G)

i. Proposal to Establish the Position Associate Vice-President (Equity and Inclusion)

Dr. VrkJan explained that the Committee on Appointments had approved a recommendation from the Provost for the establishment of the new position of Associate Vice-President (Equity and Inclusion). It was the Provost’s intention to ask the selection committee established for this position to draw up terms of reference and to submit these for approval at a later date.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the position Associate Vice-President (Equity and Inclusion), with terms of reference to be determined at a later date, effective October 20, 2016.”

The motion was carried.

ii. Proposal to Establish the Title “Vice-Provost”

Dr. VrkJan explained that the Committee on Appointments had approved a request from the Provost to recommend changes to the titles of a number of academic administrators who report to the Provost. The change in title would apply only to academic Associate Vice-President positions and would take effect on July 1, 2017 with the appointment of the new Provost.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the following changes of title:
‘Associate Vice-President (Faculty)’ becoming ‘Vice-Provost (Faculty)’
‘Associate Vice-President (Teaching and Learning)’ becoming ‘Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)’
‘Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies’ becoming ‘Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies’
‘Associate Vice-President (International Affairs)’ becoming ‘Vice-Provost (International Affairs)’
effective July 1, 2017.”
A member said he was not sure why these titles were being changed, and why only some of the Associate Vice-President titles would change.

Dr. Wilkinson said it had been his wish for some time to make this relatively minor revision to these titles in order to clarify the provostial reporting line, and he also preferred the distinction between academic and staff positions. He furthermore pointed out that the title was becoming the norm at larger post-secondary institutions. The cohort of senior officers whose portfolio was International Affairs, for example, was mostly Vice-Provosts, rather than Associate Vice-Presidents.

A member asked if the newly created Associate Vice-President (Equity and Inclusion) would be designated a Vice-Provost with the others and Dr. Wilkinson confirmed that it would.

The motion was then voted on and carried.

VIII OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business in Open Session.

In Closed Session, Senate:

a. approved the Closed Session portion of the minutes of the meeting of September 14, 2016;

b. approved, on recommendation of the Committee on Appointments, the addition of a member to the Selection Committee for a Dean of Science, so that the composition of the committee would be as follows:

Dr. David Wilkinson (Chair)  Provost and Vice-President (Academic)
Dr. Robert Baker            Vice-President (Research) (ex officio
Dr. Laurel Trainor          Professor, Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour
Dr. Bruce Gaulin            Professor, Physics and Astronomy
Dr. Megumi Harada           Associate Professor, Mathematics and Statistics
Dr. Audrey Hicks            Professor, Kinesiology
Dr. Harald Stöver           Professor, Chemistry and Chemical Biology
Dr. Ian Dworkin             Assistant Professor, Biology
Dr. Carolyn Eyles           Professor, Interdisciplinary Science
Dr. Bruce Newbold           Professor, Geography and Earth Sciences
Dr. Chad Harvey             Assistant Professor, Integrated Science Program
Dr. Karen Mossman           Professor and Chair, Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences
Mr. Rodrigo Narro Perez      Integrated Science Program student
Ms Lauren Skelly             PhD candidate, Kinesiology
Ms Joanne Smith             Assistant Dean (Studies), Faculty of Science;
c. approved, on recommendation of the Executive Committee, nominations to fill vacancies on the Committee on Appointments, the Committee on Student Affairs, the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment, and Undergraduate Council;

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

- a Director of the Offord Centre for Child Studies for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019;
- co-Directors of the Biomedical Engineering Graduate Program for a five-year term effective July 1, 2016;
- a Program Chair for Automotive and Vehicle Technology, School of Engineering Practice and Technology, for a three-year term effective July 1, 2016;
- a Program Chair for the Manufacturing Engineering Technology Degree Completion Program, School of Engineering Practice and Technology for a three-year term effective July 1, 2016;
- an Acting Director of the Centre for the Promotion of Accounting Education and Research for the period July 1 to December 31, 2016;
- an Acting Co-Director of the Master in Health Management Program for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017;
- a McLaughlin Foundation Professor in Population and Public Health for a five-year term effective July 1, 2016; and
- Canada Research Chair nominations and renewals for the October 2016 competition;

e. received from the Committee on Appointments, for information, reports on the following appointment decisions:

- an Acting Chair of the Department of Engineering Physics for the period September 1 to December 31, 2016;
- an Acting Director of the BioInterfaces Institute for the period July 1 to October 31, 2016;
- an Associate Chair (Graduate) in the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017;
- an Associate Chair (Research) in the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017;
- an Associate Chair (Undergraduate) in the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017;
- an Associate Chair (Undergraduate) in the Department of Biology for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018;
- an Associate Chair (Graduate) in the Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017;
- an Associate Chair (Undergraduate) in the Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour for a three-year term, effective July 1, 2016;
- an Associate Director (Undergraduate) in the School of Engineering Practice and
Technology for a three-year term, effective July 1, 2016; 
• an Associate Director (Graduate) in the School of Engineering Practice and Technology for a three-year term, effective July 1, 2016; 
• an Acting Associate Chair (Undergraduate) in the Department of Engineering Physics for the period September 1 to December 31, 2016; and 
• an Acting Associate Director of the BioInterfaces Institute for the period July 1 to October 31, 2016;

f. approved, on recommendation of the Committee on Appointments, the composition of a Selection Committee for an Associate Vice-President (Equity and Inclusion), as follows:

Dr. David Wilkinson (Chair) Provost and Vice-President (Academic)  
Dr. Susan Searls-Giroux Associate Vice-President, Faculty  
Prof. Mandeep Malik Assistant Professor, Faculty of Business  
Dr. Vanessa Watts-Powless Acting Academic Director, Indigenous Studies  
Dr. Juliet Daniel Professor, Department of Biology  
Dr. Mark Walton Professor, Department of Surgery  
Dr. Ishwar Puri Dean, Faculty of Engineering  
Dr. Ameil Joseph Assistant Professor, School of Social Work  
Ms Wanda McKenna Assistant Vice-President and Chief Human Resources Officer, Human Resources Services  
Ms Anne Pottier Associate University Librarian, Library Services  
Ms Vilma Rossi Senior Program Manager, Equity and Inclusion Office  
Ms Shylo Elmayan Employment Equity Specialist  
Mr. Ryan Deshpande Director, McMaster Students Union Diversity Services;

g. received, for information, a report from an ad hoc Faculty Appeal Tribunal; and

h. approved two requests for early graduation.
NOTES – OPENING REMARKS TO SENATE – OCTOBER 12, 2016

1) NEW STUDENT SENATOR – Ms Katilyn Laslo, Faculty of Humanities

2) POST-SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS STRATEGIC INVESTMENT FUND

As Senators will have seen from the recent public announcement, the federal and provincial governments are investing $43 million in the Arthur Bourns Building project, a $75-million project in total, which includes lab upgrades and retrofitted and improved infrastructure to provide enhanced research facilities for researchers in the Faculties of Science and Engineering. This is also an energy co-generation project.

3) COU ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Council of Ontario Universities has launched an initiative called “Creating Conversation for a Better Future,” which is intended to engage Ontarians in a discussion of the value of post-secondary education and of universities, through surveys, roundtables, social media, and similar outreach. Once feedback has been gathered, a strategy will be developed to ensure that universities are seen as essential partners in achieving a positive future for Ontario.

4) PRESENTATION ON RESEARCH

Immediately prior to the next Senate meeting on November 9, beginning at 3 p.m., the Vice-President (Research), Dr. Rob Baker, will give a presentation on the current state of and future prospects for research at McMaster. The presentation is open to all and Senators are particularly welcome and encouraged to attend. The presentation will be finished by 3:30 p.m. so that the Senate meeting can start promptly at that time.

5) RECEPTION FOR SENATORS

The annual Senate Reception will follow the November 9 meeting, in the Great Hall of the University Club. All are welcome and encouraged to attend.
REPORT TO SENATE
FROM THE
COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS

Open Session (Business Arising, Consent Agenda)

i. Proposed Revisions to SPS C1, “Research Leave Policy -- Tenured and CAWAR Faculty,” and SPS C2, “Research Leave Policy -- Permanent Faculty”

At the June 8, 2016 meeting, Senate approved revisions to the two Research Leave policies that are part of the McMaster University Revised Policy and Regulations With Respect to Academic Appointment, Tenure and Promotion (2012), as recommended by members of the administration and the Faculty Association Executive.

The revisions included two new appendices that clarify (a) the impact on the timing of future leaves when a deferral occurs and (b) the process to be followed when a faculty member wishes to appeal a denial of research leave.

It was subsequently observed by some stakeholders that the timing stipulated in Appendix B of the policies (the procedures for appealing a denial of Research Leave), was somewhat tight. It is being suggested that the 10 days allowed for communication between the Dean and the Research Leaves Committee and then for communication to the faculty member be extended to 15 days (see reverse).

This revision has been approved by the Committee on Appointments and is now being presented to Senate for approval and recommendation to the Board.

Motion:
“that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, revisions to SPS C1, Research Leave Policy -- Tenured and CAWAR Faculty, and revisions to SPS C2, Research Leave Policy -- Permanent Faculty, as detailed in the report from the Committee on Appointments.”

Senate: For Approval
October 12, 2016
APPENDIX B – APPEAL OF DENIAL OF RESEARCH LEAVE

A faculty member shall be entitled to appeal a Research Leave decision only if she/he has satisfied the service requirement for eligibility set out in Section II of this policy.

A faculty member who has been denied a Research Leave and wishes to appeal this decision should first request, within 20 business days of the denial of the leave, a meeting with the Faculty Dean for an informal review of the decision. The Dean will convey the concerns of the faculty member, along with a recommendation as to whether the original decision to deny leave should be overturned, to the Research Leaves Committee. The Research Leaves Committee decision will be conveyed to the faculty member within 15 business days of the meeting between the faculty member and Faculty Dean.

If, after such consultations, the member remains dissatisfied and wishes to appeal the decision of the Research Leaves Committee, she/he may ask the Vice-President (Research) to appoint a Review Committee to review the decision. Such a request shall be submitted within 10 business days from the date of the letter communicating the decision of the Research Leaves Committee to uphold the denial, and must include a written statement on why the decision should be overturned, along with a copy of the original Leave Application and the decision letter.

The Review Committee shall consist of the Vice-President (Research), who will serve as Chair, and two faculty members, normally from the same Faculty but not the same department as the faculty member requesting the review. The two faculty members, one of whom may be a Chair or former Chair, will be appointed by the Vice-President (Research) in consultation with the faculty member requesting the review. The decision of the Review Committee, which should be communicated in writing to the faculty member within 30 business days of the initial request to the Vice-President (Research), shall be final.
September 29th, 2016

To : Senate

From : Christina Bryce
Assistant Graduate Secretary

Re : Report from Graduate Council

At its meeting on September 20th Graduate Council approved and now reports the following to Senate:

NEW BURSARIES AND SCHOLARSHIPS

Bursaries

The Zonta Club of Hamilton 1, Frances Colter Memorial Bursary
Established in 2016 by members of the Zonta Club of Hamilton 1 in memory and recognition of dedicated member and supporter of our club, Fran Colter, who was a pioneer in the field of physiotherapy at Chedoke Hospital, Hamilton. To be awarded by the School of Graduate studies to students enrolled in the School of Rehabilitation Science Physiotherapy program who demonstrates financial need. Preference to be given to female students.

The Dr. Susan E. French Nursing Bursary
Established in 2016 by Dr. Susan French (Class of ’02). To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies to full time students enrolled in the graduate nursing program who demonstrate financial need.

Scholarships

The Betty Gourlay Award for Excellence
Established in 2016 by Ms. Betty Gourlay, a practicing nurse for over 40 years. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies to a full-time student in the School of Nursing Graduate
Program who, on the recommendation of the School of Nursing, has demonstrated excellence in academic achievement. Funds to be used by recipients to defer costs related to attendance at and/or participation in professional conferences or learning opportunities.

The Bernhard Banashewski Ontario Graduate Scholarship
The Bernhard Banashewski Ontario Graduate Scholarship was established in 2016 by Dr. Paul C. S. Lin (Class of 1965) to contribute to the funding of Ontario Graduate Scholarships at McMaster University. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies to a full time student studying in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics.

The McMaster Immunology Research Centre Faculty Ontario Graduate Scholarship (formerly The MIRC Faculty Scholarship)
Established in 2011 by faculty members within the McMaster Immunology Research Centre to contribute funding of the Ontario Graduate Scholarship programs in support of graduate students. To be awarded annually by the School of Graduate Studies, to an outstanding full time M.Sc. or Ph.D. candidate. First preference will be given to a candidate supervised by a graduate faculty supervisor from the McMaster Immunology Research Centre. Second preference will be given to an applicant in the infection and immunity field.

Senate: October 12, 2016
For Information
REPORT TO SENATE
FROM
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

I Terms of Award
At its meeting of September 13, 2016, the Undergraduate Council approved: i) terms of award for three new awards; ii) changes to three terms of award; iii) three new bursaries, iv) changes to one terms of bursary, v) nine awards removed from the Undergraduate Calendar, and vi) two awards added to the Undergraduate Calendar that had previously been removed.

(i) Terms of Award for New Awards
The Coco Family Scholarship
The Pat Fitzhenry Nursing Academic Grant
The McLean Family Academic Grants

(ii) Changes to Terms of Award
The Air Liquide Canada Bachelor of Engineering Scholarship
The Air Liquide Canada Bachelor of Technology Scholarship
The PwC Canada Scholarships

(iii) New Bursaries
The Hadrian Manufacturing Inc. Bursary
The Huque Family Bursary
The McMaster MD Class of 2016 Bursary

(iv) Changes to Terms of Bursary
The Matthews Hall Bursary

(v) Awards Removed from the Undergraduate Calendar
The Ambassador of Spain Book Prize
The Canheit 2011 Nature of Technology Scholarship
The Marc Kirouac Memorial Scholarship
The Labour Studies Class of '97 Legacy Bursary
The Science Class of '97 Legacy Bursary
The Dr. Ian Spenser Bursary
The Judith Sternthal Bursary
The Sara Wilkinson Spirit Bursary
The 3M Canada Inc. Bursaries
(vi) Awards Added to Undergraduate Calendar
   The Canadian Italian Business and Professional Association of Hamilton-Halton
   Scholarship in Italian Studies
   Thomas Truman Memorial Bursary

II Award Value Changes
   At the same meeting, Undergraduate Council received, for information, one award value change.

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

Senate: October 12, 2016
For Information
REPORT TO SENATE
FROM THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Open Session

i. Annual Report on Petitions to Remove Transcript Notations (for information)

The annual report on petitions to remove notations from transcripts dealt with by the Executive Committee is contained in Attachment I.


The Executive Committee noted that, since Senate had approved the automatic removal of “Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty” notations, the number of petitions to remove transcript notations coming before the Committee has dropped substantially. Now only notations about suspension or expulsion require a petition for removal, and the Executive Committee is receiving only one such petition per year. It therefore seems more practical to include this statistic in the annual report of the Office of Academic Integrity, since that report contains data on the number of cases per year, the number of automatic removals of transcript notations, and similar information.

The Executive Committee would continue to report on individual requests for the removal of notations for suspension or expulsion since the Committee brings any such requests that it supports forward to Senate for approval.

Motion:

“that the Senate approve the inclusion of a report on petitions to remove transcript notations in the annual report of the Office of Academic Integrity.”

iii. Recommendation to Terminate the Faculty of Theology

A rationale for terminating the Faculty of Theology is set out in Attachment II.

Motion:

“that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the termination of the Faculty of Theology, effective December 31, 2016.”
# Transcript Notation Removal Requests – Summary (Sept 2011 to Apr 2016)

*Denotes cases in which student has submitted more than one transcript notation removal petition.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of petition (Senate Exec meeting)</th>
<th>Date of charge</th>
<th>Date of penalty</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
<th>2nd Offense?</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Sept. 28, 2011</td>
<td>March 27, 2008</td>
<td>T2 2008</td>
<td>F in course</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Approved†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st offense in April 2006; plagiarism -submitted assignment largely copied from internet, received mark of zero on assignment. 2nd offence, submitted assignment answer copied from Instructor’s Manual for textbook, which contained an error, to make it appear software necessary to answer the question had been used, in a capstone course. Student appealed unsuccessfully on the grounds that 1st offence was “not plagiarism” and hearing was “unfair,” and penalty for 2nd offense was too harsh.

†Senate Executive Committee’s decision to grant the petition was defeated at Senate (Oct 12, 2011).


Caught with cheat sheet while writing deferred exam.

| 25 Feb 27, 2013 | April 28, 2009 | May 27, 2009 | 0 on final exam and F in course | No | Approved |

Changed date on medical documentation submitted to defer exams in two courses. Legitimate medical documentation covered exam for one of the courses, but not the other; penalty given only for course not covered by original medical document.

| 26 Mar 27, 2013 | April 11, 2007 | July 5, 2007 | 0 on final exam; F in course Suspended for 12 months. Effective Aug 14, 2007 | No | Approved |

Submitted falsified medical notes (one was forged and date was changed on another) on two occasions to defer a lab test and an exam in a course. Penalty included transcript notations for both F in course and suspension; petition is for both notations.

| 27 May 22, 2013 | Fall 2010 | Feb 15, 2011 | F in course | Yes | Approved |

1st offense in Fall 2010 plagiarized term paper (from internet sources); was given opportunity to re-write and re-submit. 2nd offense in same term, different course, plagiarized 2 assignments (from internet sources) - after 1st assignment, instructor explained what plagiarism is and how to avoid it & gave opportunity to re-write/re-submit, 2nd subsequent assignment also plagiarized from internet.

1st offense Apr 2010, caught cheating on final exam using cell phone in communication with other student(s) outside of exam room; student’s subsequent appeal was dismissed. Evidence from 1st offense led to 2nd charge of cheating with another student on final exam written a week earlier, by passing a cell phone/calculator with answers entered back and forth between them (through an invigilator, who was not involved). In both cases a copy of the exam was missing from the exam room and the students denied having stolen the exams. The adjudicator in the 1st case found the evidence compelling enough to believe they had stolen the exam; the adjudicator in the 2nd case did not. (cf #31, Nov 18, 2015)

29 Feb 26, 2014 Jan 24, 2012 Feb 16, 2012 transcript notation only No Denied
Charged with plagiarism on a draft of M.Sc. thesis; transcript notation reads: “Academic dishonesty in draft of thesis; determined at adjudication hearing February 16, 2012”. Student was made aware that earlier drafts were plagiarized, but did not rectify in subsequent draft. Claimed not to know policy applied to drafts and to have been focused on improving original parts of thesis first.

Details of 1st offense unclear in this file – student successfully appealed 1st offence – although from this petition, it seems there may also be a charge of use of a cell phone during an exam. However, evidence from 1st offense led to 2nd charge of cheating with another student on final exam written the week earlier by passing a cell phone/calculator with answers entered back and forth between them (through an invigilator, who was not involved).

The following entries are new since the date of the last report (August 2014)

31* Nov 18, 2015 Dec 2010 Dec 23, 2010 F in course Suspended 4 months, effective Sept 1, 2010 F in course Suspended 4 months, effective Jan 3, 2011 Yes Approved
1st offense Apr 2010, caught cheating on final exam using cell phone in communication with other student(s) outside of exam room; student’s subsequent appeal was dismissed. Evidence from 1st offense led to 2nd charge of cheating with another student on final exam written a week earlier, by passing a cell phone/calculator with answers entered back and forth between them (through an invigilator, who was not involved). In both cases a copy of the exam was missing from the exam room and the students denied having stolen the exams. The adjudicator in the 1st case found the evidence compelling enough to believe they had stolen the exam; the adjudicator in the 2nd case did not. (cf #28, May 22, 2013)
September 19, 2016

TO: Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Patrick Deane, President and Vice-Chancellor

RE: PROPOSED CLOSURE OF THE DORMANT FACULTY OF THEOLOGY

At the time of the major review and reorganization of the University’s charter in 1956-57, which led to the establishment of McMaster Divinity College as a separately incorporated but affiliated institution, it was agreed that the University would retain a non-denominational Faculty of Theology. It was intended that the Faculty would initially be identical with the work and staff of the Divinity College, with the possibility of expansion at a later date in the event that external funds, outside the regular budget of the University, were made available.

In President Gilmour’s summary of the proposed reorganization, dated September 11, 1956, which was presented to the Board of Governors on October 12, 1956 and discussed at Senate on October 19, 1956, he made the following statement:

"The University will continue to have a non-denominational faculty of theology (as is usual in British and other universities). At first, the Divinity School staff will constitute members of the faculty of theology staff, but the way is open for other churches to share in the faculty of theology later, provided funds are available. Instruction in the College and the faculty of theology must be paid for outside the regular budget of the University.

It must be clearly understood that the University’s faculty of theology constitutes no financial charge of any kind on the University, and that the appointment of the Divinity School staff to the faculty of theology is for academic purposes only. The faculty itself will be otherwise dormant until activated by donations of interested parties."

Accordingly, in 1957 all full-time members of the Faculty of Theology were appointed members of the newly-established Divinity College. The 1957 Memorandum of Agreement entered into between the University and the College records that such teaching staff would retain their status as members of the Faculty of Theology for so long as their appointments to Divinity College were maintained. The Agreement also makes clear that the salaries for such individuals would be paid by the College, notwithstanding their University affiliation.
In a subsequent statement made to Senate on July 23, 1957, President Gilmour further clarified the position, noting as follows:

"It should be understood by the Senate that membership of and rank in the teaching staff of the Faculty of Theology of McMaster University continues, under the terms of the Agreement between the University and the Divinity College, in the cases of full-time instructors in Theology who were members of the University staff as of June 30, 1957, but only in such cases. Future appointees to the staff of the Divinity College will not become members of the University's Faculty of Theology until so appointed through this Senate."

In the intervening period since 1957, the University has continued to appoint certain members of the Divinity College teaching staff as members of the Faculty of Theology. There are currently three members of the Faculty. These appointments are made by the University Senate but are purely nominal; they are linked to continued employment by the College, and receive no stipend or other monetary compensation. These appointees do not undergo any academic assessment under the University's Tenure and Promotion Policy, but assume the rank of their College appointment.

Aside from these three faculty appointments, the Faculty of Theology has remained dormant in all other respects since 1957. In particular, the requisite funds needed to activate it and maintain additional scholars without regard to denominational ties, as imagined by President Gilmour, have never materialized. In the meantime, the University has established a successful and well-respected Department of Religious Studies, which focuses on religious diversity and the major world religions through a variety of disciplines—anthropological, literary, historical and theological.

In the circumstances, I cannot foresee any situation where the Faculty of Theology would be awakened from its dormant state and am therefore proposing that the Senate recommend to the Board of Governors that it exercise its power under Clause 9(j) of the McMaster University Act, 1976, to formally terminate the Faculty. Currently the three members of the Faculty of Theology have one teaching staff seat on the University Senate, so this seat would be lost. Divinity College would, however, still hold two seats on the University's Senate; one held by an elected member of their teaching staff, and the other held by their Principal, as an ex officio member. In addition, the nominal University appointments held by the three members of the College's teaching staff would end as at the date of termination of the Faculty. Aside from those issues, I am not aware of any further practical impact of the proposed closure.

I accordingly request that the Senate Executive recommend to Senate and the Board of Governors the closure of the Faculty of Theology effective December 31, 2016.
REPORT TO THE SENATE
FROM THE
UNIVERSITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Research Institute and Centre

At its meeting of September 21, 2016, the University Planning Committee received, for approval, two closely related proposals involving revisions to the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging and the establishment of a Centre for Mobility on Aging under that Institute. Attachment I (i) outlines the relationship between the two proposals and how the research Centre fits into the structure of the revised Institute.

(i) Proposal to Revise the Terms of Reference for the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging

At its meeting of September 21, 2016, the University Planning Committee approved a proposal to revise the structure and function of the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging. The most significant change is the development of the Institute as a structure that will oversee the work of a number of embedded research centres, along with the introduction of an Executive Committee, which will provide insight and advice to the Scientific and Managing Directors regarding operation and strategic priorities of the Institute and those associated centres that will fall under the Institute’s governance.

The University Planning Committee now recommends,

that Senate approve, the revisions to the structure and function of the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging (MIRA) as set out in Attachment I (ii).

(ii) Proposal to Establish a Centre for Mobility in Aging

Also at the same meeting, the University Planning Committee approved the establishment of a Centre for Mobility on Aging, as the first centre to be created under the umbrella of the Institute for Research on Aging. This premier research and knowledge generation hub will bring together researchers from all six Faculties to achieve integrated, human-centered solutions to mobility challenges of older people through a unique research platform.

The University Planning Committee now recommends,

that Senate approve, the establishment of the Centre for Mobility in Aging (CMA) as set out in Attachment I (iii).

Senate: October 12, 2016
September 14, 2016

TO: University Planning Committee

FROM: Robert Baker

RE: Centre for Mobility in Aging Proposal, and Transformation of the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging

The Committee on Research Institutes has reviewed the attached Proposal for the Centre for Mobility in Aging, as well as the transformation of the McMaster Institute for Research in Aging, as per the policies and guidelines.

The above items have the support of the Committee on Research Institutes.

Please include these as an Agenda Item for the next University Planning Committee Meeting.

RB: pb

Attach.

cc: David Wilkinson
    Paul O'Byrne
    Doug Welch
    Helen Ayre
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: DR. ROB BAKER, VICE-PRESIDENT, RESEARCH
FROM: PARMINDER RAINA, DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: UPDATE ON THE STRUCTURE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE MCMASTER INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON AGING
DATE: SEPT. 8, 2016
CC: SUSAN DENBURG, LAURA HARRINGTON

On April 9th, 2014 and April 17th, 2014 the Senate and Board of Governors approved the establishment of the McMaster Institute of GeroScience. I have been Director of the Institute since it was inaugurated, and since that time, I have been conducting consultations with donors and senior management about the future directions of the Institute.

As a result of these consultations, as well as an analysis of strategic knowledge mobilization opportunities, locally, provincially, and nationally, the name of the Institute was changed to the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging (MIRA), which was approved on June 29, 2016.

During this time, the structure and function of the Institute have also evolved through consultation and input from the Institute members, as well as the University’s senior management. In particular, it was agreed that the most effective way to integrate and mobilize McMaster researchers and ensure that the resulting research impact is transformative is to create centres focused on priority research areas. The first of these will be the Centre for Mobility in Aging.

In terms of the governance of the Institute, we have proposed the creation of an Executive Committee, which will provide insight and advice to the Scientific and Managing Directors regarding operation and strategic priorities of the Institute and corresponding centres, including the Centre for Mobility in Aging. Moreover, the Centre for Mobility in Aging is wholly supported by a gift of significant magnitude that includes, as a goal, maximizing educational and research opportunities in the area of aging more generally at McMaster. It has thus drawn additional infrastructure and support from the University aimed at the Institute as a whole. In order to ensure alignment with the Institute’s goals and provide coordinated oversight for this support, an additional layer of accountability has been assigned by the President, Vice-President Research, and Provost. A senior academic, to be identified as the University Lead, will join the Governing Board. As before, the Board will review the strategic direction and operations of the Centre and ensure accountability and performance.
The structural changes to the Institute, as well as a modified research approach and integration with the University’s academic mission, are outlined in the attached document, which I recommend should replace the initial proposal to create the Institute. I think you will agree that this refined Institute structure and function is more strategic, better aligned with the University’s research priorities, and will facilitate the accelerated achievement of the original goals of the Institute.

I am enthusiastic about these changes and the future of the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging, and I look forward to updating you about developments as they arise.
McMaster Institute for Research on Aging
Promoting Optimal Aging
September 12, 2016

This document has been prepared as an update to the proposal to create a research institute on aging, initially named the McMaster Institute for Geroscience. As approved by the Executive Committee of the Senate and the Board of Governors on June 29, 2016, the Institute will now be named the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging (MIRA). The structure and function of the Institute has evolved from its original conception thus this document outlines its current status.

Mission
The mission of MIRA is to optimize the health and longevity of the aging population through innovative research, education and stakeholder collaborations.

Values
Integrity • Excellence • Transformation • Interdisciplinarity • Collaboration • Transparency

About MIRA
In 2015, for the first time in Canadian history, there were more older people (age 65 and over) than younger people (under age 15) in the country. Canada’s population is aging rapidly: a trend that accelerated sharply when the baby boomers began turning 65 years old in 2011 and continues to increase. In less than fifteen years, the proportion of people aged 65 and older will grow by ten percent to reach one-quarter of the Canadian population. The rising age of our population is going to have a profound impact on individuals, families, communities, and health and social care systems. In fact, aging as a social force is not only playing a role in shaping developed societies but is also becoming an important social issue in less developed nations. In other words, aging is a global phenomenon, and by 2050, there will be close to two billion people over the age of the 65, worldwide.

In Canada, the importance of addressing the needs of an aging population has been recognised by provincial ministries of health across the country, who have named ‘aging in place’ as a key priority. In Ontario, the 2013 ‘Action Plan for Seniors’ reflected the province’s proactive approach to achieving “independence, activity, and good health – helping seniors stay safe, healthy, vibrant, and active.” There is a need for a focused effort among researchers in this field to launch a coordinated approach to support the
health and meaningful engagement of the aging population. McMaster is poised to lead such an initiative. MIRA (formerly named The McMaster Institute of GeroScience) was established in the spring of 2014 with a mandate to:

- Create a hub for researchers and community stakeholders to link for mutual gain;
- Coordinate a shared research agenda;
- Operate outside any single faculty, yet interact will all faculties;
- Conduct research in a collegial and mutually supportive fashion with transparent project funding mechanisms;
- Employ non-traditional research approaches to create solutions;
- Establish a culture of interdisciplinary collaboration across all faculties and schools of the University in all projects;
- Engage all stakeholders in all stages of research, evaluation and implementation of interventions and technologies.

MIRA brings together over 60 researchers from across most McMaster Faculties to achieve integrated, human-centred solutions. MIRA’s researchers are organized in interdisciplinary teams to conduct studies that will address the issues faced by older adults, their families, communities and our society as a whole (Figure 1).

**Identifying Strategic Research Priorities for the Institute**

Although members of the Institute are diverse in their respective fields of research expertise focused on aging, we share the aim of advancing the science of aging at McMaster. Together, our members identified a need to focus on specific areas of strategic priority. This focus requires multiple disciplines and stakeholders to work collaboratively and efficiently to advance and promote scientific inquiry within a targeted research area. These priorities require substantial investment to generate new empirical evidence and to design and evaluate interventions that will provide the scientific basis to inform policy and practice and, most importantly, to have a significant impact in the day-to-day lives of older people. After several months of consultation with researchers across the University, the Institute has identified “Mobility in Aging” as a research area in which McMaster has substantial expertise and could become a national leader, therefore this will be a strategic research priority of the Institute over the next seven years. Further, this strategic priority builds on the initiatives funded through Labarge Optimal Aging Initiative. The work on mobility will be advanced through the creation of a focused Centre on mobility, within the Institute, as described below. Additional strategic priorities will be developed in the next few years that will form the research agenda for the Institute and that are harmonized with its overall vision, and complement the first priority area: Mobility in Aging.
Additional potential strategic priorities could include, but will not be limited to:
1) Sensory aging: this strategic area would explore issues related to changes in hearing and vision, and how they are linked to functional autonomy and healthy aging;
2) Intergenerational aging: with the goal to understand how environmental, lifestyle, psychosocial and biological factors cross generations to affect the aging process and how one could design intergenerational communities that support healthy aging;
3) Social, community and technology innovation and aging: the purpose of this strategic area would be to determine how social, structural, or community environments and their interaction with technology facilitate age friendly environments;
4) Economics, public policy and aging: there is a tremendous opportunity to understand how economic drivers and public policies at the federal, provincial and municipal levels shape aging societies; and
5) Comparative aging: this area would focus on basic science that is fundamental to our understanding of biological processes involved in aging, for example comparing different aging model systems (e.g., flies, worms, rodents to humans).
Strategic priority areas will form the basis of focused Centres within the Institute, which will work collaboratively across all focused Centres to advance the overall mission of the Institute. Further, the Institute from time to time will also access the expertise from other existing Centres at McMaster University such as the Geriatric Education and Research in Aging Sciences (GERAS) or the Gilbrea Centre to pursue collaborative efforts, which will mutually benefit all parties. However, the governance of these external Centres will not be part of the mandate of the MIRA unless they formally join the Institute.

Why McMaster?
McMaster is in a unique position to lead a new and emerging paradigm of research on aging that integrates biological and population sciences in promoting healthy and functional aging populations. Further strengthening research in aging at McMaster was supported by the generous gift of $10 million by Suzanne Labarge to establish Optimal Aging Initiative. McMaster University is also the host of one of the largest and most comprehensive population-based studies of aging anywhere in the world: the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging (CLSA). Data and biological samples from the CLSA provide McMaster researchers with a unique opportunity to develop high-impact research agendas. In addition, McMaster already has extensive infrastructure needed to carry out research including:

- Biobanks and high-throughput biomarker laboratories to support high-quality research;
- Knowledge translation platforms such as the McMaster Optimal Aging Portal and the McMaster Health Forum to share evidence-based research to investigators, decision-makers and citizens;
- Models for developing new technologies, such as the Smart Home;
- Existing programs focused on community-dwelling older adults, such as Health TAPESTRY (Teams Advancing Patient Experience: Strengthening Quality), which enables community-based primary care research that provides McMaster researchers with a living laboratory to carry out novel research and knowledge translation;
- Established Centres such as GERAS (Geriatric Education and Research in Aging Sciences) and the Gilbrea Centre for Studies in Aging, uniquely provide clinical and social/cultural/community links to facilitate the research agenda of the Institute for mutual benefit.

MIRA-Training Program (MIRA-TP)
McMaster’s infrastructure to support excellence in research is complemented by its innovative approach to education. The MIRA-Training Program (MIRA-TP), to be developed in the coming years, will provide an unprecedented learning environment in the science of aging that will facilitate communication, group process, and leadership
skills for trainees across all Faculties. We believe that learning is a process of inquiry and collaboration, not just between students and faculty mentors, but also amongst students and mentors across diverse Faculties working in interdisciplinary teams. We will draw on the expertise and experience of existing resources, such as the Paul R. MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching (formerly MIIETL) and the Program for Interprofessional Practice, Education and Research (PIPER) when developing this training program.

The MIRA-TP will educate the next generation of researchers and clinician scientists within the field of aging. Providing qualified, innovative personnel with interdisciplinary training in aging with the capacity to work across industry sectors enables the realization of the potential of McMaster researchers to prolong and improve the health of hundreds of thousands of Canadians.

The MIRA-TP will capitalize on the strengths of the McMaster-pioneered problem-based learning (PBL) approach. PBL involves small group, self-directed learning that emphasizes interpersonal skills, independent learning, and leadership qualities – all of which are required for successful interdisciplinary, collaborative projects. We will build on McMaster’s existing strengths in training by advancing the Labarge Curriculum on Aging, which will provide an interdisciplinary perspective on communication skills and attitudes among health professionals working with older adults, and prepare our trainees for a broad range of roles after graduation. Novel education initiatives that we are exploring are an interdisciplinary diploma program in aging, which will be available across Faculties, an undergraduate specialization program in aging, and new funding initiatives for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows including the Labarge Mobility Fellowship. Through these innovative educational opportunities, our trainees will develop projects that target research in aging within an environment that facilitates their application, evaluation, integration into practice, and uptake into policy. Training talented people to work across disciplines in a collegial and collaborative environment will allow McMaster graduates to develop the pragmatic skills to work across perspectives and foster the collaborations needed to answer the very complex questions related to aging that cannot be addressed from any single Faculty. This type of training will prepare our graduates for fulfilling careers where they can appreciate the value of tackling real-world problems through teams of diverse professionals coming together to achieve real change in society.

The Structure of the Institute
The most effective way to integrate and mobilize McMaster researchers and ensure that the resulting research impact is transformative is to create centres focused on priority research areas. The first of these will be the Centre for Mobility in Aging. The structure and mandate of MIRA will facilitate and provide incentives for collaboration between the
Centres within the Institute to foster a culture of collaboration. Further, the Institute will also facilitate collaboration between Institute focused Centres (e.g., Centre for Mobility in Aging) and access the expertise from other existing university Centres (i.e., GERAS or Gilbrea), where there is potential for mutually beneficial synergies (Figure 2).

Figure 2: The Conceptual Structure of MIRA. The ring in the middle highlights the focused Centres within MIRA (both existing, i.e., Centre for Mobility in Aging (highlighted in peach colour square) and proposed (not highlighted by coloured squares)) and the entities listed across external rings depict other institutional Centres, Institutes, and Initiatives external to the governance of the MIRA that are key platforms for research on aging.

Focused Centres created within MIRA will utilise a single, centralized, and shared operational, governance and administrative model to facilitate advancement of the strategic objectives of all Centres as part of the advancement of the strategic scientific objectives of the whole Institute. The centralised governance and administration model is essential to maintaining the Institute’s unique operating model while creating multiple
focused Centres that will advance diverse but integrated strategic priorities. The individual Centres, Institutes and Initiatives created prior to, or outside of the MIRA structure will retain their own governance and administrative models but will still work closely with MIRA to position McMaster University as a leader in research on aging (further details on leadership and governance are provided below).

Each of the MIRA focused Centres will advance the Institute's overall mission, and will build upon McMaster's existing strengths in aging, evidence-based medicine, population and clinical studies, as well as the development and evaluation of interventions. The University is also a recognized leader in knowledge exchange and policy (see Figure 1), which the Institute will use to our advantage. Developing expertise in specific areas of aging and the use of a 'design thinking' approach will promote the rapid integration of solutions into policy and practice.

Design thinking is a collaborative process that engages the community and other stakeholders at the outset and has been found to be effective in bringing together individuals from different areas of expertise with end-users to develop human-centred innovations. Incorporating a team-based, interdisciplinary approach and community engagement at the outset, design thinking provides a framework where ideas are created through a dynamic, iterative process within a 'system of spaces' (inspiration, ideation, and implementation), as opposed to an orderly (linear) set of steps, which is commonly employed in traditional approaches to innovation and design. Within these spaces, individuals trained in a variety of disparate disciplines collaborate to observe, evaluate, and work directly with users to determine innovations that come from understanding the problem. In the context of aging, innovations could include, but are not limited to, assistive devices or technologies (products), clinical or caregiver-targeted programs (services), and/or other interventions (e.g., changes in urban design). Such research can involve basic science research labs that act as centralized knowledge-generating hubs and population-based cohorts like the CLSA that improve our understanding of mechanisms at the cellular and population levels, while involving stakeholders to accelerate discovery and its adoption in practice.

MIRA and its contributing Centres, beginning with the Centre for Mobility in Aging, are structured to facilitate collaborative decision-making, community engagement, support areas of research strength, and broadly disseminate research products in order to advance the science of aging in Canada and beyond.

**Knowledge Translation Opportunities**

Emphasis will be placed on translating knowledge generated within the Institute into policy and practice or the market place to ensure that we achieve the shared goal of creating a
society that allows its people to live long and live well—‘a life worth living.’ The Institute will be unique in combining a coordinated research agenda with the use of design thinking to generate human-centred solutions and will make ongoing interaction with diverse stakeholders a requirement.

Within each Centre, and as a priority within the Institute as a whole, our researchers will develop a comprehensive knowledge translation strategy that supports collaboration between clinicians and researchers, increases public awareness and leads to translation of evidence, exchange of ideas including best practice guidelines, to all relevant stakeholders including practitioners and policy makers. The Institute will ensure the translation of research evidence that enables people to live long and live well. We will transform the experience of aging by transforming the science of aging.

**Governance and Management of the Institute**

The Institute’s governance and management structure will facilitate the work of each Centre. An identified lead of each Centre (or a representative from each Faculty) will join the Executive Committee of the Institute in order to ensure an interdisciplinary perspective in strategic decision-making. The Institute will provide an administrative hub for internal and external communication, partnership development (e.g., not-for-profit organizations and private industry) as well as the identification of strategic grant opportunities. The Institute will serve as a core training facility for undergraduate and graduate students, clinician scientists and early career scientists for each of the Centres, and will provide physical space where trainees, researchers, and stakeholders can interact to generate collaborative ideas for cutting-edge research and further establish McMaster as a global leader in aging. Overall, the Institute will provide the necessary administrative and management structure to advance the collective research agendas of the focused Centres.

The governance and management structure of the Institute and its focused Centres is shown in Figure 3. The Institute will be led by a Scientific Director and supported by a Managing Director. The Executive Committee of the Institute will include the Scientific Director of the Institute, Managing Director, and Directors of each focused Centre (e.g., Centre for Mobility in Aging). The Institute will also be supported by several other committees including an International Advisory Board and an End-User and Stakeholder Committee. The Managing Director of the Institute will also be responsible for the management of the Centre. However, as additional focused Centres are created in the future, the role of the Managing Director will be reconsidered in light of the responsibility and the work load. The administrative structure of the Institute will also meet the
administrative needs of each Centre. The Scientific Director and Managing Director will report directly to the VPR.

![Diagram of University Governance and Institute Governance](attachment:diagram.png)

**Figure 3:** Management Structure of MIRA and focused Centres

The Centre for Mobility in Aging is wholly supported by a gift of significant magnitude that includes, as a goal, maximizing educational and research opportunities in the area of aging more generally at McMaster. It has thus drawn additional infrastructure and support from the University aimed at the Institute as a whole. In order to ensure alignment with the Institute’s goals and provide coordinated oversight for this support, an additional layer of accountability has been assigned by the President, Vice-President Research, and Provost. A senior academic, to be identified as the University Lead, will join the Governing Board. The Board will review the strategic direction and operations of the Centre and ensure accountability and performance.
INVESTING IN NEW FRONTIERS FOR OPTIMAL AGING
The Centre for Mobility in Aging
Nested Within the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging

In 2015, for the first time in Canadian history, there were more older people (age 65 and over) than younger people (under age 15) in the country. By 2036, an estimated nine million Canadians will be 65 years and older—representing about one-quarter of the population. In Canada, the importance of addressing the needs of an aging population is recognized by provincial ministries of health, which have identified “aging in place” as a key priority. In Ontario, the 2013 Action Plan for Seniors reflects the province’s proactive approach to achieving “independence, activity, and good health—helping seniors stay safe, healthy, vibrant, and active.” A key component of maintaining good health is optimizing mobility, which includes both physical and social/community aspects of mobility.

In order to clearly capture and communicate the extent of our work on mobility in aging at McMaster, and funded by a generous gift from Suzanne Labarge, we are proposing to create a Centre for Mobility in Aging. This Centre will be a major component of our broader integrated research enterprise devoted to aging research and education, recently renamed as the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging (MIRA).

Developed after extensive consultations across the campus, the Centre will be organized in interdisciplinary teams that will apply a design thinking approach to their work. These teams will identify important questions with a health focus through collaborative exchange with colleagues, practitioners and citizens, investigate these questions using diverse methodologies, evaluate and analyze results and apply their findings to ultimately improve the health and well-being of older adults, their families, communities and society as a whole.

This premier research and knowledge generation hub will bring together researchers from all six McMaster Faculties to achieve integrated, human-centered solutions to mobility challenges through a unique research platform. McMaster is poised to lead on the national and international stage in this domain. Through excellence in research, education and training and the translation of scientific research findings into practical, beneficial applications, McMaster experts expect to profoundly impact the way Canadians stay mobile and engaged.

EXISTING PLATFORMS AT MCMASTER
McMaster is in a unique position to lead a new, emerging paradigm of research on aging that
integrates a wide variety of disciplines, including but not limited to social sciences, biology, psychology, engineering and health sciences, to promote healthy and functional aging populations.

There are a number of aging-related research platforms at McMaster, including the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging (CLSA). Data and biological samples from the CLSA provide McMaster researchers with a one-of-a-kind opportunity to develop high-impact, targeted research agendas that answer critical questions by integrating the perspectives of a variety of disciplines. In addition to the CLSA, we have the extensive infrastructure needed to carry out and disseminate this research, including:

- knowledge translation platforms such as the McMaster Optimal Aging Portal and the McMaster Health Forum, which enable evidence-based research to be easily shared with investigators, decision-makers and citizens
- models for developing new technologies, such as the Smart Home (in development)
- programs focused on community-dwelling older adults, such as Health TAPESTRY (Teams Advancing Patient Experience: Strengthening Quality), which enables community-based primary care research
- biobanks and high-throughput biomarker labs to support high-quality research
- established centres such as the Geriatric Education and Research in Aging Sciences Centre (GERAS) and the Gilbreath Centre for Studies in Aging, providing complementary clinical, social, cultural and community links that have the potential to augment the research agendas of the newly proposed Centre and the Institute (MIRA).

The Labarge Optimal Aging Initiative has raised the profile of healthy aging research across the University. Its Opportunities Fund has seeded multiple interdisciplinary research collaborations and influenced highly successful researchers to turn their minds to optimal aging, including several with the theme of mobility. The Centre will capitalize on this activity by ensuring that these researchers are collectively engaged and focused on shared problems in mobility that, with their expertise, can be solved.

**MOBILITY IN AGING**

Mobility is a cornerstone of healthy aging. The challenges of maintaining mobility can affect social and economic independence, along with physical and mental health. Emerging evidence suggests that individual factors, and built and social environments, play an important role in older adults’ mobility, social engagement and overall health, yet few studies address the complexity of factors across all levels.
Investments in research addressing the range of issues associated with mobility in aging have the potential to optimize the well-being of a large number of Canadians, as well as significantly reduce the nation’s health and social care costs.

Researchers define mobility in a number of ways, ranging from muscle mass and strength measures to the ability to move independently and continue living at home. Mobility encompasses not only specific maneuvers, such as walking or climbing stairs, or the execution of fundamental daily activities, but also participation in society (e.g. social participation, the ability to drive or access to public transportation).

Maintaining mobility is difficult for many older people. In addition to extrinsic barriers to mobility, such as built environments (e.g. availability of services or unsafe neighbourhoods), older adults must also cope with intrinsic barriers, such as the fear of falling and physical mobility impairments.
Within the cohort of people aged 60 years or older, 13 per cent have mobility impairments that impact physical performance, such as difficulty walking or driving, a figure that increases to 30 per cent by age 80. Over the next four decades, the number of Canadians living with such physical impairments will grow exponentially. In fact, 54 per cent of older Canadians already believe that they are less mobile than they were 10 years earlier. Evidence indicates that more than one-third of seniors have difficulty climbing several flights of stairs and at least one-quarter have difficulty bending or stooping (28 per cent) or walking a kilometre or more (24 per cent). Mobility challenges in older adulthood (e.g. difficulty walking, driving or lack of social participation) not only affect individual seniors: collectively these challenges increase the social and economic costs associated with additional health care, social supports and broad public policies.

Objectives
The Centre for Mobility in Aging has as its long-term goal the generation, sharing and implementation of new knowledge to improve the mobility of older Canadians and people worldwide.

The Centre’s initial objectives are to:
- establish McMaster as a national leader in this focused area of research
- increase broad awareness of the importance of mobility for the well-being of older adults
- pursue target areas for training, research and knowledge translation activities around mobility
- identify issues and questions of importance to stakeholders
- promote collaboration among researchers, the community and other stakeholders (e.g. housing industry, transportation, government/policymakers)
- engage in public outreach initiatives so stakeholders such as policymakers, business leaders, community leaders, media, educators, practitioners, etc. have a ready means to access the knowledge they need, when they need it.
- within and together with the Institute as a whole, provide a learning environment in the science of aging and undertake novel educational initiatives.

Building on McMaster’s culture of collaboration and interdisciplinarity, the Centre will be the nexus for integrated mobility research within the broader Institute.

Leadership and Governance
The Centre for Mobility in Aging will be the inaugural research centre encompassed within the newly renamed McMaster Institute for Research on Aging (MIRA). The Institute itself will serve
as an umbrella entity providing administrative and strategic support to the interconnected centres/programs that we see developing as the research progresses.

Together with the Managing Director, the Scientific Director will assume responsibility and accountability for all research endeavours and for the day-to-day activities of the Centre. In keeping with the University’s policy on institutes and centres (*Guidelines for the Governance and Review of Research Institutes, Centres and Groups*), the Centre will report through the Scientific Director of MIRA to the Governing Board of the Institute. The Centre itself is wholly supported by a gift of significant magnitude that includes, as a goal, maximizing educational and research opportunities in the area of aging more generally at McMaster. It has thus drawn additional infrastructure and support from the University aimed at the Institute as a whole. In order to ensure alignment with the Centre’s goals and provide coordinated oversight for this support, an additional layer of accountability has been assigned by the President, Vice-President Research, and Provost. A senior academic, to be identified as the University Lead, will join the Governing Board. The Board will review the strategic direction and operations of the Centre and ensure accountability and performance.

In order to provide scientific oversight and uphold the highest research standards, an International Scientific Advisory Committee (ISAC), composed of international experts, will advise and provide critical feedback to the Scientific Director on the Centre’s scientific strategy on an annual basis. This will ensure that all activity is directed to achieving the goals and milestones established for the Centre. The input of the ISAC will inform decision-making, including determining whether a research initiative will proceed as planned, be modified and resubmitted, or be rejected as it does not fit into the research framework. This interaction will occur through the Executive Committee of MIRA so that there is alignment between the activities of the Centre and the Institute more broadly.

The Labarge Gift Board will receive, for information, annual updates on project milestones and deliverables, the status of the funds, research successes, outreach activities and financial outcomes that occur each year from the Scientific and Managing Directors of the Centre.

Finally, the performance of the Centre will undergo an interim review at 3 years, as well as a
major review at 5 years from inception and at least once every five years thereafter, by an External Review Board (ERB), as part of an analysis of the performance of the Institute. The ERB will typically involve internal and external members, and the review will ensure that the Centre is meeting its scientific, performance and fiscal targets.

**The Research Approach**

Given the range of intrinsic and extrinsic factors that can affect physical and community mobility during the aging process, the Centre will take an interdisciplinary approach to examine biological, behavioural, technological and environmental factors affecting mobility.

Initial consultations with McMaster researchers identified a number of priorities for study and three areas emerged:

1. Understanding and defining mobility in aging
   - Identify trajectories of changes in physical and community mobility during aging
   - Understand and define mobility across disciplinary domains

2. Maintaining and restoring mobility: prevention, intervention and interaction with health systems
   - Identify and develop new interventions that affect mobility across or within diverse populations and conditions
   - Identify barriers for maintaining/promoting mobility in older adults within the health system, including access and navigation, lack of information, coordination, and continuity of care
   - Identify psychosocial factors affecting motivation and adaptation in mobility in aging

3. Environmental facilitators and barriers influencing mobility
   - Explore technological innovations, such as assistive devices.

These themes are elucidated more fully through the research questions outlined in the Appendix.

In order to advance these research priorities, we propose the use of a design thinking approach, which involves the consideration of multiple intersecting aspects of a problem and including older adults in the concept and design stages when the research questions are being developed. This method will generate practice- and policy-relevant high quality evidence, as well as educational methods for creating or identifying products, services, and environments
that improve older Canadians’ health and quality of life.

Core Activities
To achieve the overall objectives for the Centre for Mobility in Aging, we propose several mechanisms to conduct research, support community engagement and promote knowledge translation, including:

1. Stakeholder Consultation and Community Engagement Activities
   - events and outreach (e.g. workshops, think-tanks) with a particular focus on communities outside of Hamilton (e.g. Oakville, Burlington, Brantford) that will facilitate and enable research collaboration and networking across disciplines and stakeholders, such as the Health TAPESTRY network
   - work with the McMaster Health Forum to conduct public and citizen dialogues
   - create a high profile national and international speaker series to inform researchers and the public about the Centre’s research outcomes

Here, we will focus on activities that will maximize both impact and leveraging opportunities.

2. Research Reviews: Synthesis and Scoping
   - identify research gaps in mobility
   - identify evidence that informs the evaluation of emerging interventions
   - identify interventions that have been shown to be effective
     o generate new evidence for the McMaster Optimal Aging Portal
     o implement evidenced-based interventions into practice

3. Catalyst Grants
   - provide an opportunity to conduct collaborative and interdisciplinary research with the goal to catalyze new research ideas in mobility
     o for example, assess the feasibility of creating residential areas that integrate university students and older people to improve social participation and mobility across generations

4. Demonstration Projects/Case Studies
   - demonstrate research products, such as wearable devices, in different cultural groups and diverse communities
   - examine the integration of health teams and community volunteers through initiatives such as Health TAPESTRY
5. Major Interdisciplinary Research Initiatives (e.g. Randomized Controlled Trials of Interventions)
   - support an interdisciplinary team, for example, in the study of complex relationships between social isolation, built environment, immune system and mobility impairment, and the subsequent consequences in health and social care (cost effectiveness studies)
   - perform major research studies, for example the role of affordable, usable assistive devices and consider the biomechanical and psychological needs of the aging population to promote mobility

Membership
Researchers with an interest in mobility in aging are eligible for membership in the Centre, which will maintain an open membership approach for all interested faculty members, clinicians and researchers at McMaster. Preliminary membership of the Centre includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Psychology, Neurosciences and Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Bosch</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Bowdish</td>
<td>Pathology &amp; Molecular Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Costa</td>
<td>Clinical Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shlegel Chair in Clinical Epidemiology and Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Jamal</td>
<td>Deen</td>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering / Biomedical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Dolovich</td>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>Health, Aging &amp; Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>Gilsing</td>
<td>Clinical Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Gonzalez</td>
<td>Psychiatry &amp; Behavioural Neurosciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Grenier</td>
<td>Health, Aging &amp; Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Gilbrea Centre for Studies in Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbrea Chair in Aging and Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>Clinical Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhagwati</td>
<td>Gupta</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Helsz</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori</td>
<td>Letts</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derelie</td>
<td>Mangin</td>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Papaioannou</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gianni Parise</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Phillips</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parminder Raina</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>McMaster Institute for Research on Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond and Margaret Labarge Chair in Research and Knowledge Application for Optimal Aging</td>
<td>CRC in Geroscience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Richardson</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Sekuler</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Psychology, Neurosciences and Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponnambalam (Ravi) Selvaganapathy</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama Singh</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Spencer</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Steinberg</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Tarnopolsky</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Verschoor</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Pathology and Molecular Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Vrkijan</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Space**

Many of the activities of the Centre will be virtual in nature, however, space has been made available at the McMaster Innovation Park within the space that has been provided as a contribution to the McMaster Institute for Research on Aging from the Faculty of Health Sciences for at least the next five years. The space will be sufficient to house administrative staff and will offer meeting and collaboration areas.

**Budget**

The new Centre will be funded through a generous donation of $15M from Suzanne Labarge. The gift agreement was signed in July 2016, and the formal gift announcement and launch of the Centre will occur in Fall 2016, following the formal approval of the Centre and its naming.
The gift is expendable over a minimum of seven years. During this time, the Centre staff and researchers will work to leverage and gradually supplant the donor funds through external sources, including grant funding.

A draft budget for the first two years is presented below and it is anticipated that the funds for the remainder of the gift will be allocated in a similar manner. Opportunities for new funds and for leveraging the current funds will undoubtedly emerge that will influence the allocation of funding in subsequent years. To that end, it has been decided to hold approximately 10% of the total for leveraging purposes over the course of the gift. The intention is to retain maximum agility in our response to new, exciting opportunities as they emerge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Funding: catalyst grants, research reviews, major research projects</td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td>$1,335,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and stakeholder engagement activities, knowledge translation</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships, PDF support</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Travel/Administration</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$810,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,960,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

McMaster has the opportunity to take a leadership position in the area of mobility in aging, which will be amplified by the excellence and external profile of the broader McMaster Institute for Research on Aging. Supported by a generous donation, we propose the creation of a Centre for Mobility in Aging to enable enhanced collaboration, strengthen research excellence in this area, and increase the critical mass of researchers and trainees at McMaster that are exposed to opportunities in aging research and knowledge translation.
APPENDIX

Thematic Areas of Research in Mobility

1. Understanding and defining mobility in aging
   i. Identify trajectories of changes in physical and community mobility during aging and the aged:
      a. What are normal age-related changes associated with mobility?
      b. Identify and define criteria that are indicative of pathology or impairment and require treatment.
   ii. Define mobility across disciplinary domains
      a. How do external (physical and social) and internal (cognitive and biological) environments function, individually and collectively, to influence mobility as people age?
      b. Is there a link between social isolation and biology?
      c. How do social isolation and biology influence mobility-related impairment and well-being?

2. Maintaining and restoring mobility: prevention, intervention and health systems
   i. Identify and develop new interventions that affect mobility across or within diverse populations and conditions: “who-how-where-when”
      a. Evaluate models for existing and novel interventions.
      b. How do we prevent, maintain and limit (or delay) decline in mobility in an aging population? This may include interventions targeting healthy lifestyles (e.g. exercise programs or dietary changes), or community engagement (e.g. peer mentorship and volunteering).
   ii. Identify barriers for maintaining/promoting mobility in older adults within the health system, including access and navigation, lack of information, coordination and continuity of care.
      a. What are challenges faced by seniors and their families with respect to mobility and health?
      b. How does poly-pharmacology affect mobility? How can medication be used more effectively for people as they age?
      c. How can health and social systems be integrated to help people function optimally?
   iii. Identify psychosocial factors affecting motivation and adaptation in mobility in aging.
      a. What makes people engage with their communities?
      b. What are some of the obstacles people experience when engaging in their
community?
c. How do sensory impairments impede social participation, and how do these psychosocial factors influence mobility?

3. Environmental facilitators and barriers that influence mobility
   i. Technological innovations, (e.g. assistive devices)
      a. What outcome measures and assessment tools, devices, and equipment are most effective for determining interventions that will have a real impact on the mobility of older adults?
      b. What measurement outcomes and indicators/predictors of mobility status are most important when considering the design of generalizable vs. tailored tools?
      c. What is the best way to develop affordable, usable assistive devices and technologies that consider the biomechanical and psychological needs of the aging population that promote mobility?
REPORT TO SENATE
FROM THE
COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS

Open Session (Regular Agenda)

At its meeting on September 19, 2016, the Committee on Appointments approved the following two recommendations from the Provost and now recommends them to Senate for approval.

i. Proposal to Establish the Position Associate Vice-President (Equity and Inclusion) (Attachment I)

Motion:
"that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the position Associate Vice-President (Equity and Inclusion), with terms of reference to be determined at a later date, effective October 20, 2016."

ii. Proposal to Establish the Title “Vice-Provost” (Attachment II)

Motion:
"that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the following changes of title:
‘Associate Vice-President (Faculty)’ becoming ‘Vice-Provost (Faculty)’
‘Associate Vice-President (Teaching and Learning)’ becoming ‘Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)’
‘Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies’ becoming ‘Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies’
‘Associate Vice-President (International Affairs)’ becoming ‘Vice-Provost (International Affairs)’
effective July 1, 2017.”

Senate: For Approval
October 12, 2016
MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 15, 2016

TO: Senate Committee on Appointments

FROM: David Wilkinson
Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

RE: Establishment of Position of
Associate Vice-President Equity and Inclusion

The proposed reconfigured structure for the Equity and Inclusion Office (formerly the Office of the Human Rights & Equity Services) recommends the establishment of an Associate Vice-President, Equity and Inclusion.

An AVP dedicated to equity, diversity and inclusivity would allow a sustained focus on issues of equity and diversity across the institution and provide a consistent and coordinated approach to complaint handling and resolution, and effective policy implementation. This would be consistent with current practice at a number of other institutions, and the current division of responsibilities under McMaster policies and processes.

I would like to create this position as soon as possible and will also be recommending the membership of a Selection Committee for the Committee’s approval. As it is my intention to consult with this Selection Committee on the terms of reference for the position, the detailed terms will be presented for approval at a later date.

I will be happy to speak to the creation of this position at greater length at the September 19, 2016 meeting.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:    July 11, 2016

TO:       Senate Committee on Appointments

FROM:     David Wilkinson
          Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

RE:       Revised title of the Associate Vice-Presidents

I am writing to recommend that McMaster alter the title of the Associate Vice-Presidents who
hold academic positions that report to the Provost. The new title would become vice-Provost.
This would be consistent with current practice at a number of other institutions including
several members of the G6. The primary reason for this change is to make the reporting
relationship clearer and to connote that these positions are dedicated to supporting the
Provost’s role as Chief Academic Officer of the university. The positions that should be retitled
would be:

Vice-Provost (Faculty)
Vice-Provost (Teaching and Learning)
Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies
Vice-Provost (International Affairs)

These changes would become effective July 1, 2017 coincident with the appointment of the
new Provost and would need to be adopted in the terms of reference for the Provost being
developed by that search committee.

I have discussed this matter with the President and this suggestion meets with his approval.

cc: President