McMaster University

SENATE MINUTES

Wednesday, May 17, 2017 at 3:30 p.m.
In the Council Room (111), Gilmour Hall

PRESENT: Dr. Patrick Deane (Chair), Ms Leah Allan, Dr. Catherine Anderson, Mr. Jacob Bailey, Dr. Rob Baker, Dr. Lee Beach, Mr. Jack Boshart, Dr. Ana Campos, Dr. Lorraine Carter, Dr. Philippa Carter, Dr. Narat Charupat, Dr. David Clark, Mr. Gary Collins, Mr. Roger Couldrey, Dr. Ken Cruikshank, Dr. David Earn, Dr. Carlos Filipe, Dr. Meridith Griffin, Dr. Janice Hladki, Dr. Alison Holloway, Dr. Shafiqul Huque, Dr. Jerry Hurley, Dr. Violetta Igneski, Dr. Graeme Luke, Dr. Maureen MacDonald, Ms Beth Manganelli Staite, Mr. Sid Nath, Mr. Alex Nielsen, Dr. Paul O’Byrne, Prof. Bridget O’Shaughnessy, Dr. Robert Pelton, Dr. Christine Quail, Dr. Jonathan Schertzer, Dr. Susan Sears Giroux, Dr. Ravi Selvaganapathy, Dr. Spencer Smith, Mr. Peter Tice, Dr. Matt Valeriote, Dr. Brenda Vrkljan, Dr. Patricia Wakefield, Dr. Len Waverman, Dr. Doug Welch, Dr. David Wilkinson, Ms Mary Williams, Ms Helen Ayre (Secretary of the Senate), Susan Welstead (Governance Advisor and Assistant University Secretary)

OBSERVERS: Ms Esme Davies, Dr. Susan Denburg, Dr. Del Harnish, Dr. Martin Horn, Dr. Emad Mohammad, Ms Melissa Pool, Mr. Sean Van Koughnett, Dr. Jean Wilson

BY INVITATION: Dr. Ameil Joseph, Dr. Gary Warner

REGRETS RECEIVED: Dr. Vishwanath Baba, Dr. Sigal Balshine, Dr. Lori Campbell, Dr. Michele George, Dr. Sheila Harms, Dr. Suzanne Labarge, Dr. Jacy Lee, Mr. Luke Little, Dr. Dorothy Pawluch, Dr. Stan Porter, Dr. Ishwar Puri, Dr. Petra Rethmann, Ms Moira Taylor, Mr. Philip Tominac, Dr. J.P. Xu

A. OPEN SESSION

OPENING REMARKS

Dr. Deane noted that the Provincial Budget had been tabled since the last meeting. It did not contain a great deal bearing on the post-secondary education sector. Funding was essentially flat, with some changes to the Ontario Student Assistance Program to reduce the costs of tuition. There was also a $220 million investment in access initiatives for Indigenous students and a commitment to removing financial barriers to post-secondary education for Indigenous students. The “Career Kick-Start Strategy” included a $190 million investment over three years in initiatives intended to create 40,000 new opportunities for K-12 and post-secondary students, as well as recent graduates. This was likely to cover co-op programs and internships, class projects linked directly to employers, and participation in entrepreneurship programs. The Province was also investing $15 million over three years for more than 3,000 new internships and fellowships through the Mitacs Accelerate Program.
Dr. Deane said the universities had hoped for some provisions for enrolment growth; there had been pressure last year and now again this year to increase admissions, but financial support for this was not forthcoming. This would have an impact for universities like McMaster with enrolment increases.

Following the last Senate meeting, McMaster submitted its draft Strategic Mandate Agreement to the Province for review. There had not yet been a response, but it was understood that Dr. Bonnie Patterson and her colleagues were reviewing all the submissions and would get back to the universities later in the Spring. The goal was still apparently to finalize the agreements by the summer.

Dr. Deane said he had been in Ottawa the previous week and had met with the Prime Minister and the Minister of Science. Ottawa was very focused on the Fundamental Science Review led by Dr. David Naylor, which recommended $1.3 billion in new money and an overhaul to the way research is overseen.

The federal government had been cautious in the last budget -- there had been no increase to the granting councils. According to the Deputy Minister, the U.S. President’s call for changes to the North American Free Trade Agreement would have a significant impact on Canada’s economy, and therefore caution was the byword.

However, it did seem that there was a policy-level commitment to science, and the federal government was specifically committed to evidence-based decision-making in all the sciences.

Dr. Deane then noted that, as suggested at the last meeting, a small group had been put together to consider issues of protest and freedom of expression, led by Dr. Searls Giroux, with a view to making recommendations for appropriate principles or guidelines intended to assist event planners and organizers, and support the University in achieving a high level of academic discourse.

A committee chaired by former Dean of Social Sciences at McMaster and former Provost at Queen’s University Dr. Alan Harrison was currently reviewing McMaster’s new budget model. The membership of the review committee included Dr. Scott Mabury, Vice-President (University Operations), University of Toronto, and, from McMaster, Drs. Alison Sills, Khaled Hassanein, and Steve Hanna. The committee was aiming to report by the end of this academic year.

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 May 17, 2017 and that items II to V 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 April 12, 2017 be approved as circulated

Approved by Consent

**III  BUSINESS ARISING**

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

i. Proposed Revisions to the Senate By-laws

Motion:

that the Senate give final approval to revisions to the Senate By-Laws as set out in Appendix A, effective May 17, 2017

Approved by Consent

**IV  COMMUNICATIONS**


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

**V  REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS** (Appendix C)

a. Recommendation to Change the Name of the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells

Motion:

that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, changing the name change of the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem
Cells to the ‘Boris Family Chair in Drug Discovery,’ as set out in Attachment I of Appendix C

Approved by Consent

b. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on the Awarding of the Title “Professor Emeritus / Emerita”

Motion:

that the Senate approve revisions to the Policy on the Awarding of the Title ‘Professor Emeritus / Emerita,’ as set out in Attachment II of Appendix C

Approved by Consent

REGULAR

VI BUSINESS ARISING

There was no business arising for Open Session.

VII ENQUIRIES

There were no enquiries.

VIII COMMUNICATIONS

a. President’s Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community Annual Report for 2016 (Appendix D)

Senate received the above-listed report for information.

IX REPORT FROM THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

a. Recommendation to Revise the Faculty By-laws (Appendix E)

Dr. Cruikshank explained that the Faculty was proposing changes to its by-laws governing membership of the Dean’s Advisory Council to remove positions that no longer exist, and revisions to the terms of reference of the Undergraduate Reviewing Committee to remove from those terms responsibility for adjudicating the results of formal rereads, and for reviewing in-course results. Re-reads will now be processed as outlined in Section C, paragraph 15 of the Student Appeal Procedures.

It was duly moved and seconded,
"that the Senate approve in principle proposed revisions to the Faculty of Humanities By-laws as set out in Appendix E, and refer the changes to the Committee on By-laws for review."

The motion was carried.

Dr. Deane noted that once they had been reviewed by the Committee on By-laws, the revisions would come back to Senate for final approval.

X REPORTS FROM COUNCILS

a. Graduate Council (Appendix F)

i. Proposed Change to Admission Requirements for the Master of Finance

Dr. Welch explained that the Faculty of Business was proposing a change in the admission requirements for the Master of Finance Program to remove the requirement for a statement of interest, which is more appropriately required of students applying to a research-based program rather than a course-based program such as this. Students would also be allowed to provide one non-academic letter of reference, in recognition of the fact that a number of applicants to the program are working professionals for whom an employer’s letter of reference may be equally as relevant as an academic reference.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve revisions to the admission requirements for the Master of Finance Program as detailed in Appendix F, effective September 2017."

The motion was carried.

ii. Proposed Addition of a Full-Time Option for the Master of Health Management

Dr. Welch further reported that the Faculty of Business was also proposing a revision to its Master of Health Management Program to allow for a full-time option in addition to the current on-line part-time stream. Full-time students would be able to complete the program in one year, rather than two. The Faculty of Health Sciences concurred with the addition of this option.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the recommendation from Graduate Council that a full-time option be added to the Master of Health Management Program as detailed in Appendix F, effective September 2018."

The motion was carried.
iii. Proposed Change to Admission Requirements for the PhD in Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour

Dr. Welch explained that the Faculty of Science was proposing to revise the wording of the admission requirements for the PhD in Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour to highlight the fact that enrolment in the Research and Clinical Training stream is limited, that there is no direct entry into this stream, and that students in this particular stream are subject to the same admission requirements as other PhD students in the Department.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the revisions to the admission requirements for the PhD in Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour as detailed in Appendix F, effective September 2017."

The motion was carried.

iv. Change in Course Requirements for the Master of Finance
v. Change in Course Requirements for the Master of Business Administration
vi. Change to Course Requirements for the M.Sc. in Kinesiology
vii. Change to Course Requirements for the PhD in Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour
viii. Change to Course Requirements for the M.Sc. in Radiation Sciences and Health Radiation Physics
ix. New Scholarship
x. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Academic Accommodation of Students With Disabilities
xi. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Academic Program Reviews
xii. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Certificates and Diplomas
xiii. Proposed Revisions to the Undergraduate Awards Policy

Senate received the above-listed reports for information.

b. Undergraduate Council (Appendix G)

i. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Academic Accommodation of Students With Disabilities

Dr. Searls Giroux explained that, as described in the report from Undergraduate Council, the Working Group on Academic Accommodations had spent the past year updating the policy on the Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities in order to respond to changes in the law around the issue of accommodations and to reduce as much as possible the level of bureaucracy that students must navigate in order to secure accommodations.
The new policy also addressed mental health issues more clearly than was previously the case.

There had been very wide consultation on the proposed changes and the revised policy had been approved at both Graduate and Undergraduate Councils.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the revisions to the Policy on Academic Accommodations of Students with Disabilities, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Appendix G."

The motion was carried.

ii. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Academic Program Reviews

Dr. Searls Giroux reminded Senators that the Policy on Academic Program Reviews was first approved in 2011 in response to the introduction of the Quality Assurance Framework which required universities to develop an Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). With the benefit of several years’ experience with the IQAP, a review of the policy was launched this year and a number of revisions were now proposed. A list of the major revisions had been provided to Senate. For the most part, these revisions were designed to streamline and clarify the process and to reflect current practice.

Graduate Council had also approved the proposed revisions.

It was duly moved and seconded,

"that the Senate approve the Policy on Academic Program Development and Review, effective May 17, 2017, as set out in Appendix G."

The motion was carried.

iii. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on Certificates and Diplomas

Dr. Searls Giroux explained that the Certificates and Diplomas Committee, a sub-committee of Undergraduate Council, had established an ad hoc committee to undertake an extensive review of the policies and procedures surrounding the awarding of certificates and diplomas.

The policy was subsequently extensively reorganized to include definitions of key terms and to clarify reporting requirements and approval processes. Among the major proposed revisions was the establishment of a new "concurrent certificate" that would enable Faculties to introduce certificate programs with courses that overlap up to 100 per cent with undergraduate degree courses. Existing certificates would now be referred to as "stand-alone certificates."
The policy would apply to both undergraduate and graduate certificates and included reference to graduate diplomas. However, graduate diplomas would continue to be approved through the IQAP process.

The proposed new policy had been reviewed and approved by Graduate Council as well as Undergraduate Council.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the Policy on Diplomas and Certificates, effective May 17, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.

iv. Proposed Revisions to the Undergraduate Awards Policy

Dr. Searls Giroux explained that the Awards Committee of Undergraduate Council was recommending a restructuring of the general regulations and terms of conditions of awards, as well as a change in title for the University Aid and Awards Policy. The proposed new policy would now include graduate awards and would, it was hoped, promote access and equity in the administration of awards. Further changes, to address specific eligibility requirements for awards and corresponding calendar copy, would be undertaken in the next academic year.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the University Aid and Awards Policy, effective May 17, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.

v. Proposal to Establish a Diploma in Business of Golf and Resort Management Program

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the establishment of a Diploma in Business of Golf and Resort Management Program, as recommended by the Centre for Continuing Education, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.

vi. Proposal to Establish an Applied Clinical Research Certificate Program

It was duly moved and seconded,
“that the Senate approve the establishment of an Applied Clinical Research Certificate Program, as recommended by the Centre for Continuing Education, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.

vii. Proposal to Establish a Certificate in Marketing Program

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the establishment of a Certificate in Marketing Program, as recommended by the Centre for Continuing Education, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.

viii. Proposal to Establish a Canadian Health Care Certificate Program

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the establishment of a Canadian Health Care Certificate Program, as recommended by the Centre for Continuing Education, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.

ix. Proposal to Establish a Certificate in Business Technology Management Program

Dr. Searls Giroux explained that the proposed Certificate in Business Technology Management would be a concurrent certificate, the requirements for which were set out in the proposed Policy on Certificates and Diplomas, above, and, as such, were approved by Undergraduate Council conditional on Senate approval of that policy.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the establishment of a Certificate in Business Technology Management Program, as recommended by the Faculty of Business, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.
x. Proposal to Establish a Certificate in International Engagement Program

Dr. Searls Giroux noted that the proposed Certificate in International Engagement was also a concurrent certificate that was approved conditional on Senate’s approval of the new Senate Policy on Diplomas and Certificates.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the establishment of a Certificate in International Engagement Program, as recommended by the Faculty of Humanities, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.

xi. Proposal to Establish a Certificate in Essential French Program

Dr. Searls Giroux noted that the proposed Certificate in Essential French was another new concurrent certificate the approval of which was conditional on Senate’s approval of the new policy. Open to all undergraduate students (except those registered in a degree program or a minor in French), the program would provide formal recognition of competency in French.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve the establishment of a Certificate in Essential French Program, as recommended by the Faculty of Humanities, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Appendix G.”

The motion was carried.

xii. Proposal to Establish a Credit / No Credit Course Option

Dr. Searls Giroux explained that Undergraduate Council had approved an option whereby undergraduate students would be permitted to explore courses outside of their program without affecting their GPA. The courses would be graded on a Credit or No Credit scale. This option would be established for a two- to two-and-a-half-year trial period, beginning no later than September 2018, after which time Undergraduate Council would review the outcome and determine whether to continue with the option, and, if continuing, would make any necessary changes to the process. The precise name of the credit / no credit course option was yet to be determined.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve a credit / no credit course option, the precise name of the option still to be determined by Undergraduate Council, for a two- to two-and-a-half-year trial, beginning no later than September 2018, as set out in Appendix G.”
A member asked about the risk of having a student potentially claiming that he or she had a minor in a subject when he or she may have barely passed the course.

Ms Thyrett-Kidd, who was managing the review of academic regulations and related policies, explained that the idea was to encourage the exploration of minors with the hope that if a student awoke to a new interest they might excel at it and improve their entire academic experience.

The motion was then voted on and carried.

xiii. 2018-19 Sessional Dates
xiv. Revisions to Schedule E of the Senate By-laws
xv. Revisions to the Business Administration Diploma Program
xvi. Revisions to the Marketing Diploma Program
xvii. Establishment of the Certificate of Completion in Creative, Critical and Design Thinking and the Certificate of Completion in Epidemiology and Pathophysiology
xviii. Curriculum Revisions for Inclusion in the 2017-18 Undergraduate Calendar
xix. Terms of Award

Senate received the above-listed reports for information.

XI REPORTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEES

a. Executive Committee (Appendix H)


Dr. Deane invited Dr. Warner, the Chair of the Panel to Review the Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response Policy to comment on the report before Senate.

Dr. Warner explained that in 2015 a significant redrafting of the policy had been undertaken to consolidate the existing anti-harassment and anti-discrimination policies, with the proviso that the new policy would be reviewed in two years.

A group Dr. Warner called a “dream team” was assembled to undertake the review with a focus on correcting weaknesses and ensuring alignment with the new Sexual Violence Policy. The group was recommending the removal of some educational material which was making the policy unwieldy to use and the loosening of some of the timelines required by the 2015 policy, since they had proven to be too rigid.

It was duly moved and seconded,
“that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the recommendations of the panel to review the Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response Policy as set out in Appendix II, including the revised policy and the Hearing Procedures for the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence, effective June 8, 2017.”

A member asked about the provisions for sanctions in the policy, noting that a faculty member could be suspended for a transgression of the policy and pointing out that the proposed revisions of the policy did not offer guidelines for suspension.

Ms Bennett, the Hearings Officer in the University Secretariat, said that the policy did allow for suspension as a sanction. If a tribunal decided that suspension was an appropriate sanction, it would recommend to the President that there be one, but it would also set a maximum time for the suspension. There would also be consultation with the decision-maker.

The member countered that the policy stated that, if removal was being recommended as a sanction the rules of the Tenure and Promotion Policy would apply, but it did not make the same statement regarding suspension.

Ms Bennett noted that suspension had always been codified in the Tenure and Promotion Policy and this policy did not change that.

Dr. Deane pointed out that suspensions did not typically go beyond one year and also reminded the member that there was currently an ongoing discussion with the Faculty Association about how suspensions should be codified in University policy.

The motion was then voted on and carried.

b. University Planning Committee (Appendix I)

i. Proposal to Establish the McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies

Dr. Wilkinson explained that the University Planning Committee had approved a proposal from the Faculty of Social Sciences for the establishment of a Research Centre for Buddhist Studies in the Department of Religious Studies. Buddhist Studies has long been an area of excellence in research and teaching in the University and a recent grant from the Tianzhu Foundation has provided the opportunity for more robust support of this work. The Centre would provide a focus and international profile to attract additional funding for researchers and students at McMaster and to enhance the stature and profile of the University in an area that is attracting significant global attention.

It was duly moved and seconded,
“that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies, effective immediately, as detailed in Appendix I.”

The motion was carried.

ii. Proposal to Establish the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research

Dr. Wilkinson explained that the University Planning Committee had also approved the establishment of a new research institute for medicinal cannabis research, joint with St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton. The purpose of the institute would be to apply the highest standards of scientific research and evidence-based medicine to understanding the therapeutic potential and risks for cannabis and its derivatives, particularly in the areas of pain management. Research would focus on possible adverse consequences, particularly in terms of addiction and other negative psychiatric and neurocognitive effects.

It was duly moved and seconded,

“that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research, joint with St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton, effective immediately, as outlined in Appendix I.”

The motion was carried.

XII 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 April 12, 2017;

b. approved the 2017 Spring graduands for the Divinity College, for the School of Graduate Studies for Health Sciences and for the Faculty of Health Sciences;

c. approved, on recommendation of the Executive Committee, the membership of Senate Committees and Boards for 2017-18, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS

Dr. Suzanne Labarge
Dr. Patrick Deane
Dr. David Wilkinson
Dr. Rob Baker
Dr. Doug Welch
Dr. Nancy Doubleday
Dr. Brenda Vrljar (Chair)
Dr. Carlos Filipe
Dr. Vic Satzewich
Dr. Erik Sorensen
Dr. Vishwanath Baba
Dr. Alison Holloway
Mr. Sid Nath

COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES

Dr. Suzanne Labarge (Chair)
Dr. Patrick Deane
Dr. Spencer Smith
Dr. Pamela Baxter
Dr. Catherine Anderson
Dr. Graeme Luke
Ms Beth Manganelli Staite

SENATE BOARD FOR STUDENT APPEALS

Dr. Suzanne Labarge
Dr. Patrick Deane
Dr. Audrey Hicks (Chair)
Dr. Aaron Schat (Vice-Chair)
Dr. Ian Dworkin
Dr. Phil White
Dr. Anne Niec
Dr. Sean Corner
Mr. Mitchell Hajnal (Social Sciences)
Ms Katslyn Laslo (Humanities)
Ms Rina Patel (Health Sciences)
Ms Veronica van der Vliet (Science)
Vacancy
Mr. Alexander Nielsen (Science)

COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY CEREMONIALS AND INSIGNIA

Dr. Suzanne Labarge
Dr. Patrick Deane
Dr. Henry Jacek
Dr. Narat Charupat
Dr. Thia Kirubarajan
Dr. Carlos Filipe
Dr. Diane Enns
Dr. Sheila Harms (Chair)
Dr. David Earn
Ms Veronica van der Vliet
Mr. Sid Nath
Ms Melissa Pool (Consultant)

COMMITTEE ON BY-LAWS

Dr. Suzanne Labarge
Dr. Patrick Deane
Ms Helen Ayre
Dr. David Clark (Chair)
Dr. Ana Campos
Dr. Meridith Griffin

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Dr. Suzanne Labarge
Dr. Patrick Deane
Dr. Doug Welch
Dr. Susan Searls Giroux
Dr. Martin Beckmann
Dr. Robert O’Brien
Dr. Philippa Carter (Chair)
Dr. Spencer Smith
Mr. Jason Chestney
Ms Mariam Munawar
Ms Kim Mason (Consultant)
Ms Melissa Pool (Consultant)
Ms Stephanie Baschiera (Consultant)

TENURE AND PROMOTION APPEALS NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Dr. Ron Balvers
Dr. Jamal Deen
Dr. Stephanie Atkinson
Dr. William Hanley
Dr. Sue Becker
Dr. Ellen Badone

COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS

Dr. Suzanne Labarge
Dr. Patrick Deane
Mr. Sean Van Koughnett (Chair)
Dr. Grace Kehler
Dr. James Gillett
Dr. Michael Farquharson
Mr. Richard Piekarczyk-Vacca
Ms Angela Dong
Ms Esra Bengizi
Ms Anita Acai

BOARD-SENATE RESEARCH MISCONDUCT HEARINGS PANEL (Senate Component)

Dr. Peter Miu
Dr. Brian Detlor
Dr. Ron Balvers
Dr. Natalia Nikolova
Dr. Chan Ching
Dr. Gianluigi Botton
Dr. Ram Mishra
Dr. Michael Mazurek
Dr. Alexander Ball
Dr. Lorraine York
Dr. Barry Allen
Dr. Suzanne Crosta
Dr. Matt Valeriote
Dr. Colin Seymour
Dr. Kari Dalnoki-Veress
Dr. Robert Storey (Chair)
Dr. Shayne Clarke
Dr. Michael Veall
Ms Natasha Sandhu
Ms Chelsea Barranger
Mr. Jack Boshart
Ms Anita Acai
Vacancy
Mr. Tim Van Boxtel

BOARD-SENATE HEARING PANEL FOR DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT, AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE (Senate Component)

Dr. Elzbieta Grodek
Prof. Bridget O'Shaughnessy
Dr. Tim Davidson
Dr. Frances Tuer
Dr. Kari Dalnoki-Veress
Dr. Michelle MacDonald (Chair)
Ms Udoka Okafor
Mr. Luke Little
Mr. Cam Brandreth  
Ms Mariam Munawar  
Ms Stephanie Tombri

**FACULTY DISCIPLINE BOARD**

Dr. Rick Hackett  
Dr. William Farmer  
Dr. Judith West-Mays  
Dr. Michael Gauvreau  
Dr. David Venus  
Dr. Cyril Levitt

d. approved, on recommendation of the Executive Committee, the appointments of a Council of Ontario Universities Academic Colleague and an Alternate Colleague, each for a two-year term, both effective July 1, 2017;

e. received from the Executive Committee a slate of nominees for an election to the Board of Governors to fill three vacancies for Senate representatives, together with information on how to make additional nominations;

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

- a Director of the Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis for the period May 1, 2017 to June 30, 2022;
- a Boris Family Chair in Drug Discovery for a five-year term, effective July 1, 2017;
- the Cisco Chair in Bioinformatics for the period July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019;
- the Chair in Infection and Anti-Infective Research and Director of the Michael G. DeGroote Institute for Infectious Disease Research for a five-year term, effective July 1, 2017;
- Canada Research Chair nominations for the April 2017 competition; and
- recommendations for the title “Distinguished University Professor”;

g. approved, on recommendation of the Committee on Appointments, conferral of the title Professor Emeritus on a retiring colleague, effective July 1, 2017;

h. nominated, through the President to the Board of Governors, the appointment of an Associate Professor with continuing appointment without annual review in the Department of Biochemistry and Biomedical Sciences effective July 1, 2017, and the appointment of an Associate Professor with tenure in the Department of Economics effective July 1, 2017, both as approved by the Committee on Appointments;

i. received from the Committee on Appointments, for information, a report on the appointments of Acting Chairs of the Department of Linguistics and Languages to cover the period January 1 to June 30, 2017;
j. approved, on recommendation of the Committee on Appointments, the compositions of the following selection committees:

**Associate Vice-President (Research)**

Dr. Rob Baker, Vice-President (Research) (Chair)  
Ms Mary Williams, Vice-President (University Advancement)  
Dr. Chandrima Chakraborty, Associate Professor, English and Cultural Studies  
Dr. Stephen Collins, Professor, Medicine; Associate Dean (Research), Health Sciences  
Dr. Jim Dunn, Professor and Chair, Health, Aging and Society; Director, McMaster Institute for Healthier Environments  
Dr. Marie Elliot, Associate Professor, Biology  
Dr. Ronald Balvers, Professor, Finance and Business Economics  
Dr. Stephen Veldhuis, Professor, Mechanical Engineering; Director, McMaster Manufacturing Research Institute  
Ms Kathy Charters, Executive Director, Research Office for Administration, Development and Support  
Dr. Gay Yuyitung, Executive Director, McMaster Industry Liaison Office; and

**Dean of Business**

Dr. David Wilkinson, Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (Chair)  
Dr. Rob Baker, Vice-President (Research)  
Dr. Willi Wiesner, Human Resources and Management  
Dr. Peter Vilks, Strategic Management  
Dr. Manish Verma, Operations Management  
Dr. Gillian Mulvale, Health Policy and Management  
Dr. John Maheu, Finance and Business Economics  
Dr. Milena Head, Information Systems  
Dr. Manish Kacker, Marketing  
Dr. Sue McCracken, Accounting and Financial Management Services  
Dr. Patty Solomon, Co-Director, Master of Health Management Program, Health Sciences  
Mr. Kamran Eshghi, PhD candidate, Marketing  
Ms Susan Mitchell, Director of Administration, Faculty of Business  
Ms Stephanie Caines, Undergraduate student, Commerce (consultant); and

k. approved three requests for early graduation.
REPORT TO SENATE

FROM THE

COMMITTEE ON BY-LAWS

At the April 12, 2017 meeting, Senate gave approval in principle to revisions to the Senate By-laws as set out in the attached.

The Committee on By-Laws reviewed these changes by e-mail on April 18, 2017 and had no questions or concerns about the revisions or their proposed wording.

The Committee on By-laws therefore recommends,

"that the Senate give final approval to revisions to the Senate By-Laws as set out in the attached, effective May 17, 2017."

Senate: May 17, 2017
For Final Approval
REPORT TO SENATE

FROM THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Open Session

i. Recommendations to Revise the Senate By-Laws

At its March 22, 2017 meeting, the Executive Committee approved the following recommendations to revise the Senate By-laws and now recommends these revisions to Senate for final approval.

1. Faculty of Theology

The Executive Committee recommends:

“that the Senate approve revisions to Schedule A of the Senate By-laws, to reflect the termination of the Faculty of Theology.”

2. Regulations Governing Student Elections to Senate

The Executive Committee recommends:

“that the Senate approve a revision to Clause 6 of the Campaign Rules for Student Elections to Senate, as outlined in Attachment I.”

3. Academic Administrator Titles

The Executive Committee recommends:

“that the Senate approve the revision of the Senate By-laws to reflect the change in title from Associate Vice-President to Vice-Provost for those academic administrators with that title who report to the Provost, in regard to Article VI, 43; Article IX, 114 (a), 114 (b) iii, 115 (c), 116, 118, 133; Article X, 146, 147; Article XI, 157, 158; and to Schedule A, and, further, that the University Secretariat be authorized to make the same editorial change to all Senate policies and procedures.”

Senate: For Approval
April 12, 2017

T:\Senate\Executive Committee\March 22 17\report (open session).docx
March 15, 2017

TO: Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Helen Ayre
University Secretary

RE: Proposed Revisions to Senate By-laws

I am recommending some relatively minor revisions to the Senate By-laws.

Faculty of Theology

You will recall that, on the recommendation of the Senate, the Board of Governors terminated the Faculty of Theology as of December 31, 2016. The Senate By-laws should now be amended to remove that Faculty from the list of those represented on the Senate.

Schedule A – Composition of the Senate

Elected by and from the Teaching Staff of the University:

34-30 members
- Faculty of Business - three members
- Faculty of Humanities - six members
- Faculty of Engineering - three members
- Faculty of Health Sciences - six members
- Faculty of Science - six members
- Faculty of Social Sciences - six members
- Faculty of Theology - one member

Recommendation:

that the Senate Executive Committee approve, for recommendation to the Senate, revisions to Schedule A of the Senate By-laws, to reflect the termination of the Faculty of Theology
Regulations Governing Student Elections to Senate

Attachment I outlines a request for a revision to the Regulations for student elections to Senate, in particular, the campaign rules for those elections. It is proposed that clause 6 of the current campaign rules be amended to allow students to use social media for campaigning, even on voting days.

Recommendation:

that the Senate Executive Committee approve, for recommendation to the Senate, a revision to clause 6 of the Campaign Rules for Student Elections to Senate, as outlined in Attachment I

Academic Administrator Titles

On October 12, 2016, Senate approved a recommendation that the titles of those academic Associate Vice-Presidents who report to the Provost be changed to ‘Vice-Provost’ effective July 1, 2017. The Senate By-laws should be amended to reflect this change in title, as should the various policies and procedures approved by the Senate.

Recommendation:

that the Senate Executive Committee approve, for recommendation to the Senate, that the Senate By-laws be revised to reflect the change in title from Associate Vice-President to Vice-Provost for those academic administrators with that title who report to the Provost. This revision would apply to Article VI, 43; Article IX, 114 (a), 114 (b) iii, 115 (c), 116, 118, 133; Article X, 146, 147; Article XI, 157, 158; and to Schedule A, and further that the University Secretariat be authorised to make the same editorial change to all Senate policies and procedures.
March 15, 2017

TO: Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Tamara Bates
Governance Advisor and Assistant University Secretary

SUBJECT: Regulations Governing Student Elections to the Senate

The Senate By-Laws set out the requirements for students when running for election to McMaster’s Senate. In recent years, the campaign rules have been updated to reflect the shift to electronic voting and to update the regulations regarding use of social media for campaigning. The increased use of social media, in particular, has generated a number of questions from candidates about what is and is not permitted under the rules, and complaints about how their opponents are campaigning.

Social media has created challenges for candidates, whether or not they are using it to campaign. The regulations include a campaign ban, whereby students are required to stop campaigning at 11:59pm the night before the voting begins. Under the ban, candidates are required to remove any and all campaign posters from within sight of the computer labs, they cannot approach voters to solicit votes on election day(s) and they must refrain from posting on social media platforms. Candidates are strongly encouraged to maintain as much control over their own posts and profile pages as possible and to be vigilant throughout the voting period. Although candidates are generally respectful of the ban and most are cautious about posts, this is becoming increasingly difficult to police. There are inevitably concerns from candidates about what constitutes a post (versus a repost, a like or a share). Moreover, the majority of voters and supporters are unaware of the election regulations or the campaign ban. Candidates often report that third parties have posted messages of support for other candidates, and allege that this is a breach of the regulations. Candidates themselves are concerned about such third party postings. Given the nature of social media, the campaign ban causes more anxiety among candidates than is necessary and increases the amount of questions, concerns and complaints from them.

I propose that candidates be permitted to continue to campaign using social media during the voting period, but that the campaign ban continue for campaigning done in person. Upholding the ban for campaigning in person prevents candidates from interfering with voters during the act of voting and from setting up makeshift or mobile polling stations, which are both prohibited under the election regulations.

The following revision to the election regulations is recommended:

Campaign Rules
1 ... 5

6. All in-person campaigning must end at 11:59 p.m. the night prior to the start of the first day of voting. Candidates may, however, continue to campaign using social media platforms on election day(s).

7 ... 13
March 2017

TO: University Planning Committee

FROM: Susan Searls Giroux
Associate Vice-President, Faculty

Doug Welch
Dean, Graduate Studies

RE: 2014-15 and 2015-16 IQAP Cylcical Program Reviews

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) program reviews is to assist academic units in clarifying their objectives and to assess curriculum and pedagogical policies, including desirable changes for future academic development. Although the primary objective for these reviews is the improvement of our academic programs, the processes that we adopt are also designed to meet our responsibility to the government on quality assurance. The process by which institutions meet this accountability to the government is outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF), developed by the Ontario Councils of Academic Vice- Presidents (OCAV). Institutions’ compliance with the QAF is monitored by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance, also known as the Quality Council, which reports to OCAV and the Council of Ontario Universities.

The goal of McMaster’s IQAP is to facilitate the development and continued improvement of our undergraduate and graduate academic programs, and to ensure that McMaster continues to lead internationally in its reputation for innovation in teaching and learning and for the quality of its programs. McMaster’s IQAP is intended to complement existing mechanisms for critical assessment and enhancement, including departmental reviews and accreditation reviews. The uniqueness of each program emerges through the self-study.

All program reviews are submitted to McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee, a joint committee of Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. The Quality Assurance Committee assesses the reviews and submits a Final Assessment Report of all reviews conducted during the previous academic session to Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council that:

- Identifies significant strengths of the program;
- Addresses the appropriateness of resources for the success of the program;
- Identifies opportunities for program improvement and enhancement;
- Identifies and prioritizes the recommendations;
Prior to University Planning Committee review, the Undergraduate Council and/or Graduate Council will review reports to determine if it will make additional recommendations.

**2014-2015 IQAP CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS**

The following undergraduate programs were reviewed during 2014-15:

- Bachelor of Health Sciences (Honours)
- Chemistry and Chemical Biology
- Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour and Psychology
- History (joint with graduate programs)

**2015-2016 IQAP CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS**

The following undergraduate programs were reviewed during 2015-16:

- Chemical Engineering
- Engineering Physics
- Mechanical Engineering
- Political Science (joint with graduate programs)
- Sociology (joint with graduate programs)
- Theatre & Film Studies

The following graduate programs were reviewed during 2015-16:

- Occupational Therapy
- Physiotherapy

For your review, the Final Assessment Reports are attached.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review

Bachelor of Health Science (Honours) Program

Date of Review: April 21 – 22, 2015

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the Bachelor of Health Science (Honours) undergraduate program. This report identifies the significant strengths of the program, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

This Final Assessment Report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible leading the follow up for the proposed recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Bachelor of Health Science (Honours) Program Cyclical Program Review

The Bachelor of Health Science (Honours) program submitted a self-study to the Associate Vice-President (Faculty) on April 2, 2015. The self-study presented the program description and learning outcomes, an analytical assessment of the program, and program data including the data collected from a student survey along with the standard data package prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appended were the course outlines for all courses in the program and the CVs for each full-time faculty member in the Department.

Two arm’s length external reviewers, both from Ontario and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on April 21 – 22, 2015. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Assistant Dean of the department and the Associate Vice-President of the Faculty of Health Sciences submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (March 2016). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.

The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the QAC to be submitted to Undergraduate Council and Senate (January 2017).
BRIEF SUMMARY OF REVIEWERS’ COMMENTS.

The following program strengths and areas for improvement were also noted:

Strengths

The Review Team noted key strengths of the program that were summarized overall as:

“This is an impressive program, not only for its attention to principles of PBL and aligned curricula, but also for its attention to the developmental arc of its learners. It assumes that students can achieve excellence in a motivated and intentional fashion and it puts in place the structures to support this outcome. The scaffolding and mentoring are further supplemented by a governance structure that embeds consultation and ongoing curriculum development into its equally sustainable structures of pedagogy and course development. It would be easy to think it is ‘easy to do this’ because of the apparent ease and fluidity of the processes; however, the complexities and intricacies ought not to be underestimated. The program team is well integrated and believes in its mission. Their commitment to their own ongoing development as academic professionals and scholars is further testimony to the strength and depth of this program.”

Areas for Improvement

The Review Team’s report noted that there is the potential for transition overload going from group work dynamics to a more specialized focus. In addition, the report notes that the apparent level of student stress, especially as experienced in early years seems to be on the program’s radar and does require monitoring.

The Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, in consultation with the Assistant Dean of the program shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the Progress Report and filed in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty’s office.

Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and Associate Vice-President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic’s Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades (in the context of electives, stress and external view of the program)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities for more efficient use of existing resources (issues related to program practices, collaboration with engineering and term 3 programming)</th>
<th>Continue to consult with students on all issues related to term 3 programming but early feedback acknowledges that there are already several subcultures with the program specializations and therefore, there may be ways to maintain the existing culture if term 3 programming is realized.</th>
<th>Assistant Dean</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More reflection on mental health programming in level one</td>
<td>Continue to formally review the current programming every year with level one students and faculty A new course on mental health will be added</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase communication strategies to help address career aspirations</td>
<td>The program will continue to develop new communication strategies to help address career aspirations for the wild-</td>
<td>Assistant Dean</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Response:

The AVP Academic, Faculty of Health Sciences noted in her report that she was “extremely gratified to see the recognition on the part of the reviewers of the myriad strengths of the program. These include: the deep commitment and camaraderie of faculty and staff in the program; the very positive and challenging environment experienced by the students who are encouraged to become aware and critical thinkers capable of grappling with increasing independence; the introduction of creative support structures to enable students to cope with the pressures of collaborative self-directed learning; and the continuous efforts to introduce and evaluate innovative pedagogical approaches.”

The AVP Academic further notes that the response from the assistant dean of the program “includes both an instructive discussion about the issue of grade inflation and students’ relationship to grades, as well as a systematic response to the key comments and recommendations made by the reviewers. These latter relate to the efficient use of resources and the need to protect the current program culture in the event of a three term program; quality enhancement suggestions related to stress and mental health, career options, and communication; issues of staff workload; and opportunities to increase interaction with the university generally, both at a student and at an instructional level.

The AVP Academic highlights that “the reviewers were intrigued by the potential for engagement with other parts of the university and adopting the “champion model for program leadership within the wider McMaster context”. There has long been discussion of how to scale up the innovative approaches adopted by the BHSc (and other signature programs e.g. Arts & Science and iSci) within the broader university. In the context of the ever-increasing attention to student experience and outcomes evident across all Faculties at McMaster, the opportunities for cross-fertilization abound. The BHSc program, through its current partnering with both Engineering and Business, is actively collaborating in these conversations. As the reviewers so aptly noted, such cross-fertilization requires “active engagement with core principles rather than potentially more superficial replication of structural elements – the distinction between what they term “core values/substance” and “surface-level features”.

Finally, the AVP Academic notes that the issue of leadership succession has been satisfactorily addressed with the selection of a new assistant dean as of July 1, 2015.
Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation

That the Quality Assurance Committee recommends that the undergraduate Bachelor of Health Sciences (Honours) program should follow the regular course of action with an 18-month progress report that should provide additional commentary about what is further being done to help support issues of student mental health and wellness within the program. A subsequent full external cyclical review will be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Chemistry and Chemical Biology
Undergraduate Programs

Date of Review: March 9 - 10, 2015

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the undergraduate programs delivered by the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology. This report identifies the significant strengths of the programs, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate Chemistry and Chemical Biology Programs

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology submitted a self-study in January 2015 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty to initiate the cyclical program review of its undergraduate programs. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appendices to the self-study contained all course outlines associated with the program and the CVs for each full-time member in the department.

Two arm’s length external reviewers, both from Ontario and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean of Science, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on March 9 – 10, 2015. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Chair of the department and the Dean of the Faculty of Science submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (May 2015). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.
The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the QAC to be submitted to Undergraduate Council, and Senate (January 2017).

In their report (April 2015), the Review Team was impressed by the quality of both the undergraduate chemistry and chemical biology programs. The Review Team noted that both programs offer a comprehensive array of theory together with a practical lab experience that must rank amongst the best in Canada. The Review Team acknowledged that the undergraduate students they met with were enthusiastic about their respective programs of study, expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the two academic programs, and as well with the level of support offered by the Department and the faculty members teaching them.

The following program strengths and areas for improvement were noted:

**Strengths**

The reviewers made special mention of the extensive and superior quality of the experiential aspects of both programs. The report highlighted that these unusually intense integrated laboratory exercises bring the programs to the forefront of undergraduate chemistry (and probably all experimental science) programs across Canada.

The report also highlights that the department has been successful in obtaining student feedback over multiple years, which has led to incremental improvements in many courses.

**Areas for Improvement**

The report indicated that while the programs are of high quality, overall enrolment in both Honours programs is relatively low compared to others offered in the Faculty of Science. The reviewers noted that all chemistry programs in Canada are up against a demographic shift, namely an increased desire amongst students to engage with Life Science programs due to the perception that only Life Science can lead to medical school. While the reviewers acknowledged that this problem is difficult to address, they stressed the importance of the department engaging students in first year courses.

Another key concern of the reviewers was the high attrition rate between second and third year, specifically in the Chemical Biology program. The reviewers strongly encouraged the Department to review the workload in the second year of the program.

With respect to communications, the review team felt that the department could improve upon communicating its events through the academic year and the report suggested that the department increase its use of social media to communicate more effectively with students.

The Dean of the Faculty of Science, in consultation with the Chair of the Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the progress report and filed in the Associate Vice President, Faculty’s office.
### Summary of the Reviewers' Recommendations with the Department's and the Dean's Responses

#### Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look into courses that can be deferred to 3rd or 4th year to add flexibility in course sequence and electives within the program to potentially reduce attrition rates, without affecting quality</td>
<td>Review course curricula for 4PC3/4PD3 with a view to increasing the attractiveness of the courses to students in physics, material sciences, etc.</td>
<td>Chemistry 4PC3/4PD3 course instructors</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look into courses that can be deferred to 3rd or 4th year to add flexibility in course sequence and electives within the program to potentially reduce attrition rates, without affecting quality</td>
<td>Consider development of a new level 3 separations course</td>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look into courses that can be deferred to 3rd or 4th year to add flexibility in course sequence and electives within the program to potentially reduce attrition rates, without affecting quality</td>
<td>Follow up with BBS regarding Biochem 3G03</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further engagement with first year students and continuous review and improvement of student engagement in the first year chemistry courses</td>
<td>Review and enhance Level 1 recruiting “tools”</td>
<td>RIO Committee</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further engagement</td>
<td>Review chemistry course offerings at</td>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with first year students and continuous review and improvement of student engagement in the first year chemistry courses</td>
<td>competitor institutions; consider new service course offerings and modifications of existing courses to attract broader clientele</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review workload in second year Chemical Biology (specifically)</td>
<td>Develop plan for undergraduate curriculum renewal</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review workload in second year Chemical Biology (specifically)</td>
<td>Enhance the follow-up on annual Program Refinement exercises in both programs</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review workload in second year Chemical Biology (specifically)</td>
<td>Remedy workload issues in ChemBio 2Q03 and 2AA3</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase social media presence (activate a Facebook page and/or a Twitter feed)</td>
<td>Create new committee to redesign departmental webpage; establish use of social media tools to enhance contact with current students and with alumni; establish workable mechanism for maintaining these resources</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop exit surveys for graduating students and 2–3 year alumni surveys; develop and maintain database of student contact information</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examine role of communication and other soft skills development in the two programs to ensure adequate and equal representation in the curricula</td>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction or semiannual departmental reviews of course grades prior to end-of-term grade submission and approval</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create faculty/staff/student committee to examine efficiencies and inefficiencies in undergraduate laboratory space usage; create a record of what is used when and to what end for all areas</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop new end-of-course surveys based on NSSE-CLASSE survey system</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15 Engaging Lecture Committee to review and modify initial production</td>
<td>2014-15 Engaging Lecture Committee</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review laboratory exercises and modify those for which time over runs are a problem</td>
<td>Chem 2LA3/2LB3 and ChemBio 2L03 instructors</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee recommends that the program should follow the regular course of action with an 18-month follow-up report and a subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour
Undergraduate Programs

Date of Review: March 2 - 3, 2015

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the undergraduate programs delivered by the Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour. This report identifies the significant strengths of the programs, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour Programs

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour submitted a self-study in February 2015 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty to initiate the cyclical program review of its undergraduate and graduate programs. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appendices to the self-study contained all course outlines associated with the program and the CVs for each full-time member in the department.

Two arm’s length external reviewers, one from Ontario and one from British Columbia and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean of the Faculty of Science, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on March 2 - 3, 2015. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate and graduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Chair of the department and the Dean of the Faculty of Science submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (August 2015). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.
The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the QAC to be submitted to Undergraduate Council and Senate (January 2017).

In their report (May 2015), the Review Team noted the department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour (PNB) at McMaster University is one of the very top departments of psychology in Canada. The report highlighted that the program is unique, with focused strength in the NSERC areas of behavioural neuroscience, cognitive neuroscience, and evolutionary psychology, which distinguishes it from other departments of psychology both nationally and internationally.

The following program strengths and areas for improvement were noted:

**Strengths**

The Review Team noted key strengths of the department and they highlighted in their report that they came away from their visit very impressed by the high level of commitment and involvement of the PNB faculty and staff with respect to undergraduate education. The report noted that undergraduate students, as well as staff and faculty all are very happy with their program(s), and there is a strong sense of esprit de corps throughout the Department. The reviewers reported that this is an outstanding department in which top-flight researchers and an extraordinary staff work in concert to provide an exceptionally strong and very well liked set of undergraduate programs.

**Areas for Improvement**

The Review Team’s report noted that the existing laboratory space should be reviewed to identify any under-utilized space, which could be used for one or more PNB labs. The report also suggested that the department move forward on a plan to introduce a programming course.

The Dean of the Faculty of Science, in consultation with the Chair of the Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour department shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the Progress Report and filed in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty’s office.

**Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and the Dean’s Responses**

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department should not be required to lower its program admission standards at this time.</td>
<td>Department has proposed a gradual approach to adjusting the criteria for granting admission to the Honours programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one teaching stream faculty positions should be added in the next five years</td>
<td>Continue to work with the Dean's office to acquire the faculty that best serves the needs of the students</td>
<td>Chair of Department</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As staff retires, the positions should be replaced. A new position should also be added with half of the duties tracking alumni and the other half absorbing the duties of exiting, over-stretched staff</td>
<td>The department's last projected budget was balanced and received a favourable review by the dean's office. The department believes that PNB has a good chance of being able to replace staff that retire during the next 2 – 3 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify existing laboratory space for undergraduate labs and should assist Psychology in finding suitable space(s) in which its student lab courses can be held</td>
<td>The Faculty of Science is currently conducting a review of undergraduate laboratory space and simultaneously, is developing a new undergraduate laboratory for the Life Science program. The department will work with the Associate Dean (Academic) to determine if it is possible to use existing, under-utilized space or the new laboratory for one or more PNB labs</td>
<td>Chair of Department and Associate Dean (Academic)</td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the new budget model, that proportion of the Basic Income Unit (BIU) corresponding to each student's enrolment in PNB (and other Faculty of Science courses) that currently flows to the Faculty of Social Sciences should be routinely transferred to</td>
<td>Recently, the budget model was revised so that inter-faculty teaching was reimbursed at a rate of 100% of tuition. In addition, the Dean of Science continues to have discussions with the Dean of Social Sciences with a comprehensive funding</td>
<td>Dean's Office (see note under Dean's comments below)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Faculty of Science (In addition to the 100% of tuition being transferred from the Faculty of Social Sciences to the Faculty of Sciences for each PNB or other Faculty of Science course taken by a student registered in the Faculty of Social Sciences).</td>
<td>The department will advocate for a tenure-track appointment as it is eager to expand its research capacity as well as teaching capacity.</td>
<td>Chair of Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department should be reallocated a teaching stream position with primary expertise in the area of Developmental Psychology to replace the recent departure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move forward on plan to introduce a programming course. A method-related Python course would potentially have appeal and generalizability and would likely be of interest to other students across the Faculty</td>
<td>The department is examining how other programming courses (PHYSICS 2G03) meet the needs of Psychology students and continue to explore the possibility of offering a Python programming course as part of the program.</td>
<td>Chair of Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Update at progress report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean's Response:**

**Hiring:** The Faculty recognizes the implications of the possible retirement of a colleague who teaches several large courses. Other departments face similar issues and the Faculty has instituted a new system whereby each unit will submit requests for new faculty hires. The requests will include details on the needs relevant to teaching and research and will be evaluated in terms of enrollment, the degree of “fit” with existing research programs etc. It is inevitable that the Faculty will be able to make far fewer hires than the number of retirements and the system is designed to ensure new hires are placed in those units with the greatest need. As for Teaching Stream Faculty, the Faculty of Science is home to many outstanding Teaching Stream appointments and is convinced that it would be in a better position to offer high quality programs if its current allocation of 16 was increased.
Given the financial difficulties facing the Faculty, it is not in a position to guarantee that all staff retirements will be replaced; this is particularly true for individual departments that are in deficit. However, for units not running deficits the Dean is, in general, prepared to support Chair’s decisions about staffing needs. It should be noted however that staff hires must be approved by the Provost’s office.

**Funding:** On funding from the Faculty of Social Science for the Social Science programs with very large contributions from colleagues in PNB, the Provost is currently searching for a new Dean of the Faculty of Social Science and the Dean of Science will engage with the new Dean to continue the discussion. It is not expected that any new hire relevant to the Social Science programs will be approved until the situation is resolved.

**Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee recommends that the program should follow the regular course of action with a progress report and subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
History
Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Date of Review: April 9 - 10, 2015

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the undergraduate and graduate programs delivered by the Department of History. This report identifies the significant strengths of the programs, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate and Graduate History Programs

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the Department of History submitted a self-study in February 2015 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty and School of Graduate Studies to initiate the cyclical program review of its undergraduate and graduate programs. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appendices to the self-study contained all course outlines associated with the program and the CVs for each full-time member in the department.

Two arm’s length external reviewers, one from Ontario and one from Quebec and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean of Humanities, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty and Associate Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on April 9 – 10, 2015. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate and graduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Chair of the department and the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (June 2015). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.
The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the QAC to be submitted to Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council and Senate (January 2017).

In their report (May 2015), the Review Team noted that the programs in History are strong ones, offered by a corps of dedicated and talented scholars and teachers. The Review Team highlighted that the department has a distinguished history, and enjoys excellent library and archival resources.

The following program strengths and areas for improvement were noted:

**Strengths**

The Review Team noted key strengths of the department and its program include the quality of each individual professor; the collective collegiality of the faculty; the resources of the Wilson Institute for Canadian History; and the ability to recruit students who are already in-course to stay with the department for a more intensive program.

**Areas for Improvement**

The Review Team’s report raised some concerns that the faculty complement is shrinking with recent retirements and further ones impending. The report noted that the immediate challenges are: undergraduate recruitment in the face of declining enrolments and the faculty complement in the face of impending retirements and the way this connects with the shape and future of the graduate program.

The Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, in consultation with the Chair of the Department of History shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the 18-month Follow Up Report and filed in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty’s office and the School of Graduate Studies.

**Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and the Dean’s Responses**

**Recommendations for Undergraduate Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconsider decision to introduce Level 1 seminars, in light of the resource commitment it involves</td>
<td>Review the Level 1 seminars after they have been given a proper trial run of three years. Faculty will encourage Department to consider alternative modes of delivering such a course, such as in a larger active learning</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure instructors are familiar with and adopt “inquiry” methods in courses</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiment with a popular Level I course, such as “History of the internet”, both to increase service teaching and as a way of recruiting more students to the program</td>
<td>Review the success of the relatively new Level I lecture courses</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Within 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More service courses, given the nature of the budget model</td>
<td>Introduce a new Level II course that is both traditional and innovative – The Second World War: A Global History – as a service course Willingness to develop online courses</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Ongoing review of service teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase offerings in non-western history and in western history prior to the modern era</td>
<td>Associate Dean to work with the department to ensure some balance in course offerings and encourage the department to review its course list requirements</td>
<td>Department and Associate Dean</td>
<td>Within 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of the history practicum and offerings in digital humanities</td>
<td>Ongoing review of Practicum and Digital Humanities in curriculum. Open to practicums History instructors have been learning more about Digital Humanities and are incorporating those skills into their courses, which seems a better strategy than</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Review progress in 18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the impact of the separation of the Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences on recruitment in History, noting for example, the unusually small proportion of students combining History and Political Science compared to at other institutions</td>
<td>There is no formal impediment to Combined Honours with disciplines in Social Sciences and such combinations are encouraged. The Dean has brought this concern to the attention of the Task Force struck by the Provost and the Deans of Humanities, Science and Social Sciences to consider such issues</td>
<td>Dean, as part of response to Task Force</td>
<td>Next 12 – 24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve website as one recruitment initiative</td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities is set to launch a new Content Management System website which will allow Departments to more easily make changes and update their website. The Dean’s Office will encourage the department to review its content</td>
<td>Department and Dean</td>
<td>Over next 6 – 12 months as website launches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review faculty complement</td>
<td>Dean will work with the Chair and the Department on strategic complement planning</td>
<td>Dean and Department</td>
<td>Ongoing review of faculty complement requirements in 12, 24, 36 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations for Graduate Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review quality of the applicants to the graduate program and the ability of the department to support</td>
<td>Department has been modifying the program (recent abolition of doctoral fields and further proposed)</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Review effectiveness over next 2 – 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Growth</td>
<td>Changes that will do away with a comprehensive examination in order to move students more quickly to the dissertation in a variety of ways to give the department a competitive advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize particular expertise of faculty members so that graduate students will focus on the benefits of a wider committee</td>
<td>Department has made appointments so as to strengthen its specialization in the British world as well as various thematic areas. Dean will recommend that the department do more to highlight the depth it has in those areas.</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Ongoing efforts to emphasize particular strengths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and recommends that the program should follow the regular course of action with an 18-month follow-up report and a subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Chemical Engineering and Chemical Engineering and Biosciences
Undergraduate Programs

Date of Review: March 31 – April 1, 2016

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the undergraduate programs delivered by the Department of Chemical Engineering. This report identifies the significant strengths of the programs, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Cyclical Program Review of the
Undergraduate Chemical Engineering Programs

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the Department of Chemical Engineering submitted a self-study in January 2016 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty to initiate the cyclical program review of its undergraduate programs. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appendices to the self-study contained all course outlines associated with the program and the CVs for each full-time member in the department.

One arm’s length external reviewer from Ontario and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean, Faculty of Engineering, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on March 31 – April 1, 2016. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Chair of the department and the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (October 2016). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.
The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the Quality Assurance Committee to be submitted to Undergraduate Council, and Senate (January 2017).

**Strengths**

In their report (September 2016), the Review Team noted that overall, the Chemical Engineering program is an excellent program that is attracting top students and that the program has excellent faculty and staff committed to high quality teaching, student support and to continuous improvement. The Department leadership team (Chair and Associate Chair) are committed to the program and its students and this is well recognized by students, faculty and staff.

Program strengths include a strong sense of community among and between students, faculty and staff, and a demonstrated commitment to teaching excellence. The program continues to innovate and experiment with new modes of course delivery (e.g. on-line, project based), building upon its historical reputation for introducing problem based learning over 2 decades ago. The program offers students several choices including CO-OP placements, specialization options in upper years and five-year programs (bioengineering, engineering and society, management).

**Areas for Improvement and/or Enhancement**

The reviewers noted that overall, there are no significant areas that require improvement. Some areas that could be enhanced include: in the Bioengineering combined program, a review of the biochemistry courses and earlier timing of the MatLab course; improved TA training and mentoring; improve the tracking of graduates from the program; balancing project loads between Fall and Winter terms; exploring opportunities to list upper year courses from other Departments (e.g. polymers in chemistry); continuing to work with the Math Department to improve math courses; improving access to midterm examination facilities.

The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, in consultation with the Chair of the Department of Engineering Physics shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the progress report and filed in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty’s office.

**Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and the Dean’s Responses**

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue with the Quality Assurance process that has been recently setup with</td>
<td>This is maintained</td>
<td>Chair and Associate Chair (Undergraduate)</td>
<td>This is done yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder meetings etc. Keeping this maintained in a regular way and adjusting as required will require attention from the Department's leadership team.</td>
<td>Review the combined Chemical Engineering and Bioengineering program to look for redundancies in courses and opportunities for better timing of some (e.g. numerical methods) courses.</td>
<td>We absolutely agree with this recommendation. This was discussed in our retreat (May of 2016) and the Associate Chair will create a working group, which includes students, alumni, faculty and staff, to improve on these issues.</td>
<td>Chair and Associate Chair (Undergraduate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a program for enhanced TA training and best practices for faculty/TA interaction.</td>
<td>A significant part of our retreat was dedicated to this particular issue. We all agreed, as a department, to implement a multi-level strategy to improve TA quality/training/support. This includes awareness of faculty members about the fact that graduate students are also employees of the Faculty for their TA duties and as such, the ability to be effective TAs needs to be considered when recruiting graduate students. Starting in September 2016, all graduate students will have a TA training session (this will be part of the 130 hours of paid work). Moreover, faculty members all agreed to provide more feedback</td>
<td>Chair and Associate Chair (Graduate). All faculty members agreed to work towards improving the experience for the TAs and the undergraduate students working with the TAs.</td>
<td>To be started in September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the potential to better balance project workloads across terms.</td>
<td>For the next two years, we will be revamping our capstone project. Balancing the load is one of the aspects we will certainly be focusing on.</td>
<td>Chair and Associate Chair (Undergraduate)</td>
<td>Starting in September 2016 for a period of two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the tracking of graduates from the program.</td>
<td>This issue is quite difficult to tackle and one that is present in essentially every program we know of. Our faculty has an alumni office that keeps the contact with former students. As a department, we will increase our presence in social media and we hired a person to redesign our web page and how we communicate with potential new students and former students.</td>
<td>Chair and Department Administrator</td>
<td>Already started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the potential to cross list courses in other programs (e.g. Chemistry) for students in upper years.</td>
<td>We agree and already talked with Chemistry about at least one course being included. There is a limit on the amount of technical electives our students can take because of highly constraining accreditation requirements.</td>
<td>Chair and Associate Chair (Undergraduate)</td>
<td>Already started and ongoing for 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the potential to provide spaces for students to work on computers, including bookable computing facilities and/or exploring ways to</td>
<td>We appreciate the comments from the reviewers and we realize that ours is not the only department struggling with space. We will make a department</td>
<td>Dean has been extremely supportive of the undergraduate student experience, but there is only so much that can be done with the current space.</td>
<td>This is a problem for the ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure all students have a computer so that regular classrooms could be used.</td>
<td>Laptop available and encourage students to bring laptops to tutorial rooms where possible.</td>
<td>University level</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to midterm examination facilities</td>
<td>We agree that this is an issue, but one beyond departmental control. As new infrastructure is built, some pressure may be relieved. We may need to explore alternate assessment methods as well.</td>
<td>University level</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Math Department courses</td>
<td>The first year office has been working closely with the Math Department, and the Engineering Faculty as a whole recognises the need for improvements.</td>
<td>Dean, first year office and curriculum committee</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Response:**

As detailed in the Chair's response, the recommendations in the review have led to a series of discussions within the department focused on TA training and obligations, an examination of redundancies in the Chemical and Bioengineering program, means to balance workloads across terms in senior undergraduate years and the enhancement of alumni tracking after leaving McMaster. Many of these initiatives have been addressed or are on-going. Several initiatives at the Faculty level – such as improvements to the mathematics courses offered – are also on-going.

Overall, the dean is satisfied with the replies of the department to the concerns raised by the IQAP reviewers.

**Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and recommends that the undergraduate Chemical Engineering programs should follow the regular course of action with an 18 month progress report and a subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Engineering Physics
Undergraduate Programs

Date of Review: March 31 – April 1, 2016

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the undergraduate programs delivered by the Department of Engineering Physics. This report identifies the significant strengths of the programs, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate Engineering Physics Program

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the Department of Engineering Physics submitted a self-study in January 2016 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty to initiate the cyclical program review of its undergraduate programs. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appendices to the self-study contained all course outlines associated with the program and the CVs for each full-time member in the department.

Two arm’s length external reviewers, one from Ontario and one from Quebec and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean, Faculty of Engineering, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on March 31 – April 1, 2016. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Chair of the department and the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (October 2016). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.
The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the Quality Assurance Committee to be submitted to Undergraduate Council, and Senate (January 2017).

**Strengths**

In their report (September 2016), the Review Team confirmed the high quality of the Engineering Physics program, and the adequate resourcing, for the time being, of the Department of Engineering Physics. The reviewers noted that the program was recognized as “cutting edge” by students and faculty alike, and one that reflects the needs of industries in the areas of the program’s specialization. The reviewers highlighted that this favourable context is a guarantee of the sustainability of the program.

The visiting team was also impressed by the leadership displayed by the management of the Department, particularly in its efforts to optimize the quality of teaching and training throughout the program.

**Areas for Improvement**

- Find a solution for the Nuclear Engineering laboratories. This is a restatement of a key recommendation made in the previous review report.

- Better use should be made of the Department’s Advisory Committee. Some of its recommendations are currently under consideration, such as continuing the emphasis on communications skills, teaching the fundamentals, and the importance of software skills. Extending the membership, scope and frequency of meetings of the Advisory Committee is recommended.

- A better coordination with the Coop office. The Department could share information with the office on the potential industries and government laboratories that could provide internships to Engineering Physics students.

**Areas for Enhancement**

- Participation of the Department in the future Biomedical Engineering program. Its expertise in Biophotonics, Nuclear Radiation, Sensors and Materials is well in phase with the requirements of such a program.

- A stronger effort in marketing the Biomedical Engineering could attract more female students.

- Increase the number of faculty to ensure a critical mass in all its sub-programs while taking advantage of new areas of relevance to Engineering Physics (such as Biomedical Engineering).
The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, in consultation with the Chair of the Department Engineering Physics shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the progress report and filed in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty’s office.

**Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and the Dean’s Responses**

**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that the department establishes (or enhances the role of) the Advisory Committee comprised of industry executives, senior practicing engineers and the alumni of the Engineering Physics program working in the fields represented by the program.</td>
<td>Formation of formal Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find a solution for the Nuclear Engineering laboratories. This is a restatement of a key recommendation made in the previous review report.</td>
<td>Review of nuclear lab space requirements; possible expansion of labs to NRB 117/118</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better coordination with co-op office. The department could share information with the office on the potential industries and government laboratories that could provide internships to Engineering Physics students.</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of seminar series, alumni events, capstone sponsorship, Industry Night/Recruiter Night, and sharing the ensuing information with the co-op office</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of the Department in the</td>
<td>The department is already committed to</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Biomedical Engineering program. Its expertise in Biophotonics, Nuclear Radiation, Sensors and Materials is well in phase with the requirements of such a program. A stronger effort in marketing the Biomedical Engineering could attract more female students</td>
<td>Participation in the new Biomedical Engineering program. The department is taking action to promote biomedical engineering options within its programs, including revisions to its website, social media, and program brochures.</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of faculty to ensure a critical mass in all its sub-programs while taking advantage of new areas of relevance to Engineering Physics (such as Biomedical Engineering)</td>
<td>In its latest strategic hiring plan, the department has identified the need for one new faculty member in biomedical engineering, one in nuclear engineering, and another in optoelectronics, in that order of priority. These new faculty positions are pending Faculty approval, with an expected hiring date of July 2018.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Response:**

As detailed in the Chair's response, the recommendations in the review have sparked a series of discussions within the Department, which included substantial input from the undergraduate students via an undergraduate departmental retreat. To date, this has resulted in substantial revisions and enhancements to the departmental website, the formation of a formal Advisory Board and a substantial review of the laboratory space devoted to the undergraduate nuclear program. The other concerns raised by the reviewers, such as better co-ordination with our Engineering Co-op and Career Services are currently underway.
McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee recommends that the program should follow the regular course of action with a progress report and subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Mechanical Engineering
Undergraduate Program

Date of Review: March 31 – April 1, 2016

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the undergraduate programs delivered by the Department of Mechanical Engineering. This report identifies the significant strengths of the programs, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entitled by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate Mechanical Engineering Program

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the Department of Mechanical Engineering submitted a self-study in January 2016 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty to initiate the cyclical program review of its undergraduate program. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appendices to the self-study contained all course outlines associated with the program and the CVs for each full-time member in the department.

One arm’s length external reviewer from Ontario and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean, Faculty of Engineering, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on March 31 – April 1, 2016. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate, Faculty, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Chair of the department and the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (October 2016). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.
The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the Quality Assurance Committee to be submitted to Undergraduate Council, and Senate (January 2017).

**Strengths**

In their report (September 2016), the Review Team noted several strengths of the Mechanical Engineering program. The ME program is offered in three variants: ME, ME and Society, and ME and Management, all of which can be combined with Co-op to give six different pathways for undergraduate students. The measurement and composite laboratory courses are considered to be strengths in that they introduce students to safety training, experiments that complement lecture theory, and shop activities to expose students to methods of manufacturing. The reviewers were particularly impressed with the ME student shop area and the machines and equipment available to students for project and prototype construction. The technical staff are engaged in laboratory and shop delivery and oversee and enforce safety in the shop area. The office administrative staff provides excellent service to the Department Chair and the Department Associate Chairs. In addition, the faculty members value the staff, which contributes to a pleasant departmental environment. Faculty members consider the department leadership to be strong, supportive and inclusive.

**Areas for Improvement and/or Enhancement**

The reviewers only noted minor issues through the review process. First, it was mentioned by undergraduate students that more care could be taken in timetabling courses, since in some cases early morning and late day classes were separated by large gaps. This contributes to attendance issues in late-day classes and is a nuisance for students commuting to the campus. Two issues deal with the rotation of people through various activities related to course delivery. It is recommended that graduate TAs in the Measurement and Composite lab courses be rotated through different laboratory activities for the sake of their own interest and development, and to avoid disruption when TAs graduate. In a similar manner, it is recommended that the department consider some rotation of faculty members teaching the core undergraduate courses. It is felt that the department would be a lower risk of disruption if all faculty members could teach more than one core course. This is not recommended for technical elective and graduate courses as these are more specialized and can be removed to avoid disruption. The ME program currently takes in approximately 120-135 excellent-quality undergraduate students from the common first-year program. The reviewers do not recommend further growth, as it might disrupt the delivery of the program due to lab time restrictions and the faculty and graduate student (TA) complement.

The Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, in consultation with the Chair of the Department Engineering Physics shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the progress report and filed in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty’s office.
Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and the Dean’s Responses

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAs in lab course should be rotated so that they do not work with the same experiment year after year</td>
<td>In assigning teaching assistantships for laboratory courses, we will ask for the students to indicate which labs they would like to be the TA for and encourage rotation of lab assignments.</td>
<td>Chair (M. Lightstone) will work with Dr. Ross Judd who does our TA assignments.</td>
<td>August 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members should be encouraged to rotate through two or three core courses in their area of specialization. This will lower the risk of disruption due to sabbatical leaves, illness and other absences, in addition to allowing individual faculty members to develop a fresh perspective on their teaching methodology.</td>
<td>This recommendation was discussed at the Mechanical Engineering Department Retreat on May 24, 2016. The department did not support this recommendation for the following reasons: 1. Teaching rotation will add a significant workload to the faculty members as a result of the very large time required to develop a new course. 2. Teaching evaluations are typically at their lowest during the first few years of teaching a new course. The students will not benefit from this rotation. 3. The additional time spent on teaching will negatively impact on research productivity. 4. Teaching rotation will not protect the department in the event that an instructor is unable to continue</td>
<td>Chair (M. Lightstone) Currently, teaching is reassigned if there is a compelling reason to do so. For example, if an instructor is not performing well with a particular course (and has been given sufficient opportunity to improve), then the teaching will be reassigned. Teaching rotation without a compelling reason to do so was not supported by the department faculty members.</td>
<td>Addressed at Department Retreat on May 24, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Co-op process and the purpose of the Co-op office needs to be clarified.</td>
<td>Co-op office needs to be informed of this and take steps to address the concern.</td>
<td>Chair (M. Lightstone) to inform Co-op office of this.</td>
<td>June 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetabling of courses does not always work well for students.</td>
<td>Timetabling is complex due to the restrictions imposed by classroom availability and avoidance of course and instructor conflicts. We will attempt to ensure that the timetable works well for our students.</td>
<td>Chair (M. Lightstone) to work with administrative staff to try to create better timetable for our students.</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of student body in Mechanical Engineering.</td>
<td>McMaster Engineering has a common first year and students enter Mechanical Engineering in the second year of the program. The class size in Mechanical is determined by the demand for the program by the first year students and the overall first year class</td>
<td>Chair (M. Lightstone) has worked with the laboratory coordinator to increase lab sections and plan for future growth.</td>
<td>Has already been addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
size (which has been increasing). We have responded to the increased numbers by increasing the number of laboratory sections to ensure that student group sizes remain small. We will further consider sectioning of key courses where it is found that the students would benefit from a smaller class size. The recent growth in faculty numbers will allow for this sectioning to occur. This may also help with timetabling since it would provide more flexibility to the students.

**Faculty Response:**

As detailed in the Chair's response, the recommendations in the review were largely minor and centered around TA cross-training in the Measurements and Level 3 and 4 composite laboratories to minimize disruption after student graduation and cross-teaching of core courses for Faculty members. There were also recommendations concerning accommodating future growth. These recommendations were discussed within the Department and actions have been taken to address the majority of the recommendations.

Overall, the dean is satisfied with the replies of the department to the concerns raised by the IQAP reviewers.

**Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

That the Quality Assurance Committee recommend that the undergraduate Mechanical Engineering program should follow the regular course of action with an 18-month progress report and a subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the Quality Assurance Committee to be submitted to Undergraduate Council, and Senate (December 2016).

In their report (September 2016), the Review Team found that the “undergraduate and graduate programs perform very well across key indicators and are well governed” and that the “department has leveraged its faculty resources and research strengths to offer a high quality undergraduate program that covers all the major subfields of political science, and a graduate program that builds on its particular research strengths.” The report highlights that the department “has developed a reputation for particular strengths in historical and critical approaches in its graduate programs, while still offering courses and training across a wide range of approaches and methodologies in the field at all levels”.

**Strengths**

The reviewers noted many strengths within the programs. Along all teaching criteria, alignment of degree level expectations and learning outcomes, and consistency with McMaster’s Mission and Academic Plan, the department performs extremely well. Undergraduate teaching is especially strong. The teaching program has benefited, in particular, from the appointment of two teaching-track faculty, both of whom have won teaching awards. Their skill sets have contributed to growing strengths in innovative teaching and experiential learning. At the graduate level, the department has established a culture of close supervisory and mentor relationships among faculty and students that has contributed to excellent times to completion for the PhD program and very good success on the job market. There are also a large number of opportunities for students to present their work in progress, engage in department and university workshops and conferences, and to collaborate with faculty on research projects.

**Areas for Improvement**

**Undergraduate Program**

- Decline in total undergraduate enrolment numbers in the five-year period ending 2013-14
- Experience of students in the three-year general BA in Political Science program can be made as positive as that for students in the four-year Honours program
- Website enhancements to profile steps taken for experiential learning and skills development

**Graduate Program**

- Faculty complement as a result of recent retirements and faculty departures
- Inconsistencies in requirements across MA programs in relation to the major research paper for MA International Relations and comprehensive for MA Political Science
- Graduate students need to be prepared for multiple career tracks with enhanced professional development opportunities and workshops within the department
- Professional skills and collaborative research opportunities should be integrated with community partners
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Political Science
Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Date of Review: March 22 – March 23, 2016

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the undergraduate programs delivered by the Department of Political Science. This report identifies the significant strengths of the programs, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Cyclical Program Review of the Undergraduate and Graduate Political Science Programs

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the Department of Political Science submitted a self-study in January 2016 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty to initiate the cyclical program review of its undergraduate programs. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appendices to the self-study contained all course outlines associated with the program and the CVs for each full-time member in the department.

Two arm’s length external reviewers, one from Ontario and one from Quebec and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty and Associate Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on March 22 – March 23, 2016. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Chair of the department and the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (October 2016). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.
The Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, in consultation with the Chair of the Department Political Science shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the progress report and filed in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty’s office.

**Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and the Dean’s Responses**

**Recommendations – Undergraduate Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Add a first year course to provide a general introduction to the discipline</td>
<td>The existing 1st year course was split into 2 3-unit courses. The 2 sections will offered for the first time in 2016-17, each of which will provide a different introductory basis to the broader discipline. U/G Committee will monitor the experiences of students and faculty members before adding an additional 1st year course. U/G Committee will also clarify whether both courses are required for entrance into a major in political science or whether one course is sufficient, with that requirement that both courses be completed as part of degree expectations.</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee</td>
<td>Ongoing basis over next three years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean’s Response:** The dean shares the department’s view that it is best to first monitor and assess the experience with this new format for level-1 courses before launching an entirely new course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a. Raise caps on course enrolments</th>
<th>U/G Committee will review the existing caps and enrolment numbers as part of an overall and relatively comprehensive reconsideration of the offering and scheduling of courses listed in the course calendar, with an exception of increasing the enrolment numbers as well as the number of courses offered at the 2nd year level. Consistent with this approach is the introduction of a new 2nd year course (PolSci – Force and Fear) that will be offered for the first time in Winter 2017.</th>
<th>Undergraduate Committee</th>
<th>Overall review of U/G course offerings will occur in fall of 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b. Increase number of tutorials that teaching assistants lead from 2 – 3 per week, if permitted under the collective agreement; if not, reducing the number of weeks in which tutorials are held.</td>
<td>The U/G committee will consider this recommendation as part of its overall consideration of the U/G program and will make an explicit recommendation to the department concerning this issue. Consultation will also have to be undertaken with the University and CUPE to determine if such changes can be made within the context of the existing collective agreement.</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Reduce number of 4th year courses taught in a given year in order to increase 2nd year course offerings.</td>
<td>The U/G Committee will consider this recommendation as part of its overall consideration of the course offerings and scheduling. Existing 2nd year course offerings are consistently offered on an annual basis. Two new 2nd year courses were created this past year (Pol Sci 2C03 Force and Fear and Pol Sci 2U03 Public Policy and Public Administration). One of these courses will be offered in Winter 2017 and the other in the 2017-18 year.</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean’s Response:** The dean noted that these recommendations make good sense as part of strategy to increase enrolment in political science courses. The dean also noted that the department has already indicated that it will consider these changes this coming year as part of its review of its undergraduate curriculum and the associate dean and the dean will support the department in the process.

| Split the remaining full- | The department has already reduced its full year course offerings | Undergraduate Committee | Fall 2016 |
| Year Courses | over the last 6 years. The 3rd year Public Law class will be split in 2016 to permit greater flexibility in its offering in conjunction with the specialization degree. The U/G Committee will consider splitting remaining courses. |  |
| Dean’s Response: The dean highlighted that this recommendation is consistent with the broader practice in the Faculty to reduce the number of full-year courses. |  |

| Add more minors, including interdisciplinary minors | The department has recently created a new minor in Justice, Law and Order. The U/G Committee will monitor the impact of this new minor over the next 3 years to determine its success in increasing student enrolment. In 2015, the department proposed a minor in Public Leadership. It was determined at the time that department lacked sufficient faculty resources to introduce and support 2 new minors at the same time. The U/G Committee will likely review and bring the issue of a minor in Public Leadership back to the department in the 2017-18 academic year. The department will continue to consider all requests to have its courses included in interdisciplinary minors | Undergraduate Committee | Ongoing over next 3 years |
| Dean’s Response: The dean acknowledged that this recommendation is consistent with broader curriculum approaches that the Faculty is undertaking to create sub-BA designations with which students more readily identify within the disciplinary degree itself and that help position them for careers in which they are interested. |  |

| Administer an exit-survey to 3 year BA program students to diagnose sources of dissatisfaction with their undergraduate experience | 2015-16 marks a trial year of administering an electronic exit survey (previously on paper). Issuing the survey electronically has permitted the department to more accurately target both 3rd and 4th year graduating students. The U/G Committee will ensure that the exit survey is more fully implemented for all graduating students in the future with specific questions for 3rd year graduating students in order to assess their undergraduate experience. | Undergraduate Committee | Work will commence in 2016-17 academic year |
| Dean’s Response: The dean noted that the number of BA students is quite small as the Faculty encourages eligible students to enter the Honours |  |
BA program. As a result, BA enrolments should fall in the coming years. The dean also noted that it is important to identify the source of dissatisfaction of BA students with their experience.

| Experiential Learning and Skills Development – Add an internship in Political Science for course credit | The department has already pursued experiential learning and skills development through the creation of 2 courses – Public Service Leadership and Practice of Politics. The department’s website will be enhanced to more clearly identify the experiential learning and skills development opportunities that these courses provide as well as detailing potential career options for students with political science degrees. The U/G Committee will consider the creation of an internship and/or work experience based course as part of its curriculum review in the fall of 2016. | Undergraduate Committee | Fall 2016 |
| Dean’s Response: The dean noted that further opportunities for internships and other experiential learning can be pursued through the Faculty’s Experiential Education program. The EE program is working with departments, including political science, to enhance their offerings to respond to this student interest (and broader calls within the province for experiential learning). |

| Make more use of new teaching technologies | U/G Committee and/or Chair will invite experts from the MacPherson Institute and Centre for Continuing Education (CCE) to make a presentation at a department meeting as well as provide overall assistance to faculty members interested in incorporating new technology into classroom experiences. The department will form a sub-committee to explore and report on opportunities for blended/online course offerings. | Chair/U/G Committee | Initiate in Fall 2016 |
| Dean’s Response: The Faculty will continue to support the department’s use of such technologies when it will improve learning outcomes and the student experience. |

| Promote study abroad opportunities | Information will be posted on the department’s website over the course of summer 2016 An Internationalization Officer has been appointed to explore exchange and study abroad opportunities and report to the department on an ongoing basis | Chair/Internationalization Officer | Ongoing |
**Dean's Response:** The dean advised that the university has just announced a new model for global engagement, including strategies to both increase the global content of the curriculum at McMaster and to increase opportunities for student exchange. The department has appointed an Internationalization Officer to lead the department’s efforts in exploring such opportunities within the university’s broader model.

---

### Graduate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unwind the Guelph-McMaster Public Policy and Administration Program and plan on the future of a similar degree within the department and/or university</td>
<td>A departmental sub-committee was established at the end of May 2016 to lead the task and it will be meeting over the course of summer 2016 to clarify the department’s options. Recommendations of the sub-committee will be forwarded to the graduate committee for further consideration and subsequent referral to the department as a whole. It is expected that the department will make a decision on the direction of the CMA-PPA program by the end of 2016 or early 2017.</td>
<td>Chair/Sub-Committee/Graduate Committee</td>
<td>Early 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean's Response:** The current collaborative arrangement with the University of Guelph for this program is not sustainable into the future. The Faculty, working with the department and other units with policy focus at McMaster, will consider which option can best advance the offerings in the area of public policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engage with other relevant units on the future of public policy at McMaster to inform about and leverage departmental strengths and experience in these areas</td>
<td>The department will explore possibilities of developing a program with the proposed public policy institute, either as part of a revised and interdisciplinary CMA-PPA or as a complement to a stand-alone program.</td>
<td>Chair/Sub-Committee</td>
<td>Consultations will take place over the summer and fall of 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean's Response:** A working group was established in the Faculty of Social Sciences to examine the options of building the McMaster’s research and education profile for public policy. The group is expected to make recommendations shortly. Any initiatives that follow from the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make the Major Research Paper a requirement across all MA programs and eliminate comprehensive exams</td>
<td>This recommendation was discussed at a department retreat in early May 2016. There was no agreement among faculty members, so the issue will be reviewed in future on an ongoing basis by the Graduate Committee.</td>
<td>Graduate Committee</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If comprehensive exams are retained, provide a grade that appears on students’ transcripts</td>
<td>The Chair will consult with the Registrar’s Office in 2016 to determine the feasibility of transcript inclusions of comprehensive grades. Once it has been ascertained that such transcript notations are possible, the Graduate Committee will provide recommendations concerning the nature of grades and methods for their inclusion in transcripts by assigning a course code to the department for its consideration by the end of 2016.</td>
<td>Chair/Graduate Committee</td>
<td>By the end of 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make quantitative methods a requirement for PhD students in both streams</td>
<td>Consultation between the Graduate Committee and the International Relations area group as well as the department as a whole to explore will commence to explore the recommendation that the quantitative methods course be made a requirement for International Relations PhD students.</td>
<td>Chair/Graduate Committee</td>
<td>Commence 2016 and a recommendation expected to be made to the department for its decision by April 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide small amount of funds to graduate students to assist instructors in adapting courses to new technologies and pedagogical methods</td>
<td>The Chair and the Graduate Committee will consult with faculty in the department and with the MacPherson Institute to determine the need and interest of current instructors at both the graduate and U/G levels and identify any potential sources of funds.</td>
<td>Chair/Graduate Committee</td>
<td>Consultations throughout 2016 with any funding arrangements to be accessed or put in place for start of 2017-18 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore fundraising for fieldwork fellowships or</td>
<td>The department will make information more readily and easily available to students on School of Graduate Studies field research.</td>
<td>Chair/Graduate Committee</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowments or other means to create more regular access to field work funds</td>
<td>Funding. It will encourage faculty to provide support to their students from existing research grants. The Graduate Committee will also explore further external funding opportunities offered through organizations such as MITACS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dean's Response:** The dean suggested that the department may find it valuable to discuss this issue with departments that regularly send students into the field to understand better the financial arrangements associated with such field work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide additional TA training</th>
<th>The department will continue its training session for new TAs at the beginning of every academic year. The Graduate Committee, in consultation with the School of Graduate Studies, will consider adding another workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Chair/Graduate Committee**

**Consultations will take place in fall of 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhance professional development opportunities at the graduate level</th>
<th>The department will consider incorporating additional professional development opportunities through a more formalized seminar/presentation series.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Graduate Committee in collaboration with the Research Progress Committee**

**Begin fall 2016 and continue on an ongoing basis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explore opportunities for experiential education such as research with community-based partners</th>
<th>The department will discuss the possibility of including the community engagement course as one of its permitted electives for graduate students in the MA and PhD programs and consider establishing a position of Outreach Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Chair**

**Fall 2016**

**Dean's Response:** The dean acknowledged that the School of Graduate Studies has created a number of new opportunities for graduate students to better develop their professional skills and abilities. The dean noted that it is also important for the department to complement these general sessions with discipline-specific opportunities available to political science graduate students.

---

**Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee recommends that the program should follow the regular course of action with a progress report and subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review

Sociology

Date of Review: March 3rd and 4th 2016

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the graduate and undergraduate programs delivered by Sociology. This report identifies the significant strengths of the program, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Review

The Sociology program submitted a self-study to the School of Graduate Studies in February 2016. The self-study presented the program descriptions and learning outcomes, an analytical assessment of these two programs, and program data including the data collected from a student survey along with the standard data package prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appended were the CVs for each full-time faculty member in the Department.

• Strengths

The review team identified a number of strengths of the department. They were particularly impressed with the overall high quality of the department’s graduate and undergraduate programs, the department’s alignment with McMaster’s commitment to community engagement, internationalization, and enhancing the student experience. The reviewers highlighted the vibrant research culture within the department among faculty and its graduate students. The review team also noted progress made in promoting diversity, enhancing collegiality and promoting a positive climate, conducive to working and learning.

• Areas for Enhancement or Improvement

The review team noted the challenges the department faces with high student enrolments and relatively modest faculty complement. The reviewers make a number of specific recommendations
regarding how the department should restructure its undergraduate program. The department has already flagged many of the same issues, and is in the process of drafting revisions to its program along the lines suggested by the reviewers. We expect to have a revised curriculum ready for department and broader faculty approval by September, 2017.

With the Graduate Committee, providing leadership, the Department is always seeking to improve the quality of the MA and PhD programs in sociology and to make the Sociology Department a supportive environment for graduate student development. The IQAP self-study and external review has recommended reducing the graduate student-faculty ratio and paying attention to the distribution of the supervisory load. The processes to address these concerns are already underway.

Faculty renewal and retention are central challenges. Securing replacements for retiring and departing faculty is essential to maintaining program quality. To this end, the department must continue to nurture a collegial and supportive environment, mentor its junior faculty, and make important contributions to Faculty of Social Science and University initiatives.

### Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and Dean’s Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert 6 unit courses to 3 unit courses in undergraduate program</td>
<td>The department has discussed, and agrees that it should convert its level I, II, and III 3 6 unit courses to three unit courses</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee and department faculty</td>
<td>Sociology 1A06 and Sociology 3H06, faculty approval for September, 2016. For level II courses, September, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more level II and III courses, and reduce offerings at level IV</td>
<td>Proposal is under consideration as part of ongoing broader undergraduate program review</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee and department faculty</td>
<td>September, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer more sections of required courses</td>
<td>Proposal is under consideration as part of ongoing broader undergraduate program review</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee and department faculty</td>
<td>September, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall orientation for undergraduate students</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>September, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish two streams</td>
<td>Proposal is under</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>September, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within honours program</td>
<td>consideration as part of ongoing broader undergraduate program review</td>
<td>Committee and department faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers workshop and additional steps to provide undergraduates with information concerning careers, skills, links with institutions offering vocational programs (e.g., Mohawk College)</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee, Department Chair and Sociology Students' Society</td>
<td>March, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing community into the classroom</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Individual faculty</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look into student complaints that social science counseling is not always informed and helpful to their concerns</td>
<td>This issue only surfaced during site visit. Undergraduate Chair and Department Chair will follow-up with FSS counseling office to and with students to better understand issues</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee, Department Chair and Sociology Students' Society</td>
<td>September, 2016 (initial information gathering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in the classroom. Greater diversity (gender, race, ethnicity and other dimensions) among students and instructors can give rise to challenges over power and pedagogy. Supports must be put in place for all instructors, (especially junior faculty members) should these situations occur in the classroom.</td>
<td>Agreed. Because it is unlikely that this concern is not specific to sociology, the Department will bring this concern to the Dean of FSS and with chairs and directors in the Faculty. Within sociology, the Department will take steps to learn if and how these challenges are surfacing, and resources available (e.g., MIETL) in meeting these challenges. Plan for next steps will emerge from this assessment.</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee, Department Chair and department faculty</td>
<td>September, 2016 (initial information gathering)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor distribution of graduate supervision among faculty</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Graduate Chair, Department Chair</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce graduate student-faculty ratio</td>
<td>Underway - smaller PhD cohorts, larger MA cohorts</td>
<td>Graduate Committee</td>
<td>September, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardize expectations for dissertation proposal.</td>
<td>This already exists in policy but is not enforced.</td>
<td>Graduate Chair, Department Chair</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Chair and Department Chair will impress importance on supervisors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consider reducing comps from two to one</th>
<th>Graduate Committee will review and consider recommendation to faculty</th>
<th>Graduate Committee and department faculty</th>
<th>September, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Departmental Faculty and Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organize departmental retreats on a regular basis</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Department Chair and department faculty</th>
<th>September 2016 and thereafter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue ongoing efforts to clarify the roles of teaching professors in the department</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Department Chair and department faculty</td>
<td>September 2016 and thereafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider a nominations committee, allowing department members to vote on committee membership</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Department Chair and department faculty</td>
<td>September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship of junior faculty</td>
<td>In 2015, to enhance mentorship, the Department shifted to mentoring committees in place of individual mentors. We will monitor success and challenges of this recent change and continue to assess mentorship more generally.</td>
<td>Department Chair and department faculty</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build on positive trajectory in regards to collegiality and climate</th>
<th>Agreed</th>
<th>Department Chair and department faculty</th>
<th>Immediately</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued attentiveness to diversity initiatives</td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Department Chair and department faculty</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Response:

Undergraduate Program

1. *Consider creating two streams within the honours program.* This recommendation is consistent both with recent curriculum revisions in other departments in the Faculty, and with changes proposed within Sociology, which has already begun the process of creating a streamed honours program.
2. Reduce the number of 4th-year courses and re-allocate resources to 2nd and 3rd-year courses. Offerings at the 4th-year are excessive—few courses even reach the cap of 25 students—and this past year the department began reducing the number of such courses. Combined with the creation of a streamed honours program that includes some larger 4th-year courses for the more applied stream, it should be possible to re-allocate resources to the 2nd and 3rd years to reduce class sizes at those levels and increase choice and scheduling flexibility. These changes will also support the specific recommendation to split 3H06 (Research Techniques and Data Analysis) into day and evening sections.

3. Reduce reliance on 6-unit courses. At the encouragement of the Faculty, the department has already acted to reduce the number of 6-unit courses it offers.

4. Reduce a sense of alienation by early-year students. Multiple factors contribute to the feelings of alienation from the program for some early-year students, including large class sizes and a disproportionate number of sessional instructors in years one and two. The large first-year classes will not go away without substantially more resources to the Faculty. It is possible, however, to increase the number of full-time faculty teaching in those courses, and to create other activities outside the classroom to connect the students more meaningfully with the program.

5. Increase professional development opportunities. This theme reflects broader feedback that the Faculty has received from students. It is useful to divide our response into two types of activities, both identified by the reviewers. The first is the help the students understand the valuable skills and abilities they obtain through their social science training—in this case, through their training in sociology. The second is to provide opportunities for them to discuss career/professional issues and develop additional specific skills that will be valuable when entering the labour market. The Dean and Associate Dean’s offices fully supports the need to do both, and has been investigating ways to do them better. We will be working with Sociology and other departments to implement in the near future both Faculty-wide strategies and program-specific strategies.

6. Develop new ways to link the classroom and the community. This is a large challenge, and I am grateful for the suggestions of the review committee. Social Science is a highly community-engaged faculty. Much of this engagement is focused around research and related activities, although it is increasingly being integrated into the undergraduate experience (within and outside the formal Experiential Education program). But as the reviewer notes, this can be very resource intensive and difficult to integrate into the curriculum. Again, this challenge extends beyond Sociology. The suggestion to bring the community into the classroom (e.g., through guest speakers) is a good one. As a Faculty, however, we need to experiment with and develop a fuller array of strategies that can be used by programs and individual instructors to integrate community engagement more thoroughly into our undergraduate programs.

7. Improved academic counselling regarding the sociology program. We were not aware of any problems with the counselling provided to sociology students, and are not sure how widespread the problem may be, but will investigate any such issues. Currently each program has a designated advisor. In some cases, for whatever reason, the students/advisor pairing doesn’t work as well as it should. We are experimenting with a model in which students from a given program could seek advice from more than one advisor, therefore giving another option to a student in case they have difficulty with a particular advisor.
Graduate Program

8. *Maintain reasonable supervisory loads on faculty.* This touches on two areas: the total number of graduate students in the program and the distribution of supervisory responsibilities among faculty. As the reviewer notes, the department is passing through a period of unusually high PhD enrolments due to large intake cohorts a few years ago. This is a temporary problem that will work its way through the system, but it has created challenges at this time. The emphasis in the university on expanding graduate enrolment creates a tension with the desire of some in the department to reduce graduate enrolment. The department’s plan to increase master’s enrolment while holding steady on doctoral enrolment makes sense. This maintains graduate enrolment while changing the mix. It is easier to manage natural fluctuations in masters enrolment than it is for doctoral enrolment. Further, this provides a larger pool from which to draw PhD students, which should enable the program to increase average student quality in the doctoral program. It is perhaps more difficult to address the problem of imbalance across faculty in supervisory responsibilities. The specific sub-fields that are “hot” change over time. Further, when choosing supervisory committee members students naturally gravitate to subset faculty who teach in the core courses of the graduate program. Still, there are explicit strategies the department can implement to give greater exposure to faculty who might be less visible to first- and second-year students, such as events in which faculty talk about their research and the types of opportunities available to graduate students working with them. The department is exploring such strategies.

9. *Add professional development sessions.* Again, this is a theme that extends beyond Sociology, especially as increasing numbers of graduate students pursue careers outside of academia. Given this, the School of Graduate Studies has created a number of new opportunities for graduate students to develop better their professional skills and abilities. These are open to all graduate students at McMaster. While it makes sense for the SGS to do this, given the general need for such opportunities, it is also important for the department to complement these general sessions with discipline-specific opportunities available to sociology graduate students --- the specific challenges they face differ in some important way from even those faced by, for example, economics students within the Faculty. Again, the department is committed to providing such opportunities to its graduate students.

10. *Reconsider course and comprehensive exam requirements.* This is a perennial issue within graduate programs. The good completion times among students in Sociology’s doctoral program indicates that the current requirements are not causing undue delays. Still, it is a situation that deserves examination, which the department is committed to doing.

11. *Increase opportunities for graduate students to teach in their upper years.* In the past, the collective agreement between the university and sessional instructors sometimes made it difficult to assign a senior PhD student to teach a course. The most recent collective agreement, however, includes an explicit mechanism to enable this by allowing a certain number of courses each year to be assigned to graduate students without going through the normal posting process. Each department in the Faculty receives an allocation of such slots each year, which should increase teaching opportunities for graduate students.

Governance
12. As noted by the reviewers, governance and collegiality have increased notably in recent years within the department. This is due to explicit efforts by the previous Acting Chair, Roy Cain, the current Chair, Greg Hooks, and a commitment by all departmental faculty to create a better work environment. This remains an area of focus for the department, and me as Dean, to ensure that it can build on the success to date. In addition to the specific recommendations of the reviewers, the department continues to examine aspects of its governance and operations to identify ways to improve its functioning.

Other Issues

13. *Pay attention to diversity.* I list the issue of diversity here because it cuts across both educational programs and governance. The reviewers identify two important, and quite distinct diversity-related challenges. One relates to the fact that diversity among the faculty complement is not changing nearly as rapidly as is diversity in the student body. This can create misunderstanding and tensions in the classroom. The second relates to the challenges faced by faculty members who are visible minorities (and predominately junior) in their roles both as teachers and as faculty members sometimes breaking new ground within the university. We have begun discussing these issues at the regular meetings of the Chairs and Directors, with a goal to develop strategies to address them in ways that reflect the sensitive nature of the issues involved and that provide support to both faculty and students as needed.

Quality Assurance Recommendation

McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee recommends that the program should follow the regular course of action with a progress report and subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Theatre and Film Studies
Undergraduate Program

Date of Review: March 17 – March 18, 2016

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the undergraduate Theatre and Film Studies program delivered by the School of the Arts. This report identifies the significant strengths of the programs, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Cyclical Program Review of the Theatre and Film Studies Program

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the School of the Arts submitted a self-study in January 2016 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty to initiate the cyclical program review of its Theatre and Film Studies program. The approved self-study presented program descriptions, learning outcomes, and analyses of data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appendices to the self-study contained all course outlines associated with the program and the CVs for each full-time member in the department.

Two arm’s length external reviewers from Ontario and one internal reviewer were endorsed by the Dean, Faculty of Humanities, and selected by the Associate Vice-President, Faculty. The review team reviewed the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to McMaster University on March 17 – March 18, 2016. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Chair of the department and meetings with groups of current undergraduate students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Chair of the department and the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities submitted responses to the Reviewers’ Report (October 2016). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.
The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the Quality Assurance Committee to be submitted to Undergraduate Council, and Senate (December 2016).

Strengths

In their report (June 2016), the Review Team noted that the in-depth experiential learning opportunities engage students through innovative and collaborative creative projects that successfully intersect with the wider community. The reviewers were especially taken with the program's concentration in devised theatre. Much of their evaluation was filtered through supporting and building further this central component of the program.

Areas for Improvement

- Communicate more precisely, to the student body and the wider public, what the aims and goals of the program are, with an emphasis on strengths in teaching devising processes.
- A more clearly articulated vision of the relationship of courses within the program.
- A more structured process for supporting ongoing learning in the technical aspects of performance creation.

The Dean of the Faculty of Humanities, in consultation with the Director of the School of the Arts shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendations implementation plan. The details of the progress made will be presented in the progress report and filed in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty's office.

Summary of the Reviewers' Recommendations with the Department's and the Dean's Responses

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revisit the core values and goals of the program</td>
<td>Faculty in the program, in consultation with current students and the director of SOTA, will meet over the course of the coming year to discuss how to better articulate the relationship of the different analytic methods, media, and performance practices we teach in the program. By September 2017, we</td>
<td>Theatre &amp; Film Studies Program Committee (the committee includes the four permanent faculty members who teach in the program).</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-2017 session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-affirm and strengthen the focus on performance and situate what students learn within the parameters outlined in the IQAP, that is, within the practices of international devising/creation companies (such as Complicite, Frantic Assembly, etc., as outline in 3.1 p. 19). This will help further position what it is unique about the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We appreciate the reviewers’ suggestion that we might increase our focus on internationalization through more discussion of well-known international devising companies. To date, we have done this by using the companies mentioned as examples within courses from Levels I to III. This is largely because our approach to internationalization has not focused as much on a coverage model as it has on teaching students basic skills in cross-cultural collaboration and analysis, often through looking at how colonization and globalization have affected Canadian performance and media practices. We will consider whether this skill set should be separated out and taught as an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre &amp; Film Studies Program Committee</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will produce a new description of the program to help prospective and current students, as well as our colleagues, better understand the goals and practices of the program. We will disseminate the new program description through SOTA’s website and through the university’s academic calendar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the outreach and publicity of program events to the university and wider community. For example, simple measures such as regular events listing updates to the program and SOTA website should be undertaken.</td>
<td>As part of SOTA’s ongoing efforts to increase its public profile, we will work with the director and SOTA staff to find a more effective way to do outreach to communities within and outside the university that might have a particular interest in different performance events and exhibitions we are organizing. We also look forward to further changes to SOTA’s website that will make it easier to publicize events. The Theatre &amp; Film program remains convinced that the program and the School as a whole requires specialized outreach expertise that is not currently available in SOTA or the university as a whole. Arts outreach is about community building and depends on relationships being developed consistently over time. It requires a strategy carefully developed by an outreach professional working in close conjunction with the program(s) and the local communities we wish to reach.</td>
<td>Director of SOTA and Theatre &amp; Film Studies Program Committee</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-2017 session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-examine teaching duties in the program. Given the emphasis in the program on creative</td>
<td>Several course taught by faculty members who do not teach studio-based courses</td>
<td>Theatre &amp; Film Studies Program Committee</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-17 session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devising are students exposed to as many influences as possible in this stream? Are there ways in which all faculty in the program could be contributing to the devising stream courses?</td>
<td>already offer emphases on creative practices used in devising. For example, the Level II course, “Culture and Performance” addresses devising by focusing on analysis of how performance art practitioners develop their creative methods. A new course, “Visual Storytelling”, taught for the first time in 2016-17 addresses devised, digital film creation. More generally, the Program will meet and reflect on ways we can encourage students to integrate material covered in different kinds of courses, whether through adjustments to course content, to pedagogical approaches, or to changes in the types of assignments required. We will seek to strengthen the program through an intersection of ideas and methods across courses.</td>
<td>Theatre &amp; Film Studies Program Committee</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-2017 session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider an evaluative process for admission (other than an audition) to the devising courses that would help students think about and prepare for the collaborative and challenging nature of performance creation they are going to</td>
<td>Currently, there is an evaluative process in place for admission to the two central production courses: 3503 Major Production Workshop and 4A06: Theatre and Society: A Performance Project. Our program is open by design to allow students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTA and Theatre &amp; Film faculty and staff need to work closely with the Wilson building implementation team to advocate for the proper staffing and management of the new performance and teaching spaces.</td>
<td>The dean of the Faculty of Humanities has already struck a new committee of users for the New Media and Performance Hub (the Black Box Theatre) and we look forward to collaborating with staff and faculty to advocate for proper staffing and management. The Theatre &amp; Film program stands by its argument in our IQAP report that maximizing the potential of this space will require additional technical and administrative staff: namely a Production Manager/Technical Director and Arts Administrator. We believe the reviewers’ criticism of preparations for use of the space acknowledges this necessity. We are surprised that there is no mention of the need for a research position in design for the program, which was identified as a pressing need in our 2010 Undergraduate Program Review and continues to be the case today. There is an urgency about making recommendations concerning the best use</td>
<td>Some faculty members from the program; Director of SOTA; Associate Dean</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-17 session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Theatre &amp; Film Studies program should be re-designated as the Theatre, Performance and Film Studies Program</td>
<td>We suggest the name should in fact be changed to “Theatre, Film, and Performance Studies.” The faculty feel that the program might best be characterized as a Performance Studies program and this aligns us well with the latest developments in local graduate programs, e.g. University of Toronto’s Graduate Centre for the Study of Drama has been renamed the Centre for Drama, Theatre and Performance Studies and York University’s graduate program is in Theatre and Performance Studies. Our proposed renaming therefore leaves the two subjects that prospective students recognize in the title, but still works to break the binary of theatre and film that has led students and reviewers to believe we are teaching two separate disciplines rather than an integrated program that explores the relationships between a range of performance modes. Finally, the new name will also directly align our program with the Wilson buildings New Media and</td>
<td>Director of SOTA and Theatre &amp; Film Studies Program Committee</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-17 session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Hub</td>
<td>A representative of Theatre &amp; Film Studies Program Committee will meet with the associate dean of the Faculty of Humanities and the director of SOTA</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-17 Faculty curricular sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The THTRFLM 3503 Major Production Workshop should be developed from a 3-credit to a 6-credit one-term course</td>
<td>The program agrees with this recommendation and is in the process of submitting the change to the curriculum committee in Fall 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical skills training can no longer be acquired in a haphazard and unstructured manner and a 3-credit one-term basic skills training course (including, amongst other aspects, stage management, light and sound design) as preparatory for all devising courses should be mandatory.</td>
<td>This recommendation appears to stem from a misunderstanding. The program already has such a course at Level II, 2BB3 “Designing as Devising”, with an average enrolment of 35 out of a possible 40 spaces. While students learn the basic skills the reviewers are concerned with in this course, they need more support to implement technical and design skills in performance creation processes in order to develop mastery. In the devising model at the core of our approach, breaking traditional silos between different elements of theatrical creation is a crucial part of our pedagogical process. In this kind of problem-based approach, students further develop design and technical skills as they need them to achieve different aesthetic goals. Such an approach calls for a more flexible model of technical support than is presently in place, as well as expert knowledge that is not</td>
<td>Program faculty will discuss possibilities with director of the School of the Arts and implement new training workshops for our devising courses.</td>
<td>To begin in 2016-2017 Faculty curricular sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
always available with our current faculty and staff complement. We would like to have the resources to hire additional technical support, as necessary, for example in costume design. The program will also consider using the discretionary funds available to us to hire guest artists to teach discrete workshops in areas of design and performance that would support particular performance creation processes. We will also look at ways to have the school technician available for resource support at hours necessitated by student schedules.

**Faculty Response:**

The review team clearly identify the core strength of the program – its distinctive focus on “devising”, an approach to performance developed by a number of companies around the world. The reviewers at the outset express concern that the approach of this program of four full time faculty may be overly-ambitious.

I support the attached response of the School of the Arts and faculty members in the program. I would add only a few comments to that response.

The faculty members believe that the reviewers’ main concern represented a misunderstanding of the role of film in the program. Rather than dismiss this concern, however, I am very impressed that they are eager to better articulate and communicate that this is not a program in film studies, but a program in which film is part of the focus on devising and performance. And, as part of that review, they will consider some proposals to ensure that the focus on devising is front and centre.

The reviewers rightly were concerned about planning for the use of the new Performance and New Media Hub (the black box theatre) in Wilson Hall. Anticipated delays in the opening of this space, and a focus on ensuring that the theatre was properly equipped, meant that this level of operational planning was postponed. I now have struck a committee composed of members of the Theatre and Film and Multimedia programs, including technical staff, which is supported by a member of the Dean’s Office.
They have adopted a series of principles surrounding the use of the space, and currently are working through the practical arrangements needed to support those principles. As Dean, I am also in the process of having a consultant familiar with the program and both the new theatre and the Concert Hall to help develop models for ensuring that the technical and other support needed to run the spaces meets health and safety standards and the learning needs of students.

I look forward to reporting progress on the detailed response of the faculty members, and on the general state of the program. The opening of the new shared space in Wilson Hall represents a great opportunity to highlight and build on the strengths of this program around devising, and to strengthen connections to Multimedia and other programs in the Faculty.

**Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

That the Quality Assurance Committee recommend that the undergraduate Theatre and Film Studies program should follow the regular course of action with an 18-month progress report and a subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Occupational Therapy M.Sc.

Date of Review: May 31st and June 1st 2016

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the Occupational Therapy M.Sc. program delivered by School of Rehabilitation Science. This report identifies the significant strengths of the program, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Review

The Occupational Therapy program submitted a self-study to the School of Graduate Studies March 2016. The self-study presented the program descriptions and learning outcomes, an analytical assessment of these two programs, and program data including the data collected from a student survey along with the standard data package prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appended were the CVs for each full-time faculty member in the Department.

• Strengths
  - Strong alignment of the program with Degree Level Expectations and the mission, vision and strategic priorities articulated by the University and the School of Graduate studies. The reviewers noted that the program’s mapping makes explicit the link between program learning objectives and teaching and learning strategies as well as evaluation methods. In addition, the IQAP review team identified clear articulation of the program’s contributions to the Strategic Mandate Agreement between the University and the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities.
  - Employment of “sound educational theories and practices that align with institutional priorities”. The reviewers note that the use of the Steps and Pillars model is brought to life across the curriculum, and is a reflective and evidence-based model, that is well understood by faculty, students and community stakeholders, and is consistently used in...
curriculum development. In a later section of the report the reviewers commend the program “for the comprehensive content of the framework, the effectiveness of the symbols used to convey the integration of the components of the curriculum and for the detailed consultation process used to develop the model”.

- Strong alignment with national competency standards, with outcomes from a variety of sources (certification exam results, graduate follow up surveys, employer surveys and anecdotal reports from stakeholders during the review) supporting the strength of the program in producing graduates meeting entry-to-practice requirements.
- Access to adequate physical space and resources to meet program demands.

Areas for Enhancement or Improvement

- Areas for Enhancement

The IQAP reviewers summarize three areas of program enhancement:

1. **Universal Design for Learning**: After describing the program’s initial work in adopting UDL principles, the reviewers describe this initiative as “very progressive”, and support continued work in this area.

   Program Response: As noted in the IQAP report, the Occupational Therapy program held its program retreat in May 2016, with a focus on Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and developing and implementing plans to adopt UDL principles across various aspects of the Occupational therapy program will be a priority in the upcoming academic year, led by the Occupational Therapy Curriculum Committee (OTCC). In fact, a School of Rehabilitation Science (SRS) faculty member with expertise in this area, Dr. Wenonah Campbell, has received a two-year Educational Innovation Grant from the McMaster Faculty of Health Sciences to engage with the OTCC members in a participatory project to design and evaluate processes to implement UDL principles within the program. This will include professional development topics for OTCC members, articulation of learning goals for all evaluations of student performance, and initial explorations of strategies to offer more flexibility in assessments of student competence/knowledge. We look forward to collaborating with Dr. Campbell to ensure our efforts are not only evaluated, but shared more broadly at McMaster and beyond.

2. **Tutorial performance evaluation**: The reviewers note that the program has already been conducting evaluation associated with tutorial performance evaluation for students in the second year of the program.

   Program Response: The Occupational Therapy Curriculum Committee has undertaken a review of the current initiative to modify how tutorial performance is evaluated in the second year of the program. A report was received by the committee at its July 2017 meeting; a decision was made to modify the criteria and process of tutorial evaluation in both first and second years of the program. The new process will ensure that evaluation of student tutorial evaluation is fair, constructive and
meaningful to students, tutors, and the program.

3. **Curriculum Framework Model**: while the Steps and Pillars Framework received high praise from the IQAP review team, they suggested continued review and revision, along with a multi-pronged communication strategy as revisions are undertaken.

Program Response: The program concurs that the Steps and Pillars Framework requires further review and minor modifications. The framework was initially developed to integrate the educational and professional conceptual frameworks that are drawn upon within the program, which is a requirement of accreditation. Once the accreditation site visit and report from the program’s accreditation is completed in the fall 2016, feedback from the IQAP review, Accreditation, and stakeholder input (from students, faculty members and community partners) will be integrated by the Occupational Therapy Education Council to make further refinements to the model. Detailed plans will then be formulated to further communicate the Steps and Pillars Framework to stakeholders.

- **Areas for Improvement**

The IQAP review team identified five areas of improvement in their report:

1. **Resources to support students**: the review team noted that recent changes in counselling services for graduate students were raised by many stakeholders during their on-site visit as an issue of concern. Although they clearly understand the change was prompted by a decision tied to funding by graduate students themselves, they expressed concern about the risks associated with this removal of some service in relation to student and faculty well-being. In addition, they described writing supports for graduate students as an area that could benefit from attention.

Program Response: The program shares the IQAP reviewers’ concerns in both of these areas, while recognizing that the review occurred very soon after the change in service for counselling was announced, before the program’s or university’s response was finalized. In addition, while it may be perceived to be beyond the direct scope of the IQAP review mandate, the reviewers’ comments no doubt reflect the concerns expressed by students and faculty alike. Given the impact of these services on both the well-being and academic performance of students in the program, the issue warrants attention. Indeed, the university administration is aware of the issues and have indicated efforts are planned to ensure graduate students are provided adequate supports.

2. **Time and space management**: although the IQAP review team members identify good quantity and quality of space for program delivery, they noted areas for improvement to address
challenges and tensions associated with sharing space between programs (in particular between Mohawk and McMaster programs in the shared IAHS building).

Program response: As enrollments and program offerings have increased and will likely continue to increase for both Mohawk College and McMaster University programs, it will be important for the Joint Building Committee to continue to work constructively to address challenges associated with space and classroom bookings. The School of Rehabilitation Science will have representation on this Committee and a leadership role in addressing the issues.

3. **Use of media to enhance teaching and learning:** The IQAP review team lauded faculty members’ interest in adding additional media and technologies to enhance the educational programs, while acknowledging input that supports and infrastructure may need to be improved to optimize use of these media.

Program Response: A number of faculty members have embraced technologies such as clickers, flipped classrooms etc. Challenges with infrastructure within the classroom environments do need to be addressed; in particular, use of video in the large classroom (especially in room 367) has been limited by the equipment in the classroom. In addition, supports to create on-line modules, videos for exams or assignments, use of computer labs for written examinations all warrant attention in the future. Support to faculty through training of support staff and infrastructure will both be important.

4. **Admissions:** The IQAP review team was supportive of the planned initiative to conduct a review and evaluation of admissions policies and procedures. In addition, they suggested attention be paid to admissions for people of aboriginal/indigenous descent.

Program Response: The Occupational Therapy Education Council discussed ideas for an Admissions Working Group at its June 2016 meeting, with terms of reference for the working group drafted in July 2016. Although the initial terms of reference did not make specific reference to issues associated with admissions for people of aboriginal/indigenous descent, this aspect will be added. It is anticipated that the working group will report back to the OTEC in July 2017, with recommendations emerging from the group’s report to be considered and approved by OTEC for implementation starting in the 2018 admissions cycle.

5. **Harmonization of IQAP and accreditation reviews:** The IQAP review team noted significant similarities between the two review processes, and identified significant efficiencies that could be achieved by combining these reviews.

Program Response: The program is strongly in support of this recommendation; in fact, in December 2014, discussions were held with the acting Dean, Graduate Studies to discuss the possibility of
harmonizing the two reviews. However, it was recommended that the program needed to prepare separate self-study reports, and separate site visits were subsequently organized. In June 2016, a meeting was held with a MIIETL staff member to discuss strategies that may be implemented in future to harmonize the two reviews. The example of a combined IQAP/Accreditation review for the University of Ottawa Occupational Therapy program may represent one approach to such harmonization. Next steps in formulating a plan for this will include comparison of IQAP and accreditation review reports, and recommendations to the School of Graduate Studies and MIIETL to support programs with professional accreditations to undertake harmonized IQAP and Accreditation reviews in future.

Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and Dean’s Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify appropriate alternative counselling resources and communicate to students and faculty as soon as possible</td>
<td>Follow up with Centre for Student Wellness to identify alternative community resources; formulate strategy to communicate information to students.</td>
<td>OT Assistant Dean &amp; director, Centre for Student Wellness</td>
<td>July, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Find a solution to address student needs for support to improve their writing skills.</td>
<td>* Ongoing communication with School of Graduate Studies regarding needs of students in professional and course-based graduate programs for writing support. * Consider assigning TA supports within the program for profession-specific student writing support.</td>
<td>Assistant Dean, Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>Initiate for 2016-2017 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Follow-Up</td>
<td>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</td>
<td>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop ways to optimize IPE opportunities with the PT and OTA/PTA assistant programs co-located in the IAHS building.</td>
<td>• Review of current IPE opportunities re OTA/PTA &lt;br&gt; • Consider development of new PBL opportunities that may include collaboration with Mohawk OTA/PTA program.</td>
<td>OT Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>2016-2017 year and continuing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop strategies to improve access and utilization of various media to enhance teaching, learning, and the overall student experience.</td>
<td>a) Continue exploration of technology supports &lt;br&gt; b) Share learning re technologies amongst faculty</td>
<td>a) SRS Associate Dean and Director, Administration &lt;br&gt; b) OTCC</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Explore and address issues related to building space, with focus on class scheduling.</td>
<td>• Establish a joint (McMaster-Mohawk) working group to lead a review of scheduling and academic planning in the IAHS &lt;br&gt; • Create a Scheduling Operational Agreement &lt;br&gt; • Review SRS room booking protocols to better align scheduling windows &lt;br&gt; • Clarify the protocol and SRS access to book in other McMaster buildings (e.g. to accommodate large capacity classes)</td>
<td>Sarah Bouma, Director of Administration</td>
<td>August 2016 &lt;br&gt; March 2017 &lt;br&gt; August 2016 &lt;br&gt; August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Follow-Up</td>
<td>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</td>
<td>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conduct planned review of admissions policies and procedures, with inclusion of attention to aboriginal/indigenous students.</td>
<td>Terms of reference to be formulated and consideration regarding aboriginal/indigenous students will be incorporated.</td>
<td>Admissions working group with advisory group to be struck by the Occupational Therapy Education Council.</td>
<td>Admissions working group report required by July 2017. Implementation of recommendations to be initiated in the 2017-2018 academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Combine future IQAP and accreditation reviews of the occupational therapy program, adjusting timelines for IQAP reviews if necessary.</td>
<td>Review policy and processes associated with combining IQAP and accreditation. Set plan in writing for future combined IQAP/Accreditation reviews. Communicate with OT Accreditation Council (if required)</td>
<td>OT Assistant Dean, Associate Deans (SRS, Graduate Studies, Health Sciences) MIETL and School of Graduate studies.</td>
<td>By 2018-2019 academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Response:**

The Faculty agrees with the program’s thoughtful response to the concerns raised, including those pertaining to IAHS space management and aspects of the program’s admissions procedures. While the review did not identify any major weaknesses, it did highlight that the program faculty and students were concerned about recent changes to graduate student access to counseling services at the Student Wellness Centre. The Faculty agrees with the program’s response to this concern, and recognizes that the matter lies beyond the scope of the IQAP review and program’s control. We acknowledge that student wellness is important to graduate education. We also appreciate that the concerns about reduced counseling supports have been heard by the university administration and the graduate student leadership and that this matter needs follow up at many levels in the university.

**Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee recommends that the program should follow the regular course of action with a progress report and subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review

Physiotherapy M.Sc.

Date of Review: May 9th and 10th 2016

In accordance with the University Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the Physiotherapy M.Sc. program delivered by the School of Rehabilitation Science. This report identifies the significant strengths of the program, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

The report includes an Implementation Plan that identifies who will be responsible for approving the recommendations set out in the Final Assessment Report; who will be responsible for providing any resources entailed by those recommendations; any changes in organization, policy or governance that will be necessary to meet the recommendations and who will be responsible for acting on those recommendations; and timelines for acting on and monitoring the implementation of those recommendations.

Executive Summary of the Review

The Physiotherapy program submitted a self-study to the School of Graduate Studies April 2016. The self-study presented the program descriptions and learning outcomes, an analytical assessment of these two programs, and program data including the data collected from a student survey along with the standard data package prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appended were the CVs for each full-time faculty member in the Department.

• Strengths
  • Unique focus on problem-based learning and small group instruction
  • Clear alignment of the MSc Physiotherapy Program with the McMaster University academic plan, and the University’s MSc Degree Level Expectations (often exceeding expectations)
  • A curriculum that reflects the current state of discipline and that is line with core physiotherapy competencies
  • The variety of clinical learning experiences, including role emerging placements
  • Active engagement of graduates and the local physiotherapy community
  • ‘Admirable’ achievement of the distinctive challenges in coordination of instruction (related to a problem-based curriculum) by program administration
  • The Clinical Education Team
  • Curriculum renewal and revision
  • High quality Program as evidenced by several quality indicators
  • Well-funded faculty, with a strong research capacity and research expertise
  • Impressive number of student projects presented at national and international conferences, and published in journals relevant to physiotherapy
o Expected benefits from the implementation of the new budget model, which when implemented, is expected to result in long-term financial sustainability of the program
o Well-respected Assistant Dean (Physiotherapy), Assistant Dean (Physiotherapy) leadership
o Broadly consultative, ongoing and extensive system of planned program evaluation
o Being co-located with Mohawk College in the Institute of Applied Health Sciences, in order to leverage technology

• Areas for Enhancement or Improvement

o Workload and Faculty: Very high teaching workload for the Assistant Dean and Faculty Members, (p1) (p3) (p11); Very high service workload for Assistant Dean and Faculty Members, (p1) (p4) (p12); There is a dearth of mid-career faculty within the MScPT program and several senior faculty who are nearing retirement, (p10); Students reported a perceived disconnect from faculty members (p4) (p7)

o Extent of teaching by academic staff in non-continuing appointments: A large component of teaching completed by contract academic staff in non-continuing appointments, (p1) (p3) (p4) (p5); Contract staff reported some concern about receiving academic assignments in July of each year, with no position security or continuity of responsibilities from year to year (p4)

o Space: Availability of space in IAHS (especially with the new SLP program starting), (p2); Coordination in space utilization at IAHS, double booked rooms for small group work or student studying. Lack of rooms large enough to fit all students at once ... students and sessional staff report little study space indicative of a program that is nearly ‘bursting at the seams’ (p6)

o Technology: inconsistent use of effective communication strategies including modern instructional technologies, (p2); IT support is typically strong, but can be inconsistent (p6); Additional space and IT support pressures may arise with the new SLP program, (p6); lack of web-based conferencing facilities within the IAHS ... again identified by faculty and contract staff as a need, (p11); purchase of video-conferencing software that would allow more flexibility ... software would facilitate learning in the Clinical Skills laboratories, (p12)

o Student Mental Health: Concerns around an impending lack of availability of mental health counseling for graduate students, (p2) (p13); Stress and anxiety of students (p6)

o Admissions: Little formal evaluation of the psychometric properties of the MMI and it is unknown whether candidate scores on the interview predict future performance in the program. It is also unknown how well the interview screens out unsuitable candidates (p2); Re-evaluating consideration of international students, (p3)

o Curriculum: Concerns raised that problem-based approach combined with a high number of teaching staff with different approaches led to unstandardized learning experiences that did not prepare them for standardized examinations, (p3) (p5); Approximately half of the research projects are supervised by sessional instructors. This was not identified as a problem within the self-study report or during on-site interviews. Increasing the involvement of tenure and tenure stream faculty in supervision of the research projects may, however, be a way to enhance student learning and the quality of the student experience (p8) (p9)

o Communication and Decision-making: Dissatisfaction among faculty who reported not being consulted on the cancellation of the NSS decision (p5); There appears to be limited input sought from faculty on School/Faculty-level decisions that directly or indirectly affect the MScPT program and a lack of communication regarding the rationale for such decisions (p10); decisions around program finances (there appears to be a lack of understanding about what resources are available and how resources are allocated), (p10); it seemed clear faculty would welcome a higher level of involvement, and a higher level of transparency about decision making, (p10)
- **Support Staff:** University appears to have no formal annual evaluation process for support staff (p6); this change in staffing operations does not yet appear to be fully understood by tenure-stream or sessional faculty who reported not knowing who to approach when various needs arise, (p10); Full-time and sessional faculty reported that they did not have clear direction around the duties assigned to each staff member, and which member to contact depending on specific situations when they arise (p6) (p11)

**Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Department’s and Dean’s Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Address high teaching and workloads</td>
<td>Experienced .8 FTE CLA hired to fulfill teaching roles</td>
<td>Dr. Patty Solomon Associate Dean SRS</td>
<td>July 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New tenure track position hired</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implement strategies to address large proportion of program teaching being conducted by academic staff in non-continuing appointments</td>
<td>Experienced .8 FTE CLA hired to fulfill teaching roles</td>
<td>Dr. Patty Solomon Associate Dean SRS</td>
<td>July 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New tenure track position hired</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan developed for retirement replacements based on financial review of School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Address IAHS space issues</td>
<td>Establish a joint (McMaster-Mohawk) working group to lead a review of scheduling and academic planning in the IAHS</td>
<td>Sarah Bouma Director of Administration</td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create a Scheduling Operational Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Follow-Up</td>
<td>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</td>
<td>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Revise the training plan for the new IAHS scheduling officer to include an orientation to the SRS</td>
<td>Review SRS room booking protocols to better align scheduling windows</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify the protocol and SRS access to book in other McMaster buildings (e.g. to accommodate large capacity classes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase scheduling efficiency through supporting the IAHS course-review audit and reviewing outcomes in conjunction with space utilization data</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hosted consultation sessions with faculty and staff about SLP space planning (January 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer/Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review space requirements for SLP (with new SLP leadership) and increase communication of ideas/plans with SRS faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Address communication strategies including lack of modern instructional technologies, IT support, high-definition video cameras and video-conferencing</td>
<td>Meeting with McMaster IT groups (UTS/CSU) and Mohawk IT as part of the McMaster IT services review project</td>
<td>Sarah Bouma Director of Administration</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of a new IT Service Level Agreement between Mohawk-McMaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore options to create better access to web conferencing services/software within SRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer/Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore options to make video conferencing available to SRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer/Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Follow-Up</td>
<td>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</td>
<td>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5   | Implement strategies to address lack of availability of mental health counseling for graduate students, student stress and anxiety | Several strategies have already been implemented since the GSA vote:  
The SRS has been in contact with Student Wellness Director to clarify services that will be available for students in our Program. No student will be turned away from Student Wellness, should s/he require an immediate appointment. Students will still be able to access Student Wellness and will be referred to other services for ongoing counselling.  
Student Wellness will collate a list of services that will be included in the PT Program Handbook, that the Program will distribute to Faculty and Staff (including Faculty Advisors), and that the Program can use when student issues warrant.  
The PT Program Co-ordinator attended the Mental Health First Aid Course (June 2016), and a list of Hamilton resources received at this course will be distributed.  
The PT Program Student Council now has a new position/role: Mental Health Alliance PT Representative. The Assistant Dean (Physiotherapy) will meet with the representative within the next month to further investigate issues from the students’ perspective (stress, anxiety due to the program) and | Vanina Dal Bello-Haas, Assistant Dean, Physiotherapy | Ongoing  
Summer 2016  
July 2016 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Examine admissions processes, including MMI and international students</td>
<td>With the transition to new PT curriculum September 2017, the admissions process will be thoroughly reviewed and evaluated.</td>
<td>Vanina Dal Bello-Haas Assistant Dean, Physiotherapy</td>
<td>Ongoing over academic year 2016 – 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizing the need for examination of admissions, the SRS admissions committee will be on hiatus for the 2016-2017 academic year. This hiatus will provide an opportunity for the PT Program (and Occupational Therapy Program) to determine specific Program needs as they relate to admissions and to determine admission criteria that align with the PT Program’s mission, graduate outcomes, new curriculum et cetera. The new admissions process may or may not include MMI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Examine unstandardized learning experiences</td>
<td>The Program has been addressing the needs to standardize processes related to teaching and learning for the past four years e.g., developing role documents (Unit Chair, Course Co-ordinators, et cetera); incorporating co-teaching models (tenure-track, tenured faculty with sessional or more experienced with less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vanina Dal Bello-Haas Assistant Dean, Physiotherapy</td>
<td>Ongoing over academic year 2016 – 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Follow-Up</td>
<td>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</td>
<td>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experienced sessional) when resources and availability allow; providing policies and procedures to sessional faculty; implementing an annual sessional orientation session. The Program has also developed a new role, Clinical Lab Oversight Coordinator – this individual has been standardizing processes related to the Clinical Lab courses (which many sessionals teach within) and the OSCE processes. As well, the Program hired an individual to work with the Sessional charged with Unit 1 and Unit 2 Clinical Lab courses to develop objectives for individual clinical lab sessions and to develop a clinical lab handbook. It will take some time to see the full benefits of these strategies. Within the new curriculum, strategies will be implemented to underscore student expectations related to Problem-based tutorials e.g., only tenured or tenure-stream faculty will be tutors in the first PBT course to set the stage for expectations. Training of tutors and other related to the new curriculum will be necessary and will be used as an opportunity to address expectations and consistency. The Assistant Dean (Physiotherapy) will meet with to the Department Education Coordinator to develop a</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Proposed Follow-Up</td>
<td>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</td>
<td>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Examine perception of faculty disconnect from students</td>
<td>The PT Program had MIIEITL conduct several focus groups across different cohorts of students, as part of accreditation and IQAP self-studies. This perception was not raised in any of these focus groups. As well, this concern has not been raised by students on course and faculty evaluations, or on graduate surveys. The Program is unclear of the source of this perception, as the data/evidence does not seem to triangulate with the student’s comments to the IQAP review team. The Assistant Dean (Physiotherapy) will develop a plan to delve into and more fully understand students’ perceptions. The PT Program will monitor sources of data/evidence for this theme.</td>
<td>Vanina Dal Bello-Haas, Assistant Dean, Physiotherapy</td>
<td>Ongoing over academic year 2016 – 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9   | Address communication issues related to decisions, and decision-making          | Revamping of SRS Council meeting format  
Leadership retreat                                                                                       | Dr. Patty Solomon, Associate Dean SRS                      | Ongoing                                                  |
<p>| 10  | Clarify formal annual review process of staff                                  | McMaster’s current practices (Collective Bargaining Agreement) does not enable an annual review process for unionized administrative staff.                                                                               | Sarah Bouma, Director of Administration                    | N/A                                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Proposed Follow-Up</th>
<th>Responsibility for Leading Follow-Up</th>
<th>Timeline for Addressing Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clarify staff members’ roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>McMaster HR is exploring this as an option for future implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Examine involvement of tenured and tenure-track faculty involvement in REBP</td>
<td>The IQAP team noted the “Impressive number of student projects presented at national and international conferences, and published in journals relevant to physiotherapy” as a strength. The detriment to students re: not having involvement of tenured and tenure-track faculty involvement in REBP is not evident at the present time. As part of curriculum renewal, the REBP course and the REBP project will be reviewed and revised. Involvement of tenured and tenure-track faculty involvement in REBP will be discussed at future PT Program Curriculum Committee meeting(s).</td>
<td>Vanina Dal Bello-Haas Assistant Dean, Physiotherapy</td>
<td>Ongoing over academic year 2016 – 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Response:**

The review highlighted the demands that the curriculum and learning methodology place on the faculty members. Given the importance of this approach to the program’s reputation, the Faculty fully agrees with the strategic decision made by the School of Rehabilitation Science to hire additional faculty. The response of the program regarding IAHS space concerns, communication strategies, mental health services, admissions, and support staff was very thoughtful, as was the program’s explanation for the large number of academic staff in non-continuing appointments. The Faculty agrees with the detailed
response to the external review and thank the program and School for their thoroughness in addressing the concerns that relate to the mandate of the IQAP review.

Going forward, the goal is to ensure that the MSc Physiotherapy Program continues to thrive as a leading program that trains the next generation of clinical practitioners for physiotherapy practice. The Faculty appreciates the opportunity to respond to the review and to reiterate their continued support of this valued program.

**McMaster Quality Assurance Committee Recommendation**

McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee recommends that the program should follow the regular course of action with a progress report. The progress report should contain an update on the admissions criteria. A subsequent full external cyclical review to be conducted no later than 8 years after the start of the last review.
REPORT TO SENATE

FROM THE

COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS

Open Session (Consent Agenda)

At its April 17, 2017 meeting, the Committee on Appointments approved the following recommendations and now recommends them to Senate for approval:

a. Recommendation to Change the Name of the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells (Attachment I)

b. Proposed Revisions to the Policy on the Awarding of the Title “Professor Emeritus / Emerita” (Attachment II)

Senate: For Approval
May 17, 2017
March 20, 2017

Senate Committee on Appointments
c/o University Secretariat
Gilmour Hall, Room 210

Re: Name Change for the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells

On behalf of the Faculty of Health Sciences, I would like to recommend the name of the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells be changed to the Boris Family Chair in Drug Discovery.

In 2011, the Boris family pledged $30 million to McMaster with the goal of advancing translational research and patient care. Part of that gift included an endowment fund in support of the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells. The terms of reference for the Chair, approved in 2012, are being revised to reflect the broadened focus for the Chair and better alignment with the Faculty’s research strategy.

The original terms of reference were specific to the field of translational neural stem cell research. While this is an important area of research at McMaster and other leading stem cell centres, the Faculty was unable to recruit a sufficiently qualified candidate for the role. The very specialized research focus of the Chair led to applicants that were either too junior, or individuals that were not comfortable uprooting the established research programs at their home institutions. The total costs for the latter were also prohibitive and beyond the level available from the Chair and supplemental support from the Faculty.

The revised terms broaden the scope of the Chair to the field of drug discovery, a key research theme for the Faculty. Based out of our Michael G. DeGroote Institute for Infectious Disease Research, the Chair would support activities in translational research and “bench to bedside” research with other biomedical researchers at McMaster.

Communication and consultation regarding these changes has taken place with the Boris family, as well with the affected areas in our Faculty.

Thank you for considering this recommendation. Enclosed please find a copy of the original and revised terms of reference.

Sincerely,

Paul O’Byrne MB, FRCP(C), FRSC
Dean and Vice-President

Encl.
PB/rl
TERMS OF REFERENCE

Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells

General

A gift from the Boris Family has been directed to the Faculty of Health Sciences at McMaster University to provide an endowment fund in support of the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells. The research, education interests and accomplishments of the incumbent will encompass a broad and comprehensive range of topics in human (neural) stem cells.

Details and Duties of the Chair

The holder of the Chair shall be an individual with sufficient research and education experience and who has demonstrated interest in and capability to implement the objectives set out below.

Specifically, the Chair will

- Build and lead a team of experts to implement the proof of principle testing that is required in the field of neural stem cells in human therapies;

- Contribute significantly to the body of scholarship in the area of human neural stem cells, through research and teaching at McMaster University;

- Focus on the field of human neural stem cells, address scientific uncertainty, address scientific advancement and include the calibre of scientific content displayed with other research projects ongoing at the University;

- Be an integral part of the institutional vision towards establishing and maintaining a world class translational research program in human neural stem cells and thereby exemplify the central values of the University;

- Undertake the normal duties of a faculty member in the Faculty of Health Sciences, including participation in the education programs of the Faculty.

Selection Process

The Dean and Vice-President of the Faculty of Health Sciences will appoint an appropriate ad-hoc Selection Committee. The Selection Committee will recommend the appointment of the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells. The Committee will forward its recommendation to the Senate Committee on Appointments.

Term

An appointment to the Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells shall be for up to five (5) years, with the understanding that renewal for additional terms is possible.
Acknowledgement

The incumbent will acknowledge that she/he holds the “Boris Family Chair in Human (Neural) Stem Cells” in all publications, lectures and any other activities supported through the fund.

March 2012
TERMS OF REFERENCE

Boris Family Chair in Drug Discovery

General

A gift has been directed to the Faculty of Health Sciences to provide support for the Boris Family Chair in Drug Discovery. The incumbent will have demonstrated excellence in the area of drug discovery.

Details and Duties

The holder of the Chair shall be an individual with sufficient research, education and/or clinical experience.

Specifically, the chairholder will:

- Hold a full-time appointment in the appropriate department in the Faculty of Health Sciences at McMaster University, and be an active member of the Michael G. DeGroote Institute for Infectious Disease Research;

- Be an integral part of the institutional vision towards establishing and maintaining a world-class program in drug discovery which exemplifies the central values of the University and the Michael G. DeGroote Institute for Infectious Disease Research;

- Contribute significantly to the body of scholarship in the area of drug discovery, through teaching, research and/or clinical work at McMaster University;

- Undertake the normal duties of a faculty member in the Faculty of Health Sciences and the applicable department, including participation in the education programs of the department.

Selection Process

The Dean and Vice-President of the Faculty of Health Sciences will appoint an appropriate ad-hoc selection committee which shall include, at minimum, the Associate Dean, Research and the Director of the Michael G. DeGroote Institute for Infectious Disease Research. The Committee will forward its recommendation to the Senate Committee on Appointments.

Term

An appointment to the Chair shall be for up to five (5) years, with the understanding that renewal for additional terms is possible.

Acknowledgement

The incumbent will acknowledge that she/he holds the “Boris Family Chair in Drug Discovery” in all publications, lectures and any other activities supported through the fund.

January 2017
The title "professor emeritus/emerita" shall be accorded to all retiring professors on regular staff and shall retroactively be accorded to all those faculty members who have retired from the University with the rank of professor with tenure, permanence, or CAWAR.

The Senate Committee on Appointments is willing to consider a recommendation from a Faculty Appointments Committee for awarding the title "professor emeritus/emerita" to an untutored faculty member who holds an appointment at the rank of professor and for whom that committee would be prepared to recommend a tenured appointment at the rank of professor. In exceptional circumstances, the Senate Committee on Appointments will consider a recommendation from a Faculty Appointments Committee that a former faculty member who has retired at the rank of professor from another institution be accorded the title 'professor emeritus/emerita'.
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PACBIC was established in 2002 in response to the third goal of McMaster’s strategic plan, Refining Directions: ‘to build an inclusive community with a shared purpose’1. The University’s commitment to inclusion was amplified in the principles set out by President Patrick Deane in 2011 in Forward with Integrity: A Letter to the McMaster Community2, and most recently reiterated in the emphasis on ‘building an inclusive community, promoting equity and fairness, and celebrating our rich diversity’ in Forward with Integrity: The Next Phase (2015)3.

PACBIC contributes to these institutional objectives in its advisory capacity. It acts as a hub open to all of the University’s constituent groups for exchange, discussion and the generation of ideas for redressing within McMaster’s orbit the systemic barriers that characterize our wider society.

PACBIC provides advice to the President and directs its questions and recommendations to relevant offices, groups and individuals on campus that have the authority and resources to implement change, adjust practices and advise on the processes involved.

By documenting its ongoing work in this Report (which spans September 2015 – December 2016), PACBIC hopes to engage everyone in the campus community in working toward the inclusive and just institutional practices to which the University aspires.

PACBIC’S MANDATE & ORGANIZATION

Mandate
The key elements of PACBIC’s mandate read as follows:

- **Identify and anticipate issues affecting equity-seeking communities (including but not limited to First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples, members of racialized communities, newcomers and refugees, members of diverse faith communities, persons with disabilities, LGBTQ+-identified individuals, and women) both within the University and relevant to those seeking access to the University, and advise the President on such issues.**

- **Provide a forum for discussion, reflection and learning on issues of inclusion, equity and community-building and, in keeping with the spirit of the University, create spaces for respectful debate on important social issues.**

---

• Provide reports and make recommendations for action to the President, the University Planning Committee (UPC) and other relevant University bodies in order to channel advice through the University structure and thus sustain a University culture that advances equity and inclusion.⁴

Enhancing inclusion of First Nations, Métis and Inuit (FNMI) peoples on campus continues to be a particular focus for PACBIC, mirroring the University’s priority⁵ to address the under-representation of FNMI peoples and to foster the integration of Indigenous perspectives into the University’s academic activities. The approval this year of the new undergraduate degree program in Indigenous studies was an encouraging development in this pathway and one that PACBIC has eagerly supported.

Membership
PACBIC’s membership includes students, staff and faculty – a mix of both individual members and representatives of organizations and groups key to its mandate. Membership is organized through a nomination process and members are appointed by the President. The formal membership is constituted to secure diverse representation from across campus and is the committee’s base (see Appendix A for list of members for 2015-2016). However, all members of the McMaster community are welcome to participate and meetings are open. PACBIC is chaired by a faculty member who is supported by student and staff vice chairs, currently: Ameil Joseph (School of Social Work), Ryan Deshpande (MSU Diversity Services) and Andrea Cole (School of Graduate Studies).

Working Groups
PACBIC’s activities are organized through working groups that take up particular issues or facets of inclusion and include both members of PACBIC and individuals with relevant experience and responsibilities on campus. Each group is supported by the expertise of a staff member from the Equity and Inclusion Office. The Provost’s Office provides a small annual budget to support working groups’ initiatives and PACBIC-related events (listed in Appendix B).

Currently active working groups include:

• **Accessibility, Disability & Ableism**
  Convenor: Rhonda Moore, Manager, Lyons Media Centre
  Resource Person: Raihanna Hirji-Khalfan, Accessibility Specialist

• **Employment Equity**
  Convenor: Dr. Suzanne Mills, Faculty member, Labour Studies, School of Geography & Earth Sciences
  Resource Person: Craig Foye, Senior Human Rights Officer

---

⁴ [http://pacbic.mcmaster.ca/documents/](http://pacbic.mcmaster.ca/documents/)
⁵ [http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/publications/vision/McMasterAgreement.pdf](http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/pepg/publications/vision/McMasterAgreement.pdf)
• **First Nations, Métis and Inuit Priorities**  
  Convenor: Dr. Vanessa Watts, Academic Director, Indigenous Studies Program  
  Resource Person: Pilar Michaud, Director, Human Rights and Dispute Resolution

• **Inter-Faith Issues**  
  Convenor: Andrew (Andy) Crowell, Ecumenical Chaplain  
  Resource Person: Vilma Rossi, Senior Program Manager

• **Madness/Distress, Eugenics, Discrimination & Saneism (MEDS)**  
  Convenor: Alise deBie  
  Resource Person: Raihanna Hirji-Khalfan, Accessibility Specialist

• **Priorities & Planning**  
  Convenor: Dr. Amell Joseph, Faculty member, School of Social Work  
  Resource Person: Vilma Rossi, Senior Program Manager

• **Race, Racialization & Racism**  
  Co-Convenors: Kayonne Christy, Dr. Daniel Coleman, Faculty member, English and Cultural Studies and Dr. Juliet Daniel, Faculty member, Department of Biology  
  Resource Person: Khadijah Rakie, Human Rights Specialist

• **Violence Against Women/ Gender-Based Violence**  
  Co-Conveners: Dr. Amber Dean, Faculty member, English & Cultural Studies & Lainey Stirling, Coordinator, MSU Women and Gender Equity Network (WGEN)  
  Resource Person: Meaghan Ross, Sexual Violence Response Coordinator

• **LGBTQ+**  
  Convener: (TBD-Newly formed group)  
  Resource Person: Michelle Poirier, Complaint Resolution & Equity Specialist

Enhancing equity and inclusion on these various dimensions of experience on campus requires change in university policies, practices and conversations – endeavors that typically involve the work of the many offices, groups and individuals with whom PACBIC collaborates and consults and vice versa. Highlighted below are some of the areas in which PACBIC and its many partners have worked over the past year.

**WORK IN PROGRESS**

**UNIVERSITY WIDE CAPACITY BUILDING WITH RESPECT TO ACCESSIBILITY, DISABILITY & ABLEISM**  
The Accessibility, Disability & Ableism Working Group organized a series of brown bag lunch and learn workshops from January to May 2015. The topics for learning covered areas of policy, law, practice and ethics relevant to staff, faculty, teaching assistants and others who are working with other people interested in learning about academic accommodations (facilitated by: Student Accessibility Services (SAS), workplace accommodations (facilitated by: Employee Health Services, Human Resources Services), tips and tools for closed captioning (facilitated by: The McMaster Closed Captioning Working Group), What is accessibility? (facilitated by: The Office of Human Rights & Equity Services) and tips and tools for web
accessibility (facilitated by: The McMaster Web Accessibility Advisory Group)⁶. These lunch and learn sessions were well attended and well received.

The Accessibility, Disability & Ableism Working Group also organized a public lecture with speaker Dr. Tanya Titchkosky, Professor, Social Justice Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto on Tuesday April 5th. The Lecture entitled: The Question of Access examined how values such as ‘access’ and ‘inclusion’ are unquestioned in the contemporary educational landscape. But many methods of addressing these issues — installing signs, ramps, and accessible washrooms — frame disability only as a problem to be ‘fixed.’ “The Question of Access” lecture investigated the social meanings of access in contemporary university life from the perspective of Cultural Disability Studies.⁷

**Recommendations:**

1. The Accessibility, Disability & Ableism Working Group would like the University to continue to specifically advance accessibility as a key priority while supporting the development and strengthening of an ethos of accessibility at McMaster.

**FOLLOWING THROUGH WITH ADVOCACY FOR EMPLOYMENT EQUITY**

PACBIC’s Employment Equity Working Group has continued to build on its 2013 research on employment equity policy and practice across University Institutions that led to the hiring of an Employment Equity Specialist at McMaster University - Shylo Elmayan. The group worked with Shylo on how to design the staff and employee data survey that would collect current employment equity information from McMaster employees.

The employment equity survey was released and the Employment Equity Working Group has been supporting the encouragement of staff and faculty to complete it. Once the results have been analyzed, the Employment Equity Working Group will focus its attention and all of ours, to addressing employment equity concerns.

**Recommendations:**

1. That the university continue its work in employment equity by completing the hire of an EE specialist, analyzing survey results and presenting these results to PACBIC and the broader McMaster community in an open and timely fashion.

⁶ [https://pacbic.mcmaster.ca/working-groups/access-accommodation](https://pacbic.mcmaster.ca/working-groups/access-accommodation)
⁷ [https://pacbic.mcmaster.ca/images/PublicLecturePosterApril52016page001.jpg](https://pacbic.mcmaster.ca/images/PublicLecturePosterApril52016page001.jpg)
2. That when a committee is formed to further the EE committee’s work of designing and implementing employment equity policy – that it includes representatives from PACBIC and from each of McMaster’s employee groups.

3. That the committee membership includes representation from employees from designated categories.

4. That the PACBIC Employment Equity Working Group and employee groups have the opportunity to advise on Human Resources employment equity initiatives and policies prior to their implementation.

FIRST NATIONS, MÉTIS AND INUIT PRIORITIES AND CONTINUING THE PUSH FOR PROGRESS ON THE TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION COMMISSION’S RECOMMENDATIONS

In May, the Indigenous Studies Program (ISP) received news that, after 20 years of effort, the program had received permission to introduce an Honours BA and combined Honours BA. In June, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) presented their findings about residential schools. Dr. Vanessa Watts, from the Indigenous Studies Program and convener of PACBIC’s First Nations, Métis and Inuit Priorities Working Group, spoke on CTV about the TRC’s findings. The Indigenous Undergraduate Summer Research Scholars Program invited 22 students to campus over the summer and the Harvey E. Longboat Graduate Scholarships for First Nation, Inuit, and Métis Students were awarded to 6 students this year. In November, Audra Simpson spoke about Indigenous Health Sovereignty on campus. Also in 2016, in partnership with the McMaster Museum of Art and Perspectives on Peace, an exhibition titled “Art of Peace” by artist Elizabeth Doxtater shared Haudenosaunee stories and culture. The ISP also co-sponsored several special events on campus. ISP has also worked with the Anti-Violence Network on the plaque to honour Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women in front of the L.R. Wilson Hall Liberal Arts building and for fundraising for the National Day of Mourning and Action on Violence Against Women (December 6th) commemorative events including the white pine trees also to honour missing and murdered indigenous women. While all of these efforts and achievements are important and necessary, there is ongoing need for progress at McMaster with respect to the TRC recommendations. There is a petition circulating for mandatory courses on Indigenous studies for all McMaster undergraduate students following a recommendation that came out of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The School of Social Work is making 3 units required, Arts and Science will be putting an ISP Level II course in their required coursework for their students starting 2017-2018. Peace Studies has included wording from the TRC in their calendar for 2017-2018, and promotes a combined degree in Indigenous Studies. There is still much work to be done and many TRC recommendations relevant to McMaster that have yet to be addressed. This is work for all of us to

---

8 https://indigenous.mcmaster.ca/
Recommendations:

1. Committed funds towards the annual National Day to End Violence Against Women event on December 6th: The Anti-Violence Network, FNMI Working Group and Indigenous Studies work diligently every year to raise funds from various units across campus towards this important event. While fundraising amongst varied units helps to facilitate promotion, caring, and commitment to this campus-wide event, it also places strain on the planning group to raise enough funds. Some committed core funding would help to alleviate this strain.

2. Promotion of an Introductory Course in Indigenous Studies: Mandatory courses in Indigenous Studies present both opportunities and careful considerations. Promotion of an introductory course in Indigenous Studies as an elective option through McMaster’s social media and/or admissions communication might address this need while also safeguarding a fruitful learning environment in the classroom.

BEING TRANSPARENT ON EQUITY AND INCLUSION FOR MENTAL HEALTH: NAMING MADNESS/DISTRESS, EUGENICS, DISCRIMINATION & SANISM

PACBIC’s working group dedicated to mental health equity and inclusion has refocused attention on thinking through and being transparent on its purpose and goals. Much of this has come about through the development of a collective critical consciousness with respect to perspectives that are often marginalized or silenced within mental health discourse. Re-naming the group to Madness/Distress, Eugenics, Discrimination & Sanism (MEDS) was one product of this refocusing10. While appreciating the perspectives of those who have experienced and lived the realities and systems of mental health and distress, the group has a continued commitment to challenge processes and practices that contribute to discrimination often while wielding ideas that cohere with sanest and eugenic rationale. This year much work went into supporting suggestions for purchasing scholarly literature from the field of mad studies and critical disability studies. Going forward, directed efforts will be on developing Mad studies and critical disabilities studies curricula, advocating for an undergraduate minor and developing a graduate course.

Recommendations:

1. University support for the work that MEDS is doing to develop and offer further critical disability studies courses (a graduate-level social science course on critical disability studies and a 1st/2nd year introductory undergraduate course), with the goal of establishing an undergraduate minor.

10 https://pacbic.mcmaster.ca/working-groups/mental-health
2. MEDS recommends that there be institutional support for campus-wide conversations on madness, eugenics, sanism, and non-medical approaches to mental health and that these kinds of conversations be incorporated into all campus trainings and activities related to mental health, suicide prevention and accessibility. The knowledge of Mad-identified people, consumer/survivors, and people with lived experience should be prioritized, present, and valued in these conversations. Further institutional resources need to be provided so that skilled and appropriate staff have the time and resources to develop and facilitate these conversations.

3. MEDS recommends that graduate student mental health services be available for all graduate students and that the institution take responsibility for providing these services rather than requiring students to pay for them.

DEEPENING THE CONVERSATION ON INTER-FAITH ISSUES AND FOOD JUSTICE

With the approval of the Policy on Academic Accommodation of Religious, Indigenous and Spiritual Observances (RISO)\(^\text{11}\), the implementation, resourcing and education for its effect are key priorities. The accommodations request forms were developed and distributed in September of 2015. Students from the Muslim Students Association, McMaster Hillel and the Indigenous Studies Program attended a meeting on September 1st to receive information about RISO and to discuss ways in which they - as student leaders - are instrumental in informing students of the new process. All students were enthusiastic in their commitment to raising awareness and supporting students to make use of the new policy and process. RISO "rave" cards were distributed at ClubsFest. Members of the Office of Human Rights Office & Equity Services (now Equity and Inclusion Office) also attended a General Meeting of the MSA to present on the new policy.

PACBIC's Inter-faith Issues Working Group has helped forward the agenda on the lack of access to Kosher and Halal food options. Through their efforts, and in collaboration with Hospitality Services, a twice-weekly delivery of kosher sandwiches and Danishes are now available from Tuesday-Thursday in LaPiazza, MUSC. The work of the group raised a number of ongoing concerns with respect to food justice at McMaster. Not only is access to Kosher and Halal food an issue, but issues of access to Indigenous, sustainable, fairly traded and affordable food on campus have been raised in PACBIC meetings as ongoing concerns\(^\text{12}\).

In April 2016, the Inter-faith Issues Working Group organized and facilitated a food justice panel, to educate and engage the McMaster community on these important issues\(^\text{13}\). While the dialogue was powerful and the event well attended, one major general outcome was the need for more collaboration and

\(^{11}\) [https://pacific.mcmaster.ca/working-groups/interfaith-issues](https://pacific.mcmaster.ca/working-groups/interfaith-issues)


\(^{13}\) [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=koVQKMc-lg&feature=youtu.be&list=PLUnV7X02cbxqHEXlxqQ4byvme4WrN1fJ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=koVQKMc-lg&feature=youtu.be&list=PLUnV7X02cbxqHEXlxqQ4byvme4WrN1fJ)
conversation between marginalized and equity-seeking groups and the relevant University systems and structures for food justice.

**Recommendations:**

1. That the University recognizes and takes action on providing equitable, respectful, accessible prayer/spiritual/Indigenous space on campus.

2. That the University makes a commitment to equitable, affordable access to food that recognizes inequities for faith-based groups, issues of food security for students, environmental and sustainability issues related to food.

These commitments will help to promote inclusion while enhancing McMaster University's reputation as a place of higher learning that operates within an international context – attractive and welcoming to students, staff and faculty from all religious/spiritual groups and identities.

**STRIVING FOR IMPACT AND JUSTICE ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN PRINCIPLE, PRACTICE AND POLICY**

The Sexual Violence Response Protocol (SVRP) and website launched with the leaderships of Meaghan Ross through her much advocated for and needed role as Sexual Violence Response Coordinator\(^4\). A great deal of work has been done and supported by PACBIC’s Violence Against Women/Gender Based Violence (VAW/GBV) working group on the implementation of this valuable protocol and resource.

The VAW/GBV has been working in a principled, respectful, considerate and ethical way to engage with the expertise, knowledge and experiences of people in the campus community and beyond on the new Sexual Violence Policy\(^5\). The goal is to attempt to ensure that the development of the new Sexual Violence Policy reflects the current knowledge, perspectives and understandings that exist about the diverse impacts and effects of sexual violence, and treats people with the highest degree of compassion and respect. While the Policy has now moved from its consultation and development phases to amendments, approvals and implementation, an emphasis is now more than ever required on valuing the voices and contributions of diverse students, subject-matter experts, survivors and others who bring an anti-oppressive lens to the Policy’s implementation. Specifically, the working group continues to advocate for a policy that recognizes the historical and contemporary role of institutions in fostering a climate of mistrust and (re)-traumatization, and seeks institutional recognition of the concerns raised by members of the working group about the policy in the work going forward. In order for trust to be reestablished and services to be effective, systemic and structural issues would need to be addressed. In particular, the working group continues to advocate for the

\(^4\) [http://svrp.mcmaster.ca/](http://svrp.mcmaster.ca/)

need for Complainants to have the right to appeal findings and decisions made by the University, as well as to be fully informed of the outcomes and any sanctions arising from their complaint.

The VAW/GBV also continues to build relationships and opportunities for learning from / collaborating with members of other working groups, especially the First Nations, Métis and Inuit Working Group and the Race, Racism and Racialization Working Group, in the interests of more effectively developing and integrating anti-racist analysis into responses to sexual violence.

Recommendations:

1. The VAW/GBV Working Group recommends ensuring sufficient resources are put in place to support the creation of a university-wide, trauma-informed, anti-oppressive approach to preventing and responding to sexual and gender-based violence that is also reflective of the many diverse communities at McMaster. We recommend a directive from the upper administration that the creation of such a university-wide cultural shift is an important priority for the University. Additional counseling support is needed for survivors, as is additional training for those providing counseling currently. Anti-oppressive, trauma-informed training and education related to sexual/gender-based violence is also badly needed across the university. This work cannot happen without additional resources, as current resources (e.g. the designated trauma counselor in Student Wellness; the Sexual Violence Response Coordinator) are already at maximum capacity.

2. The VAW/GBV Working Group recommends that the outcomes and sanctions arising from Complaints made under the new Sexual Violence Policy be reviewed annually and assessed with attention to any equity-related concerns that may arise from the Policy’s implementation (for e.g., the University should monitor whether Respondents from racially minoritized communities are more likely to be found in violation of the policy or given more severe sanctions).

3. The VAW/GBV Working Group recommends that the Sexual Violence Policy be reviewed in the future to include a commitment to fully informing Complainants of the outcome of their Complaints, including full disclosure of any corrective measures or actions taken by the University, and to include an option for Complainants to appeal the findings of an investigation and the decision made on the basis of those findings.

Exposing and Challenging Racism
Since its formation, PACBIC’s Race, Racism and Racialization (R3) Working Group has been in the complex throes of forming, growing and being committed to responding to the expanding demands of global and local increases in racialized violence, bigotry and hatred. In late 2015, at Hamilton City Hall, the Anti-Racism Resource Centre was approved unanimously. The approval comes after decades of work by activists in the community and members of R3. The approval signifies the beginning of another uphill struggle for

transformative change in the City. The Centre is a result of a partnership among McMaster University, McMaster’s Equity and Inclusion Office, City of Hamilton, The Office of Access and Equity at the City of Hamilton and The Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion. In March of 2016, R3 participated on a panel on the Criminalization and Racialization of Poverty organized by the McMaster Community Poverty Initiative. The event was attended to capacity. R3 is currently in the process of conducting some research on the experiences of racism at McMaster.

The Challenging Islamophobia on Campus initiative was developed by Khadijah Rakie and Raihanna Hirji-Khalafan as part of the Equity and Inclusion Office’s education and training portfolio as a result of the violent backlash targeting Muslims, and those perceived to be Muslims, after the deadly attacks in Paris, France in November, 2015, violence in Beirut and increases in Islamophobic rhetoric, hate crimes, and other directed violence in Ontario. The Initiative included goals to support Muslim students who are now living and coming to McMaster with heightened anxieties and fears of hatred and violence directed towards them, and to educate students at large about anti-racism and Islamophobia specifically due to historical and pressing needs. The Initiative report is forthcoming and has directed our attention to the importance of this work and the work ahead.

Recommendations:

1. That the University officially establish and resource a permanent University-wide, Black History Month Committee, as well as resource the recognition of current groups and projects across campus dedicated to challenging racism and amplifying the voices of racialized groups. i.e., including a permanent McMaster website that values Black History Month, the African Caribbean Faculty Association of McMaster, McMaster Womanist, related Faculty, courses, news, events and information.

2. As indicated by the Challenging Islamophobia on Campus Initiative Report: To acknowledge Islamophobia as a real and legitimate issue on campus with dedicated resources devoted to institutional mechanisms for the proactive engagement of affected communities to address issues concerning the campus climate and to ensure adequate (involving the perspectives of communities affected) University responses to geopolitical/local concerns.

EXPANDING TO THE DEMANDS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE WORK: PACBIC’S NEW LGBTQ+ WORKING GROUP AND A NEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

Over the spring and summer, there was an increased acknowledgement that a structural focus on LGBTQ+ staff, students and faculty members and their concerns was both timely and necessary. PACBIC historically has been deeply concerned with the experiences of marginalization and injustice specifically related to

gender and sexual orientation. This attention helped form PACBIC as it is now. Yet with shifts in roles and membership, the work and the attention needed to be solidified within our organization in a transparent way. Current work on all-gender washrooms on campus and experiences of oppression specifically related to gender identity and sexual orientation by students, faculty and staff have demonstrated a need for a working group that is dedicated to these concerns. We have now formed an LGBTQ+ Working Group\(^\text{19}\) of PACBIC and revised our Terms of Reference\(^\text{20}\) to acknowledge the increase in the work of PACBIC and an expansion of our membership from a total number of 40 to a general membership number of 40 with conveners and executive members to be counted on top of this. The new Terms of Reference have been approved through our internal processes and have also been approved through the Office of the President.

**CHALLENGES AHEAD**

**RESPONDING TO INCREASED BIGOTRY AND HATRED**

The United Kingdom’s withdrawal from the European Union (also known as Brexit), the rise of incidents of racialized, xenophobic and Islamophobic violence and discourse in Canada as well as the 2016 Presidential Election in the United States of America were major national and global shifts that carried with them and have since (re)produced many uncertainties, anxieties, and exacerbations of hatred and bigotry. This has increased incidents both globally and locally, many of which have been made public and some are often outside of public awareness. Anti-immigration rhetoric, white-nationalism, misogyny, the use of torture, the dehumanization of people living with disabilities, racism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and violence against women and members of the LGBTQ+ communities have been either validated, accepted or promoted during Brexit and the Presidential Election in the United States. There have been reports and an acknowledgement of increased fear and anxiety among students, faculty and staff, especially the marginalized groups targeted as well as specific incidents\(^\text{21}\) of hatred and bigotry on the McMaster Campus. While it is and will be all of our responsibilities to respond to, and continue to resist, these incidents and their sources of leadership and promotion, PACBIC has committed to working with these difficult contexts and concerns. We are currently working on developing collaborative interventions and resources for students, faculty and staff campus wide to listen to, support, and mobilize those interested, effected and concerned.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That we work to develop an education and communications plan in partnership the Office of the President, and the Equity and Inclusion Office (with corresponding dedicated resources) to respond to

---

19 [https://pacobc.mcmaster.ca/working-groups/LGBTQ](https://pacobc.mcmaster.ca/working-groups/LGBTQ)


21 [https://www.thesil.ca/alt-right-posters-appear-campus](https://www.thesil.ca/alt-right-posters-appear-campus)
Mcmaster/community events, incidents, occurrences and issues related to equity and inclusion in ways that are integrative, considerate and respectful to the communities effected and the concerns of students, faculty and staff.

TRANSITIONS IN PACBIC’S ORGANIZATION IN 2016-2017
Upon her retirement from McMaster University, Dr. Jane Aronson, School of Social Work, stepped down as Chair of PACBIC at the end of June 2016, succeeded by Dr. Ameil Joseph. Reverend Carol Wood has also moved on from her role as Ecumenical Chaplain at McMaster University and as convener of PACBIC’s Interfaith Issues Working Group. Reverend Andrew Crowell is the current Ecumenical Chaplain at McMaster University and new convener of PACBIC’s Interfaith Issues Working Group. These are major shifts for PACBIC. The wisdom, leadership and unfathomable contributions made by Jane Aronson and Carol Wood will not be forgotten. We hope to continue to carry on their valuable work and take with us all we have learned from them in our efforts to build equity and inclusion at McMaster.
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22 https://pabic.mcmaster.ca/presidents-advisory-committee-on-building-an-inclusive-community-pabic see “Farewell and Welcome"
# APPENDIX A
## LIST OF PACBIC MEMBERS, 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Members</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ameil Joseph</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Deshpande</td>
<td>Vice-Chair (Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Cole</td>
<td>Vice-Chair (Staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet Daniel (African Caribbean Faculty Association of McMaster)</td>
<td>R3 Co-Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Crowell (Chaplaincy Centre)</td>
<td>IFI Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Watts (Indigenous Studies Program)</td>
<td>FNMI Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lainey Stirling (Women &amp; Gender Equity Network)</td>
<td>VAW/GBV Co-Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Dean</td>
<td>VAW/GBV Co-Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Coleman</td>
<td>R3 Co-Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayonne Christy</td>
<td>R3 Co-Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Moore</td>
<td>AA Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Mills</td>
<td>EE Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>MEDS Convener</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Members</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Students Health Sciences, FHS</td>
<td>Danielle Soucy/Jordan Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Andrew Pettit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Union of Public Employees 3906</td>
<td>Sarah Wahab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Equity (Human Resources)</td>
<td>Shylo Elmayan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Mad Students Collective</td>
<td>Alise deBie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Wanda McKenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU Maccess</td>
<td>Alex Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Accessibility Council</td>
<td>Anne Pottier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Graduate Students Association</td>
<td>Colette Nyirakamana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Hillel</td>
<td>Judith Dworkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Indigenous Student Community Alliance (MISCA)</td>
<td>Esmonde Jamieson-Eckel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching</td>
<td>Erin Aspenlieder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Muslim Students Association</td>
<td>Sawsan El Darrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Students Union</td>
<td>Justin Monaco-Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Students Union Diversity Services</td>
<td>Lilian Obeng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster University Academic Librarians' Association</td>
<td>Lynne Serviss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster University Faculty Association</td>
<td>Nancy Boucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Office</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Public Interest Research Group</td>
<td>Shelley Porteous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer Students Community Centre</td>
<td>Aly Khalifa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Accessibility Services</td>
<td>Tim Nolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wellness Centre</td>
<td>Roseanne Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFOR 5555</td>
<td>Jim McAndrew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Members</th>
<th>Membership Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albina Veltman</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Jackiw</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Cipryk</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eulene Victoria Bomberry</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Pollock</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Buckley</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Sutton</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Stewart</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meha Bhatt</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merima Menzildzic</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natacha Ngo</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Virgin</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padmina Sreeram</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachèle Marshall</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Colavecchia</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Dickson</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Jama</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stash Nastos</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaun Tieu</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Voting Members</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity and Inclusion Office (formerly Human Rights &amp; Equity Services)</td>
<td>Vilma Rossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds Office</td>
<td>Carolyn Brendon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF PACBIC MEMBERS, 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Members</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Aronson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishan Zewge-Abubaker</td>
<td>Vice-Chair (Student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Pettit</td>
<td>Vice-Chair (Staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Members</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Students Health Sciences</td>
<td>Danielle Soucy/Jordan Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Caribbean Faculty Association of McMaster</td>
<td>Juliet Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Theresa Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Union of Public Employees</td>
<td>Chandra Kavanagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplaincy Centre</td>
<td>Carol Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Health</td>
<td>Carrie Allen &amp; Monica Poulin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Andrea Cole; Peter Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Wanda McKenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Studies Program</td>
<td>Rick Monture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Graduate Students Association</td>
<td>Lucia Myongwaon Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Hillel</td>
<td>Judith Dworkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Institute for Innovation &amp; Excellence in Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Beth Marquis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Muslim Students Association</td>
<td>Umer Javed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Students Union</td>
<td>Ehima Osazuwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Students Union Diversity Services</td>
<td>Ryan Desphande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster University Academic Librarians' Association</td>
<td>Lynne Serviss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster University Faculty Association</td>
<td>Marshall Beier, Nancy Bouchier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Public Interest Research Group</td>
<td>Kojo Dampney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer Students Community Centre</td>
<td>Emily Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Accessibility Services</td>
<td>Tim Nolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wellness Centre</td>
<td>Roseanne Kent &amp; Melissa Fernandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFOR 5555</td>
<td>Jim McAndrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Members</td>
<td>Membership Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albina Veltman</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alise deBie</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Dean</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameil Joseph</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eulene Victoria Bomberry</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennie Anderson</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Buckley</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Sutton</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Stewart</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Virgin</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Moore</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Colavecchia</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Jama</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Lewchuk</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Dickson</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Vander Kloet</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Voting Members</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds Office</td>
<td>Carolyn Brendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights &amp; Equity Services</td>
<td>Vilma Rossi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PACBIC SPONSORED OR SUPPORTED EVENTS

QUEER PEOPLE OF COLOUR (QPOC) CABARET, ORGANIZED BY MATAPA MUSIC AND ARTS ORGANIZATION, JUNE 20, 2015
Two hour event that featured dance, drag, spoken word, and musical performances by queer artists of colour. The event was open to everyone, with the aim to create a space to celebrate the art of queer, trans* and two-spirit people of colour.

BLACK LIVES MATTER: THE RALLYING CRY OF THE NEW MOVEMENT AGAINST RACIST POLICE VIOLENCE, SEPTEMBER 24, 2015
Alicia Garza, co-founder of the Black Lives Matter Movement, spoke about the historic work that the Black Lives Matter Movement is doing to oppose racism, police brutality and the epidemic of racialized police killings in the US. Chris Williams of the Toronto Police Accountability Coalition spoke to contextualize the similar struggle in Ontario.

CULTURAL GATHERING ORGANIZED BY THE MCMASTER INDIGENOUS STUDENT COMMUNITY ALLIANCE (MISCA), SEPTEMBER 24TH, 2015
This educational event centered on Indigenous performances, and a way of welcoming students to campus. The event brought awareness of Indigenous culture and encouraged inclusivity as well as student involvement.

ACCESSIBILITY FORUM: BREAKING THE STIGMA ORGANIZED BY THE MCMASTER STUDENT UNION (MSU), OCTOBER 21ST, 2015
This forum allowed all students at McMaster to voice concerns about accessibility and point out barriers on campus.

The public lecture and workshop on the “Politics of Storytelling” contributed to relevant conversations already occurring within the McMaster campus community including important campaigns raise awareness about the confluence of social identities and the need to eliminate mental health stigma, improve campus accessibility and focus on efforts to establish all-gender washroom options.

MCMASTER STUDENT UNION LEADERSHIP SUMMIT FOR WOMEN, OCTOBER 24TH, 2015
The 2015 Leadership Summit for Women is an annual intergenerational community-wide event that aims to create a safe space for the diverse voices of women, Trans* individuals, and their allies in their demonstration of creative and engaged leadership.

NATIONAL DAY OF MOURNING AND ACTION ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN, DECEMBER 6TH, PRESENTED BY THE ANTI-VIOLENCE NETWORK (AVN) AND HOSTED ON DECEMBER 4TH, 2015
Annual event to commemorate the Montreal Massacre of 1989 where 14 women in the Faculty of Engineering, Ecole Polytechnique, were murdered. The Anti-Violence Network (AVN) also uses this date to commemorate the thousands of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women in Canada.
MCMaster Indigenous Health Conference, Organized by a Student-Run, Interdisciplinary Planning Committee and Hosted on January 16, 2016
The goal of this conference is to introduce students to Indigenous health disparities and to develop understandings of the need for cultural competency and safety when working with Indigenous populations in contexts that extend even beyond health care.

Black History Month: African Inventors Museum, Presented by the Ontario Public Interest Research Group (OPIRG), January 29th, 2016
The International African Inventors Museum promotes positive images and self-esteem in children and adults and teaches people of all nationalities about the contributions that Africans throughout the world have given to society.

Interfaith Shabbat Dinner, Sponsored by MCMaster Hillel, February 5, 2016
The Shabbat Dinner provides an opportunity for campus members to participate in an important aspect of Jewish life. The traditional/explanatory Friday night dinner is held at McMaster's Celebration Hall. The purpose of the evening is to bring communities together; to discuss our individual practices while celebrating our similarities and shared experiences.

Mind Crawl, Presented by the MCMaster Student Union, March 31st, 2016
This event highlighted intersectionality when discussing mental health, an aspect that is often left out among advocacy initiatives around mental health on campus.

Food Justice Panel, Hosted by the President’s Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community, April 19th, 2016
The event featured Dr. Ameil Joseph (Convener, PACBIC; School of Social Work), Chris Roberts (Hospitality Services), Josh Dockstator (Indigenous Studies Program) and Ben Buckler (MCMaster Hillel) who each spoke to issues surrounding food justice on campus.

Challenging Islamophobia on Campus Initiative, Equity and Inclusion Office and the President’s Advisory Committee on Building an Inclusive Community, 2015-2016
The Challenging Islamophobia on Campus Initiative was developed as a result of the violent backlash targeting Muslims, and those perceived to be Muslims, after the deadly attacks in Paris, France in November, 2015. The initiative included drop-in sessions, a roundtable discussion, workshops, presentations and self-defence classes for Muslim-identified women.
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: SENATE
FROM: DR. KEN CRUIKSHANK
SUBJECT: CHANGE TO FACULTY OF HUMANITIES BY-LAWS
DATE: APRIL 27, 2017

The Faculty of Humanities would like to submit the following changes to the Faculty of Humanities By-Laws:

1) Dean's Advisory Council

The Faculty of Humanities is removing two of the consultants from the membership since the positions no longer exist in the Faculty. The Dean will invite staff as they are needed for consultation.

2) Undergraduate Reviewing Committee

The Faculty of Humanities is proposing a change in the function of the committee with respect to formal re-read appeals, to make it consistent with the practice in other Faculties. Since the work for this committee is significantly reduced, the number of faculty members required is being decreased.

These changes were approved at Faculty of Humanities meeting on March 22, 2017. The Faculty of Humanities By-Laws may be found at:

http://www.humanities.mcmaster.ca/about/policies-procedures/

RECEIVED
By University Secretariat at 4:03 pm, May 01, 2017
B. STANDING COMMITTEES

...

(iii) Undergraduate Reviewing Committee

Functions:

To adjudicate the results of formal re-readings in accordance with the Student Appeal Procedures. Each case will be considered by a minimum of three members of the Committee. To review and approve in-course results on behalf of the Faculty; and to establish and review guidelines related to the adjudication of petitions for special consideration, including applications for reinstatement and requests for deferred examinations.

Composition:

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

Ex Officio: President
Provost
Dean of the Faculty
Associate Dean

Faculty: Five Three members, appointed by the Nominating Committee for staggered three-year terms

Consultant: Assistant Dean (Studies) (non-voting)
A. ADVISORY COMMITTEES

(ii) Dean's Advisory Council

Functions:

To advise the Dean of the Faculty on budget and related matters; to exchange information on, and to co-ordinate, Departmental policies and procedures; to assist in the dissemination of information about Faculty policies as established by the General Faculty and University policies as established by the Senate and other appropriate bodies; and to nominate candidates for election, by the Faculty, to the Nominating Committee, in accordance with the provisions of Section III, A, (i).

Composition:

Chair: Dean of the Faculty

Ex Officio: Associate Deans of the Faculty
Assistant Dean (Studies)
Chairs of all Departments in the Faculty
Director, Information Technology
Director, Peace Studies Program
Director, Gender Studies and Feminist Research
Graduate Program

Consultants: Director, Administration
Faculty Executive Officer
Faculty Liaison Officer

(non-voting)
To: Senate

From: Christina Bryce
Assistant Graduate Secretary

Re: Report from Graduate Council

At its meeting on April 18th, Graduate Council approved the Senate Policy on Diplomas and Certificates, the University Aid and Awards Policy, the Policy on Academic Program Review and the Policy on Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities for recommendation to Senate. Please find the revised policies within the report to Senate from Undergraduate Council.

At the same meeting Graduate Council also approved the following for recommendation to Senate:

For Approval:

1. Faculty of Business
   Master of Finance
   Change to Admission Requirements (M.Fin.)
   The program proposed a change to their admission requirements to allow for one non-academic reference and to remove the requirement for the statement of interest. The rationale for the change to references is that a portion of the program's applicants are working professionals and so allowing for letters of reference from their employers can provide valuable information and insights into their competencies and readiness to enter the program. With respect to removing the requirement for the statement of interest the program's rationale is that traditionally, research-based graduate programs require statements of interest from applicants in order to identify their research interests and locate suitable supervisors. The Master of Finance program is a course-based, professional program (with no thesis or major research paper requirement). Accordingly, statements of interest are not particularly relevant. The proposed effective date for this change is September 2017.

   Health Management*
   Addition of Full-Time Option (M.H.M.)
   Since its inception the program has offered an on-line, part-time stream. As the program has become more established there have been inquiries about the possibility of full-time enrolment. To meet this need the program proposed the development of a full-time stream commencing September 2018. The curriculum will remain unchanged but will be offered in such a way to allow full-time students to
complete the program in one year. The only difference between the two options, other than timing is that the scholarly paper option will not be available to full-time students.

*This recommendation was also approved by the Faculty of Health Sciences.

2. Faculty of Science
Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour
Change to Admission Requirements (Ph.D.)
The program proposed a change to the wording around their admission requirements to clarify that enrollment in the Research and Clinical Training stream is limited, that students in this stream are subject to the same admission requirements as students entering the PNB Ph.D. generally and clarification around the fact that students don’t enter the stream directly. This change will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2017.

For Information:

3. Faculty of Business
Master of Finance
Change in Course Requirements
The program proposed a change to the course requirements to shift the number of elective versus required courses. Previously there had been 11 required courses and 4 electives. The change proposed means there would be 13 required courses and two electives. The changes proposed are intended to ensure students are trained on subjects relevant to the discipline. This change will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2017.

M.B.A
Change in Course Requirements
The program proposed a change to the course requirements for the Supply Chain Management Specialization, removing K731 Project Management from the list of elective courses for the specialization. The rationale for the change was that project management is a general management skill applicable to all specializations and that students specializing in supply chain management are not likely to benefit from such a general course, given that the basic operations course provides exposure to project management.

The program also proposed a change to their overall course requirements to remove the requirement for students to participate in the DeGroote Day workshops. The rationale is that the material is covered in modules in the redesigned year-one MBA curriculum.

These changes will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2017.

4. Faculty of Science
Kinesiology
Change to Course Requirements (M.Sc.)
The program proposed a change to their course requirements, reducing them from four to three courses. The change is intended to facilitate graduate student research productivity in their program
and will allow for a greater emphasis for M.Sc. students on acquiring fundamental research skills pertinent to the discipline. By increasing the emphasis on research, the program is encouraging their students to become the best possible candidates to be competitive for tri-council funding and eventually for future research. Additionally, they believe that the proposed change will help facilitate on-time completion of the Master’s degree within the two-year window. This change will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2017.

Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour
Change to Course Requirements (Ph.D.)
The program proposed a change to the course requirements to require two additional courses for students in the Research and Clinical Training stream within their Ph.D. The first course is related to feedback they received from the licensing organization for clinical psychologists who noted they needed an additional course in personality. The second change was the addition of a second practicum course to ensure students get as much clinical experience as possible. This change will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2017.

Radiation Sciences and Health Radiation Physics
Change to Course Requirements (M.Sc.)
The program proposed a new course in Monte Carlo Simulation and updated their list of additional required courses to allow students to take this course as part of their degree requirements. The new course confers a skill that makes graduate from the program highly employable. This change will be included in the next Graduate Calendar, effective September 2017.

5. New Scholarship
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR FUND:
Established in 2016 by James Kennedy. To be granted to a graduate student or postdoctoral fellow associated with McMaster Stem Cell and Cancer Research Institute who has demonstrated academic excellence. To be awarded annually by the Faculty of Health Sciences on the recommendation of the Director of the McMaster Stem Cell and Cancer Research Institute.

Faculty of Health Sciences, Ryan Liddell as the Trust Fund Administrator. He will work with SGS if the recipient is a graduate student.
REPORT TO SENATE
FROM
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

I  Policy Revisions (Attachment I)
   At its meeting of April 18, 2017, Undergraduate Council approved revisions to four policies, as are outlined below. All four policies were also approved by Graduate Council at its meeting of April 18, 2017.

   i. Policy on Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities
      Revisions to the Policy on Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities were made to reflect changes in the law; to adequately respond to the needs of students with disabilities, including mental health disabilities, on campus; and to adapt to changes to educational methodology and delivery.

      The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

      that Senate approve the revisions to the Policy on Academic Accommodations of Students with Disabilities, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Attachment I (i).

   ii. Policy on Academic Program Development and Review
      The revised Policy on Academic Program Reviews, now titled the Policy on Academic Program Development and Review, has been reorganized and many sections have been edited to improve clarity and to better reflect both internal approval processes and Ministry submission processes.

      The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

      that Senate approve the Policy on Academic Program Development and Review, as set out in Attachment I (ii).

   iii. Senate Policy on Certificates and Diplomas
      Revisions to the Policy on Certificates and Diplomas, now called the Senate Policy on Diplomas and Certificates, include the addition of an undergraduate concurrent certificate, a graduate certificate, and an outline of the requirements for graduate diplomas. It is clearly noted, however, that graduate diplomas, although defined in the revised Policy, are approved through the process outlined in the Policy on Academic Program Reviews. Sections related to transfer of credit between credentials have been simplified for clarity.
The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the *Senate Policy on Diplomas and Certificates*, as set out in Attachment I (iii).

iv. University Aid and Awards Policy
The *Undergraduate Awards Policy*, now called the *University Aid and Awards Policy*, has been restructured overall, and the general regulations, or terms and conditions, of award have been revised for clarity and to promote access and equity in the administration of awards. Provisions for graduate awards are now also included in the policy. These policy changes are the first phase of the revision of processes surrounding awards. The second phase will address the specific eligibility requirements for awards and the Award Regulations that appear in the Undergraduate Calendar and the Graduate Calendar.

The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the *University Aid and Awards Policy*, as set out in Attachment I (iv).

II Establishment of New Certificates and Diploma Programs (Attachment II)
At its meeting of April 18, 2107, Undergraduate Council approved, for recommendation to Senate, the establishment of the following certificate and diploma programs in the Centre for Continuing Education.

i. Diploma in Business of Golf and Resort Management Program
The *Diploma in Business of Golf and Resort Management* program has been developed in consultation with the Golf Management Institute of Canada (GMIC).

The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the establishment of a *Diploma in Business of Golf and Resort Management* program, as recommended by the Centre for Continuing Education, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Attachment II (i).

ii. Applied Clinical Research Certificate Program
The *Applied Clinical Research Certificate* program will enable clinical research associates to develop competencies identified by the Association of Clinical Research Professionals (ACRP).

The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the establishment of an *Applied Clinical Research Certificate* program, as recommended by the Centre for Continuing Education, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Attachment II (ii).
iii. Certificate in Marketing Program
The Certificate in Marketing program offers students an alternative to the existing Marketing Diploma program.

The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the establishment of a Certificate in Marketing program, as recommended by the Centre for Continuing Education, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Attachment II (iii).

iv. Canadian Health Care Certificate Program
The Canadian Health Care Certificate program includes health preparatory courses for students wishing to pursue further health-based programs. The original program name, Canadian Health Studies Certificate, was revised by Undergraduate Council, with the agreement of the Centre for Continuing Education, to avoid confusion with the Faculty of Social Sciences’ Health Studies degree program.

The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the establishment of a Canadian Health Care Certificate program, as recommended by the Centre for Continuing Education, effective September 1, 2017, as set out in Attachment II (iv).

v. Certificate in Business Technology Management
The proposed Certificate in Business Technology Management is a concurrent certificate, the requirements for which are set out in the proposed Senate Policy on Certificates and Diplomas and, as such, approval of the program is pending approval of that policy. The Certificate in Business Technology Management will be open to students in the Honours Bachelor of Commerce program. Students will be able to complete the requirements for the certificate using degree program electives. The program combines existing Commerce and Software Engineering Technology courses.

The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the establishment of a Certificate in Business Technology Management program, as recommended by the Faculty of Business, effective September 1, 2017 and pending approval of the Senate Policy on Diplomas and Certificates, as set out in Attachment II (v).

vi. Certificate in International Engagement
The proposed Certificate in International Engagement is a concurrent certificate, the requirements for which are set out in the proposed Senate Policy on Certificates and Diplomas and, as such, approval of the program is pending approval of that policy. Open to all undergraduate students, the Certificate in International Engagement combines coursework, which includes courses in one or two languages other than English, with international experience at home or abroad.
The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the establishment of a *Certificate in International Engagement* program, as recommended by the Faculty of Humanities, effective September 1, 2017 and pending approval of the *Senate Policy on Diplomas and Certificates*, as set out in Attachment II (vi).

vii. Certificate in Essential French

The proposed *Certificate in Essential French* is a concurrent certificate, the requirements for which are set out in the proposed *Senate Policy on Certificates and Diplomas* and, as such, approval of the program is pending approval of that policy. Open to all undergraduate students (except those registered in a degree program or a minor in French), the program provides formal recognition of competency in French.

The Undergraduate Council now recommends,

that Senate approve the establishment of a *Certificate in Essential French* program, as recommended by the Faculty of Humanities, effective September 1, 2017 and pending approval of the *Senate Policy on Diplomas and Certificates*, as set out in Attachment II (vii).

### III Credit/No Credit Course Option

Undergraduate Council has approved an option whereby undergraduate students will be permitted to explore courses outside of their program without affecting their GPA. The courses will be graded on a Credit or No Credit scale. This option will be established for a two to two-and-a-half year trial program, beginning no later than September 2018, after which period Undergraduate Council will review the outcome and determine whether to continue with the option, and if so, make any necessary changes to the process. The precise name of the credit/no credit course option is yet to be determined.

The credit/no credit course option is proposed as follows:

- Courses are assessed on a Credit or No Credit (CR/NC) grading scale.
- Students must be registered above Level I in a participating degree program and have a GPA of 3.5 or higher.
- The credit/no credit option is not available to students who:
  - are enrolled in the School of Medicine;
  - are enrolled in a Program/Faculty which is not participating in the option (see Faculty Academic Regulations); or
  - are Second Degree Students, Continuing Students, or in a non-degree program.
- The credit/no credit option is available to Engineering students for complementary studies electives only.
- Exchange students may be eligible to participate in the credit/no credit option.
- Credit will be given to a student who earns a final mark of 50% or higher in the course.
- Earned units will be counted toward the student’s degree.
- The grade achieved will not be calculated toward the student’s GPA or other averages.
Students may declare credit/no credit courses up to 3 units per term to a maximum of 12 units for a four- or five-level degree or 9 units for a three-level degree.

Student may declare credit/no credit courses up to a maximum of 6 units to satisfy requirements toward a Minor.

The credit/no credit option is not available for any course that is on the list of required courses for the student’s degree program; nor for independent study, thesis, field study or placement courses.

Students cannot use the credit/no credit option for courses in which they have been charged with academic dishonesty.

Students must declare a credit/no credit course on Mosaic by the Last Day for Enrollment and Changes date.

If the student would rather keep the numeric grade as the recorded grade, they must indicate that the course is no longer a credit/no credit course on Mosaic by the last day for cancelling courses without failure by default.

Once declared as a credit/no credit course, the course is counted toward the maximum unit limits regardless of whether or not the course is ultimately graded as a credit/no credit course.

If the student changes their program of study and a course taken as credit/no credit becomes a required course, the new Faculty office may accept the course grade of CR or NC or have the grade converted back to a numeric grade; if a grade is converted back into a numeric grade, there will be no retroactive reconsideration for aid and awards.

It is the student’s responsibility to ensure that they do not use the credit/no credit option for courses for which numeric grades may be required for future applications to graduate or professional school.

It is the student’s responsibility to carefully review any government (e.g., OSAP) and University aid and award eligibility rules which may be affected by the use of the credit/no credit option.

It is now recommended

that Senate approve a credit/no credit course option, the precise name of the option still to be determined by Undergraduate Council, for a two- to two-and-a-half-year trial, beginning no later than September 2018, as set out above.

For Information:

IV Sessional Dates (Attachment III)
At its meeting of April 18, 2017, Undergraduate Council approved the 2018-19 Sessional Dates, as set out in Attachment III.

V Update to Schedule E of the Senate By-Laws (Attachment IV)
Updates to Schedule E of the Senate By-Laws are set out in Attachment IV.
VI Modifications to Existing Certificate and Diploma Programs

i. Revisions to the Business Administration Diploma Program
   At its meeting of April 18, 2017, Undergraduate Council approved the establishment of a new Creative, Critical and Design Thinking Concentration within the Business Administration Diploma program. The new concentration includes three new elective courses.

ii. Revisions to Marketing Diploma Program
    At the same meeting, Undergraduate Council approved the establishment of a new Digital Marketing Concentration and a new elective, Design Thinking, within the Marketing Diploma program.

VII Establishment of New Certificate of Completion Programs
At its meeting of April 18, 2017, Undergraduate Council received information from the Centre for Continuing Education about two new Certificates of Completion: the Certificate of Completion in Creative, Critical and Design Thinking and the Certificate of Completion in Epidemiology and Pathophysiology.

VIII Curriculum Revisions for Inclusion in the 2017-18 Undergraduate Calendar
At its meeting of April 18, 2017, Undergraduate Council approved curriculum revisions in the Faculty of Engineering and Faculty of Social Sciences, for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar.

IX Terms of Award
At its meeting of April 18, 2017, the Undergraduate Council approved: i) terms of award for seven new awards; ii) changes to terms of one award; iii) four new bursaries, and iv) the removal of eighteen awards from the Undergraduate Calendar.

i. Terms of New Awards
   The Asante Sana Global Health Award
   The Walker Wood Foundation Academic Grant

ii. Changes to Terms of Award
    The CFUW-Hamilton Memorial Prize in Political Science

iii. New Bursaries
    The Paul Ray and Alexander Bishop Bursary
    The Collegiate Guardian Bursary
    The Averbuch Family MD Bursary for New Canadians
    The Clinical Education Leaders Bursary Fund

iv. Awards Removed from the Undergraduate Calendar
    The Ryan B. Clarke Political Science Scholarship
    The Hamilton Transportation Club Scholarship
    The Multimedia Senior Thesis Prize
    The Science Class of ‘97 Legacy Community Contribution Award
The Mark and Bev Taylor Family Academic Grant
The Rachel Barsky Memorial Bursary
The Rachel Barsky II Memorial Bursary
The Matt Casey Bursary
The Gupta Family Emergency Bursary Fund
The Labour Studies Class Of'97 Legacy Bursary
The McFadgen Bursary
The McMaster MBA Alumni Association Bursaries
The Allen and Milli Gould Family Foundation Bursaries
The Ross Hammond Bursary
The Gary James Minnett Bursary
The Physician’s Assistant Bursary
The Rotary Club of Ancaster A.M. Murray Ferguson Bursary
The Albert Snow Hair Design Bursary

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

Senate: May 17, 2017
Overview of the Policy Review for the Development of the Proposed 'Academic Accommodations of Students with Disabilities' Policy

In May 2015, the Academic Accommodations Working Group (AAWG) was struck. Reporting to the AVP Students & Learning, Dean of Students, AAWG’s objective has included conducting a landscape scan, a review of the University’s current practices and to examine and propose ways by which the University’s policies, procedures and practices reflect: (a) the changes in the law; (b) adequately respond to the needs of students with disability on our campus (e.g. mental health disability is the primary disability being accommodated on our campus; whereas in previous years it was physical disabilities), and; (c) adapt to the highly varied ways in which education is occurring (e.g. experiential learning).

The Working Group did not review specific situations, but rather examined university policies, procedures and practices as they relate to providing accommodations to students with disabilities on our campus, in both an academic and experiential learning setting.

Membership of the Academic Accommodations Working Group (AAWG) included:

**Committee Members:**
- Sue Baptiste, Chair
- McMaster Students Union, VP Education
- Graduate Students Union, VP Student Services
- Allison Drew-Hassling, Student Affairs
- Raihanna Khalifan, Human Rights & Equity Services
- Alan Neville, Health Science
- Bruce Newbold, Geography and Earth Science
- Greg Rombough, School of Business
- Tim Nolan, Student Accessibility Services
- Geraldine Voros, Social Science
- Jan Young, Student Wellness Centre

**Key Consultants:**
- Experiential Learning
- Ombuds Office
- FHS, Professionalism Office
- Graduate Studies
- University Secretariat Office
- McMaster Accessibility Council
- McMaster Association of Part Time Students
- Registrar’s Office
- Academic Integrity Office
- Associate Dean’s Group (ADG)*
- University Secretariat’s Office *
- Andrea Thyret-Kidd, Provost Office*

*Second phase of Consultation Process
1) During the development of the policy, special consideration included:
   a) A landscape review to incorporate accepted ‘best practices’ into both policy development and overall recommendations.
   b) Balancing the University’s legal obligation to offer reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities while upholding and maintaining academic integrity.
   c) Balancing the obligation to accommodate in clinical and experiential settings, with academic requirements and the standards of professions and community partners.

2) The consultation process included:
   a) Community Consultation: Members of the Consultation Group (Appendix A) were asked to provide feedback during a think tank in May 2016 and on multiple drafts of the policy.
   b) University Secretariat Review of Policy: The Secretariat has provided helpful guidance and input on three draft versions of the policy to date.
   c) Think Tank: AAWG identified several areas of the policy that required thoughtful consideration and the Think Tank offered an open space to voice a range of perspectives from across the campus community. (See Appendix B: Think Tank Overview).

3) During the development of the policy, the landscape of Academic Accommodations within Post-Secondary settings changed considerably, with a letter from the Ontario Human Rights Commission, which articulated expectations for all universities to align their approaches to medical documentation and accommodation with the Ontario Human Rights Code and their Policy on Preventing Discrimination Based on Mental Health Disabilities and Addictions (see Mental Health Policy at ohrc.on.ca)

Further to this, the letter from the Commission included a checklist for all Universities to comply with by September 2016. The six expectations were articulated as follows:
   a) Do not require students to disclose their mental health disability diagnosis to register with Student Accessibility Services, or receive accommodations or supports
   b) Make it clear that students may request interim accommodations for mental health disabilities pending receipt of medical documentation;
   c) Make it clear that both temporary and permanent mental health disabilities will be accommodated. All disabilities that give rise to functional limitations that impair academic functioning should be accommodated;
   d) Do not state or imply that request for accommodation after a deadline, test or course completion (i.e. retroactive accommodation) will not be considered. Establish a process to meaningfully consider requests for retroactive accommodation, or if a process already exists, provide clear information to students, faculty and staff about that process.
e) Do not require students to reveal their private medical information to, or seek accommodation directly from, their professors, instructors, teaching assistants, etc. Students should not be requested to deliver accommodation letters directly to professors, instructors or teaching assistants. Offices, such as SAS, should communicate with professors, instructors and teaching assistants about academic accommodations; and,

f) Communicate to students, faculty and staff about the documentation guidelines, forms and procedures (e.g. include information about academic accommodations on all course syllabi distributed to students.

4) On September 20th, 2016, a draft of the Academic Accommodations for Students with a Disability Policy was reviewed by Graduate Council. Graduate Council requested edits to the document, of which have been embedded in this current version.

During this time, consultation with other stakeholders on campus was solicited, beyond the initial ‘key consultant group’, including: members of the Associate Deans Group, Assistant Deans, the Ombuds, the Secretariat Office, Andrea Thyret-Kidd from the Office of the Provost and the School of Social Work, Graduate Studies). This version of the policy has changed both in appearance and content from the earlier version presented to Graduate Council. Key changes include:

a) **Improved readability and flow**

Changes to the arrangements of sections within the body of the policy and inclusion of Sections to the policy. Sections now include: Introduction, Roles and Responsibilities, Guidelines & Procedures, Appeals, Appendix A: Related Policies and Legislation, Appendix B: Essential Requirements and Off-Site Placements.

b) **Refined Key Definitions**

The roles and responsibilities section has been heavily edited and pared down to articulate roles in more general terms rather than taking a prescriptive, procedural approach.

“Campus Accommodation Teams” have been changed to “academic accommodation teams” (AT) with the purpose of minimizing confusion that these are “Campus-wide” teams, rather the academic accommodation teams are described as informal, decentralized networks of individuals who assist Associate/Assistant Deans with the implementation of the policy.

Greater emphasis has been put on the role of the Associate/Assistant Deans and the ‘academic accommodation teams (AT).

Three types of accommodation requests have been articulated on page 9 and referenced throughout the document, in accordance with the Ontario Human Rights Commission: Permanent Disability, Retroactive Accommodation and Temporary Disability.

Retroactive Accommodation definition has been refined to be applicable to students with undiagnosed and/or not previously accommodated by Student Accessibility Services with articulated procedures for how a student may request a retroactive accommodation.
Temporary Disability definition has been articulated with clearly articulated procedures for how a student may request a temporary disability request.

5) **Implementation Plan:**
   a) Education and Training: A Policy implementation plan is currently being developed, led by the AVP, Dean of Students. This plan will include educational material to ensure that students, staff and faculty are aware of the new policy highlighting new responsibilities and key changes to the policy; along with the creation of information sessions for key stakeholders in the policy (e.g. Associate Deans).
   b) Petition for Special Consideration: In order to align the procedures as outlined in the draft policy with current practices across the campus, a modification will need to be made to the Petitions for Special Consideration in the Undergraduate and Graduate Calendars in order to reflect retroactive accommodations for disability.
Appendix A: Consultation Framework, Phase One

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATION WORKING GROUP
CONSULTATION FRAMEWORK
FINAL VERSION
Appendix B: AAWG Think Tank Agenda

The Think Tank invitation was distributed to members of AAWG and the Consultation Group. Each recipient of the invitation was encouraged to invite other colleagues to also participate in the Think Tank discussion. The Think Tank occurred on May 10th, 2016 from 8:30-12:30.

Attendees Included: Alan Neville (FHS); Allison Drew-Hassling (Student Affairs); Joseph Ameill (Social Work); Anne Niec (FHS); Bernadette Belan; Blake Oliver (MSU); Bruce Newbold (Geography, AAWG); Cathy Oudshoorn (FHS); Finola Foley (Student Wellness Centre); Geraldine Voros (Social Science; Helen Ayre (Secretariat Office); Henriette Silman (SAS); Janice Young (Student Wellness Centre); Lori Letts (Rehab Science); Mark Castrodale (MIIETL); Mary Fletcher (Student Wellness Centre); Meaghan Ross (EIO); Mei-Ju Shih (SAS); Michelle Bennett, (Secretariat Office); John Miller (FHS); Tim Nolan (SAS); Vilma Rossi (EIO); Mile Komlen (EIO); Raihanna Khalfan (EIO)

Purpose: During our recent AAWG meetings, several areas of policy content have been identified as needing thoughtful consideration before putting into the narrative of the policy. This Think Tank is being held in order that these highlighted topics and concepts can be the foci of a modified Open Space process. There will be small cluster groups set up for attendees to join for 45 minute time periods at which the discussion will be facilitated by the AAWG member (topic champion) for whom the topic is of particular importance.

Topics Included:

- Linkages between other policies and the incoming Accommodations policy
- The continuum from “Fit to Study” to “Too Sick to be in School”
- Transition between the Medical and Social models of health and disability
- Documentation
- Temporary/Short Term accommodations
- Informal accommodations
- Routes for developing accommodations in addition to SAS?
- Communication pathways
- Accountability/responsibility in off-site learning experiences

Following the Think Tank, the recommendations and feedback obtained during the various group discussions was compiled and distributed to the participants. The recommendations was also considered for the further development of the policy.
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SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

PREAMBLE AND SCOPE

1. McMaster University is committed to excellence in teaching and learning. The University strives to ensure every student is afforded an academic environment that is dedicated to the advancement of learning and is based on the principles of equitable access and individual dignity. At McMaster we nurture and support a culture of acceptance, inclusion and the celebration of diversity. Creating a learning environment that is accessible to all students is a value embedded within the University's fabric as well as our policies, services and practices.

2. Academic Accommodation is a shared responsibility. It is a highly collaborative process requiring engagement and full participation of multiple stakeholders, each playing a vital role in shaping a student's Academic Accommodation. The provision of accommodations for students with disabilities requires students, instructors and administrative staff to exercise creativity and flexibility in crafting solutions that meet the needs of the students, as well as to preserve the academic requirements of the University's courses/programs.

3. Disability is a concept that encompasses varied definitions including medical, socio-cultural and social definitions. Up to the present, the system at large, including at McMaster University, has relied on the definition of disability provided in the Policy and Guidelines on Disability and the Duty to Accommodate (2000), from the Ontario Human Rights Commission [OHRC]. This approach is built upon a medical model of understanding disability. An alternate view is that of a social disability model that is exemplified within the definition of disability articulated by the World Health Organization (WHO). It is our institutional aspiration to work towards a campus community that adopts the social definition of disability by responding with the creation of universal design for instruction in accessible classrooms and the need for on-going consultation with people with lived experience with disability to guide the design of buildings and instructional resources. However, this Policy acknowledges, upholds, and aligns itself with the medical definition of disability to be in accordance with the OHRC's definition of disability and accompanying policies and statements.

4. The University recognizes that barriers to participation exist and adjustments to policies and practices of the University are required. This is accomplished through the prevention, identification and removal of barriers (such as a physical, architectural, technological, information or communication barrier, an attitudinal barrier or learning barrier, or a policy or practice) within the University systems, structures and policies.

5. This policy applies to all McMaster University students [any individual recorded by the University Registrar as enrolled in an educational course of study recognized by the Senate and for whom the University maintains education records (graduate, undergraduate, continuing education students, and students in shared institutional programs e.g. Mohawk College and Conestoga combined programs where they are registered as a McMaster student)].

DEFINITIONS

6. For the purpose of interpreting this document:
   a) words in the singular may include the plural and words in the plural may include the singular;
   b) for graduate students, the relevant Associate/Assistant Dean of their Faculty, is their Associate Dean in the School of Graduate Studies;
   c) for students in degree programs not offered by a Faculty (e.g., the Arts and Science program), the Program Director is equivalent to the Associate/Assistant Dean of a Faculty, and the Chair of the Program Hearings Committee is equivalent to the Faculty Dean;
for students in Senate-approved certificate or diploma programs offered by the Centre for Continuing Education, the Director of the Centre is equivalent to the Associate/Assistant Dean of a Faculty, the program co-ordinator is equivalent to the Department Chair, and the Provost is equivalent to the Dean of the Faculty; and

e) for students in the Faculty of Health Sciences, the Assistant Dean of the Program is equivalent to the Associate/Assistant Dean of a Faculty.

7. All definitions in this Policy include, but are not limited to, the definitions articulated in the *Ontario Human Rights Code*.

8. **Disability** includes:

   a) any degree of physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfigurement that is caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, a brain injury, any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical co-ordination, blindness or visual impendiment, deafness or hearing impendiment, muteness or speech impendiment, or physical reliance on a guide dog or other animal or on a wheelchair or other remedial appliance or device;

   b) a condition of mental impairment or a developmental disability;

   c) a learning disability, or a dysfunction in one or more of the processes involved in understanding or using symbols or spoken language; and

   d) a mental health disorder/illness, or

   e) an injury or disability for which benefits were claimed or received under the insurance plan established under the *Workplace Safety and Insurance Act*.

9. An **Academic Accommodation** for a disability is an individual arrangement that reduces or removes barriers that limit the ability of students with disabilities to participate in formal post-secondary education. Academic Accommodations are developed based on the functional limitation of the student as it relates to the academic environment. For example, a student may have a functional limitation that affects their ability to remain focused for prolonged periods. An Academic Accommodation is recognition that individuals may require adjustments in order to support their performance in a practice-based context or in the classroom and are intended to provide access for students with disabilities; they do not guarantee or predict outcomes. Appropriate Academic Accommodation results in equitable opportunity to attain the same level of performance; or, to enjoy the same level of benefits and privileges experienced by others; or, if it is proposed or adopted for the purpose of achieving equitable opportunity, and meets the individual's disability-related needs. Accommodation is not a courtesy or a favour, neither is it a lowering of standards. Academic Accommodations are based only on functional limitations, not on individual preferences.

10. **Accessible Learning Environment**: The degree to which individuals with and without disabilities, can access the academic learning environment without encountering barriers.

11. **Barrier** refers to barriers such as a physical barrier, an architectural barrier, information or communication barriers, an attitudinal barrier, a technological barrier, a learning barrier, or a policy or practice, in relation to the academic learning environment.

12. **Interim Academic Accommodation**: An interim Academic Accommodation can be enacted on behalf of a student requesting an Academic Accommodation and implemented 'in good faith' pending receipt of supporting documentation for requests that related to a disability as defined in **Section II**.
13. **Functional Limitation:** A health condition that impairs/limits a student's academic functioning as a learner and/or access level. A functional limitation includes an impairment/limitation in the following areas: cognitive skills/ability; physical skills/ability; social-emotional skills/ability; fieldwork skills/ability.

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

14. This Policy acknowledges, upholds, and aligns itself with the medical definition of disability to be in accordance with the Ontario Human Rights Commission's definition of disability.

15. It is our institutional aspiration to work towards a campus community that adopts the social definition of disability by responding with the creation of universal design for instruction in accessible classrooms and the need for on-going consultation with people with lived experience with disability to guide the design of buildings and instructional resources.

16. The University will strive to nurture and support all students to be as healthy as they can be and to reach their potential. Mental health and wellbeing are understood as key components to health. We will achieve this outcome through our ongoing commitment to creating an inclusive, supportive, and healthy educational environment (Student Mental Health & Well-Being Strategy)

17. This Policy incorporates the principles of the *Policy on Ableism and Discrimination Based on Disability* and position paper *OHRC Policy Position on Medical Documentation* which include the following statements:

   - A disability may be the result of combinations of impairments and environmental barriers, such as attitudinal barriers, inaccessible information, an inaccessible built environment or other barriers that affect a student's full participation at the University.

   - The duty to accommodate exists to the point of “undue hardship.” The Code only allows for three considerations when assessing whether an accommodation would cause undue hardship; these are: cost, outside sources of funding, and health and safety requirements. Accommodation may mean making rules, policies, practices or procedures more flexible to make sure that people with disabilities are able to participate. It may also mean making changes to the built environment to remove barriers for people with disabilities.

   - Generally, the accommodation provider does not have the right to know a person’s confidential medical information, such as the cause of the disability, diagnosis, symptoms or treatment, unless these clearly relate to the accommodation being sought, or the person’s needs are complex, challenging or unclear and more information is needed.

   - Overbroad requests for private medical information, such as diagnostic information, undermine the dignity and privacy of people with disabilities. The ongoing stigma associated with many disabilities, especially and including mental health disabilities, means that requests for diagnostic information may pose a barrier to a person with disabilities proceeding with their accommodation request.

   - Where more information about a person’s disability is needed, the information requested must be the least intrusive to the person’s privacy while still giving the organization enough information to make an informed decision about the accommodation.

   - To implement appropriate accommodations that respect the dignity and privacy interests of people with disabilities, the focus should always be on the functional limitations associated with the disability, rather than a person's diagnosis.
18. The provision of an accommodation is based on three principles:
   a) **Dignity:** Students with disabilities have the right to receive educational services in a manner that is 
      respectful of their dignity. Human dignity encompasses individual self-respect and self-worth. It is 
      concerned with physical and psychological integrity and empowerment. Dignity is harmed when 
      individuals are marginalized, stigmatized, ignored or devalued.
   b) **Individualization:** Each student's needs are unique. At all times, the emphasis must be on the individual 
      student and not on the category of disability. Two students with the same disability may have very different 
      needs; for example, while some students with visual impairments read Braille, many do not. Different 
      effects of a disability and different learning styles will or may call for different approaches.
   c) **Inclusion and Full Participation:** Inclusion is exemplified by policies, programs, services and activities 
      designed inclusively with the needs of all students in mind. Inclusivity in design emphasizes full 
      participation and recognizes that all students have varying abilities and needs.

19. All personal information, including supporting documentation (e.g. personal health information) requested by 
the University to facilitate the Academic Accommodation process, shall be handled in accordance with the 
*Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and the *Personal Health Information Protection Act*. 
SECTION II: ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

STUDENTS

20. Students must meet University and program/degree requirements, including participation in classes, labs, clinical or practicum placements, tutorials, etc.

21. Students seeking an Academic Accommodation are required to participate fully in the Academic Accommodations process. This participation includes:
   a) when the student is aware of their disability and the need for Academic Accommodation, contacting Student Accessibility Services before classes or academic work begins;
   b) providing the information required so that Student Accessibility Services can assess the duty to accommodate and develop Accommodation Plans;
   c) after the approval of the Accommodation Plan, should the student have any questions they may choose to speak with their instructor, SAS advisor or Faculty Office to review steps for the implementation of the Accommodation Plan;
   d) notifying Student Accessibility Services of any changes that may impact already established Accommodation Plans in a timely fashion.

INSTRUCTORS AND CHAIRS

22. Instructors and Chairs are responsible for implementing the approved Accommodation Plan, as applicable, by:
   a) referring all accommodation requests related to disability (that have not been previously accommodated) to Student Accessibility Services;
   b) implementing the Accommodation Plan requests with the support of Student Accessibility Services and their academic units, and participating where appropriate in the development of Accommodation Plans.
   c) working collaboratively with Student Accessibility Services, the student, and the Associate/Assistant Dean to find a satisfactory resolution in those instances where the Instructor believes that an Accommodation Plan puts at risk the student’s ability to meet course/program requirements (see Appendix B: Essential Requirements and Appendix C: Off-Site Placements).

23. Instructors, in collaboration with the MacPherson Institute, should consider instructional elements of their course that minimize the need for accommodations.

TEACHING ASSISTANTS

24. Teaching Assistants are responsible for implementing the approved Accommodation Plan, as applicable, by referring all accommodation requests related to disability (that have not been previously accommodated) to Student Accessibility Services.

STUDENT ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES

25. Student Accessibility Services is the central resource for disability advising and the development of Accommodation Plans for students with disabilities. Student Accessibility Services is responsible for coordinating the Academic Accommodations process, which includes:
   a) obtaining and storing relevant disability related information (e.g. documentation related to any functional limitation);
b) assessing the University's duty to accommodate; and  
c) working collaboratively with Faculty Offices, Instructors, students and academic units to inform accommodation decisions and develop Accommodation Plans.

ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEANS

26. Associate/Assistant Deans have a key leadership role within academic units and are responsible for:  
   a) working with the pertinent Accommodation Team and Student Accessibility Services to develop, refine, and implement Accommodation Plans as necessary.  
   b) working with the academic unit and Instructors to define the academic requirements of programs and courses;  
   c) consulting with the Faculty Dean, where necessary, on resources required for accommodations;  
   d) working with Chairs and Directors to ensure Instructors are implementing Accommodation Plans as specified; and  
   e) working with the Accommodation Team and Student Accessibility Services to make informed decisions related to complex or retroactive accommodations, as well as appeals.

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATION TEAMS

27. The Academic Accommodation Teams ("Accommodation Teams") are informal networks of individuals within academic units who have the knowledge and expertise required to inform decisions related to Academic Accommodations. Accommodation Teams complement the expertise residing centrally in Student Accessibility Services and support the Associate/Assistant Deans in the consideration of complex and/or retroactive Academic Accommodation decisions and appeals. In some areas there may be Accommodation Teams specific to the departments and professions within that Faculty.

EQUITY AND INCLUSION OFFICE

28. The Equity and Inclusion Office is responsible for providing education and training on the duty to accommodate, accessibility and broader human rights, equity, and inclusion matters for staff, students and faculty. The Equity and Inclusion Office is an intake office for any complaints related to harassment and/or discrimination based on disability. When there has been a failure to accommodate, a failure to accommodate reasonably, or a failure to consider a retroactive accommodation, Equity and Inclusion Office staff will work with complainants to identify appropriate avenues of recourse as per the policy Discrimination, Harassment & Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response.

CAMPUS STORE

29. The Campus Store is responsible for implementing the terms of any agreed upon Accommodation Plan, as applicable, by:  
   a) accessing required learning resources in formats appropriate to individual student need;  
   b) making every reasonable effort to provide students registered through Student Accessibility Services equal access to information; and  
   c) providing publisher information to Library Accessibility Services (LAS) in Mills Library for students who may require textbooks in a different format (e.g. audio, Braille, large print, etc.).
LIBRARY

30. The Library is responsible for making every reasonable effort to provide equal access to information for students with disabilities, and implementing the terms of any agreed upon Accommodation Plan, as applicable, by:
   a) accessing required learning resources in formats appropriate to individual student need;
   b) obtaining eversions and converting file formats of learning materials e.g. required texts, course websites, A2L posts, course-packs, supplementary materials, etc.;
   c) closed captioning media used in the classroom and online; and
   d) helping students with disabilities navigate and access Library services and supports.

OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

31. The Office of the Registrar is responsible for implementing the terms of any agreed upon Accommodation Plan, as applicable, by:
   a) scheduling and coordinating accommodated exams;
   b) providing special timetabling or classroom use;
   c) ensuring that University admissions policies and procedures are inclusive and accessible;
   d) making special arrangements for students with disabilities at convocation ceremonies; and
   e) working closely with Student Accessibility Services to ensure that the accommodated exams are scheduled and executed effectively, while also ensuring that Academic Integrity standards are met.

MACPHERSON INSTITUTE

32. The MacPherson Institute will provide assistance and support to Instructors that facilitate the academic success of students with disabilities. Areas of focus include providing educational opportunities, resources and support for instructors that encourage application of pedagogical methods that support accommodations and encourage overall accessibility, e.g. universal design; identification of essential requirements.

ADMINISTRATION

33. The term “Administration”, as used in this Policy, refers to individuals and groups responsible for the University’s academic programs and academic support services and includes the: Provost; Associate Vice-President (Students & Learning) and Dean of Students; Vice-Provost (Faculty); Vice-Provost (Teaching & Learning) and Director of the MacPherson Institute; Deans; Associate Deans/Assistant Deans; Department Chairs; and Directors of Schools and Programs. Members of the Administration shall ensure that:
   a) students with disabilities who have been approved for accommodation under this Policy, are accommodated in line with this Policy and as per their Accommodation Plans; and
   b) staff and instructors are familiar with this Policy, and have the knowledge and resources necessary to implement Accommodation Plans.

ASSOCIATE VICE-PRESIDENT (STUDENTS & LEARNING) AND DEAN OF STUDENTS

34. The Associate Vice-President (Students & Learning) and Dean of Students (“Dean of Students”), is responsible for the oversight of the Policy and for monitoring progress and addressing issues that arise in its execution. To inform this process, the Dean of Students will coordinate meetings at least once per year with
key stakeholders, including Associate/Assistant Deans, Student Accessibility Services, and the Equity and Inclusion Office.
SECTION III: GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

GUIDELINES

35. The following guidelines apply to all requests for Academic Accommodations:
   a) students are not to seek accommodation directly from their professors, instructors, and/or teaching assistants. Accommodation requests should be directed to Student Accessibility Services or the Faculty Office;
   b) students are not required to reveal their private medical information, such as the cause of the disability, diagnosis, symptoms or treatment (unless these clearly relate to the accommodation being sought - see Documentation) to register with Student Accessibility Services, or receive accommodations or supports;
   c) students may request interim accommodations for disabilities (this includes mental health disabilities) pending receipt of medical documentation;
   d) both Temporary and Permanent disabilities will be accommodated;
   e) requests for accommodation should be submitted in a prompt and timely manner. Requests made after a deadline has passed may be considered Retroactive Accommodations;
   f) students who make an accommodation request directly to an Instructor, prior to having an accommodation plan in place, should be informed by the Instructor that they must submit their request to Student Accessibility Services.

TYPES OF ACCOMMODATION REQUESTS

36. Permanent Disability is where a functional limitation will occur for more than one academic term or as defined by a regulated health professional.

37. Temporary Disability may be a short-term injury or illness (such as mononucleosis, a broken limb or concussion) or an episodic condition (e.g. mental illness) where a functional limitation generally occurs within one academic term or less or as defined by a regulated health professional.

38. A Retroactive Accommodation may be for either a Permanent or Temporary Disability when the request is made after-the-fact (e.g. after a course has been completed), as the result of the discovery or diagnosis of an existing disability of which the student was previously unaware.

DOCUMENTATION

39. The University complies with the Policy on Ableism and Discrimination Based on Disability, Section 8.7, “Medical information to be provided,” which sets out the type and scope of medical information to be provided to support an accommodation request.

40. Requests for information and/or supporting documentation will, where possible, be limited to the nature of the limitation or restriction, in order to assess needs and make an appropriate academic accommodation. Requests for information and/or supporting documentation may include:
   a) that the student has a disability (without disclosure of the medical diagnosis);
   b) the functional limitations or needs associated with the disability;
   c) whether the student can perform the course/program/degree requirements, with or without accommodation, including participation in classes, labs, clinical/practicum placements, tutorials, etc.
d) the type of accommodation(s) that may be needed to allow the student to fulfill course/program/degree requirements.

41. Students are required to provide documentation that supports their accommodation request before a decision or Academic Accommodation plan is developed. Supporting documentation does not require the disclosure of a medical diagnosis but must be sufficient to allow the University to determine appropriate accommodation measures and/or explore reasonable alternatives.

42. An interim Academic Accommodation may be enacted on behalf of a student requesting an Academic Accommodation and implemented 'in good faith' pending receipt of supporting documentation.

43. For Temporary Disability accommodation requests, the Associate/Assistant Dean may determine that while documentation was requested, it may not always be necessary and students may be accommodated in 'good faith' for a temporary disability.

44. Documentation will only be considered if completed and signed by a registered and regulated health professional (i.e. medical doctor, registered psychologist, registered occupational therapist, registered speech and language pathologist, etc.) or a recognized and credible expert (e.g. McMaster University's Sexual Assault Response Coordinator).

45. The University may make inquiries to request documentation, as appropriate, to confirm the need for and/or type of Academic Accommodation required. The University may initiate a detailed request for supportive documented information, tailored to the particular accommodation request. The University reserves the right to seek additional assessments or opinions about the nature of the functional limitation(s) as it relates to the student's disability.

PROCEDURES

Timeliness of Submissions

46. Student Accessibility Services requires adequate time to review requests and coordinate needed arrangements. Some accommodations take longer to arrange than others (e.g. sign language interpreters and transcriptions), and students with these types of requests should be particularly cognizant of the timing of their requests. Failure to make a request or supply the required documentation in a timely manner may delay the approval and/or implementation of the requested accommodation.

47. New students and transfer students are encouraged to contact Student Accessibility Services and submit their accommodation request as soon as possible after they receive their offers of admission, or by August 1st of the academic year, whichever comes first.

48. Students whose circumstances change or who develop difficulties after the aforementioned dates should contact Student Accessibility Services and their designated faculty contact immediately, to initiate a review of their Accommodation Plan.

Submitting an Academic Accommodation Request

49. Student Accessibility Services and the Faculty Offices work collaboratively and share information in order to facilitate academic accommodation requests. This includes transferring the facilitation of a request between offices where appropriate (e.g. a Temporary Disability accommodation may require the scheduling of rooms or invigilators, which is the responsibility of Student Accessibility Services; or the accommodation requires deadline extensions that the Faculty Office is able to arrange with the Instructor).
50. Students must submit an Academic Accommodation Request Form with the appropriate documentation (see Documentation above) to either the Faculty Office or Student Accessibility Services in order to request an Academic Accommodation.

51. Student Accessibility Services or other Intake Offices (e.g. Faculty Office) may refer the request to another office, as deemed appropriate in order to review the Academic Accommodation request.
   a) Student Accessibility Services is responsible for all PERMANENT DISABILITY requests. Students may elect to drop off the Academic Accommodation Request Form to their Faculty Office; however dropping the form off at the Faculty Office may delay the facilitation of the request.
   b) Student Accessibility Services or the Faculty Office may process Temporary Disability requests and Retroactive Accommodation requests.

Intake Meeting with a Program Coordinator regarding PERMANENT DISABILITY

52. Students requesting Academic Accommodation for Permanent Disability must meet with a Program Coordinator in Student Accessibility Services.

53. At the meeting the Program Coordinator will review with the student the following:
   a) the request, including documentation, and academic program information;
   b) the need for accommodation and other supports; and
   c) the process for the activation of Academic Accommodations.

Review of Request

54. The office facilitating the request (Student Accessibility Services or the Faculty Office where appropriate) shall review the request for Academic Accommodations and determine whether the request meets the criteria for Academic Accommodation under this Policy. The office may consult with the Equity and Inclusion Office, or other relevant resources throughout the process.

55. In complex situations, once documentation is received, Student Accessibility Services and the Faculty Office will consult with each other, the Accommodation Team, and the student, as appropriate before a decision or accommodations plan is made:
   a) greater consultation may be required when there are concerns related to a practicum or placement, in cases where there are challenges in meeting accommodation requirements, or in cases related to the student's ability to fulfill the requirements of the course/program;
   b) Student Accessibility Services and the Faculty Office will work to coordinate the request and assist with the provision of the accommodation, including exploring alternative forms of accommodation when the student may not be able to fulfill the requirements of the course/program without accommodation;
   c) Should further guidance be required, the Faculty Office and/or Student Accessibility Services may consult with the appropriate senior administrator, and other offices as appropriate, including the Equity and Inclusion Office, the Student Wellness Centre, and the Student Support and Case Management Office.

56. Student Accessibility Services/the Faculty Office shall:
   a) inform the student in writing that the request has been:
      (i) denied and provide the reasons for denying the request; or
(ii) accepted and provide next steps for the development of the accommodation plan.

b) send a copy of the letter to the other office (Student Accessibility Services/Faculty Office).

**Developing the Accommodation Plan**

57. Student Accessibility Services will work with the student to develop a proposed accommodation plan based on the student's needs (as determined by Student Accessibility Services after consultation with the student, review of the documentation, and in consultation with the Faculty Office, including the instructor where appropriate) and any available course/program information and requirements.

58. Throughout the development of an Accommodation Plan, all parties should review the plan and are encouraged to discuss openly the needs and special considerations necessary in order to prepare for implementation. Through the development process, if there are questions/concerns, all efforts will be made to resolve the matter informally.

59. If, at any time during the development of an Academic Accommodation plan, the Chair, the Associate Dean and/or the Faculty Dean believe that there are substantial financial implications to granting the requested accommodation, the Accommodation Plan should be forwarded directly to the Provost. The Provost shall review the plan and work with the Associate/Assistant Dean to implement an appropriate plan.

60. If there are concerns about the Accommodation Plan, outside of financial hardship, the person with the concerns shall notify the Associate/Assistant Dean, who shall consult with their Accommodation Team and Student Accessibility Services, as appropriate. In exceptional circumstances and where further guidance is required, other offices and administrators may be consulted (Vice-Provost (Faculty), Dean of Students, Equity and Inclusion Office, Student Wellness Centre, and/or the Student Support and Case Management Office).

61. In some circumstances, SAS may request permission to consult with the student's health care provider to seek further information or clarification, in order to assist with the development of the Academic Accommodation plan.

62. In some cases SAS may need to seek independent consultation (such as the Regional Assessment Resource Centre, an independent Occupational Therapist, etc.) in order to assist with the development of the academic accommodation plan.

63. Once the Accommodation Plan has been finalized, if the student agrees with the Accommodation Plan, the coordination for the implementation of the plan will commence as quickly as possible.

64. If the student does not agree with the finalized Accommodation Plan they may request a Re-Assessment (see clauses 82-84).

**Implementation of the Accommodation Plan**

65. New accommodation plans will also include how (e.g. electronically or at the discretion of the student) and to whom (e.g. instructors) the plan will be communicated. Student Accessibility Services can provide a print form of the accommodation plan, in order for the student to hand-deliver the letter.

66. Returning students should confirm with SAS that the Accommodation Plan is still accurate and to confirm their preference for communicating the Accommodation Plan to instructors. Returning students can choose to have their plan communicated electronically to instructors or to opt for a print form of the accommodation plan.
67. At any time, a student may request a printed copy of their Academic Accommodation Plan from SAS, should they wish to have hard copy to discuss with their instructor(s).

68. Student Accessibility Services will provide notice to the Office of the Registrar for examination accommodation or classroom accommodation. A minimum of 10 business days is normally necessary to make special arrangements for examinations.

69. Student Accessibility Services will notify the Library and Campus Store for accommodations relating to specialized literature in appropriate formats for the student. The student must contact the Library and/or the Campus Store, with any additional requirements they may need to facilitate the request.

**Duration and Review of Accommodation Plan**

70. Once the accommodation has been approved, the Accommodation Plan for a Permanent Disability remains active and does not need to be renewed during the student's University academic career.

71. Should circumstances change that may require a revision of the Accommodation Plan (Permanent/Temporary Disability) or an extension of the Accommodation Plan (Temporary), an expedited review will occur in compliance with clauses 57-64 *Developing the Accommodation Plan*, to develop an Accommodation Plan to meet current needs.

72. Where need for accommodation review is warranted a review can occur at any time and may be initiated by the student, Student Accessibility Services, or the Faculty Office. Any such review may require a review of documentation and request for an updated assessment.

**Student Participation**

73. If the student does not participate or denies any need for accommodation, the University reserves the right to document the conversation with the student and/or obtain written acknowledgement from the student that an accommodation is not desired. Failure to follow through with organized accommodations without advising Student Accessibility Services and/or the Faculty/School in a timely manner may result in the University being unable to fulfill the Academic Accommodation requirement for that particular situation.

**RE bâtive AC commodations**

74. An Academic Accommodation for either a Permanent or Temporary Disability is considered retroactive when the request is made after-the-fact (e.g. after the end of an academic term), as the result of the discovery or diagnosis of an existing disability that the student was previously unaware of.

75. Retroactive accommodation requests will be assessed upon the unique factors for each case, which may include:
   a) timeliness of the request (e.g. when did the student know about the disability, how much time has passed between making the request and the time period that the request is for, etc.)
   b) nature of the accommodation requested;
   c) supporting documentation provided;
   d) amount of course work completed during the term; and
   e) the student's academic record.
76. When a retroactive accommodation is granted, the University may request further documentation and/or assessments to determine the student’s readiness to return to studies, and/or to determine whether additional, and in some cases Permanent Academic Accommodations are necessary.

77. If granted, the Faculty Office will work with the appropriate individuals or offices to facilitate the accommodation. The decision will be communicated to the student in writing.

DATA GATHERING & RECORD KEEPING

78. Student Accessibility Services is responsible for collecting data on Academic Accommodations at the University. The data shall be kept and maintained by Student Accessibility Services and includes data provided to that office by the Faculty Offices.

79. Student Accessibility Services shall maintain a confidential record for all Academic Accommodation requests. These records are property of the University and will normally be destroyed 7 years after last use.

80. Instructors should retain any accommodation documents for the same period of time that they must retain marked coursework. When that time lapses, that material shall be destroyed, with that marked coursework

81. The Accommodation Team should forward any accommodation documents to the Faculty Office, as appropriate.
SECTION IV: APPEALS

RE-ASSESSMENT OF THE ACCOMMODATION PLAN

82. The student may request a Re-Assessment of the Accommodation Plan by submitting, in writing, an explanation as to why the plan is not adequate and what accommodation they seek, to the Director of Student Accessibility Services.

83. The Director of Student Accessibility Services, upon receipt of the request, will notify the Faculty Office to discuss the Accommodation Plan; the explanation submitted by the student; and, a review of the requirements of the course and/or program to make a recommendation for next steps related to an Accommodation Plan.

84. If the Faculty Office decides that the request for Reassessment is approved and the Accommodation Plan will be revised to grant the proposed accommodation, they will notify Student Accessibility Services in writing and the coordination for the implementation of the plan will commence as quickly as possible. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the student, appropriate instructor(s), and the Chair of the student’s Department.

85. If the Faculty Office decides the request for Reassessment is denied and the Accommodation Plan will not be revised, they will notify Student Accessibility Services in writing and will provide the reasons for the decision. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the student, appropriate instructor(s), and the Chair of the student’s Department.

APPEAL OF THE RE-ASSESSMENT DECISION

86. Students may appeal the Re-Assessment decision not to revise the Accommodation Plan, when they believe that there has been a procedural error in the application of the Policy. The appeal must be filed within 3 weeks of receipt of the decision, to the Senate Board for Student Appeals as outlined in the Student Appeal Procedures.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMPLAINT

87. If the student believes that a decision may be a violation of their human rights, such as when there has been a failure to accommodate (denial of the request) or a failure to accommodate reasonably (the student believes the Accommodation Plan does not provide reasonable accommodation) they should contact the Equity and Inclusion Office to identify appropriate avenues of recourse as per the policy Discrimination, Harassment & Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response

ACCOMMODATION PENDING REVIEW OR APPEAL

88. The University recognizes that decisions involving accommodations must be made expeditiously to assist students in their ongoing courses. Once the Faculty Office has approved an Accommodation Plan, it shall be implemented promptly. In the event that a student appeals the approved Accommodation Plan and the appeal is pending, the instructor, the Faculty Office, and Student Accessibility Services shall determine what portion, if any, of the plan is reasonable to implement immediately. Any such accommodations shall remain in place until there is a final disposition of all appeals.
APPENDIX A: RELATED POLICIES AND LEGISLATION

This Policy is to be read in conjunction with the following policies, statements, and legislation. Any question concerning the application of this Policy or related policies shall be determined by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) or the Vice-President (Administration) as appropriate, and in conjunction with the administrator of the other policy or policies. The University reserves the right to amend or add to the University's policies and statements from time to time (this is not a comprehensive list):

- Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous and Spiritual Observances (RISO)
- Academic Integrity Policy
- Accessibility – University Policy
- Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities
- Discrimination, Harassment & Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response
- Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
- Graduate Course Outlines
- Ontario Human Rights Code
- Personal Health Information Protection Act
- Professional Behaviour Code for Graduate Learners, Health Sciences
- Professional Behaviour Code for Undergraduate Learners, Health Sciences
- Statement on Building an Inclusive Community with a Shared Purpose
- Statement and Guidelines on Inclusive Communications
- Employment Accommodation, Policy and Procedures on
- Research Integrity Policy
- Student Appeal Procedures
- Undergraduate Course Management Policies
APPENDIX B: ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS

1. The Ontario Human Rights Commission has noted that while courts and tribunals have provided little guidance on the definition or nature of essential requirements, terms that have been used include indispensable, vital and very important. "For example, it may likely be an essential requirement that a student master core aspects of a course or curriculum. It is much less likely that it will be an essential requirement to demonstrate that mastery in a particular format, unless mastery of that format (for example oral communication) is also a vital requirement of the program. Educators must provide accommodation, up to the point of undue hardship, to enable students to meet these essential requirements". 2

2. In a university setting, the essential requirements of a course/program may include, but are not limited to, the knowledge and skills that must be acquired or demonstrated in order for a student to meet the learning objectives of the course/program successfully. Essential requirements are the expected learning outcomes of a program or course and involve the successful demonstration of specific knowledge, skills and abilities. Although there may be variations in the language used to describe an essential requirement within each program or course, the objective of outlining the essential requirements is to help students understand what they must be able to demonstrate at the end of the course or program.

3. Essential requirements can be defined by 2 factors: 1) a skill that must be necessarily demonstrated in order to meet the objectives of the course and 2) a skill that must be demonstrated in a prescribed manner. 3 Conclusions about inability to perform essential requirements must not be reached without actually testing the ability of the student.

4. A particular challenge arises with managing accommodations for students in professional programs because of the need to separate the educational elements of the university curriculum from the perceived professional competencies of the practicing clinician. As Oakley et al. (2012) have reported, education is deemed a service under Human Rights Legislation even when students are participating in off-campus training programs in the clinical setting or in field placements. 4 In these settings, students are entitled to the same type of accommodation as they would receive in the classroom. Clearly, however, some accommodations that are appropriate for the classroom will be inappropriate or inadequate in the clinical or practicum situation.

5. In this situation, SAS will liaise with the relevant Faculty to consider how the particular profession would normally accommodate individuals with such disabilities. In this way, the essential requirements related to the clinical tasks in the placement will be considered along with the academic requirements. Professional programs have distinct essential requirements outlined for undertaking the educational programs or curricula that will include expectations for functioning as a practicing professional in the

---

2 Ibid
3 Ibid.
career that is the planned outcome for students in that program. Students may elect to complete the program if feasible but not to sit any certification examinations offered by the profession or to seek registration in regulatory bodies such as regulatory colleges. There may be occasions, particularly in a professional program where an accommodation contradicts an essential requirement. For example, providing extra time for a learner in a particular clinical setting might in fact impact on patient/client safety. However, it is incumbent upon the University to conduct a thorough task analysis of an essential requirement before developing an accommodation plan or denying an accommodation on the basis that the accommodation breaches the academic integrity of the education program.

6. Increasing application of the principles of universal design in educational programs may allow more students to meet the essential requirements of the learning environment without accommodation, although for some students, differential treatment may still be required to allow equal opportunity to enjoy the same level of benefits and privileges of success in the educational program.

7. Continuing advances in technology both in the classroom and in the clinical and practicum setting in professional programs necessitate close cooperation and liaison between SAS, Accommodation Team and resources, and students, in order to optimize accessibility of students to meet the essential requirements of courses and educational programs.
APPENDIX C: OFF-SITE PLACEMENTS

OFF-SITE PLACEMENTS

1. In order to engage in the academic accommodation process as it applies to the experiential learning setting, multiple stakeholders may need to be involved, including the fieldwork coordinator (the faculty member who organizes fieldwork), the on-site supervisor, the preceptor (University or clinical supervisor who oversees individual fieldwork experiences) and SAS.

2. The University's duty to accommodate exists independently from the placement entity. Ideally, all parties will collaborate on the development of an appropriate accommodation plan that meets the student's needs. However, in the event of a disagreement or misalignment of expectations (or where there is some conflicting third party policy etc.), we cannot force or impose a particular accommodation measure on a third party, without some contractual mechanism. Ultimately, in the circumstance where all parties cannot agree, the only appropriate accommodation that satisfies McMaster's duty may be to explore another placement. Academic accommodation extends to off-campus coursework such as fieldwork, placement, internship and out-of-the classroom learning experiences.

3. In some Programs (such as the Bachelor of Social Work) graduation from an accredited program allow students to register with a regulatory college. Demonstrating readiness for practice is an essential requirement for graduation from these programs.

4. Notification of accommodation need for placement, fieldwork and practicum, is flexible according to individual student circumstances.

5. The vastness of placement/fieldwork and practicum settings and academic requirements for such activities is too extensive to easily detail in one procedure. However, regardless of the nature of the program or degree the following process will apply to all students and all requests for academic accommodations within a placement/fieldwork or practicum setting:

   a) students will meet with SAS Program Coordinator to review the Academic Accommodation Plan in the context of an off-site placement.

   b) placement criteria for consideration may include: documentation, academic program information, placement evaluation criteria, need for accommodation and other supports for the learning environment and review process for activation of academic accommodations;

   c) the accommodation request is shared with the off-site learning placement location. The placement may or may not be able to accept the accommodation request on their site.

   d) SAS may need to consult with the Faculty Office before the accommodation is implemented;

   e) where necessary, SAS may request additional documentation or the ability to consult with a student's regulated health care provider(s) to seek further information regarding the student's functional limitations in order to make a determination of the most appropriate academic accommodation;

   f) in some cases, SAS may need to seek independent consultation before activating an academic accommodation;

   g) notice to Faculty Office is then facilitated by or provided directly from SAS outlining the accommodation for the off-site learning environment;
h) if the accommodation plan is not accepted by the off-site learning placement location, the University will explore other off-site learning opportunities, within reason; and

i) where a need for accommodation review is warranted, this can occur at any time.
IQAP Policy Revisions Update
March 2017

We have reviewed the IQAP policy and propose the following changes to our policy:

1. Minor editorial changes throughout.

2. Updated names/labels for consistency with guidebooks and templates
   a. Updated titles for Vice-Provost etc.

3. Created and updated templates and updated guidebooks where needed
   a. Plans to update flowcharts with sequence following new program approval and distribution of statement of intent
   b. Plans to update guidebooks with prompting questions on assessment, responding to the Strategic Mandate Agreement and institutional definition of experiential learning (when it becomes available).

4. Merged some sections (e.g. Resources, Quality Enhancement). Note that we did not change any of the criteria, just re-organized based on feedback we received.

5. Worked with the Registrar’s Office and with Quality Council to provide a better description, definition and examples of what constitutes New Programs v Major Modifications. Further clarified the process when the difference among a minor modification, a major medication or a new program is unclear.
   a. Moved reporting requirements for major modifications from section 7 to section 4

6. Modified language around the need for broad consultation when beginning new undergraduate and graduate programs (5.1 and 5.2).
   a. Included sharing Statement of Intent with Registrar’s Office and consulting with IRA and Fees

7. Included a provision in the external evaluation review team for the inclusion of one internal reviewer and additional reviewers where appropriate (5.4).

8. Revised the institutional approval process to match what we have been doing in practice, e.g. statement of intent; budget approvals earlier in the process (5.7).

9. Developed guidelines for advertising new programs to ensure consistency with Quality Council requirements (5.9).
   a. Included note that Ministry approval may also be required.

10. Updated the policy to reflect then new MTCU submission process (5.10).

11. Added new criteria to the New Program Proposal and the Self-study to emphasize consideration of the curriculum and current priorities (Section 5.3.4 and Section 7.1.3).
a. Added a provision for reference to the Strategic Mandate Agreement

12. Moved details of inclusion in chair’s and dean’s reports from the policy to the instructions and templates based on feedback we received.
   a. 7.2: Program Response Template

13. Clarified the institutional reporting process and institutional reporting bodies for program reviews (7.3 and 7.4)
   a. Updated that report comes from Quality Assurance Committee to UPC.
   b. Revised sequence of approvals such that University Fees precedes UGC/GC.

14. Provided further detail and clarity for the use of accreditation and other external reviews in the cyclical review process, including processes and reporting mechanisms.

15. Modified language in Review Team to indicate reviewers for professional and interdisciplinary programs

16. Clarified that joint reviews take the timeline of the earliest scheduled review
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Appendix A: McMaster University's Statement on Degree Level Expectations
1. PREAMBLE

McMaster University is widely recognized for innovation in teaching and learning and for the quality of its programs. Nevertheless, knowledge of our disciplines and the scholarship of teaching and learning are constantly evolving. It is clear that our reputation can only be maintained and improved if we, as academics and educators, critically review what we do and seek the opinion and advice from colleagues at McMaster and at other institutions.

Although the primary objective for these reviews is the improvement of our academic programs, the processes that we adopt also should be designed to meet our responsibility to the government on quality assurance: Every publicly assisted Ontario university that grants degrees and diplomas is responsible for ensuring the quality of all of its programs of study, including modes of delivering programs and those academic and student services that affect the quality of the respective programs under review, whether or not the program is eligible for government funding.

The process by which institutions meet this accountability to the government is outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF), developed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) and approved by Executive Heads in April 2010. Institutions’ compliance with the QAF is monitored by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance, also known as the Quality Council, which reports to OCAV and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU).

As part of the Quality Assurance Framework, McMaster was required to develop an Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), which is contained within this Policy. The guiding principles used for developing McMaster’s IQAP were:

- curriculum development and improvement is an ongoing, iterative process that is normally initiated, developed and controlled at the departmental level;
- McMaster’s IQAP incorporates input from all principal stakeholders; and,
- McMaster’s IQAP should be designed primarily to help improve programs and shape them to have characteristics that are most valued at our University, while also meeting the responsibility for quality assurance.

Thus, the goal of McMaster’s IQAP is to facilitate the development and continued improvement of our undergraduate and graduate academic programs, and to ensure that McMaster continues to lead internationally in its reputation for innovation in teaching and learning and for the quality of its programs. McMaster’s IQAP is intended to complement existing mechanisms for critical assessment and enhancement, including departmental reviews and accreditation reviews. The uniqueness of each program at McMaster will emerge in the IQAP self-study.

The IQAP is subject to approval by the Quality Council when it is initiated and thereafter, when it is revised. The Quality Council will audit the University on an 8-year cycle under the terms outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework.
2. CONTACT

The authority responsible for the IQAP is the Vice-Provost (Faculty). The authorities responsible for its application will be the Vice-Provost (Faculty) for undergraduate programs and the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs. When undergraduate and graduate programs are reviewed concurrently, the Vice-Provost (Faculty) and the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies will be jointly responsible for its application.

The person responsible for all contact between the University and the Quality Council is the Vice-Provost (Faculty).

Throughout this Policy, the Chair refers to the head of the academic unit (usually a Department, sometimes a School or an interdisciplinary group) that is proposing a new program or is responsible for an existing program, although we recognize that the official title of such person varies across programs and Faculties. Similarly, the Dean refers to the head of the Faculty or equivalent responsible for the program, again recognizing that the official title may vary.

In the case of joint academic programs (e.g., a combined honours program or a collaborative program with another educational institution), the relevant Chair and Dean shall be those at McMaster University who have the administrative responsibility for the program.

3. PURPOSE

This Policy on Academic Program Development and Review is meant to guide the development of new undergraduate and graduate programs (including for-credit graduate diploma programs), and to aid in the ongoing improvement of existing programs. It has been designed also to meet the University’s responsibility of ensuring the quality of such programs. It applies to all undergraduate and graduate programs offered at McMaster University, as well as programs offered in collaboration with other institutions that lead to McMaster University degrees or graduate diplomas.

4. DEFINITION OF NEW PROGRAMS AND MAJOR MODIFICATIONS

New Programs:
A new program is normally considered to be any new degree or degree program that has not been previously offered at McMaster University. In contrast to the normal evolution of academic programs, a new program will generally involve some combination of new courses, new learning outcomes, and new or re-allocated resources, and will be meant to provide students with an academic path that was previously not available to them.

Although not new, a program that has been offered at McMaster University without funding from the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD) and for which a request for funding is to be made, will follow the procedures for new programs that are outlined in Section 5.
Examples of what constitutes a ‘new program’ are included at:
http://oucqa.ca/guide/examples-of-new-programs/

Modifications to Existing Programs:

Revisions to an existing program will be classified as either a minor or a major modification to the program. In both cases, the program will continue to be subject to a cyclical program review as outlined in Section 7. Major modifications must be reported annually to the Quality Council, as outlined in Section 4.1.

Major modifications include the following program changes:
a) Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review. For undergraduate programs, it would be considered a major modification when more than 30% of the program requirements are being changed from one academic year to the next. For graduate programs, it would be considered a major modification when more than 50% of the program requirements (including requirements such as courses, major exams, and research) are being changed from one year to the next.
b) Significant changes to the program learning outcomes;
c) Significant changes lasting more than one academic year to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (such as different campus, online delivery and inter-institutional collaboration);

The addition of a new field to an existing graduate program is considered to be a major modification, but is subject to an Expedited Approval process. The inclusion of a new program of specialization where another with the same degree designation already exists will normally be considered a major modification.

Examples of what constitutes major modifications are included at:
http://oucqa.ca/guide/5-major-modifications-to-existing-programs/

In some cases major modifications may require additional steps in order to be completed. Programs should consult with the Vice-Provost (Faculty) for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs, where appropriate.

In situations where it is unclear or where disagreement exists on whether a planned change constitutes a minor modification, a major modification, or a new program, the determination will be made by the Vice-Provost (Faculty) for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs, in consultation with McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee, where appropriate. A record of any decision will be kept with McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee.

4.1 Reporting Requirements
Once per year, the Registrar’s Office will prepare a report of major modifications to existing programs and will submit the report to the Quality Council.

5. NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

The steps required for the approval of any new program include:

5.1. Beginning a New Program Proposal

Proponents of a new program may begin by preparing a Statement of Intent and acquiring endorsement from the relevant Dean(s) and Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. The Statement of Intent should be circulated to the Registrar’s Office.

5.2. Broad Consultation

The Chair, in consultation with the Dean, is responsible for ensuring that there is broad consultation. Such consultation is especially important when proposing interdisciplinary programs as those initiators of the proposed plan may not know all the disciplines or individual faculty members who might potentially be interested, or have expertise. It will also be essential to have appropriate discussions with other institutions when the proposed programs are to be offered in collaboration with those institutions.

Whenever faculty members from several departments will be involved in a proposed program, these proponents must have the opportunity to discuss the proposal with their respective Dean(s) and Chair(s). Similarly, if there is a proposal to cross-list a course, or to recommend or require students in the new program to take existing courses, the teaching Department(s) must be consulted and agreement obtained, in writing, from the appropriate Chair/Dean. Approvals of the relevant Curriculum Committees are required.

Discussions should be held with central support units such as, but not limited to, the Library, the Registrar, University Technology Services and the MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Institutional Research, and Analysis, University Student Fees Committee, as well as with Faculty-based support units, to assess the impact of the introduction of the new program. Input also should be sought from relevant groups of students for whom there is a potential impact of the proposal.

A proposal for a new interdisciplinary program must be presented to any related Faculty/Program to ensure that there is widespread awareness of the program and of its potential impact. If a new interdisciplinary program utilizes or cross-lists one or several new courses from other Departments, the Department(s) offering the course(s), rather than the new interdisciplinary group, must submit those courses for approval. Prior written
agreement also must be obtained from Chairs of participating Departments for teaching, graduate supervision and other resources required for interdisciplinary programs. Departments must be given adequate time to consider these requests. Faculties must include the proposed administrative and governance structures in interdisciplinary program proposals.

5.3. New Program Proposal

The Chair is responsible, in collaboration with relevant groups and/or individuals, for the preparation of a New Program Proposal that addresses the following criteria:

5.3.1. Program
- Description of the extent and method of the consultation process undertaken during the development of the proposal, including the groups and/or individuals who helped to prepare the proposal.
- Consistency of the program with the University’s mission and academic plans.
- Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and the Program Learning Outcomes in meeting the University’s Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) or Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLEs), as outlined in Appendix A.
- Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

5.3.2. Admission requirements
- Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the Program Learning Outcomes established for completion of the program.
- Alternative requirements, if any, for admission into the program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience.

5.3.3. Structure
- Appropriateness of the administrative, governance, and communication processes proposed in support of the program.
- Appropriateness of the program’s structure and regulations to meet specified Program Learning Outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
- For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length, which ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

5.3.4. Program content, curriculum, and teaching
- Ways in which the curriculum addresses the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
- Appropriateness of the proposed mode(s) of delivery to meet the intended Program Learning Outcomes and Degree Level Expectations and availability of the necessary
physical resources.
- Ways in which the program addresses current institutional, faculty, or departmental priorities (e.g., experiential learning, diversity and inclusion, accessibility, community engagement, entrepreneurship, et cetera).
- Ways in which the program addresses the current Strategic Mandate Agreement.
- For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
- For graduate programs, verification that the courses included meet university requirements in terms of the minimum number of courses required, the level of courses required, and the appropriate inclusion of other required elements appropriate for the degree level (e.g., transfer exams, comprehensive exams). At least two thirds of the course requirements must be at the 700-level.

5.3.5. Assessment of teaching and learning
- Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the instruction and assessment of student achievement of the intended Program Learning Outcomes. The Program Learning Outcomes must meet the Degree Level Expectations.
- Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the Degree Level Expectations.

5.3.6. Resources
For all programs:
- Adequacy of the administrative unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
- Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
- Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students as well as graduate students’ scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

For graduate programs:
- Evidence that full-time tenured/tenure-track/CAWAR faculty have the recent research and/or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation, foster an appropriate intellectual climate, and provide excellent supervision of students in academic and research components of the program.
- Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.
- For programs with a research component, evidence that faculty research supervisors have current and ongoing research programs and funding, and space and relevant research infrastructure appropriate to support students’ research in the program.
- Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.
• Evidence of prior experience in graduate teaching and research supervision for faculty participating in the program.

For undergraduate programs:
• Evidence of plans for adequate numbers of faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program;
• Evidence of plans to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program;
• Planned/anticipated class sizes;
• Provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required); and,
• Role of adjunct and sessional faculty.

5.3.7. Quality and other indicators

• Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program).
• Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.

5.4. External Evaluation: Review Team

The Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean will select a team of reviewers to assess the proposal. The review team shall consist of at least one external reviewer for new undergraduate programs and two external reviewers for new graduate programs. The team may also include one internal reviewer selected by the Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean (or the Dean’s designate). Additional members may be added to the team if appropriate, for instance when evaluating professional programs or interdisciplinary programs.

External reviews of new graduate programs must incorporate an on-site visit. External reviews of new undergraduate program proposals will normally be conducted on-site, but may be conducted by desk audit, video-conference or an equivalent method if the external reviewer is satisfied that the off-site option is acceptable; exceptions to on-site visits for undergraduate program reviews will be determined by the Vice-Provost (Faculty), in consultation with the Dean, prior to the commencement of the review.

External members of the review team shall normally be individuals who are in the same discipline as the program under review (or across disciplines for interdisciplinary programs), shall not normally be from the same institution, and who are distinguished senior academics of broad experience, with an established commitment to higher education. Non-traditional programs may consider non-academics with relevant expertise.
and experience. Reviewers must have an impartial, arms-length relationship to the program (for clarity, arms-length reviewers should not have been a research supervisor or student of members of the proposed program; and should not have collaborated with members of the proposed program within the past 6 years, or have made plans to collaborate with those individuals in the immediate future. There also should be no other potential conflicts of interest (e.g., personal or financial). Wherever possible the review team shall represent broad institutional categories and/or geographic regions.

Reviewers will be selected from a list of at least six suggested individuals compiled by the Department and endorsed by the Dean. The list shall include, for each proposed external reviewer:
- name;
- rank and position;
- institution or company and current address, telephone and fax numbers, e-mail address, and URL if available;
- professional (including administrative) experience or expertise relevant to the Program under review;
- details of any previous or current affiliation with the University, and any association with individual members of the Program under review (e.g., co-author, previous student/supervisor, close relationship); and,
- for graduate programs, a description of research expertise, and a partial listing of recent scholarly publications.

The New Program Proposal, the McMaster’s Review Team Guidelines and other materials specific to the review will be provided to all members of the review team no less than two weeks prior to their visit.

5.5. Reviewers’ report

Excepting when contrary circumstances apply, the reviewers normally will provide, within four weeks of the review, a joint report that appraises the standards and quality of the proposed program, and addresses the criteria set out in Section 5.3, including the associated faculty and material resources. Reviewers also will be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program, together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to the program.

5.6. Internal response

Responses to the reviewers’ report from both the Chair and the Dean, or their delegates, should be prepared, as per the New Program Response template, and attached to the reviewers’ report.

5.7. Institutional approval

In addition to the completion of the external review, approval of new program proposals
by the following University bodies, normally in the order listed below, is required:

- The Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will review the New Program Proposal to ensure that the program is consistent with McMaster's principles and priorities and existing strengths of the University, the program is of high academic quality; there is convincing evidence of student demand and societal need for the program; and, sufficient financial support, infrastructure, and human resources can be made available to initiate and support the program either within the Faculty budget or based on the program being a full revenue generating program.

- The Faculty Curriculum Committee(s) reviews the New Program Proposal to ensure that the new program adds sufficient value to the programs already offered in the Faculty;

- the Faculty(ies) reviews the New Program Proposal to ensure that the program is consistent with the Faculty's strategic plans and that the necessary resources are available if these are to be provided from within the Faculty's envelope;

- the Executive Director of Finance and Planning reviews the Resource Implications and Financial Viability document to ensure that all potential University resource requirements are captured and the program is properly costed. In addition, for interdisciplinary or partnership programs, ensures that an MOU is properly completed.

- for Undergraduate programs, the Undergraduate Council Curriculum Committee reviews the New Program Proposal to assess the impact of the new program on students enrolled in other Faculties;

- the University Student Fees Committee reviews the proposed Program and Supplementary Fees and ensures that Ministry and University fee policies are adhered to, are reasonable relative to market and that fee collection can be properly administered within existing systems.

- Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council reviews the New Program Proposal to provide a venue for a broad discussion on the new program by elected faculty and student members with specific knowledge of and expertise in undergraduate or graduate programming, and ensure that the program is consistent with University-wide goals and criteria specifically related to undergraduate or graduate programming;

- University Planning Committee reviews the New Program Proposal and the Resource Implications and Financial Viability documents to understand the financial implications of the new program, evaluate the impact University-wide, and assess value-for-money for the intended student; and,

- Senate ensures that the program is consistent with the University's general strategic plans with respect to academic programs.

These bodies should consider the criteria outlined in Section 5.3 when evaluating the proposal.

Normally, approvals by all of the above University bodies will take place before the external review. However, in cases where the external reviewers recommend significant changes to the program proposal, it may have to return to these bodies for re-assessment.
Special considerations, such as collaboration agreements or non-standard distribution and full revenue generating programs should refer to the Academic Revenue Generating Activity Policy and other relevant University policies as may apply.

If any one of the bodies requires changes to the proposal, those changes may have to be subsequently provided to the other approving bodies for approval, depending on the nature of the changes.

Chairs of Departments named in the proposal should be informed by the University Secretariat of the schedule for presentations to Undergraduate Council, University Planning Committee and Senate, and of the decisions of these bodies with regard to the New Program Proposal. The School of Graduate Studies should inform Chairs of the schedule of presentations to Graduate Council, and of the decisions of this body with regards to the new program proposal.

5.8. Quality Council Secretariat

Once all approvals outlined in Section 5.7 are obtained, the institution will submit the New Program Proposal, together with the Reviewers’ Report and the internal response to the Report, to the Quality Council Secretariat. The submission template will require information on whether or not the proposed program will be a cost-recovery program. The same standards and protocols apply regardless of the source of funding.

5.9. Announcement of new programs

Following its submission to the Quality Council, the University may announce, per guidelines within the New Program Proposal Guidebook, its intention to offer the program, provided that clear indication is given that approval by the Quality Council is pending, and that no offers of admission will be made until the program has been approved by the Quality Council. Ministry approval may also be required.

5.10. Approved new programs

After a new program is submitted to the Quality Council, the University may seek Provincial funding for the program, which must begin within thirty-six months of the date of approval; otherwise, the approval will lapse. If program approval lapses, the program must begin the new program proposal process again.

The first cyclical review for any new program must be conducted no more than eight years after the date of the program’s initial enrolment.

Between eighteen and twenty-four months after onset of the program, the Chair will provide the Dean and Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate studies, with a brief update on progress in the program, addressing any concerns from the initial program review, and highlighting any
unanticipated changes in curriculum, resources, enrollment, funding mechanisms, or governance structure. If, after consultation with the Dean, the Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, deems it appropriate, an informal internal assessment of the program may be undertaken, including interviews with current faculty, students, and staff, to determine if a more complete, early cyclical review is warranted.

6. EXPEDITED APPROVALS OF NEW PROGRAMS

The Protocol for Expedited Approvals applies when one or more of the following applies:

- an institution requests endorsement of the Quality Council to declare a new Field or to revise Fields in a graduate program (note: there is no requirement to declare fields in either master’s or doctoral programs);
- there is a proposal for a new collaborative specialization;
- there are proposals for new for-credit graduate diplomas; or,
- there are major modifications to existing programs, and the University requests approval.

The Expedited Approvals process requires all the approvals listed in Section 5.7 and the submission to the Quality Council of a New Program Proposal of the proposed program change/new program and the rationale for it. It does not require that external reviewers be involved in the approval process and provides for a faster turn-around on decisions by the Quality Council.

6.1. Expedited Proposal

The Expedited Proposal will describe the new graduate field, collaborative specialization, or graduate diploma or the significant changes being proposed (including, as appropriate, reference to Program Learning Outcomes, Degree Level Expectations, faculty and resource implications), provide a brief account of the rationale for the changes, and address the evaluation criteria.

6.2. Institutional Identification of Major Modifications to Existing Programs

Existing programs can be expected to routinely undergo revisions with the aim of quality enhancement. This includes, for example, the introduction or deletion of courses, major exam structures, change in emphases, options, minors, or mode of delivery. The revisions must be submitted through the normal curriculum approval process outlined in Section 5.7 (excluding the University Planning Committee, unless there are significant resource implications). These revisions will be assessed during the course of the next cyclical review of the program.

There may be, however, situations where the changes to the program are of such significance that a more immediate review is desirable. This situation may occur, for
example, where:
- the program’s revisions meet the definition of a major modification, as defined in Section 4;
- the fundamental objectives of the program change; or,
- there are significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources.

In such cases, the Department, the Faculty, Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council may, if it deems it advisable after consultation with the relevant Dean(s) and Vice-Provost (Faculty) and/or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, initiate a program review and request that the Quality Council review the major modification proposal. Normally, such review will occur through an Expedited Approval Process.

7. CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

All academic programs are to be reviewed on an eight-year cycle. Combined programs do not require review if their constituting programs are reviewed separately. Emphases, Options and Minors do not require review. The list of programs that require review, and the schedule of such reviews, will be maintained by the Vice-Provost (Faculty) in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies.

Departments can choose to review undergraduate and graduate programs jointly or separately. If the reviews are done jointly, there can be additional subsections within the report to address different situations that apply to each program. Program reviews can also be done jointly with accreditation reviews, at the discretion of the Chair, in consultation with the Dean (see Section 7.5). Where programs seek to combine previously separate undergraduate and graduate reviews they shall adopt the timeline of the earliest scheduled program review.

The review consists of the following steps:

7.1. Self-study: Internal program perspective

The Chair is responsible, in collaboration with relevant groups and/or individuals, for preparing a self-study document that is broad-based, reflective, forward-looking and inclusive of critical analysis. It should identify any pertinent information deemed appropriate for inclusion. The self-study must address and document the consistency of the program’s learning outcomes with the University’s mission and Degree Level Expectations, and how its graduates achieve those outcomes.

The self-study should include criteria and quality indicators including:

7.1.1. Program Description and Overview

- Program is consistent with the University’s mission and academic plans.
- Program requirements and Program Learning Outcomes are clear, appropriate and
align with the Degree Level Expectations.

7.1.2. Admission requirements

- Admission requirements are appropriately aligned with the Program Learning Outcomes established for completion of the program.

7.1.3. Curriculum

- How the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study.
- Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs.
- How the mode(s) of delivery are appropriate and effective at meeting the Program Learning Outcomes.
- Ways in which the program addresses current institutional, faculty, or departmental priorities (e.g. experiential learning, diversity and inclusion, accessibility, community engagement, entrepreneurship, et cetera) and the current Strategic Mandate Agreement.

7.1.4. Teaching and assessment

- Methods for assessing student achievement of the defined Program Learning Outcomes and Degree Level Expectations are appropriate and effective.
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the means of assessment, especially in the students’ final year of the program, in clearly demonstrating achievement of the Program Learning Outcomes and the Degree Level Expectations.

7.1.5. Resources

- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit’s use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering and maintaining the quality of its program(s), in relation to the University’s priorities for and constraints on funding, space, and faculty allocation.

7.1.6. Quality indicators

- Information on the quality of the program under review. Standard quality indicators, outlined in the McMaster’s Self-Study Guidebook, are available to Chairs from the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, the Office of the Registrar, the School of Graduate Studies, or from the departments themselves. Chairs will be expected to provide context and commentary on the data. When possible and appropriate, Chairs will also refer to applicable professional standards.

Additional graduate program criteria:
- Evidence that students’ time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in
relation to the program’s defined length and program requirements.

- Quality and availability of graduate supervision.
- Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:
  - Faculty: funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student mentoring;
  - Students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards;
  - Program: evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience, and commitment to development of professional and transferable skills; evidence of sufficient and regular graduate level course offerings to ensure that students will be able to meet university requirements in terms of the minimum number of courses required, the level of courses required, and the timely completion of other required elements appropriate for the degree level (e.g., transfer exams, comprehensive exams).

7.1.7. Quality enhancement

- Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews;
- Initiatives that have been undertaken to enhance the teaching, learning and/or research environments thus, the quality of the program, and how these will be sustained.
- Areas identified through the conduct of the self-study as requiring improvement;
- Areas that hold promise for continued enhancement.

7.1.8. System of governance

- Evidence that a consultative and inclusive system of governance has been used on an ongoing basis to assess the program and implement changes as appropriate.

7.1.9. Academic Services

- Academic services that directly contribute to the academic quality of each program under review.

7.1.10. Self-Study Participation

- Participation of program faculty, staff, and students in the self-study and how their views were obtained and taken into account, and who contributed to the development and writing of the self-study.

7.1.11. External Participation

- The input of others deemed to be relevant and useful, such as graduates of the
program, representatives of industry, the professions, practical training programs, and employers may also be included.

It is the Chair’s responsibility to review and approve the self-study report to ensure that it meets the above criteria.

7.2. External evaluation: Review Team

The Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean (or the Dean’s designate), will select a team of reviewers to evaluate the program. The Review Team shall consist of at least one external reviewer for undergraduate programs and two external reviewers for either graduate programs or for concurrent reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs. The team will also include one internal reviewer selected by the Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean (or the Dean’s designate). Additional members may be added to the team if appropriate, such as when evaluating professional programs or interdisciplinary programs.

External members of the review team normally shall be individuals in the same discipline as the Program under review (or across disciplines for interdisciplinary programs) who are distinguished senior academics of broad experience, with an established commitment to higher education. Non-traditional programs may consider non-academics with relevant expertise and experience. They must have an impartial, arms-length relationship to the Program (as defined in Section 5.4). Wherever possible the review team shall represent broad institutional categories and/or geographic regions. They will be selected from a list of at least six suggested individuals compiled by the Program/Department under review and endorsed by the Dean. The list shall include, for each proposed external reviewer:
- name;
- rank and position;
- institution or company and current address, telephone and fax numbers, and e-mail address, and URL if available;
- professional (including administrative) experience or expertise relevant to the Program under review;
- details of any previous or current affiliation with the University, and any association with individual members of the Program under review (e.g., co-author, previous student/supervisor, close relationship); and,
- for graduate program or combined reviews, a description of research expertise, and a partial listing of recent scholarly publications.

The Self-Study, the Guidelines for Review Team, and other materials specific to the current review will be provided to all members of the Review Team no less than two weeks prior to their visit. If applicable, the results of the previous accreditation review also will be made available to the Review Team to provide them with the views of the relevant
professional association(s). The Guidelines for Review Team describes the review process and the roles and obligations of the Review Team, which include:

- to identify and comment on the program’s notably strong and creative attributes;
- to describe the program’s respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
- to recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take with existing resources and those that require external action;
- to recognize the University’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation; and,
- to respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

It is required that all reviewers visit at the same time, normally for two days. As appropriate, the Review Team shall meet with the following:

- Chair or Director;
- Full-time faculty members (in groups);
- Part-time faculty members (in groups);
- Program students (units should encourage a broad cross section of students to participate in a meeting with the review team);
- Departmental/Program support staff;
- Associate Dean;
- Dean;
- for graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies;
- for undergraduate programs, the Vice-Provost (Faculty); and,
- Provost and Vice-President (Academic), if available.

The Review Team will submit to the Vice-Provost (Faculty), or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, a joint report, including an Executive Summary, for the program(s) under review, normally within four weeks of the visit. The report will normally be written primarily by the external reviewer(s), with input from the internal reviewer. The Review Team’s report should address the substance of both the self-study report and the evaluation criteria set out in Section 7.1. The intent of these reports is to be formative and constructive. The reports are intended to provide counsel rather than prescriptive courses of action. The Vice-Provost (Faculty), or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will circulate the Review Team’s report to the appropriate Chairs and Deans.

Responses to the reviewers’ report from both the Chair and the Dean, or their delegates, should be prepared, as per the Program Response template, and attached to the reviewers’ report.

7.3. Institutional perspective and report
All program reviews, including the self-study, reviewer’s report, and responses from the chair and dean, will be submitted to McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee, a joint committee of Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. The Quality Assurance Committee will assess the review and will submit a Final Assessment Report to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council that:

- identifies significant strengths of the program;
- addresses the appropriateness of resources for the success of the program;
- identifies opportunities for program improvement and enhancement;
- identifies and prioritizes the recommendations;
- may include a confidential section (e.g., where personnel issues may be addressed);
- may include additional recommendations or comments to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). Recommendations could include, for example, requiring a detailed progress report that will describe progress towards addressing major concerns or scheduling an additional cyclical review sooner than specified by the normal 8-year cycle.

Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council will receive the Final Assessment Report from the Quality Assurance Committee and will consider whether it will provide its own recommendations or comments to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). These will be communicated to the Chair, the Dean and the Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, to the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies.

A report from the Quality Assurance Committee, along with any recommendations or comments, will be presented first to the University Planning Committee and then to Senate, which will consider whether they will make additional recommendations or comments to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). These will be communicated to the Chair, the Dean and the Vice-Provost (Faculty) or, in the case of graduate programs, to the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies.

Eighteen months after receiving the report from Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council, the Dean will meet with the Chair for an update on the program. The Dean will submit a progress report to the Quality Assurance Committee summarizing the status of any actions taken or being taken. The Quality Assurance Committee may, in some circumstances, choose to present progress reports to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council.

7.4. Reporting requirements

The Final Assessment Reports will be posted on the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) section of the University’s website and copies of this information will be provided to the Quality Council.

7.5. Use of accreditation and other external reviews in the Institutional Quality Assurance Process
Programs that periodically undergo accreditation reviews may request that the associated accreditation documentation serve in place of an IQAP cyclical review self study. The program chair with support from the Dean of the program will submit a request form and all required supporting documentation to McMaster’s Quality Assurance Committee. When requested by the Dean and permitted by the accreditation authorities, the site visit by the external reviewers may be performed at the same time or by the same people as the accreditation reviewers.

The Quality Assurance Committee, will review the request and decide if an accreditation review can be substituted in whole or in part for a cyclical review. The program will be notified in writing of the committee’s decision. A record of substitutions or additions, and the grounds on which they were made, will be eligible for audit by the Quality Council. The Quality Assurance Committee’s decision is only applicable for the cyclical review year related to the request. The remaining steps in the cyclical review will then take place. Programs must participate in all reporting related to the cyclical review. If desired by the program, a request for accreditation substitution must be submitted for every subsequent cyclical review.
APPENDIX A
McMASTER UNIVERSITY’S STATEMENT ON DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

A McMaster education should enable students to develop sets of life and learning skills that promote a continuing ability and desire to learn, and a set of technical and professional skills that permit a range of career choices. Degree level expectations elaborate the intellectual and creative development of students and the acquisition of relevant skills that are usually widely, yet implicitly, understood.

McMaster University has adopted the following Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) or Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLEs) that were developed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents and endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities in December 2005. These degree level expectations are to be viewed as a minimum threshold for all degree programs at McMaster.

UNDERGRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Baccalaureate/bachelor’s degree</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Baccalaureate/bachelor’s degree: honours</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Depth and breadth of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) General knowledge and understanding of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Broad understanding of some of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Ability to gather, review, evaluate and interpret information relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Developed ability to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) compare the merits of alternate...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge of methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Application of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to use a basic range of established techniques to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) analyze information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) propose solutions; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to communicate accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ability to use a range of established techniques to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) propose solutions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) solve a problem or create a new work; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Awareness of limits of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autonomy and professional capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Depth and breadth of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research and scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Level of application of knowledge | Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in the critical analysis of a new question or of a specific problem or issue in a new setting. | The capacity to:  
  
a) Undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and  
b) Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials. |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4. Professional capacity/autonomy    | a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:  
  
i) The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and  

ii) Decision-making in complex situations;  

b) The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development;  
c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and  
d) The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts. | a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations;  
b) The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current;  
c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and  
d) The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts. |
| 5. Level of communications skills    | The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly, orally and in writing, to a range of audiences. | The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively, orally and in writing, to a range of audiences. |
| 6. Awareness of limits of knowledge | Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines. | An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines. |
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1. INTRODUCTION
This document provides criteria and procedures for the evaluation, approval and monitoring by Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council of undergraduate and graduate certificate and undergraduate diploma programs. It provides a framework which will enable better quality control and unambiguous communication to students and prospective students regarding the nature of each credential and the academic value of certificates and diplomas.

The intention is to provide minimum academic criteria which must be met if programs are to be approved as McMaster certificates and diplomas. With the minima clearly set, program designers will be free to build creatively around them to provide programs appropriate to their constituencies. The academic criteria proposed are intended to maintain the high academic standards of McMaster and enable certificates and diplomas to continue their traditional functions of providing studies complementary to degree programs, professional preparation or upgrading, and bridging into degree programs.

These criteria and procedures are also designed to make it straightforward for McMaster to mount new, innovative certificate and diploma programs. The number of criteria has been kept to a minimum and the procedures have been streamlined in order to allow program developers to move quickly with initiatives while subjecting them to clear, rigorous academic scrutiny. These criteria and procedures are intended to engender speed, flexibility, quality and clarity.

McMaster's diploma and academic certificate programs are operated in accordance with normal academic regulations as outlined in the Undergraduate Calendar or Graduate Calendar (as applicable). For example, students are issued a student number, student records (including grades) are kept by the Office of the Registrar, classes are scheduled within sessional dates, and part-time student fees are charged. Further, university approved certificates and diplomas will be issued by the academic unit offering the program to the student upon completion of all academic requirements of a program.

2. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS
2.1 Credential
A credential is a body of academic work or collection of course work that stands on its own and for which a parchment is issued. McMaster credentials include certificates, diplomas, and degrees.

2.2 Academic Credit Course
A course of an academic calibre consistent with those offered in undergraduate or graduate degree programs at McMaster. The most common kind of academic credit course is that included in the curricula of undergraduate or graduate degree programs. These provide a benchmark against which other academic credit courses can be evaluated. (See Section 3)

2.3 McMaster Diplomas
2.3.1 Undergraduate Diploma
A McMaster Undergraduate Diploma is a program of study involving a significant body of academic work coherently organized around clear learning objectives. Undergraduate Diplomas (which include post-baccalaureate diplomas) may be focused primarily upon academic or professional development objectives, but all must include academic content equivalent to a minimum of 24 units of undergraduate-level course work. Undergraduate
Diplomas serve such functions as: study complementary to degree programs, professional preparation or upgrading, and bridging into undergraduate degree programs. The word Diploma must be included in the program name. (See Section 4)

2.3.2 Graduate Diploma
McMaster Graduate Diplomas are based on Graduate Degree Level Expectations (see Appendix 1 of the Quality Assurance Framework) and will prepare students for employment requiring sound judgment, personal responsibility and individual initiative, in complex and unpredictable professional environments. Graduate Diplomas must include academic content equivalent to a minimum of four graduate courses at McMaster. Graduate Diplomas are defined in this Policy; however, the review and approval process falls under the Policy on Academic Program Reviews. There are three types of Graduate Diplomas. (See Section 5)

2.3.2.1 Master's Level Diploma (Type 1)
Master's Level Type 1 Graduate Diploma programs require students to develop a conceptual understanding of fundamental aspects of the discipline. Some programs require students to demonstrate Master's-level analytical, interpretative, methodological and expository skills through course-specific applications, and some may also require students to demonstrate these skills in applied activities.

2.3.2.2 Master's and Doctoral Level Diploma (Type 2)
Master's Level Type 2 Graduate Diplomas are offered in conjunction with a Master's or doctoral degree and represent an additional, usually interdisciplinary, qualification. Programs require students to develop a conceptual understanding of fundamental aspects of the discipline(s) and appropriate levels of analytical, interpretative, methodological and expository skills through course-specific applications, and some may require students to demonstrate these skills in applied activities.

2.3.2.3 Master's and Doctoral Level Diploma (Type 3)
These stand-alone, direct-entry Graduate Diploma programs require students to develop a conceptual understanding of fundamental aspects of the discipline. Programs require students to demonstrate the appropriate level of analytical, interpretative, methodological and expository skills through course-specific applications, and some may require students to demonstrate these skills in applied activities.

2.4 McMaster Academic Certificates
2.4.1 Undergraduate Certificate
A McMaster Undergraduate Certificate is a program of study coherently organized around clear learning objectives and having academic content equivalent to a minimum of half a year of full-time undergraduate study at McMaster (15 units). There are two types of McMaster Undergraduate Academic Certificates.

2.4.1.1 McMaster Stand-Alone Undergraduate Certificate
Stand-Alone Undergraduate Certificates (which include Post-Baccalaureate Certificates) may be focused primarily upon academic or professional development...
objectives, but all must meet the minimum criterion of academic content. Stand-
Alone Certificates serve such functions as bridging into undergraduate degree
programs, professional preparation or upgrading, and study complementary to
degree studies. (See Section 6)

2.4.1.2 McMaster Concurrent Undergraduate Certificate
A Concurrent Undergraduate Certificate shall be focused primarily upon academic
development objectives and must meet the minimum criterion of academic content.
This type of Certificate sets out a plan of study complementary to degree studies
and will provide added value to degree studies. (See Section 7)

2.4.2 Graduate Certificate
A McMaster Graduate Certificate is a program of study coherently organized around clear
learning objectives and having academic content equivalent to a minimum of three
graduate courses at McMaster. (See Section 8)

2.5 Non-Academic Programs
These are distinct and differentiated from Certificates and Diplomas. The term “Certificate” shall only
be used by McMaster courses and programs within the guidelines of this Policy. There are two types
of non-academic programs.

2.5.1 Certificate of Completion
Certificates of Completion may be provided for non-academic programs that include a
minimum of 30 contact hours and evaluation of the student’s learning. Certificates of
Completion may include academic content if the course or courses have been approved
for credit toward another credential. (See Section 9)

2.5.2 Certificate of Attendance
Certificates of Attendance may be provided for programs that have no academic content
and for which there is no evaluation of learning. (See Section 10)

2.6 Non-McMaster Certificates
McMaster collaborates with other organisations or institutions to offer programming toward a
credential that is issued by that other entity. Such externally issued credentials are outside the
scope of this Policy.

3. ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR DIPLOMA AND CERTIFICATE COURSES
Diploma and certificate programs include courses which are determined by Undergraduate Council or
Graduate Council, as appropriate, to be of an academic calibre consistent with courses offered in
undergraduate or graduate degree programs. While credit for courses in degree programs is normally
given in blocks of three or six units, credit can be at the one, two, three or any other unit level. This
provides a flexibility appropriate for programs which often have professional development as well as
academic goals.

To receive approval as an academic credit course, a course which is not part of a degree program must:
(i) Be at a level of intellectual rigour comparable to that found in undergraduate or graduate degree program courses in the same or similar fields. Academic credit courses are vetted by the Faculty offering the course or that is most relevant to the content of the course.
(ii) Evaluate student performance by the methods normally used in degree courses such as tests, essays, reports and other assignments.
(iii) Include a systematic student evaluation of the course using such methods as multiple-choice questionnaires, narrative responses and/or interviews.

3.1 Transfer between Credentials

Academic credits can be applied to another credential. Examples include, but are not limited to, transfer of credit from a certificate to a degree or from a degree to a diploma. Normally credits can be applied to a maximum of two credentials.

Up to 100% of the academic credit courses completed toward undergraduate diploma and certificate programs may be used for credit toward another credential at the discretion of and in accordance with the normal academic rules specified by academic unit offering the subsequent credential.

In some specific cases, courses taken for credit as part of a graduate diploma program may be considered for credit toward a subsequent Master’s degree program.

3.2 Academic Approval Criteria

When approving a program as a McMaster Diploma or Certificate, Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council (as appropriate) must ensure that the program proposal appropriately fulfills all of the following criteria. It has:

(i) a well-defined program objective(s);
(ii) well-defined program learning outcomes;
(iii) curriculum to meet the program learning outcomes; and
(iv) admission requirements (as applicable).

Additional criteria for program proposals are set out in Section 11.

4. McMaster Undergraduate Diploma

4.1 Academic Program Requirements

All McMaster Undergraduate Diplomas must include academic credit courses equivalent to at least 24 units of undergraduate study at McMaster. In addition to their academic content, Undergraduate Diploma programs may include courses and other forms of learning which are not suitable for academic credit. The maximum overlap with degree courses is 70% of the requirement for the diploma. For example, the maximum overlap for a diploma program consisting of 24 units is 15 units.

4.2 Admission Requirements

There are two sets of admission requirements:

a. General Undergraduate Diploma Admission Requirements. Students who wish to enter a McMaster Undergraduate Diploma program must have at least one of: (i) an Ontario Secondary School Diploma or equivalent; (ii) be a mature student as defined in the Undergraduate Calendar of McMaster University; (iii) be deemed an exceptional case by the admissions committee for
the Undergraduate Diploma. These requirements ensure that students have the basic capabilities necessary to deal with the academic credit courses in Undergraduate Diploma programs and take into account the bridging function that some diplomas perform.

b. **Diploma Specific Admission Requirements.** Any particular diploma program may have other admission requirements which are appropriate to its learning objectives. These requirements may include prerequisite courses or degrees specific to the particular diploma.

5. **McMASTER GRADUATE DIPLOMA**
   The minimum requirements for Graduate Diplomas are set out below. For submission and approval requirements, please see the *Policy on Academic Program Reviews*.

5.1 Academic Course Requirements
   All McMaster Graduate Diplomas must include academic credit courses equivalent to at least four courses at the graduate level at McMaster.

5.2 Admission Requirements
   There are two sets of admission requirements:
   a. **General Graduate Diploma Admission Requirements.** Students who wish to enter a McMaster Graduate Diploma program must meet the admission requirements of a Master's level program. These requirements ensure that students have the basic capabilities necessary to deal with the academic credit courses in Graduate Diploma programs.

   b. **Diploma Specific Admission Requirements.** Any particular Graduate Diploma program may have other admission requirements which are appropriate to its learning objectives. These requirements may include prerequisite courses or degrees specific to the particular diploma.

6. **McMASTER STAND-ALONE UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE**
   6.1 Academic Course Requirements
   All McMaster Stand-Alone Undergraduate Certificates must include academic credit courses equivalent to at least 15 units (half a year) of undergraduate study at McMaster. In addition to their academic content, Stand-Alone Certificate programs may include courses and other forms of learning which are not suitable for academic credit. The maximum overlap with degree courses is 60% of the requirement for the Stand-Alone Certificate. For example, the maximum overlap for a Stand-Alone Certificate program consisting of 15 units is 9 units.

6.2 Admission Requirements
   There are two sets of admission requirements:
   a. **General Undergraduate Stand-Alone Certificate Admission Requirements.** Students who wish to enter a McMaster Undergraduate Stand-Alone Certificate program must have at least one of: (i) an Ontario Secondary School Diploma or equivalent; (ii) be a mature student as defined in the *Undergraduate Calendar* of McMaster University; (iii) be deemed an exceptional case by the admissions committee for the certificate. These requirements ensure that students have the basic capabilities necessary to deal with the academic credit courses in Undergraduate Certificate programs and take into account the bridging function that some certificates perform.
b. **Certificate Specific Admission Requirements.** Any particular Undergraduate Stand-Alone Certificate program may have other admission requirements which are appropriate to its learning objectives. These requirements may include prerequisite courses or degrees specific to the particular certificate.

7. **McMASTER CONCURRENT UNDERGRADUATE CERTIFICATE**

7.1 Academic Course Requirements

All McMaster Concurrent Undergraduate Certificates must include academic credit courses equivalent to at least 15 units (half a year) of undergraduate study at McMaster. In addition to their academic content, concurrent certificate programs may include courses and other forms of learning which are not suitable for academic credit. Up to 100% of the requirement for the concurrent certificate may overlap with degree courses.

7.2 Admission Requirements

Students who wish to enter a McMaster Concurrent Undergraduate Certificate program must be enrolled in an undergraduate degree program at McMaster University. Any particular concurrent Undergraduate Certificate program may have other admission requirements, such as prerequisite courses, which are appropriate to its learning objectives.

8. **McMASTER GRADUATE CERTIFICATE**

8.1 Academic Course Requirements

All McMaster Graduate Certificates must include academic credit courses equivalent to at least three courses at the graduate level at McMaster. Up to 100% of the certificate course requirements may overlap with graduate degree courses. (Courses may or may not be unique to the certificate.)

8.2 Admission Requirements

There are two sets of admission requirements:

a. **General Graduate Certificate Admission Requirements.** Students who wish to enter a McMaster Graduate Certificate program must meet the admission requirements of a Master’s level program. These requirements ensure that students have the basic capabilities necessary to deal with the academic credit courses in Graduate Certificate programs.

b. **Certificate Specific Admission Requirements.** Any particular Graduate Certificate program may have other admission requirements which are appropriate to its learning objectives. These requirements may include prerequisites courses or degrees specific to the particular certificate.

9. **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION**

A Certificate of Completion issued by McMaster University acknowledges that an individual has completed a course or program at McMaster that does not have the status of an academic program. A Certificate of Completion can be issued when a course or program includes a minimum of 30 contact hours and there is evaluation of the student’s learning. The student must demonstrate competency in the material as determined by evaluation methods which may include an exam, paper, project, presentation, etc. This will normally be recorded as a pass or fail and records will be kept by the unit offering the program.
This category will be suitable for various types of life-long learning courses and programs. The Certificate of Completion is not an academic certificate and as such shall not be categorized as undergraduate or graduate level.

9.1 Admission Requirements
Normally, there are no specific admission requirements.

9.2 Credit Toward Another Credential
Normally, there is no credit granted towards degree program studies, unless the course or courses making up the Certificate of Completion have been approved for credit as part of degree, diploma or certificate.

A series of Certificates of Attendance cannot make up the components of a Certificate of Completion.

9.3 Approval Criteria
Although administrative and academic units at McMaster do not need permission from Undergraduate Council to issue Certificates of Completion, they are required, at minimum, to report new Certificates of Completion and revisions to existing Certificate of Completion programs to Undergraduate Council on an annual basis.

However, if new fees are being charged to students, the Faculty proposing the Certificate of Completion program must follow the process for approval of academic certificates and diplomas, as set out in Section 11 below.

It is expected that Certificates of Completion will be granted only when the activities are of benefit and/or interest to the community and are consistent with the objectives of McMaster University.

9.4 Guidelines and Limitations
Clarity and the protection of the McMaster certificate brand are paramount. Thus, any courses or programs that issue a Certificate of Completion shall not use the term Certificate in their title, unless it is part of the term “Certificate of Completion.” Exceptions may occur when a program is provided as contract training to a company (i.e., not a public program) and the program name is determined jointly with the client.

The course description should include the credit or non-credit status of the course, that there will be student evaluation, how the student shall be graded (i.e., pass/fail or a letter grade), and that a “Certificate of Completion” will be awarded for successful completion.

10. CERTIFICATE OF ATTENDANCE
A Certificate of Attendance issued by McMaster University acknowledges that an individual has participated in a set of activities at McMaster that does not have the status of an academic program. Such activities are designed to meet the interests and objectives of participants who may want to acquire general knowledge or training for general interest purposes, but who neither require nor seek any form of professional or academic recognition, and as such a Certificate of Attendance shall not be categorized
as undergraduate or graduate level. This category will be suitable for various types of life-long learning courses and programs.

10.1 Admission Requirements
Normal, there are no specific admission requirements.

10.2 Credit Toward Degree or Other Program Studies
There is no credit granted toward additional credentials.

10.3 Approval Criteria
Although administrative and academic units at McMaster do not need permission from Undergraduate Council to issue Certificates of Attendance, they are required, at minimum, to report new Certificates of Attendance and revisions to existing Certificate of Attendance programs to Undergraduate Council on an annual basis.

However, if new fees are being charged to students, the Faculty proposing Certificate of Attendance program must follow the process for approval of academic certificates and diplomas, as set out in Section 11 below.

It is expected that Certificates of Attendance will be granted only when the activities are of benefit and/or interest to the community and are consistent with the objectives of McMaster University.

10.4 Guidelines and Limitations
Clarity and the protection of the McMaster certificate brand are paramount. Thus, any courses or programs that issue a Certificate of Attendance shall not use the term Certificate in their title, unless it is part of the term "Certificate of Attendance."

11. PROCEDURES FOR THE APPROVAL OF CERTIFICATE AND DIPLOMA PROGRAMS AND ACADEMIC CREDIT COURSES
The Faculty or Centre for Continuing Education will present proposal for undergraduate diplomas, undergraduate academic certificates and undergraduate-level academic credit courses to the Undergraduate Council Certificates and Diplomas Committee. Such proposals do not need to be approved by the Undergraduate Council Curriculum Committee. Once approved, the Certificates and Diplomas Committee will then make a recommendation to Undergraduate Council. In the case of graduate certificates and graduate-level academic courses, the Faculty will present proposals to Graduate Council. Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council in turn will make its recommendations to Senate. The academic unit is responsible for providing a complete proposal. In addition to the program proposal, the complete submission must include a statement of academic merit from the office of the Dean, as described below.

Graduate Diplomas are approved through the process outlined in the Policy on Academic Program Reviews.

The approval and reporting processes for Certificates of Completion and Certificates of Attendance are outlined in Sections 9 and 10 above.
11.1 Statement of Academic Merit

The statement of academic merit is normally an attestation from a Faculty, at McMaster University, confirming that the Faculty has vetted the proposed program and found that it meets the criteria for the designation proposed. That statement will also include a general description of how the academic merit of the proposal was evaluated, including such things as which academic departments were involved and the procedures used.

Proposals for new academic credit courses, which are intended to be part of a certificate or diploma program, and which are not to be part of any degree program, will include the following:

(i) a paragraph-long course description along with a statement of the number of units of academic credit provided by the course.

(ii) a statement of how the course contributes to the learning objectives of the program(s) of which it will be a part.

11.2 Financial Viability and Resource Implications

The financial viability of a certificate and diploma program is evaluated through other mechanisms within the University. All programs should follow these approval processes and ensure they are complying with financial policies, which may include returning a portion of revenue to the University.

Diploma and academic certificate programs, as well as non-academic certificates for which fees are charged, must submit fee proposals to the University Student Fees Committee for approval. Normally, this approval should be sought prior to submission of the academic proposal to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council. Please note that fees are approved by the Board of Governors for the subsequent academic year, so approvals should be sought in sufficient time to launch programs as planned.

Following approval by Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council (as applicable), the completed Financial Viability and Resource Implications template for new certificate and diploma programs must be reviewed by the Executive Director Finance and Administration (Academic) and Vice-Provost (Faculty) or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies prior to submission of the business case to the University Planning Committee, as per the Academic Revenue Activity Policy for Revenue Generating Certificate and Diploma Programs Administered through a Faculty.

It is expected that additional fees will not be charged for Undergraduate Concurrent Certificates and Graduate Certificates and that such programs will not generate additional revenue for the University, and therefore do not normally require approval from the University Planning Committee.
APPENDIX A: SAMPLE PARCHMENTS

The Chancellor and Senate of
McMaster University
award
Firstname Lastname
the graduate diploma in
Advanced Neonatal Nursing

Dated this 20th day of November, 2015 at Hamilton, Ontario.

McMaster University
Certificate of Completion

is hereby presented to
Firstname Lastname
to recognize the successful completion of the
Project Management Program
delivered by <Faculty/Dept>
<enter optional information re: hours>
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SECTION I: PREAMBLE

McMaster University (the University) seeks to maximize aid and award opportunities for students while ensuring equity in competition and consistency in administration. In doing so, the University operates within the University Aid and Awards Policy to ensure its responsibilities to students and donors are met.

SECTION II: SCOPE

The University Aid and Awards Policy provides the framework through which all University-established aid and award programs must be approved and administered. Established aid and award programs include academic awards, community contribution awards, academic grants, bursaries and work programs.

This Policy does not cover aid and awards established outside the University including, but not limited to, those offered by federal and provincial governments, the Tri-Council Agencies and private organizations. This Policy does not cover departmental financial awards. For further information about the administration of awards outside this policy, please contact the external organization or the administering department.

This Policy is reviewed every three years by the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee, Undergraduate Council, and Graduate Council.

SECTION III: GLOSSARY

For the purposes of this Policy:

**Aid Program**
- Funding allocated to students on the basis of demonstrated financial need.

**Academic Award**
- An award program that recognizes a student for academic excellence and, in some cases, other forms of earned merit. Academic awards are assigned to categories such as Entrance, In-Course, Graduand, Travel and Exchange.

**Academic Grants**
- A hybrid aid and award program for students that recognizes academic excellence and, in some cases, other forms of earned merit, and demonstrated financial need.
  - In-course academic grants are awarded based on academic achievement in degree work completed at the University.
  - Entrance academic grants are awarded to students entering Level 1, based on the academic achievement in the studies which qualified them for admission to their program.

**Award Program**
- Funding allocated to students on the basis of academic excellence or earned merit.

**Bursary**
- An aid program providing funding to students in the form of a non-repayable grant. A bursary may include a minimum expectation of academic achievement or other miscellaneous criteria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Contribution Awards</td>
<td>Community contribution awards are non-monetary, non-academic awards, allocated on the basis of demonstrated qualities of leadership or innovative skills, service to the University or community at large, or outstanding athletic or artistic participation. Recipients of community contribution awards receive letters of recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Financial Awards</td>
<td>Departmental financial awards support students in a manner consistent with the goals of the University, but do not meet all of the approved regulations through which University-established aid and award programs are administered (e.g. assessment of financial need or merit). Departmental financial awards are administered by designated representatives at the University (e.g. Athletics and Recreation) that have established their own processes for identifying recipients. Financial awards do not have “University” or “McMaster University” in the name of the award and contain words such as “Faculty of xxx Financial Award” or “Department of xxx Financial Award” or “Athletic Financial Award”. Departmental financial awards are not Senate-approved awards and thus are not included on University transcripts, in University Calendars or recognized at University Convocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>The financial resources supporting aid and award programs. Funds may be directed from operating, research and/or donor gifts (trust funds) for awards, academic grants, bursaries and work programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Terms</td>
<td>The criteria, typically specified by a donor, that a student must meet in order to receive the proceeds of a fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Level is used to describe a student's progression through a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes</td>
<td>Academic awards, with a monetary value of $100 or less, and those with no disbursed monetary value (e.g. books, medals, letters of recognition, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>The Office of the Registrar, Student Financial Aid &amp; Scholarships in reference to the Undergraduate Aid and Award Programs, and the School of Graduate Studies in reference to Graduate Aid and Award Programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>An individual enrolled in a course or program of study approved by the Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Calendars</td>
<td>The current versions of the Undergraduate Calendar and Graduate Calendar. See <a href="http://academiccalendars.romcmaster.ca">http://academiccalendars.romcmaster.ca</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programs</td>
<td>An aid program providing on-campus employment opportunities for students. Part-time opportunities are available during the fall and winter terms, while both part-time and full-time opportunities are available during the summer term. Students earn at least minimum wage. Work programs provide partial reimbursement of an approved student's salary to employers who hired students into approved work program positions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV: PURPOSE
This Policy provides guidance and consistency for members of the University community in the provision of aid and award programs including:
(a) principles that govern aid and award programs,
(b) establishing minimum eligibility requirements, and
(c) establishing and amending fund terms.

SECTION V: PRINCIPLES
The University offers aid programs to assist students who demonstrate the greatest financial need. Need-based aid may be delivered in the form of bursaries and/or work programs.

The University offers award programs to encourage and recognize the achievement of entering, enrolled, and graduating students. University award programs include:
(a) Academic awards which recognize high levels of scholarship, and in some cases other forms of earned merit, in the form of awards and prizes;
(b) Academic grants which recognize high academic achievement and demonstrated financial need; and
(c) Community contribution awards, which recognize non-academic achievement, such as service to the University or community at large.

The University administers aid and award programs according to Canadian law, trust law and the Ontario Human Rights Commission Policy on Scholarships and Awards.

Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, on behalf of the Senate, approve the granting of aid and awards, as recommended by the Registrar, and, in the case of School of Medicine administered aid and awards, the Program Manager of the Undergraduate Medical Program.

To ensure a fair and wide allocation of aid and awards, the Registrar:
(a) Maintains, through an annual review process, the current University Calendars as the primary source of aid and award program information.
(b) Updates the General Regulations of aid and award programs in the University Calendars to confirm the availability of aid and award programs, to define all aid and award program eligibility criteria, and to identify any restrictions on the number and value of awards that a student may receive.
(c) Restricts the allocation of aid and awards, to remain compliant with external regulating bodies (e.g. Tri-Council Agencies).
(d) Restricts second baccalaureate Undergraduate degree students from receiving any academic award or academic grant, unless the terms of a particular donor award specify eligibility and the student has not received the award previously.
(e) Restricts the allocation of aid and awards according to the fund terms imposed by a donor (e.g. higher academic average requirement).
(f) May choose not to grant aid or awards in the absence of a suitable candidate; may choose to limit the number of recipients selected where funding is limited; may choose to limit the number of recipients selected where too few suitable candidates exist; and/or may choose to generate applicant pools for awards by application, where complete applications have not been received.

(g) May revise the terms and stated value and/or suspend the granting of aid and award funds (e.g., donor funds).

(h) Will make aid and award program information widely available to students through the University Calendars, websites and other means, as appropriate.

(i) Will not violate other University approved by-laws and policies (e.g., Senate By-Laws; Operational Policy and Procedures for Trust and Endowed Fund Management; Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act; Field Trips, Student Placements and Research Activity Planning and Approval Program, etc.).

SECTION VI: ELIGIBILITY FOR AID AND AWARD PROGRAMS

This Policy identifies the minimum eligibility requirements for student aid and award programs:

(a) To receive the monetary value of aid and awards, students must be enrolled at the University.

(b) Upon request of the student, and with the express permission of the Registrar, aid and awards may be deferred up to one academic year, unless otherwise specified in the General Regulations for aid and award programs or in the specific fund terms in the University Calendars.

(c) A student who withdraws, is on approved leave, changes academic load from full to part-time, reduces course load or units, has approved to graduate status or otherwise alters their program of study may be required to forfeit all or part of their funding, per the General Regulations of the aid and award programs in the University Calendars. The decision to rescind or reduce funding will be made by the Registrar and will consider the General Regulations of the aid and award programs, the specific terms of the aid/award funding, the circumstances leading to the student’s decision (e.g. compassionate grounds), the educational costs already incurred and other relevant information.

(d) If the University concludes, based on reasonable grounds, that an aid or award applicant or recipient has falsified or withheld information as part of an application or misrepresented oneself or achieved academic results through dishonest means (see the Academic Integrity Policy), the student may have their application removed from consideration and/or be required to forfeit all or part of their funding and/or be restricted from receiving further funding by the Registrar.

(e) Where selection of an aid or award recipient requires judgment, faculty representatives, and/or department representatives, a Faculty Selection Committee and/or a University-wide Selection Committee may be asked to rank and/or recommend eligible students. The Registrar and, in the case of School of Medicine administered funds, the Program Manager of the Undergraduate Medical Program, will review the returned rankings/recommendations and make the final funding decision.

(f) Allocation of aid is completed according to the General Regulations of the aid program in the University Calendars and is dependent on demonstrated financial need.

(g) Financial need must be determined on the basis of one or more of the following:
   - Canadian federal and/or provincial government student aid applications (e.g. OSAP),
   - completion of a standard University Need Profile,
student discussions with designated staff on campus (e.g. Student Loans Officer, Indigenous Student Counsellor, etc.) who confirm the need for emergency or special consideration funding.

(h) In determining need, and the allocation of University administered funds, the Registrar must also comply with the policies, procedures and guidelines provided by the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development (MAESD). This includes, but is not limited to, the Ministry's Student Access Guarantee, which mandates the institutional aid obligation (payment amount and deadline date) for a student.

(i) Allocation of awards is completed according to the General Regulations of the award program in the University Calendars.

(j) All awards must be granted on the basis of one or more of the following:

- Overall academic performance;
- Academic performance in a particular program, course, project or thesis using one or more of the following criteria including, but not limited to, work completed (e.g. essay, project, thesis, placement, research, research potential, etc.), grades, averages or standing;
- Achievement in a skill related to academic studies;
- Non-academic achievement(s) and/or the display of qualities deemed worthy of consideration;
- Demonstrated financial need in the case of academic grants (see g above).

(k) All awards have a minimum academic requirement. The minimums are defined in the General Regulations of the award program in the University Calendars. Donor funds may have additional academic requirements noted in the University Calendars and/or fund documentation.

SECTION VII: APPEAL PROCEDURES
The University has a responsibility to provide fair and equitable procedures for student appeals relating to aid and award programs. These appeal procedures are outlined in the General Regulations in the University Calendars.

SECTION VIII: PRIVACY CONSIDERATIONS
Applications for aid and awards, supporting documentation (e.g. transcripts, letters of reference, income tax notices of assessment, student loan entitlements, etc.) and responses to applications shall be held by the Registrar and, in the case of School of Medicine administered aid and awards, the Program Manager of the Undergraduate Medical Program in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

That Act and McMaster University's Notice of Collection statement shall govern the information provided to donors and others concerning award recipients, including publications such as convocation programs and award booklets.

SECTION IX: REPORTING REQUIREMENTS
Mandatory annual reporting to the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, include identification of award recipients, aid and award performance summaries and identification of participating committee members.
SECTION X: ESTABLISHING FUNDS TO SUPPORT AID AND AWARD PROGRAMS

When establishing funds, to support aid and award programs, the Registrar:

(a) Ensures that the fund terms benefit students and are written with a minimum of limiting criteria.

(b) Seeks approval of the fund terms through the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee and Undergraduate Council, or the Graduate Council.

(c) Ensures all necessary approvals are in place prior to publicizing the fund terms, making application forms available, receiving applications, selecting recipients and/or disbursing funds.

(d) Determines the manner in which recipients will be selected, for example, mathematically on the basis of calculated need or average, or judgmentally, on the basis of an application or nomination.

(e) Determines whether an application is needed to support the evaluation of non-academic criteria, such as community involvement.

(f) Where an application is required, determines the content, deadlines, and supporting documentation requirements to support the evaluation and selection process (e.g. reference letters, curriculum vitae, University transcript, statement of interest, essay, etc.).

(g) Establishes University-wide Selection Committees to rank and/or recommend students for funding where use of judgment is required. Additionally, the Registrar will provide a list of University-wide Selection Committees and participating members to the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee and Undergraduate Council on an annual basis.

(h) Oversees the University-wide Selection Committees ensuring a minimum of three members, including at least one faculty member, are involved in the funding recommendations. If the funding is open to students from more than one career (i.e. students enrolled in Graduate, Medicine, Undergraduate degrees), the Registrar ensures that the committee has representation from each area (i.e. Graduate, Medicine and Undergraduate).

(i) Establishes faculty and department contacts where faculty- or department-specific award adjudication is required.

(j) Protects the University’s academic integrity and autonomy as it relates to funding decisions. In no case shall a donor and/or their representatives select, vote or have a veto over the recipients of funding. The final choice of recipients rests solely in hands of McMaster University.

(k) Requires a minimum donor contribution to support aid and awards. Currently:

- The minimum value to establish an endowed fund that supports University aid and awards is $20,000. This commitment, at the current expenditure policy rate of 4%, generates $800 annually.
- The minimum value to establish a fund that is not endowed that will support University aid and awards is $3000 (a minimum commitment of $1000 per year for three years).
- The minimum value to establish a fund that is not endowed that will support University aid and awards by application is $7500 (a minimum commitment of $2500 per year for three years). The minimum value to establish an endowed fund that will support university aid and awards by application is $62,500. This commitment, at the current expenditure rate of 4%, generates $2500 annually.
*These minimums will be reviewed from time to time by the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council and adjusted appropriately.*

(l) Undertakes to abide by the terms attached to trust funds received through bequests and gifts, provided that such terms are consistent with this Policy. See also the *Operational Policy and Procedures for Trust and Endowed Fund Management*.

(m) Includes only Senate approved awards (i.e. approved through the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee and Undergraduate Council and/or Graduate Council) on University transcripts.

(n) Includes only Senate approved awards in the University Calendars.

(o) Includes only Senate approved graduand awards in University Convocation publications, and of these, recognizes only the top University and Faculty awards, at University Convocations.

(p) Considers the potential for emerging gift types that do not meet current University-established aid and award program policy. University Advancement may also recommend to the Registrar, the Undergraduate Awards Committee, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council that new aid and award programs and/or policies, be established to meet the requirements of emerging gift types.

**SECTION XI: GUIDELINES FOR WRITING FUND TERMS**

When writing fund terms to support new aid and awards, the following guidelines apply (see Appendix A for further information):

**Name**
The name could be representative of the donor and the aid or award program (e.g. The McMaster Alumni Association Bursary).

**Descriptive Sentence 1**
The first sentence typically identifies the year in which the award was established, the donor name(s), degree awarded, class year (e.g. Class of '50 (for 1950) and Class of 2020), or anonymous request, and the reason for its establishment.

**Descriptive Sentence 2**
The second sentence identifies the specific criteria (need-based, academic and/or other form of earned merit) that must be met by the student for whom the funding is intended. Note: the fund terms should be as broad as possible to ensure administrative sustainability and disbursement of funding as intended.

**Preference Statement**
The third sentence may confirm a donor’s preference (if applicable). “Preference will be given to ...” confirms that attempts will be made to identify a student meeting the donor preference after all conditions specified in the descriptive sentences have been met. For award purposes, this usually means that the award is judgmental in nature. For aid purposes, it may mean that a student must self-identify (e.g. “I am a sole support parent”), to be allocated particular funding. Preference statements are treated as self-declarations and are not necessarily verified by the Registrar. In the case of bursaries, preference statements typically affect the source of a student’s bursary funding, not the amount.
Note: the preference statement should be as broad as possible to ensure administrative sustainability and disbursement of funding as intended.

Award Value
An initial award value is typically specified for awards and academic grants. The value may be specified as total dollars and duration. Award values may also be non-monetary, as is the case for prizes (e.g. books, medals, etc.) or community contribution awards (e.g. letters of recognition).

Number of Recipients
It is preferable that the number of intended recipients not be specified, to allow the Registrar to set the number based on available funding.

It is also preferable that bursary values not be specified, to allow the Registrar to set bursary values annually, in accordance with the General Regulations of the bursary program.

SECTION XII: AMENDING TERMS OF ESTABLISHED FUNDS
The terms of established funds, supporting aid and awards, represent a formal agreement, whether funded through an operating or research account or donor trust fund. When a donor establishes aid or award funding it takes the form of a trust fund administered by McMaster as trustee. Trust funds hold gifts (donations and bequests) that have been designated according to terms and conditions agreed upon by a donor and the University. Trust funds may only be altered in accordance with their original purpose, and generally may only be altered if the original purpose is impossible or impracticable to administer. Superficial changes (such as changes to a name or value of an award) are allowed.

Amendment to terms may, however, become necessary due to changes such as cancellations of courses or programs which have been named in the terms, or when there are no longer eligible students. The University may propose to amend the terms to carry out the nearest possible original intent of the donor.

When aid and awards are no longer available (e.g. operating or research funding no longer exists or a trust fund has been closed) they need to be discontinued and removed from publications such as the University Calendars.

Changes to aid and award fund names and terms, as well as discontinuation of aid and awards funding must be approved through the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee and Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council.

Changes to aid and award values are managed by the Registrar based on available funding and the Operational Policy and Procedures for Trust and Endowed Fund Management and do not require Undergraduate Council Awards Committee and Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council approval. Changes to aid and award values are reported to the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council for information.
SECTION XIII: POLICY AMENDMENTS AND EXCEPTIONS

The University Aid and Awards Policy is reviewed every three years by the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee and Graduate Council. Recommended amendments must be approved by the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee, Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, and Senate prior to implementation.

The University may amend, from time to time, the general requirements to be met by all recipients of University aid and award programs. This may include, but is not limited to, the attainment of some overall level of scholarships, independent of the terms of an individual award. See Senate By-Laws (Article XI, 164, (f) and (g)).

The University may amend this Policy, as recommended, from time to time, by the Registrar to the Undergraduate Council Awards Committee, Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, and Senate.
APPENDIX A: COMMONLY USED PHRASES IN FUND TERMS

i. "A student who has completed Level x" Example: "A student who has completed Level 1" refers to a student who is enrolled above Level 1, while "A student who has completed Level 2" refers to a student who is enrolled above Level 2. Note: This phrase should not be used where level is not a factor in determining the aid or award recipient.

ii. "A graduating student" or "student graduating" refers to a student who is in their graduating year and will be assessed for an award at the completion of their graduating term. Example - "... to be awarded to a student graduating from an Engineering and Management program."

iii. "A student in a Sociology program..." allows students in all B.A., Honours and Combined Honours Sociology programs to be considered. This open language is preferred.

iv. "A student currently enrolled in a graduate program in Chemistry..." allows graduate students enrolled in programs offered by the Department of Chemistry to be considered. This includes both Master's and Ph.D. students.

v. "A student in an Honours program in Sociology..." allows students in both a single Honours program and Combined Honours programs in Sociology to be considered.

vi. "A student in Level 3 of the Honours Sociology program..." allows a student in Level 3 of the specified Honours program and will not include Combined Honours programs. This is typically as narrow as terms should be written. Note: The inclusion in the terms of a program description, rather than a specific program name or course number, is strongly encouraged to avoid a future problems where programs and/or courses are no longer offered.

vii. "A student registered in the English Ph.D. program..." allows only students enrolled in the specified Ph.D. program to be considered.

viii. "To be awarded to a graduate student in the Faculty of Health Sciences. Preference to be given to a graduate student pursuing research in preventative medicine..." allows Master's and Ph.D. students in the Faculty of Health Sciences, who are pursuing research in preventative medicine, to be considered for the award. If the administrator is unable to first identify an eligible student pursuing research in preventative medicine, the award may then be granted to eligible graduate students enrolled in Master's or Ph.D. programs in the Faculty of Health Sciences.

ix. "Most notable" or "high standing" or "excellence in" or "outstanding academic achievement" or "on the basis of scholarship" does not mean "highest mathematical standing" and must be used in conjunction with "in the judgment of ...".

x. "In the judgment of ..." means that judgment will be used to select a student who has fulfilled the minimum aid or award program requirements and other criteria as noted in the fund terms. Selection by committee may be required.

xi. "Penultimate" means the second to last level of a program. Example: "To be awarded to the student who has completed the penultimate year at the most recent spring review, and who ranks highest in scholarship, leadership and influence."
# Centre for Continuing Education
## Program Approval

### A. Department & Program Information (Complete all fields):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Designation:</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name:</td>
<td>Business of Golf and Resort Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Representative:</td>
<td>Daniel Piedra, Assistant Director, Centre for Continuing Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Date/Term of Program Start:</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Submission:</td>
<td>March 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Faculty Statement (Required):

Emad Mohammed, Associate Dean, DeGroote School of Business

### C. Academic Merit (Complete all fields; write “not applicable” as needed):

#### i. Program Overview:
The Business of Golf and Resort Management program will consist of 10 3-unit courses. Program content is based on common areas of knowledge and skills for those working in the golf and resort industry as identified the Golf Management Institute of Canada (GMIC).

Program learning objectives and specific course outcomes will align with competencies as established by the GMIC and consultations with other experts from industry.

Each course will bridge theory and practical experience through a combination of experiential learning (i.e. case studies, discussions, and presentations) and more traditional teaching methods. Emerging trends and practices will be incorporated into coursework to ensure that all content is current and relevant.

All program instructors will be practitioners in the field and will emphasize the knowledge and skills required for success in the field.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ii. Learning Objectives:</strong></th>
<th>The program will be delivered in an online format. There are no pre-requisites for this program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outline key retail management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe characteristics of entrepreneurship and industry key success factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a comprehensive business plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe club governance, committee dynamics and their strategic impact on decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct typical financial analyses such as cost volume profit analysis, ratio analysis, performance measures and benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply principles of human resource management within the golf industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply legal foundations and principles in operating a golf resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe the framework of food and beverage operations in general and specific to the golf/resort industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify legal compliance and controls in food and beverage management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply core design principals in golf course architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>iii. Meeting Learning Objectives:</strong></th>
<th>The Business of Golf and Resort Management program will use a series of courses to achieve the stated program objectives. Individual course objectives are mapped to the overall program objectives. The delivery format and teaching methods are structured to have a maximum effect on achieving the learning objectives.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>iv. Program Admission Requirements:</strong></th>
<th>Prospective students may register in the program without any application.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In compliance with the Certificate and Diploma admission policy from Undergraduate Council, students who wish to enter the Business of Golf and Resort Management Diploma should meet the following requirements based on their education and work experience:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Equivalent academic experience, such as a university degree/college diploma with relevant coursework in social work, sociology, health care or gerontology with a minimum cumulative GPA of C-, or better;
2) OR, relevant professional experience (a minimum of 2 years), or related professional certification in the field of case management;
3) OR, be a mature student as defined in the Undergraduate Calendar of McMaster University; or be deemed an exceptional case by the Centre for Continuing Education. Prospective students must contact the Program Manager for consultation and evaluation of past education and professional experience).

There are no specific program pre-requisites.

| vi. Program Completion Requirements: | Students must complete all 10 courses (30 units) in order to qualify for the Diploma in Business of Golf and Resort Management |
| viii. Program Delivery Format: | All program courses in the diploma will be delivered fully online. Delivery activities will include instructor lecture and/or presentations, readings, group discussions, and practical application activities. |
| ix. Student Evaluations (Grading Process): | Each course will include several evaluation components. The evaluations will consist of assignments, case studies, presentations, individual or group projects, class participation, or a combination thereof. Where appropriate, evaluations will be structured to evaluate participants’ level of competency in achieving overall learning objectives. |
| x. Course Evaluation: | For each course, students will complete an evaluation to assess content, delivery, materials, method of evaluation and instruction. |
| xi. Course Instruction: | Instructors for courses will be selected from a pool of qualified external professionals. In compliance with McMaster's Senate and Undergraduate Council Guidelines for Certificates and Diplomas, selection will be based on academic background and/or experience within the field. Instructors must have a Master’s Degree (or equivalent) and significant professional experience and teaching within the field. |
| xii. Credit Towards Degree Programme Studies: | The academic credit courses included in a diploma program can be used for credit towards degree programme studies in accordance with the normal academic rules specified by the Faculty offering the degree. |
xiii. Program Advanced Standing:

Upon enrolment to the program, a student may receive up to a maximum of 9 units of advanced credit. The courses used for such credit must be equivalent to the McMaster courses that they replace; specifically,

- Courses must have an 80% content/curricula overlap and a similar number of equivalent to classroom hours;
- Courses must be listed on an official transcript from an accredited academic institution with a grade; and,
- Courses must be taken within the last 5 years

D. Statement of Financial Viability:

I have reviewed the business case and financial projections which includes enrolment projections and costs. Sources of revenue for this program include tuition and supplementary fees (MAPS). Expenses are typical and include significant up front development and marketing costs, as well as typical ongoing delivery costs (such as payment of facilitators, honoraria for other guest facilitators, materials, advertising and administration).

Lorraine Carter, Director, Centre for Continuing Education, March 2017

E. Statement of Administrative Responsibilities:

The human and systems infrastructure to support the following functions exists within CCE. Costs will be fully covered by tuition.

Responsibilities for the programs are as follows:

- Budget development and monetary responsibilities
- Program and Course Development
- Course Registrations/Administration
- Supervision of Instructors to ensure University policies and practices are adhered to; courses are taught according to program requirements and standards
- Marketing and Promotions

The School of Business

The DeGroote School of Business will act as academic liaison and is charged with the responsibility of on-going academic review and assessment of curriculum. In return for services rendered, the DeGroote School of Business will receive an annual stipend at the end of each fiscal year during which the program records a surplus.
### F. Listing of Courses (complete the chart to provide suggested course title, required/elective, number of academic units, proposed hours, and estimated term offering):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Academic Units</th>
<th>Proposed Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Management in Golf Operations</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship in the Golf Industry</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Club Governance</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance for Non-Financial Managers in the Golf Industry</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management in Golf Operations</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Management in Golf Operations</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law for Golf Managers</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Management in Golf Operations</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Design &amp; Construction - Turf Management</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Courses may be taken in any order;

- Retail Management in Golf Operations
- Entrepreneurship in the Golf Industry
- Golf Club Governance
- Finance for Non-Financial Managers in the Golf Industry
- Strategic Management in Golf Operations
- Human Resources Management in Golf Operations
- Business Law for Golf Managers
- Marketing Management in Golf Operations
- Hospitality Management
- Golf Course Design & Construction - Turf Management

**Course Descriptions:**

**Diploma Required Courses:**

**Retail Management in Golf Operations**

This course focuses on the successful management of a golf shop as an integral component of a golf facility's overall operation. Topics such as seasonality, inventory management, customer identification and service, display techniques and promotional ideas for generating additional revenues for the pro shop will be addressed.

Students will acquire knowledge of retail merchandising principles and understand the differences of the various target markets that frequent a typical golf retail operation (both private and public facilities). Formulating buying plans for both hard and soft goods, establishing pricing strategies and inventory controls, and developing merchandising strategies through effective advertising and promotional strategies are covered.

**Entrepreneurship in the Golf Industry**

This course introduces students to the concept of entrepreneurship and assesses their potential as future entrepreneurs in the golf industry. Students will be encouraged to explore their business ideas and learn how to conduct a feasibility study.

The curriculum includes identification of opportunities and development of strategies by recognizing the environmental factors that affect all businesses. Organizing a business idea into a
concrete business plan, based on relevant entrepreneurial concepts, will be explored.

**Golf Club Governance**

This course explores the dynamics of boards and committees in a golf facility and their importance in ensuring effective operation. Board structures in a private course setting will be discussed. Decision-making processes and board and committee dynamics will also be covered. Club strategy and policy matters will be explored as well as the role of golf associations in the golf industry. Concepts associated with effective club management will be examined.

**Finance for Non-Financial Managers in the Golf Industry**

Finance for Non-Financial Managers in the golf industry enables decision-makers in the golf industry to understand and properly use financial data. Topics examined include how to identify the financial information required to address specific management issues and problems, assessing short- and long-term financial impacts of resource allocation decisions, and accurate interpretations of a golf operation's financial statements. The manager's role in budgeting and forecasting will be explored using cases, annual reports, and industry research.

**Strategic Management in Golf Operations**

Successful managers integrate and synthesize the many facets of management, leadership, finance and human relations into their management decisions. This course teaches aspiring managers how to develop operating strategies for all aspects of a golf operation. As key decision-makers,
students will be expected to develop and implement product, pricing, promotion, and human resource strategies, and analyze the impacts of their decisions on the organization.

**Human Resources Management in Golf Operations**

This course focuses on the professional application of human resource management practices as they pertain to the golf industry. All aspects of people management will be covered, including hiring, compensation, training and development, health and safety, performance management, and employment law.

**Business Law for Golf Managers**

Legal issues affecting the golf industry including the law of contracts, torts, occupational health and safety, environmental protection, food and liquor liability, and general negligence will be covered in this course. Different forms of business organizations will also be discussed. The legal responsibilities of the golf course owner to protect his/her employees, the public, and the golf course itself will also be examined. Students will be given opportunities to discuss and debate these issues.

**Marketing Management in Golf Operations**

Participants will apply the basic components of marketing and marketing research in the development of a marketing plan for a golf facility. Various strategies required to ensure a successful marketing environment will be introduced (segment and positioning, product, distribution, pricing and promotion strategies). Students will learn to analyze and segment markets, identify target markets, and design and develop a strategic
marketing plan that meets the needs of the specified target market. Through cases and examples, students will develop an appreciation for trends and issues in today's marketing environment. The significance of sponsorship and endorsements in marketing a special sports event will be covered.

**Hospitality Management**

This course provides an overview of the foundations for hospitality management in the golf industry. The course provides students with the opportunity to learn about specific areas of a food and beverage operation, including product knowledge, service, financial management, purchasing, and control systems. In addition, students will perform practical and applicable exercises and projects related to managing a successful hospitality management operation.

**Golf Course Design & Construction - Turf Management**

This course addresses golf course design principles and turf management practices. How the golf course architect designs the golf course throughout all phases of development will be considered. In addition to the design of a new facility, topics include how to renovate and/or expand an existing facility. The processes of obtaining permits and dealing with local authorities about environmental issues associated in golf course development are discussed. The fundamentals of golf course maintenance are also addressed. Topics such as grass and soil identification, drainage systems, equipment use in maintenance procedures, and establishment and implementation of a turf management program
will be covered. An introduction to pesticides and fertilizers is included.
March 9, 2017

To: Certificate and Diploma Committee, Undergraduate Council and Senate

From: Dr. Emad Mohammad, Associate Dean (Academic)

RE: Proposal for Business of Golf and Resort Management Diploma

I have reviewed the Business of Golf and Resort Management Diploma program submission presented by the Centre for Continuing Education. I have determined that it meets all the criteria set out by the Undergraduate Council in its guidelines for certificates and diplomas and we, therefore, endorse this submission with the support of the DeGroote School of Business.

I have had the proposal reviewed by Dr. Nick Bontis, Chair, Strategic Management DeGroote School of Business. His conclusion is that the objectives of the proposed program are viable, that the courses included in it will fulfill the stated objectives and meet Undergraduate Council’s criteria for the designation of “Certificate” and “Diploma”. I concur with this assessment.

The DeGroote School of Business is pleased to have a high quality program such as the Business of Golf and Resort Management diploma to meet the needs of people wanting to work in these fields. We support this CCE program as their academic affiliates, providing both the initial submission review and overview of ongoing curriculum issues. Additionally, we have provided CCE with the guidelines needed by their students for possible use of the advanced standing rules for students entering our degree programs using credit from completion of this program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Emad Mohammad
Associate Dean
DeGroote School of Business

Cc: Lorraine Carter, Director, CCE
    Dan Piedra, Assistant Director, CCE
Centre for Continuing Education
Program Approval

A. Department & Program Information (Complete all fields):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Designation:</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name:</td>
<td>Applied Clinical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Representative:</td>
<td>Cathy Emick, Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Date/Term of Program Start:</td>
<td>Winter 2018 (January 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Submission:</td>
<td>March 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Faculty Statement (Required):

See attached Associate Dean Letter.

C. Academic Merit (Complete all fields; write “not applicable” as needed):

i. Program Overview:

The Applied Clinical Research certificate program will consist of five, three (3) unit courses (15 units). Program content is based on common areas of knowledge and skills for clinical research associates and managers as identified by a North American Advisory Board and the competencies of the Internationally-focused Association of Clinical Research Professionals (ACRP).

Upon successful completion of the required five courses, participants will receive the McMaster University Certificate in Applied Clinical Research. Students are given a three-year period to complete all required components of the certificate program. This requirement is based on the need to remain current with legal, regulatory and ethical considerations in the field of work.

Program learning objectives and specific course outcomes align with the Association of Clinical Research Professionals (ACRP) eight knowledge domains:

1. Operations/GCP (Good Clinical Practice)
2. Communication & Teamwork
3. Data Management & Informatics
| 4. Ethical & Participant Safety Considerations  
5. Leadership & Professionalism  
6. Medicines Development & Regulation  
7. Scientific Concepts & Research Design  
8. Study & Site Management |

Each course will bridge theory and practical experience through a combination of experiential learning (i.e. case studies, discussions, and presentations) and traditional teaching methods. There will be considerable emphasis on the application of content in each course to ensure students are well prepared for employment in this field. In addition, students will complete a capstone project/practicum placement as the final course in the program, which provides a concentrated opportunity to apply the clinical research methods, techniques and strategies to a real-world situation/case. Emerging trends, theories and practices will be incorporated into coursework to ensure that program content is current and relevant.

Development subject matter experts and program instructors will be researchers and practitioners in the field and will emphasize the knowledge and skills required for employment in the fields of clinical research as an associate or manager.

The program will be delivered in an online format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii. Learning Objectives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Applied Clinical Research program provides an opportunity for individuals seeking to enter into the field of clinical research to enhance their knowledge and skills required for employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program objectives are based primarily on ACRP’s eight knowledge domains. Specifically, successful participants will be able to:

1. Describe GCP (Good Clinical Practice) requirements and explain the legal and regulatory issues in clinical research (Bloom’s: Understanding)
2. Construct a clinical research protocol and critique flawed and exemplary studies (Bloom’s: Evaluate and Creating)
3. Differentiate the key elements of successful study and site management (Bloom’s: Analyze)
4. Examine ethical issues in clinical research and select appropriate approaches strategies to navigate (Bloom’s: Analyze)
5. Practice the leadership and communication skills needed in a clinical research setting. (Bloom’s: Apply)

The following objectives will be threaded within each course:
Students will be able to:
- Demonstrate an awareness of ethical practices and professional standards applicable to the field of clinical research
- Exemplify the skills, attitudes and behaviours required to effectively communicate with various stakeholder groups engaged in clinical trials
- Demonstrate personal management, leadership and project management skills

### iii. Meeting Learning Objectives:

The Applied Clinical Research program will use a series of courses to achieve the stated program objectives. Individual course objectives are mapped to the overall program objectives. The delivery format and teaching methods are structured to have a maximum effect on achieving the learning objectives.

### iv. Program Admission Requirements:

In compliance with the Certificates and Diploma, admission policy from Undergraduate Council, students who wish to enter the Certificate in Applied Clinical Research should meet the following requirements based on their education and work experience:

1) Equivalent academic experience, such as a university degree/college diploma with relevant coursework in science, health science, nursing, or other relevant education with a minimum cumulative GPA of C-, or better;

2) OR, relevant professional experience (a minimum of 5 years), or related professional certification in the field of clinical research;

3) OR, be a mature student as defined in the Undergraduate Calendar of McMaster University; or be deemed an exceptional case by the Centre for Continuing Education. Prospective mature students must contact the Program Manager for consultation and evaluation of past education and professional experience.
| v. Program Pre-requisites (if applicable): | Not Applicable |
| vi. Program Completion Requirements: | Students must complete all 5 courses (15 units) in order to qualify for the Certificate in Applied Clinical Research |
| viii. Program Delivery Format: | All program courses in the Certificate will be delivered fully online. Delivery activities will include instructor lecture and/or presentations, readings, group discussions, and practical application activities. Where possible, simulation activities will be used to enhance experiential education. The final practicum course will permit students to work independently in a clinical setting. |
| ix. Student Evaluations (Grading Process): | Each course will include several evaluation components. The evaluations will consist of assignments, case studies, presentations, laboratory application activities, individual or group projects, class participation, or a combination thereof. Where appropriate, evaluations will be structured to evaluate participants’ level of competency in achieving overall learning objectives. |
| x. Course Evaluation: | For each course, students will complete an evaluation to assess content, delivery, materials, method of evaluation and instruction. |
| xi. Course Instruction: | Instructors for courses will be selected from a pool of qualified external professionals. In compliance with McMaster’s Senate and Undergraduate Council Guidelines for Certificates and Diplomas, selection will be based on academic background and/or experience |
Within the field. Instructors must have a Master's Degree (or equivalent) and significant professional experience and teaching within the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>xii. Credit Towards Degree Programme Studies:</th>
<th>The academic credit courses included in a certificate programme can be used for credit towards degree programme studies in accordance with the normal academic rules specified by the Faculty offering the degree.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xiii. Program Advanced Standing:</td>
<td>No advanced standing or transfer credit will be given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Statement of Financial Viability:

I have reviewed the business case and financial projections which includes enrolment projections and costs. Sources of revenue for this program include tuition and supplementary fees (MAPS). Expenses are typical and include significant up front development and marketing costs, as well as typical ongoing delivery costs (such as payment of facilitators, honoraria for other guest facilitators, materials, advertising and administration).

*Lorraine Carter, Director, Centre for Continuing Education, January 2017*

### E. Statement of Administrative Responsibilities:

The human and systems infrastructure to support the following functions exists within CCE. Costs will be fully covered by tuition, with the exception of the first year of the program, when the start-up will be subsidized by CCE.

Responsibilities for the programs are as follows:

- Budget development and monetary responsibilities
- Program and Course Development
- Course Registrations/Administration
- Supervision of Instructors to ensure University policies and practices are adhered to; course are taught according to program requirements and standards
- Marketing and Promotions

*The Faculty of Health Sciences*

The Faculty of Health Sciences will act as academic liaison and is charged with the responsibility of on-going academic review and assessment of curriculum. In return for services rendered, the Faculty of Health Sciences will receive an annual stipend at the end of each fiscal year during which the program records a surplus.
F. Listing of Courses (complete the chart to provide suggested course title, required/elective, number of academic units, proposed hours, and estimated term offering):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Academic Units</th>
<th>Proposed Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Clinical Research</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trial Design</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Winter 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Ethics</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Trial Management</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Courses may be taken in any order; however, the following order is recommended:
- Principles of Clinical Research should be the first course completed;
- Clinical Trial Design, Research Ethics and Clinical Trial Management may be taken at the same time;
- Students may enrol in the Practicum course while completing their fourth and final course.

Course Descriptions:

**ACR 101: Principles of Clinical Research**
This introductory course explores the terminology, as well as roles and responsibilities involved in a clinical research project. Good Clinical Practice (GCP) procedures will be examined, as well as an overview of legal considerations of clinical trials. Emphasis will be placed on the foundational skills needed for successful trial management including project management and communication skills.

ACRP Domains: Topics in the course are selected to meet the following competencies:
1. Operations/GCP
2. Teamwork and communication
3. Thread of Ethical considerations
4. Medicines Development and Regulation

Possible Topics:
- Terminology used in clinical trials
- Roles and responsibilities of key positions in clinical trials
- Procedural, documentation, and oversight requirements of PI's, sponsors, contract research organizations (CROs), and regulatory authorities related to the conduct of a clinical trial
- Overview of the clinical trials process
- Principles of GCP – Good Clinical Practice
- Health Canada and FDA guidelines
- Brief overview of drug approval process
- Principles and practice of Project Management as a common approach to clinical research
- Communication and Interpersonal skills for clinical research:
  - understand personal effectiveness
  - organizational conflict and resolution methods
  - communication skills for dealing with difficult people
  - communication skills for communicating with different audiences
  - role of ethics in communication

**ACR 102: Clinical Trial Design**

Scientific and statistical concepts related to the design and analysis of clinical trials will be examined, as well as the regulatory framework and guidelines that govern clinical trials. Emphasis will be placed on the concepts in the design of a clinical trial including the development of a protocol and effective use of Case Report forms.

ACRP Domains: Topics in the course are selected to meet the following competencies:

1. Scientific Concepts and Research Design
2. Data Management & Informatics
3. Medicines Development and Regulation

**Possible Topics:**

**Statistical Concepts**

- Sample size calculations
- Randomization procedures
- Other concepts as appropriate

**Trial Design:**

- Study and Protocol Design: selection criteria, study size, study duration, limiting bias, etc
- Types of clinical trial designs
- Planning of a clinical trial
- Evaluate the design conduct and documentation of clinical trials as required for compliance with GCP guidelines
- Ethics of research design
- Diversity in medical research
- Review of exemplary and flawed studies
- Effective protocol and case report form development

**Legal requirements**

- Treatment/decision making
- Confidentiality/disclosure
• Recruitment and remuneration
• Introduction to Privacy Legislation
• Identify the legal responsibilities, issues, liabilities, and accountabilities that are involved in the conduct of a clinical trial

ACR 103: Research Ethics
Professional guidelines and codes of ethics that apply to the conduct of clinical research will be analyzed. Situations presenting ethical dilemmas including vulnerable populations will be explored as well as scientific integrity, and the responsibilities of the clinical investigation team as defined by GCP guidelines.

ACRP Domains: Topics in the course are selected to meet the following competencies:
1. Ethical & Participant Safety Considerations

Possible Topics:
• Professional guidelines and codes of ethics that apply to the conduct of clinical research
• Vulnerable populations
• Effect of cultural diversity and the need for cultural competency
• Situations presenting ethical dilemmas in clinical research
• Ethical issues involved when dealing with vulnerable populations and the need for additional safeguards
• Methods of distributing and balancing risk and benefit through selection and management of clinical trial subjects
• Tools for ethical analysis used in clinical practice
• Roles and responsibilities of the clinical investigation team as defined by GCP guidelines
• Describe the roles and purpose of clinical trial audits
• Human subjects and medical research
• Informed consent; Scientific integrity; Misconduct

ACR 104: Clinical Trials Management
Strategies for conducting and managing clinical trials, as well as operational issues of a clinical research project will be examined. Effective methods for organizing data and quality assurance will be explored as well as end of trial practices, safety reporting, and the preparation of scientific documents. Topics in leadership will also be examined including management of resources, risk and professional conflicts.

ACRP Domains: Topics in the course are selected to meet the following competencies:
1. Data Management & Informatics
2. Study & Site Management
3. Scientific Concepts and Research Design
4. Leadership & Professionalism

Possible Topics:
Data Management
- Typical flow of data throughout a clinical trial and strategies for organizing
- data quality assurance systems and standard operating procedures
- GCP requirements for data correction and queries
- Case Report Form (CRF) and eCRF completion
- Privacy and data

Study Management
- Content required at the site level to run a study (financial and personnel aspects).
  Includes site and study operations (not encompassing regulatory/GCPs).
- Strategies for conducting and managing clinical trials, monitoring and quality assurance
- Operational issues that exist in the conduct of a clinical research project
- Managing types of adverse events (AEs) that occur during clinical trials
- Identification process for Adverse Events
- Process and requirements for reporting serious adverse events

Research Study Practices
- Communication strategies for writing in a research environment
- Strategies for closing out a clinical trial
- Methods by which safety issues are identified and managed during the development and post-marketing phases of clinical research
- Safety reporting requirements of regulatory agencies post-approval

Leadership & Professionalism
- Operational elements: Administrative: HR, Budget
- Procedures for managing the ethical and professional conflicts that are associated with the conduct of clinical research
- Management of the financial, timeline, and personnel resources
- Management of risk in the conduct of a clinical research study

ACR105 Clinical Research Practicum
This course is designed to offer students the opportunity to apply the theoretical knowledge and skills gained from the Applied Clinical Research program to a practical setting. Students will apply their learning in the areas of clinical research protocols, and study and site management principles. Participants will also be expected to demonstrate a solid grasp of competencies in leadership, and communication skills that are also needed to ensure a successful clinical trial.

Students will develop a set of personal learning objectives in conjunction with the course
instructor/practicum coordinator, and will agree on a learning plan.

Pre-Requisite for Practicum
In order to fully benefit from the practical experience, students will need to have a number of courses completed prior to the start of this course. Students in the Certificate program must have completed four courses (ACR 101, 102, 103 and have completed or be enrolled in ACR 104) prior to enrolling in ACR 105.

Students must also fulfill the requirements of their host organization. Students are responsible to investigate, and fulfill, these requirements before commencing the Practicum course.

Students completing the Practicum course are covered by McMaster University’s Blanket Accident Insurance Plan and Liability Insurance Plan. A Certificate of Insurance can be provided upon request.

ACRP Domains: Topics in the course are selected to meet the following competencies:
1. Operations/GCP
2. Communication & Teamwork
3. Medicines Development and Regulation
4. Data Management & Informatics
5. Ethical & Participant Safety Considerations
6. Leadership & Professionalism
7. Scientific Concepts & Research Design
8. Study & Site Management
March 13, 2017

To: Certificate and Diploma Committee, Undergraduate Council

From: Del Harnish

3M Fellow
Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education
Faculty of Health Sciences

RE: Proposal for Applied Clinical Research Program

I have reviewed the Applied Clinical Research program submission presented by the Centre for Continuing Education. I have determined that it meets all the criteria set out by the Undergraduate Council in its guidelines for certificates and diplomas and we, therefore, endorse this submission with the support of the Faculty of Health Sciences.

I have had the proposal reviewed by Kristina Trim, PhD, Chair, Student Research Committee, HiREB. Her conclusion is that the objectives of the proposed program are viable, that the courses included in it will fulfill the stated objectives and meet Undergraduate Council’s criteria for the designation of “Certificate of Applied Clinical Research”. I concur with this assessment.

The Faculty of Health Sciences is pleased to have a high quality program such as the Applied Clinical Research program to meet the needs of people wanting to work in these fields. We support this CCE program as their academic affiliates, providing both the initial submission review and overview of ongoing curriculum issues. Additionally, we have provided CCE with the guidelines needed by their students for possible use of the advanced standing rules for students entering our degree programs using credit from completion of this program.

Cc: Lorraine Carter, Director, CCE
    Carolyn McEwen, Assistant Director, CCE
A. Department & Program Information (Complete all fields):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Designation:</th>
<th>Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name:</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Representative:</td>
<td>Todd Rich, Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Date/Term of Program Start:</td>
<td>Fall 2017 (September 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Submission:</td>
<td>March 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Faculty Statement (Required):

(pending)

C. Academic Merit (Complete all fields; write “not applicable” as needed):

i. Program Overview:

This proposal is to establish a five course Certificate in Marketing within the existing Marketing Diploma offered through the Centre of Continuing Education. The Diploma in Marketing was approved by the University in the fall of 2007.

Students will complete the existing five core marketing diploma courses to earn the certificate. The courses are:

Core (complete all five courses):

- Introduction to Marketing* (3 units)
- Consumer Behaviour (3 units)
- Marketing Plans and Implementation (3 units)
- Integrated Marketing Communications (3 units)
- Business Foundations (3 units)

*Pre-requisite for the marketing courses.

Upon successful completion of the five courses, students will receive the McMaster University Certificate in Marketing. The five core marketing courses are available in person or online.
| ii. Learning Objectives: | The marketing core courses align with the already approved marketing diploma outcomes. Specifically, students will:  
- gain an introduction to marketing principles and concepts;  
- learn general business administration concepts;  
- develop an understanding of marketing strategies;  
- understand the role of marketing from a business and consumer perspective;  
- analyze marketing problems leading to actionable plans;  
- learn how external factors, such as the economy, competition, suppliers, distribution and price affect marketing functions; and  
- learn strategies and skills to create consistent marketing communications. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii. Meeting Learning Objectives:</td>
<td>The Certificate in Marketing Diploma is a series of courses targeting the stated program objectives. Individual course objectives are mapped to the overall program objectives for the diploma in marketing and the digital marketing certificate respectively. Delivery formats and teaching methods are structured to have a maximum effect on achievement of the learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| iv. Program Admission Requirements: | The Certificate in Marketing is an open-enrolment program. No application is required. In compliance with the Certificates and Diploma admission policy from Undergraduate Council, students who wish to enrol in the Diploma in Marketing with a Digital Marketing concentration should meet the following requirements:  
- Ontario Secondary School Diploma or equivalent; mature student as defined in the Undergraduate Calendar of McMaster University; or be deemed an exceptional case by the Centre for Continuing Education.  
- If English is not a student’s first language, he/she must meet the University’s English language proficiency requirements. |
<p>| v. Program Pre-requisites (if applicable): | n/a |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vi. Program Completion Requirements:</td>
<td>Students must complete all 5 courses (15 units) in order to qualify for the Certificate in Marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Program Delivery Format:</td>
<td>The five core marketing diploma core courses will be delivered in person or online. Online delivery activities will include instructor presentations, group discussions, online resources (articles and videos), and practical application activities. Course content is delivered over 13 weeks. On average, each week will consist of three hours of content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Student Evaluations (Grading Process):</td>
<td>Each course will include several evaluation components. Evaluation strategies will include assignments, case studies, presentations, individual or group projects, class participation, and other assignments in line with the learning objectives for the course. Where appropriate, evaluations will be structured to evaluate participants’ level of competency in achieving overall learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Course Evaluation:</td>
<td>For each course, students will complete an evaluation to assess content, delivery, materials, method of evaluation, and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. Course Instruction:</td>
<td>Instructors for courses will be selected from a pool of qualified external professionals. In compliance with McMaster’s Senate and Undergraduate Council Guidelines for Certificates and Diplomas, selection will be based on academic background and/or experience within the field. Instructors must have a Master’s Degree (or equivalent) and significant professional experience and teaching within the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. Credit Towards Degree Programme Studies:</td>
<td>The academic credit courses included in a certificate program can be used for credit towards degree program studies in accordance with the normal academic rules specified by the Faculty offering the degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. Program Advanced Standing:</td>
<td>Students will be permitted to receive up to 3 units of advanced standing toward the Certificate in Marketing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Statement of Financial Viability:

I have reviewed the business case and financial projections which includes enrolment projections and costs. Sources of revenue for this program include tuition and supplementary fees (MAPS). Expenses are typical and include significant up front development and marketing costs, as well as typical ongoing delivery costs (such as payment of facilitators, honoraria for other guest facilitators, materials, advertising and administration).

Lorraine Carter, Director, Centre for Continuing Education, March 2017

E. Statement of Administrative Responsibilities:

The human and systems infrastructure to support the following functions exists within CCE. Costs will be fully covered by tuition.

Responsibilities for the programs are as follows:

- Budget development and monetary responsibilities
- Program and Course Development
- Course Registrations/Administration
- Supervision of Instructors to ensure University policies and practices are adhered to; course are taught according to program requirements and standards
- Marketing and Promotions

The DeGroote School of Business

The DeGroote School of Business will act as academic liaison and is charged with the responsibility of on-going academic review and assessment of curriculum. In return for services rendered, the DeGroote School of Business will receive an annual stipend at the end of each fiscal year during which the program records a surplus.

F. Listing of Courses (complete the chart to provide suggested course title, required/elective, number of academic units, proposed hours, and estimated term offering):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Required/Elective</th>
<th>Academic Units</th>
<th>Proposed Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Marketing</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Behaviour</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Plans &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Marketing Communications</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Foundations</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3.0 units</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Intro to Marketing is a pre-requisite for the marketing core courses.
Course Descriptions: The Marketing diploma course descriptions were approved by the University in the fall of 2007.

Diploma in Marketing (core courses)

Introduction to Marketing
Marketing impacts every aspect of our lives. Where we shop, how we eat, what we drive and even where we live, can be influenced by marketing. Introduction to Marketing is a survey course that introduces learners to the basic concepts of marketing, viewed within a corporate framework. During the course we study the modern marketplace and discuss the impact of the environmental factors that shape marketing and influence the type of products that companies market. Topics include the development of new products, identifying market segments and targeting consumer groups, pricing strategies, brand equity, distribution channel and promotional activities. Lecture notes are interspersed with photos of marketing materials to provide current examples of the topics under discussion.

Consumer Behaviour
Consumer Behaviour pertains to the study of why and how consumers make decisions related directly or indirectly to a consumption event. All of us being consumers, consumer behaviour is omnipresent in our lives even if we are not consciously aware of it. As such, the study of consumer behaviour has great significance not only for marketing but for public policy as well. For marketers, understanding the field of consumer behaviour is perhaps the most important tool for commercial success. This is not an easy task because the field draws from multiple disciplines including psychology, economics, sociology, and anthropology. Its complexity also derives from the heterogeneity of cultures in this age of expanding globalization because meanings and interpretations are not necessarily portable across cultural boundaries when they exist. This has given rise to the need for a sophisticated marketing professional with a strong grasp on consumer behaviour issues. At the same time more and more questions are being raised about ethical practices, requiring this marketers to become aware of the ethical and social responsibility factors as they think through their marketing strategy.

Marketing Plans & Implementation
A company’s Marketing Plan is a document that outlines the overall marketing strategy, specific actions to be undertaken and the logic underlying the recommendations. As such, it is the culmination of a detailed analysis of the company’s marketing situation and is a vital resource in a competitive market. An effective marketing plan is often an outcome of a group effort and not only focuses on the appropriate marketing strategy for the company, but is also sensitive to the implementation challenge given time and resource constraints. At the same time, the effectiveness of any marketing plan is often a function of how convincingly the plan has been presented to the stakeholders.

This course builds on the introductory marketing course and will teach the basics of creating and communicating effective Marketing Plans by covering different aspects of such a plan like marketing audits, market analysis, marketing strategy, tactics and implementation tools. It
will do so with a combination of lectures, case studies, assignments, a practical project, role plays, discussions and student presentations.

Integrated Marketing Communications
This course will focus on the important marketing topic of communication. We will examine the strategy of communication and the effective use of communication elements: advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, public relations, and media. Learning experiences will incorporate lecture, discussion, group project and presentations, and case study methodology.

Business Foundations
During the course, we will examine material related to all the functional areas of management including finance, personnel, marketing, operations and general management. The environment in which most Canadian businesses operate will also be examined including, the economic, legislative, technological and social contexts. The integration of the topics and concepts will receive emphasis via a decision-making model, the planning concepts presented early in the course, and an ongoing group business plan project. These concepts provide a framework which aid one’s understanding of the relationships between the various topics. Students will be exposed to a variety of learning activities including, group problem solving tasks, case studies, discussion sessions, role-plays, and simulations.
DATE: March 20, 2017

To: Certificate and Diploma Committee, Undergraduate Council and Senate

From: Dr. Emad Mohammad, Associate Dean, DeGroote School of Business

RE: Proposal for the Certificate in Marketing

I have reviewed the Marketing Certificate program submission presented by the Centre for Continuing Education. I have determined that it meets all the criteria set out by the Undergraduate Council in its guidelines for certificates and diplomas and we, therefore, endorse this submission with the support of the DeGroote School of Business.

I have had the proposal reviewed by Dr. Manish Kacker, Associate Professor. His conclusion is that the objectives of the proposed program are viable, that the courses included in it will fulfill the stated objectives and meet Undergraduate Council’s criteria for the designation of “Certificate” and “Diploma”. I concur with this assessment.

The DeGroote School of Business is pleased to have a high quality program such as the Marketing Certificate to meet the needs of people wanting to work in this field. We support this CCE program as their academic affiliates, providing both the initial submission review and overview of ongoing curriculum issues. Additionally, we have provided CCE with the guidelines needed by their students for possible use of the advanced standing rules for students entering our degree programs using credit from completion of this program.

Ce: Lorraine Carter, Director, CCE
Dan Piedra, Assistant Director, CCE
**Centre for Continuing Education**

**Program Approval**

### A. Department & Program Information (Complete all fields):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name:</th>
<th>Canadian Health Studies Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Representative:</td>
<td>Nancy McQuigge, Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>May 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Submission:</td>
<td>March 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Faculty Statement (Required):

Refer to the Faculty letter from Dr. Alan Neville

### C. Academic Merit (Complete all fields; write “not applicable” as needed):

#### i. Program Overview:

The proposal is to establish a new Certificate program for the Centre for Continuing Education's health preparatory courses. This program combines 3-unit courses previously approved by McMaster University's Senate as part of the Health Information Management and Health Informatics programs. A new course in epidemiology is included with this certificate for approval. Students must complete 15 units of study for the Certificate.

The program courses include:

- Understanding the Canadian Health Care System (3 units)
- Anatomy and Physiology (3 units)
- Medical Terminology (3 units)
- Pathophysiology I (3 units)
- Pathophysiology II (3 units)
- Foundations in Epidemiology (3 units)

These academic courses are bundled together to offer individuals with no, or limited study in health care with a foundational certificate program. These courses offer a basis for future studies in health based programs. The program may be promoted to internationally trained professionals who require...
some Canadian health care education. There is potential to attract individuals who require academic upgrading, or refreshing of past courses in health care. In addition, applicants to CCE’s Health Information Management and Health Informatics diploma programs may pursue the certificate as part of the required pre-requisites for admission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ii. Learning Objectives:</th>
<th>Upon completion of all three courses, students will be able to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe the Canadian health care system; its governance, its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regulation and operation, its current trends and issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify structural units of the body including cells, tissues,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organs and systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Apply medical abbreviations and acronyms used in health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyze common diagnostic interventions to determine a normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or abnormal result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand the role of risk factors in health and disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrate knowledge of the course of a pathological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Investigate methods used in public health surveillance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disease outbreak investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore research design involving descriptive, analytical,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and intervention approaches to disease.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following objectives will be threaded within each course: Students will be able to:

- Demonstrate an awareness of ethical practices and professional standards applicable to the field of health care;
- Exemplify the skills, attitudes and behaviours required to work and collaborate with people and develop personal management skills;
- Employ effective communication practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iii. Meeting Learning Objectives:</th>
<th>Individual course objectives are mapped to the overall program objectives. The delivery format and teaching methods are structured to have a maximum effect on achieving the learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv. Program Admission Requirements:</td>
<td>This will be an open enrolment program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Program Pre-requisites (if applicable):</td>
<td>Students should complete a course in Anatomy/Physiology before enrolling in Pathophysiology I. Completion of Pathophysiology I is required prior to the start of Pathophysiology II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Program Completion Requirements:</td>
<td>To receive the Certificate, students must complete 5, 3-unit courses; 15 units of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Program Delivery Format:</td>
<td>All courses will be delivered online using McMaster University’s Learning Management System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Student Evaluations (Grading Process):</td>
<td>Each course will include several evaluation components. The evaluations will consist of quizzes, assignments, case studies, presentations, individual or group projects, class participation, or a combination thereof. Where appropriate, evaluations will be structured to evaluate participants’ level of competency in achieving overall learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Course Evaluation:</td>
<td>For each course, students will complete an evaluation to assess content, delivery, materials, method of evaluation and instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. Course Instruction:</td>
<td>Instructors for courses will be selected from a pool of qualified external professionals. In compliance with McMaster’s Senate and Undergraduate Council Guidelines for Certificates and Diplomas, selection will be based on academic background and/or experience within the field. Instructors must have a Master’s Degree (or equivalent) and significant professional experience and teaching within the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. Credit Towards Degree Programme Studies:</td>
<td>The academic credit courses included in this Certificate of Completion programme can be used for credit towards degree programme studies in accordance with the normal academic rules specified by the Faculty offering the degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| xiii. Program Advanced Standing: | A maximum of one (1) transfer credit will be accepted for this program. Requirements include:  
  • courses must have an 80% overlap in content/curricula |
and a similar number of classroom or contact hours;
- courses must have been taken within the last five years;
- courses must have been taken from an accredited academic institution and listed on an official transcript with a grade; a final grade of “C-“ or better

D. Statement of Financial Viability:

I have reviewed the business case and financial projections which includes enrolment projections and costs. Sources of revenue for this program include tuition and supplementary fees (MAPS). Expenses are typical and include significant up front development and marketing costs, as well as typical ongoing delivery costs (such as payment of facilitators, honoraria for other guest facilitators, materials, advertising and administration).

Lorraine Carter, Director, Centre for Continuing Education, March 2017

E. Statement of Administrative Responsibilities:

The human and systems infrastructure to support the following functions already exists within CCE. Costs will be fully covered by tuition, with the exception of the first year of the program, when the start-up will be subsidized by CCE.

Responsibilities for the programs are as follows:
- Budget development and monetary responsibilities
- Program and Course Development
- Course Registrations/Administration
- Supervision of Instructors to ensure University policies and practices are adhered to; course are taught according to program requirements and standards
- Marketing and Promotions

The Faculty of Health Sciences

The Faculty of Health Sciences will act as academic liaison and is charged with the responsibility of on-going academic review and assessment of curriculum.

F. Listing of Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Academic Units</th>
<th>Scheduled Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the Canadian Health Care System</td>
<td>3 units</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy and Physiology</td>
<td>3 units</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Medical Terminology | 3 units | Spring 2017
Pathophysiology I | 3 units | Fall 2017
Pathophysiology II | 3 units | Winter 2018
Foundations in Epidemiology | 3 units | Fall 2017/Winter 2018

Course Descriptions:

I) HTH 100: Understanding the Canadian Healthcare System
Course Description:
This course presents an overview of the Canadian health care system in terms of its history, health care governance and related provincial and federal regulations and legislation. The course will examine how Canada’s healthcare system is organized, regulated, and managed. The course will present the different levels of care found in the health care system, and discuss how information is used and shared within the different levels. Application activities will provide students with the opportunity to analyze the various components of the health care system, and develop an understanding how different professional roles fit within this large and complex system. This course is geared towards individuals with no previous health education, or professional experience within the Canadian health care sector.

II) Medical Terminology
Course Description:
This course is designed to familiarize the student with the relevant clinical terminology to work successfully as part of the health care team. By completion of this course, the student will gain the requisite knowledge of medical terminology commonly used in the health care environment. Specific topics of focus include the origins and composition of medical words (roots, prefixes, suffixes, abbreviations) as they relate to major body systems, common disease terms, diagnostic tests and clinical procedures. This course is geared towards individuals with no previous health education, or professional experience within the Canadian health care sector. This course is designed for individuals with limited, or no, educational background in the healthcare sector, or study of anatomy, physiology and pathology.

III) Anatomy & Physiology
Course Description:
This comprehensive course provides students with an understanding of the anatomy and physiology of the human body. Topics include an overview of the human body in health and disease, Skeletal System, Muscular System, Cardiovascular System, Lymphatic and Immune System, Respiratory System, Digestive System, Urinary System,
Nervous System, Special Senses, Integumentary System, Endocrine System, Reproductive System. This course is designed for individuals with limited, or no, educational background in anatomy, physiology and pathology.

IV) HTH 116 Pathophysiology I

Course Description:
This course provides an overview of disease processes and the effect on different body systems. The etiology, clinical manifestations, diagnostic tests and therapeutic interventions for various disorders are studied. The course builds on students’ experience with anatomy and physiology.
Pre-requisite: Anatomy & Physiology
Topics include:
- Introduction to pathophysiology
- Introduction to basic pharmacology and other therapies
- Medical disorders related to the skin, respiratory system, digestive system, sensory organs, blood and circulatory systems, and cardiovascular system

V) HTH 117 Pathophysiology II

Course Description:
A continuation of Pathophysiology I course, the course provides an overview of disease processes and the effect on different body systems. The etiology, diagnostic tests and therapeutic interventions for various disorders are studied. Pre-requisite: Pathophysiology I
Topics include:
- Environmental Factors and Pathophysiology
- Pain and immunity
- Medical disorders related to lymphatic system, nervous system, endocrines system, musculoskeletal system, and reproductive system

VI) Foundations in Epidemiology

Course Description:
This course provides an introductory overview of epidemiology concepts in terms of the distribution and determinants of diseases, health conditions and health issues within specific populations. Students will focus on foundational concepts within epidemiology in order to build an understanding of its application within public health and health research.
Topics include:
- Epidemiological definitions and common terms
- Practical disease concepts
- Strategies and statistical methods in descriptive epidemiology
- Population health indicators
- Strategies and statistical methods in analytical epidemiology
- Studies in epidemiology
- Chronic disease epidemiology
- Clinical epidemiology
DATE: March 15, 2017

TO: Certificate and Diploma Committee, Undergraduate Council and Senate

FROM: Dr. Alan Neville, Associate Dean, Health Professional Education, Faculty of Health Sciences

RE: Proposal for Certificate in Canadian Health Studies, Centre for Continuing Education

I have reviewed the Canadian Health Studies certificate program submission presented by the Centre for Continuing Education. I have determined that it meets all the criteria set out by the Undergraduate Council in its guidelines for certificates and diplomas and we, therefore, endorse this submission with the support of the Faculty of Health Sciences.

The proposal was reviewed by Dr. Lynn Martin, Assistant and Teaching Professor, School of Nursing. Dr. Martin’s conclusion is that the objectives of the proposed program are viable, the courses included in it will fulfill the stated objectives, and the program meets Undergraduate Council’s criteria for the designation of a “Certificate”. I concur with this assessment.

The Faculty of Health Sciences is pleased to have a quality program such as the Canadian Health Studies certificate to meet the needs of people wanting to pursue studies and work in this field. We support this CCE program as their academic affiliates, providing both the initial submission review and overview of ongoing curriculum issues. Additionally, we have provided CCE with the guidelines needed by their students for possible use of the advanced standing rules for students entering our degree programs using credit from completion of this program.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Alan J. Neville BMed Biol (Path), MBBChB, MEd FRCP (Lond), FRCPC
Professor, Department of Oncology
Associate Dean, Health Professional Education
Faculty of Health Sciences
McMaster University

Cc: Lorraine Carter, Director, CCE
Dan Piedra, Assistant Director, CCE
Certificate in Business Technology Management (BTM)

Submitted by:
Dr. Brian Detlor
Chair, Information Systems Area
DeGroote School of Business
McMaster University
detlorb@mcmaster.ca
x23949
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Introduction

The purpose of this document is to present a proposal for a new certificate entitled "Business Technology Management" (BTM) open strictly to Honours Commerce students and designed in a way where students complete certificate requirements through course electives in the Honours Commerce program.

This certificate aligns with the Business Technology Management (BTM) movement in Canada and takes advantage of the space left vacant by the recent closing down of McMaster’s “Business Informatics” program offered by the Department of Computing and Software in the Faculty of Engineering.

The proposed certificate also aligns with the strategic direction of the DeGroote School of Business in digital transformation outlined in DSB’s Strategic Plan 2015 – 2020 document. The strategic plan’s vision statement calls for DSB to be a global leader in research, teaching and community-building in the “management of digital innovation” and outlines an action plan that includes the creation of new and revised courses in the Bachelor of Commerce program that teach digital transformation.

Importantly, the certificate will leverage current Commerce courses offered by the DSB, as well as current courses in the Bachelor of Technology’s “Software Engineering Technology” program in the W Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology.¹ No new courses or resources are required for this certificate.

About the BTM Initiative

In 2009, the Canadian Coalition for Tomorrow’s ICT Skills (CCICT) – now called ITAC Talent following a merger with ITAC on May 1, 2014 – launched the BTM initiative to revitalize and rebrand the Information Systems (IS) field, as well as improve the quality and quantity of students who choose it. With active industry involvement, CCICT developed the Business Technology Management (BTM) learning outcomes and competency standards, designed to develop technology educated business leaders.

Currently 19 universities across Canada offer undergraduate BTM degrees, specializations, or certificates, with 24 more on the way (see Appendix 1). Although not all universities have chosen to use the BTM branding for their program at this time, all programs are aligned with BTM Learning Outcomes and Competency Standards². The elements covered by most BTM programs are: Business (e.g., Marketing, Finance, Operations Management, HR Management); Technology (e.g., Information Technology, Systems Architecture, Network Design and Management); Technology in Business (e.g., Business Change Management, Business Process Analysis, Managing the IT and Business Interface; IT

¹ Agreement “in-principle” has been made with the W Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology (Faculty of Engineering) to include courses from the “Software Engineering Technology” program.
Governance); **Project Skills** (e.g., Risk Management, Project Management, Quality Assurance, Business Analysis); and, **Personal and Interpersonal Skills** (e.g., Presentation Skills, Communication Skills, Leadership, Negotiation)

**BTM-Related Programs @ McMaster**

There are a variety of educational programs/offerings at McMaster that focus on business and information technology. These are listed below.

1) **Business Informatics** (4-year UG degree that was offered by the Department of Computing and Software, Faculty of Engineering) – *this program is being phased out as admission to Level II Honours Business Informatics was last offered in September 2016.*
   - This program is most similar to a typical BTM program offered at competitor schools. Students take computer science courses offered by the Department of Computing and Software throughout the entire program, and starting in Year 2 of the program take a broad range of Commerce courses offered by the DeGroote School of Business.
   - In total, students take 9 (3-unit) Commerce courses from the School of Business.
   - Currently students in this program take only 2 courses offered by the IS Area: 4KF3 (Project Management) and 4KH3 (Management Issues in Electronic Business).
   - When compared to the BTM program elements, this program sufficiently covers the Business (non-IS) and Technology (CS) components. The remaining areas of “Technology in Business” (~IS), “Processes, Projects and Change”, “Personal and Interpersonal” and “Integrative” (capstone) areas are lacking.

2) **Bachelor of Technology (BTech) in Software Engineering Technology** (McMaster-Mohawk Partnership; degree completion program; Faculty of Engineering). The BTech degree completion program in Software Engineering Technology is distinct from the proposed BTM specialization in that the B-Tech in Software Engineering Technology program trains students in information technology, but students do not take a large number of business courses (e.g., courses in Finance, Accounting, Marketing, Human Resources, Organizational Behaviour, Operations Management).

3) **Minor in Information Systems** (Undergraduate Minor offered in the UG program offered by the DeGroote School of Business).
   - This Minor is not open to students registered in Commerce or Engineering & Mgmt.
   - The number of students allowed to take this Minor traditionally has been capped to a small number (e.g., 30 students).

4) **MSc in eHealth** (A master’s program in health informatics offered between the Faculties of Health Sciences, Engineering and Business)
5) **Executive MBA in Digital Transformation** (New MBA program launched in August 2016)

6) **PhD in Business Administration** (Information Systems Field)

**Learning Objectives**

The learning objectives of the BTM certificate match BTM Learning Outcomes and Competency Standards (see [http://itactalent.ca/BTM-Learning-Outcomes](http://itactalent.ca/BTM-Learning-Outcomes)).

BTM Learning Outcomes and Competency Standards identify 3 Area Types and 6 Knowledge Areas that any BTM-aligned program or specialization or certificate should incorporate.

**AREA TYPES**

- Integrative
- Core
- Foundation

**KNOWLEDGE AREAS**

- Integrative
  - Processes, Projects and Change
  - Technology in Business
- Innovation
- Business
- Technology
- Personal and Interpersonal

BTM Learning Outcomes contain 70 Learning Outcomes in 7 broad competency areas described below.

1) **Integrative (I1):** This knowledge area contains learning outcomes that integrate the competencies developed in the following six knowledge areas. It produces a “deliverable” of direct relevance to employers.

2) **Personal and Interpersonal (F1):** The ability to make a meaningful contribution depends upon one’s self-knowledge and ability to have constructive, long term, interactions with others. Successful leaders have strong personal and interpersonal competencies.

3) **Business (F2):** To be effective in the workplace one must have both the broad context of business – its role and place in society – and a working knowledge of how business operates.

4) **Technology (F3):** BTM graduates must understand information and communications technologies, their current capabilities, and future trends.
5) Innovation (F4): BTM graduates are expected to be innovative in the workplace. Innovators should be able to identify new opportunities, validate and resource them.

6) Technology in Business (C1): This knowledge area is designed to synthesize the knowledge and competencies gained in the foundational knowledge areas and create an additional competency in understanding: the potential (economic, personal, societal), the risks of, and the governance, acquisition, and management of ICTs in and for business.

7) Processes, Project and Change (C2): BTM graduates will gain the foundations that enable them to help create well-designed business processes, well-managed projects, and support for the individuals and groups undergoing change.

In fact, BTM learning objectives contain more than 70 learning outcomes (see the figure below):

A detailed description of BTM learning outcomes and competency areas can be found in the 73-paged document entitled BTM Learning Outcomes and Competency Standards: Baccalaureate Programs 2.0 published in 2016.

By matching the learning objectives of the certificate with the BTM learning objectives described above, the certificate can become officially "BTM Accredited". BTM accreditation will raise the value, importance and attractiveness of the certificate to both students and employers. When the certificate
becomes BTM Accredited, it means that certificate has received national recognition of its quality, promotes "best practices" in education, directly involves faculty and staff in self-assessment and continuous quality improvement processes, and is based on learning outcomes rather than on teaching inputs.

**Rationale for the Certificate**

*The certificate is being offered for three important reasons.* First, as described above, the certificate aligns with the strategic direction of the DeGroote School of Business in digital transformation outlined in DSB’s Strategic Plan 2015 – 2020 document. The strategic plan’s vision statement calls for DSB to be a global leader in research, teaching and community-building in the “management of digital innovation” and outlines an action plan that includes the creation of new and revised courses in the Bachelor of Commerce program that teach digital transformation.

Second, BTM jobs are in demand. According to a 2016 report produced by the Brookfield Institute for Innovation + Entrepreneurship⁵ in conjunction with a number of key industry partners, the technology sector was directly responsible for $117 billion or 7.1 percent of Canada’s economic output, greater than that of the finance and insurance industry. Across Canada, the need for workers is currently so great that a number of employers and industry organizations have banded together with the Canadian government to launch Go North Canada⁶; this initiative is an attempt to lure some of the more than 350,000 Canadians⁷ who work in Silicon Valley (as well as Canadians in other parts of the US) back home. The Information and Communications Technology Council (ICTC), a Canadian not-for-profit national center of expertise for the digital economy, in its 2016 report entitled Digital Talent: Road to 2020 and Beyond⁸, advocates the training of youth in digital skills as part of a national strategy for Canada. The ICTC report describes how the growth in digital jobs in Canada has outpaced the overall economy in the last two years by over 4 to 1, leading to a strong demand of 182,000 skilled ICT workers by 2019⁹.

Third, the BTM certificate will increase exposure and raise potential interest about DeGroote’s Honours Commerce program among high school students. This is because, as a "BTM Accredited" offering, the certificate will be listed with ITAC Talent⁵ (the Information Technology Association of Canada’s Talent Division) and promoted by this association in their marketing initiatives to high school students. ITAC Talent does outreach campaigns to high schools that aim to attract incoming first-year undergraduate students to BTM programs and certificates.

---

⁶ [http://gonorthcanada.ca/](http://gonorthcanada.ca/)
List of Courses

In total, Honours Commerce students must take 9 courses outlined below to obtain the BTM certificate. All 9 courses are currently offered within the DSB’s Honours Commerce program and the Software Engineering Technology Program within the W Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology. No new courses are proposed. Appendix 2 provides recommendations on how these 9 courses would be taken within the Honours Commerce program.

There are seven required courses in the proposed BTM certificate:

- COMMERCE 3KD3 – Database Design Management & Applications
- COMMERCE 3KE3 – Management of Enterprise Data Analytics
- COMMERCE 4KF3 – Project Management
- COMMERCE 4KG3 – Data Mining and Business Intelligence
- COMMERCE 4KH3 – Management Issues in Electronic Business
- SFWR TECH 3NI3 – Networking Principles
- SFWR TECH 3PR3 – Procedural and Object Oriented Programming Concepts

Students are also required to take any two of the following courses:

- COMMERCE 3KA3 – Systems Analysis & Design
- COMMERCE 4KI3 – Implementation of IS for Small & Medium Sized Enterprises
- COMMERCE 4BK3 – Management of Technology
- COMMERCE 4MH3 – Electronic Marketing
- SFWR TECH 3CS3 – Computer Security
- SFWR TECH 3OS3 – Operating Systems
- SFWR TECH 3RQ3 – Software Requirements and Specification
- SFWR TECH 4NI3 – Advanced Networking Infrastructure
- SFWR TECH 4SD3 – Software Design
- SFWR TECH 4WP3 – Advanced Web Programming – NEW course to be offered in 2017/18

The following is a description of the above courses. More information about the courses can be found in McMaster’s Undergraduate Calendar. Full course outlines can be obtained on the DeGroote School of Business website and the W Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology website.

---

9 All SFWR TECH courses are offered “synchronously” online and run weekday evenings from 6:30 to 9:30 pm.
10 An earlier draft of the proposed certificate description was sent to Gina van Dalen, Senior Program Manager, ITAC Talent, Information & Technology Association of Canada. She in turn sent it to Dr. Stephane Gagnon, the Chair of the BTM Accreditation Council (http://itactalent.ca/talent-initiatives/btm/BTMAccreditation), who replied that it looked like an “excellent program” and that the BTM-related courses meet most, if not all, BTM learning objectives.
11 This course will appear in the undergraduate calendar in 2017-2018.
12 The title of this course will be changed in the undergraduate calendar in 2017-2018 to “Strategies for Electronic and Mobile Business”
COMMERCE 3KA3 – Systems Analysis & Design

This course examines the role of the system analyst in today’s business environment. Traditional and modern approaches to systems analysis and design will be covered. Students participate in a hands-on team project for a real-world business application. This course provides three units of academic credit.

COMMERCE 3KD3 – Database Design Management & Applications

This course is designed to introduce the basic concepts of database design, implementation and management. Students will gain hands on experience through assignments and a team project. This course provides three units of academic credit.

COMMERCE 3KE3 – Management of Enterprise Data Analytics

This course provides students with an overview of enterprise data analytics and an introduction to the concepts which underlie its effective deployment and management. The course encompasses managerial, technical and statistical perspectives, demonstrating how each area is dependent on the other to make enterprise analytics work. This course incorporates a variety of teaching and learning methods including lectures, assignments, case studies, group work, presentations, and readings. This course provides three units of academic credit.

COMMERCE 4BK3 – Management of Technology

This course provides an introduction to the innovative management of technology including the integration of the firm and technology strategy, external sourcing of technology and the internationalization of technology management. This course provides three units of academic credit.

COMMERCE 4KF3 – Project Management

Topics covered in this course include: project selection, project organization structures, life cycles, planning, estimation, budgeting, resource allocation, contracting, project management software, reporting and controlling issues and conflict management. This course provides three units of academic credit.

COMMERCE 4KG3 – Data Mining and Business Intelligence

Business intelligence (BI) is a technology-driven process for analysing data and presenting actionable information to help corporate executives, business managers and other end users make more informed business decisions. The course is designed for students in multiple business areas. Students will learn the concepts, techniques, and applications of data mining for business intelligence through lectures, class discussions, hands-on assignments, and term paper presentations. This course provides three units of academic credit.
**COMMERCE 4KH3 – Management Issues in Electronic Business**

This course covers the issues that the modern business manager must deal with in making strategic decisions concerning the choice, implementation and execution of electronic business solutions. This course provides three units of academic credit.

**COMMERCE 4K13 – Implementation of IS for Small & Medium Sized Enterprises**

This course enables students to learn about the methodologies used in business process management and related information technologies in support of process innovation. These techniques are learned through hands-on practice with SAP ByDesign software and ARIS software simulation targeted to small and medium size enterprises. This course provides three units of academic credit.

**COMMERCE 4MH3 – Electronic Marketing**

The purpose of this course is to explore cutting edge marketing strategies in a dynamic e-commerce environment. Students will cover a wide range of issues including online consumer behaviours, website analytics, search engine marketing, online CRM, online channel and pricing strategies, social media marketing, and mobile marketing. This course is taught primarily through the case method and lectures but also includes readings, videos, workshops, guest speakers and assignments. This course provides three units of academic credit.

**SFWR TECH 3CS3 – Computer Security**

This course covers network and software security, cryptography algorithms, firewalls, vulnerabilities, policies and best practices, attack and defense strategies. Learning outcomes include the ability to: i) communicate technical and non-technical concepts effectively in verbal and written forms; ii) apply cryptographic algorithms to various scenarios to ensure data confidentiality and integrity; iii) construct firewall policies restricting the flow of network traffic to protect a host or network; iv) identify and analyze weaknesses in systems by performing security audits and policy review; and v) design holistic security solutions based on the application of all security concepts in the course. This course provides three units of academic credit.

**SFWR TECH 3NI3 – Networking Principles**

This course introduces students to the OSI Model layers 1-4 including Ethernet, IP addressing, subnetting, routing, VLANs, Spanning-Tree protocol, network device configuration and an introduction to network security. Learning outcomes include the ability to: i) communicate technical and non-technical concepts effectively in written forms; ii) analyze the operation of various network and application layer protocols; iii) design a structured IP addressing scheme for a network of any size; iv) analyze the operation of network isolation, redundancy, and routing protocols; v) configure a variety of wired and wireless network devices to interoperate in a LAN environment; and vi) troubleshoot network-related problems at all layers of the OSI and TCP/IP stack. This course provides three units of academic credit.
SFWR TECH 3OS3 – Operating Systems

This course covers processes, threads and concurrency, process scheduling, memory management, protection, access and authentication and file system organization and access methods. Learning outcomes include the ability to: i) describe the organization and behavior of operating system components; ii) describe the overall structure of modern operating systems; iii) analyze the behavior of common scheduling algorithms; iv) implement a simple algorithm using multithreading; and v) implement a scheduling simulation to compare different types of scheduling algorithms. This course provides three units of academic credit.

SFWR TECH 3PR3 – Procedural and Object Oriented Programming Concepts

This course covers procedural and object oriented programming fundamentals. Concepts are exemplified with C++ and Java programming languages. Learning objectives include the ability to: i) identify the differences between C++ basic data types, select types appropriate to a purpose, and select correct and appropriate C++ identifier names; ii) construct and use functions: write correct function prototypes, definitions, and calls to the function; select the appropriate method to pass values or references; differentiate between void and valued functions; identify the scope of automatic, static and global variables; iii) use input/output methods correctly for different data types and formats; iv) properly use if, if...else and switch decision making operators, as well as select the appropriate type and implement the looping mechanisms for, while, and do...while; v) declare, initialize, and manipulate one-dimensional and two-dimensional arrays and use arrays as function parameters; vi) use object oriented programming to write programs in C++; vii) employ advanced programming procedures based on inheritance and polymorphism; and viii) apply overloading techniques to increase the performances of existing methods and classes. This course provides three units of academic credit.

SFWR TECH 3RQ3 – Software Requirements and Specification

This course covers requirements elicitation, analysis and negotiation, object-oriented requirement analysis techniques, prototyping, and requirements tracking, verification, validation and management. Furthermore, this course covers software project cost and resource estimation, as well as the role of information and business rules in the software requirements and specification process. Learning objectives include the ability to: i) elicit software requirements from system stakeholders and address common challenges of the elicitation process; ii) specify and analyze software requirements using industry standard techniques such as UML; iii) understand the effect of requirements on software project resource estimation and success; iv) negotiate software requirements; v) specify requirements that are verifiable, traceable, measurable and testable; vi) verify that specified software requirements are accurate, unambiguous, complete and consistent; vii) produce software specification (communicate software requirements through written documents and oral presentations); and viii) understand the relationship between business rules, and software requirements. This course provides three units of academic credit.
SFWR TECH 4NI3 – Advanced Networking Infrastructure

This course provides an understanding and deployment of wireless networking and infrastructure, and Software-Defined Networking (SDN) infrastructure concepts and applications for managing corporate networks. Learning objectives include the ability to: i) deploy a WLAN controller, access points, and establish connectivity; ii) design and implement a WLAN; iii) identify and explain the most suitable technology for a given problem; iv) analyze the impact of technology selection on system design; v) explain the differences between the traditional networks and SDN; vi) define and explain the internal architecture of network devices and how they are related to the operations of SDNs; and vii) explain, set up and use applications and network operations implemented in hypervisors such as VMware vSphere, Microsoft Hyper-V, and the open source KVM project. This course provides three units of academic credit.

SFWR TECH 4SD3 – Software Design

This course provides an introduction to software design and the main techniques and approaches commonly used in the business requirements and design phases within the system development life cycle. Topics include the software life-cycle, quality attributes, decomposition and interface design, specification, the design of software modules, the design of patterns, design documentation, implementation, reviews, inspections and testing. Learning outcomes include the ability to: i) design and develop use cases, and use case diagrams; ii) design and develop use case descriptions; iii) design and develop activity diagrams; iv) design and develop sequence diagrams; v) design and develop state charts; vi) design and develop class diagrams; and vii) design and develop databases based on class diagrams. This course provides three units of academic credit.

SFWR TECH 4WP3 – Advanced Web Programming

This course provides an introduction to advanced technologies for web development, apps for mobile, desktop and operating systems, and the deployment of WebAPI for communication and hardware devices. Learning outcomes include the ability to: i) use advanced HTTP and new features of HTML5 and security features; ii) develop web applications using Document Object Model (DOM); iii) create modern web apps using the latest web technologies; iv) develop and test web pages for PDAs and smart clients; v) deploy Web APIs including WebAPI, websockets and application frameworks; vi) use SVG, WebGL, MathML and TinyURL; and vii) coompare the use of a service provider to hosting your own web site. This course provides three units of academic credit.
Total Unit Value

The total unit value of the academic credit courses in the certificate is 27 units (i.e., students are required to take nine 3-unit courses).

Admission Requirements

Only students enrolled in the Honours Commerce program are eligible to complete the certificate. Thus admission requirements are the same as those applicable to Honours Commerce students.

Credit Toward Degree Studies

The courses comprising the BTM certificate will count as elective courses towards the Honours Commerce program.

Financial Viability

Costs to administer the certificate will fall within the current operating budget of the Honours Commerce Program.

Administrative Responsibility

Operational administration of the certificate program would fall under the responsibility of the Manager of Student Experience – Academic (Commerce) at the DeGroote School of Business. Academic matters pertaining to the certificate (e.g., changes, additions, deletion to the certificate structure) would be the responsibility of the Chair of the Information Systems Area in the DeGroote School of Business. He or she would follow the same procedures for courses changes and additions (i.e., first vetted by the IS Area, then forwarded to the DSB’s Undergraduate Curriculum and Policy Committee, then forwarded to the Faculty of Business, then forwarded to Undergraduate Council and/or its Certificates and Diplomas Committee). Changes and additions with respect to courses offered within the Software Engineering Technology program would be handled by the W Booth School of Engineering Practice and Technology.
Appendix 1: A List of BTM-Related Programs in Canada

The following is a list of 19 BTM-related programs currently offered in business schools across Canada.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="F.C. Manning School of Business logo" /></td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) program with a Business Technology Management major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acadia University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Athabasca University logo" /></td>
<td>Program details coming soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athabasca University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="BCIT logo" /></td>
<td>Information Technology Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Columbia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>BCIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Concordia University (John Molson School of Business) logo" /></td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce (Bcomm) with Business Technology Management (BTM) Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordia University (John Molson School of Business)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Université Laval logo" /></td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laval University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Red River College logo" /></td>
<td>Diploma in Business Technology Management (BTM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red River College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Ryerson University logo" /></td>
<td>Business Technology Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryerson University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Université de Sherbrooke logo" /></td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Technology Management (BTM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherbrooke University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Simon Fraser University (Beedie School of Business) logo" /></td>
<td>Business Administration with Certificate in Business Technology Management (BTM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Fraser University (Beedie School of Business)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Université du Québec à Montréal</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) – Certificate in Computerized Management and e-Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Université du Québec à Rimouski</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>Management Information Systems (MIS) Major with Business Technology Management (BTM) Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of British Columbia (Sauder School of Business)</td>
<td>Bachelor of Commerce with Business Technology Management (BTM) Specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
<td>Business Technology Management Option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of Toronto – Mississauga</td>
<td>Digital Enterprise Management (DEM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 16 | University of Waterloo | The University of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University jointly offer the Bachelor of Business Administration and Bachelor of Computer Science Double Degree (BBA/BCS) program.  
- Explore University of Waterloo program |
| 17 | UQO - Université du Québec en Outaouais | UQO- Université du Québec en Outaouais |
| 18) | **Laurier**  
*Wilfrid Laurier* | The University of Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University jointly offer the Bachelor of Business Administration and Bachelor of Computer Science Double Degree (BBA/BCS) program.  
- Explore Wilfrid Laurier program |
| 19) | **Schulich**  
*Schulich School of Business*  
*York University*  
*York University (Schulich School of Business)* | Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) or International Bachelor of Business Administration (IBBA) with Operations Management and Information Systems (OMIS) Specialization |
Appendix 2: Recommendation of How the Courses Would Be Taken

There is no specific order in which Commerce students must take the above list of courses to obtain the certificate. However, the following is presented as a recommendation of how an Honours Commerce student would normally take the courses within the structure of the Honours Commerce program. Courses meeting the requirements of the BTM certificate are highlighted in yellow.

YEAR 1 (mimics the existing B. Commerce Year 1 program)  
Total: 30 units

Required: 18-24 units

- Commerce 1AA3 – Financial Accounting I
- Commerce 1BA3 – Organizational Behaviour
- Commerce 1DE0 – Business I Orientation
- Commerce 1E03 – Business Environment and Organization
- Economics 1B03 – Introductory Microeconomics
- Economics 1BB3 – Introductory Macroeconomics
- 3 units from: Math 1A03, Math 1LS3, Math 1M03
- Math 1F03 (for students without Gr. 12 Calculus & Vectors U or equivalent)
- Statistics 1L03 (for Grade 12 students without Mathematics of Data Management U or equiv)

Electives: 6-12 units (to bring total to 30 units)

YEAR 2 (includes all required courses in the B. Commerce Year 2 program; however elective courses are pre-defined)  
Total: 30 units

24 units

- COMMERCE 2AB3 - Managerial Accounting I
- COMMERCE 2BC3 - Human Resource Management and Labour Relations
- COMMERCE 2FA3 - Introduction to Finance
- COMMERCE 2KA3 - Information Systems in Business
- COMMERCE 2MA3 - Introduction to Marketing
- COMMERCE 2OC3 - Operations Management
- COMMERCE 2QA3 - Applied Statistics for Business
- COMMERCE 3FA3 - Managerial Finance

6 units

- SFWR TECH 3IT3 – Networking Principles
- SFWR TECH 3PR3 – Procedural and Object Oriented Programming Concepts

YEAR 3  
Total: 30 units

\[13 \text{ All SFWR TECH courses are offered “synchronously” online and run weekday evenings from 6:30 to 9:30 pm.} \]
9 units
- COMMERCE 3MC3 – Applied Marketing Management
- COMMERCE 3QA3 – Management Science for Business
- COMMERCE 3S03 – Management Skills Development

6 units from
- COMMERCE 3KD3 – Database Design Management & Applications
- COMMERCE 3KE3 – Management of Enterprise Data Analytics – NEW\(^\text{14}\)

3 units from one of the elective courses for the BTM certificate

6 units of other Level III or IV level Commerce Courses

6 units of electives from non-Commerce courses

**YEAR 4**

Total: 30 units

15 units
- COMMERCE 4KH3 – Management Issues in Electronic Business\(^\text{15}\)
- COMMERCE 4KF3 – Project Management
- COMMERCE 4KG3 – Data Mining and Business Intelligence
- COMMERCE 4PA3 – Business Policy: Strategic Management
- COMMERCE 4SA3 – International Business

3 units from one of the elective courses for the BTM certificate

12 units of electives from non-Commerce courses

---

\(^{14}\) A change request to add this course to the undergraduate calendar is currently under consideration.

\(^{15}\) A change request is under consideration to modify the title of this course to “Strategies for Electronic and Mobile Business”
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

PROPOSAL FOR A CONCURRENT CERTIFICATE IN INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT

1 Certificate Overview

Experiential education and internationalization are key aspects of *Forward with Integrity*. This Certificate recognizes students’ efforts to gain meaningful experiences outside the classroom while promoting the concept of international engagement through an emphasis on the development of linguistic and cultural awareness. The Certificate recognizes both academic and co-curricular efforts on the part of the student to gain an international perspective and to increase his or her knowledge of what it means to be a global citizen. An international educational experience, through relevant experiences at home or abroad, is an essential part of the Certificate.

Two features of this Certificate are noteworthy: recognition of formal exchange abroad or an ‘international engagement at home’ experience, and a capstone project in the final year. The ‘international engagement at home’ component recognizes a volunteer experience at home (equivalent to a one-term (3 units) commitment) which promotes a deeper understanding of cross-cultural issues and the development of a global perspective in the Canadian context. The capstone course allows students to analyze, synthesize and reflect upon their experiences in a summative digital portfolio that they share with the university community.

2 Academic Merit

2.1 Learning Objectives

Students completing the concurrent Certificate in International Engagement will

- develop a personalized program of study with an international focus
- develop a deep understanding of cultural and linguistic differences through academic and co-curricular experiences
- develop new communicative skills in one or more languages other than English
- recognize the importance of developing intercultural competencies
- connect personal, academic and co-curricular experiences to specific, student-determined objectives within the theme of international engagement

2.2 Certificate Requirements

The Certificate is open to any student enrolled in an undergraduate program at the University and complements any undergraduate degree. Students may declare the Certificate in International Engagement at the time of graduation, and upon completion of the following courses.

Requirements (18 units)
• 12 units of a language other than English or 6 units in each of two languages other than English. Students are encouraged to consider the diversity of language offerings at McMaster, including Indigenous languages.
• 3 units of international experience at home or abroad*
  o Credit received from an International Exchange Program (‘XCH’)
  o International Engagement at Home (INTL 2A03)
• 3 units – International Engagement Capstone (INTL 3A03)

*3 units of pre-approved, alternative relevant study abroad experience may replace this requirement. This may include independent study abroad experiences, approved on Letter of Permission, or existing placement coursework, such as in HISTORY 3GH3. Previously approved experiential courses may also be substituted for the ‘International Engagement at Home’ requirement, where deemed to have met appropriate learning objectives.

No more than 6 units of the Certificate can come from non-McMaster courses.

2.3 New Courses

INTL 2A03 INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT AT HOME
This course recognizes a local volunteer experience (a minimum of 100 hours) which promotes a deeper understanding of cross-cultural issues and linguistic diversity in the Canadian context. Students participate in defining learning goals and experiences. Graded on a Pass/Fail basis.
3 units; may be taken as single or multi-term course
Prerequisite(s): Registration in Level II or above
Students must contact the Humanities Academic Advising Office, CNH-107, for details on the application process.
Permission of the Associate Dean of the Faculty of Humanities is required.

INTL 3A03 INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT CAPSTONE
Students will integrate and reflect upon aspects of their experiences within the Certificate in International Engagement, culminating in a final project (digital portfolio) and presentation (digital/poster). This course is to be completed under the supervision of an appropriate faculty member. Graded on a Pass/Fail basis.
3 units; one term
Prerequisite(s): 3 units of INTL 2A03 or XCH credit
Students must contact the Humanities Academic Advising Office, CNH-107, for details on the application process.
Permission of the Associate Dean of the Faculty of Humanities is required.

3 Statement of Administrative Responsibility

The Faculty of Humanities (Dean’s Office) will oversee the administration of the Certificate in International Engagement. The processes for approving experiences abroad or at home will be parallel to the processes currently in place for approving Applied Humanities courses (student-specific proposal, including learning objectives and evaluation criteria), independent study courses, and study abroad experiences.

Formal approval for the Certificate in International Engagement was granted by the Faculty of Humanities’ Academic Planning Committee on October 30, 2014.
1 Certificate Overview

The concurrent Certificate in Essential French will fill a need for formal recognition of the course work completed and the skills mastered by students who have taken the Beginner’s, Basic and Advanced Introductory French courses at McMaster: FRENCH 1Z06, 2Z06 and 2M06. This coherent set of French course represents over 230 hours of French instruction. Students seek a certificate acknowledging their functional understanding of written and spoken French. Currently, students without adequate high school preparation face a ‘dead end’ with French 1Z06 and 2Z06, since the two courses are not part of any degree options (Hons BA, BA, minor) in French. 1

The proposed Certificate provides students with formal recognition of competencies – competencies that can be translated into internationally recognized language benchmarks – when applying for positions in which employers and others consider knowledge of essential French an advantage.

2 Academic Merit

2.1 Learning Outcomes

Upon completion of the concurrent Certificate in Essential French, students

- will have achieved a solid foundation in essential French;
- will have developed a good knowledge of receptive linguistic skills in French (listening, reading, comprehension);
- will have developed limited but fundamental productive communication skills (speaking, writing);
- will have the ability to describe their competencies in the language of internationally recognized benchmarks.

2.2 International benchmarks

Upon completion of the concurrent Certificate in Essential French, students will have achieved proficiency levels in the following recognized ranges.

- CEFR/CEF (Common European Framework) level A2-B1
- DELF Certification A2-B1 (Diplôme d'Études en Langue Française)
- ILR Level 2 (Interagency Language Roundtable scale; US, Foreign Service)
- CLB Levels 5-6 (Canadian Language Benchmarks)

---

1 The pathway for any degree option in French begins with French 1A06/2M06, which presupposes the highest level of preparation for French as a second language coming from secondary school.
2.3 Certificate Requirements

Any student in an undergraduate degree program at McMaster may declare the certificate, at the time of graduation, and upon completion of the following courses in French.

Requirements (18 units)

- FRENCH 1Z06: BEGINNER INTENSIVE FRENCH I
- FRENCH 2Z06: BEGINNER INTENSIVE FRENCH II
- FRENCH 2M06: INTRODUCTION TO FRENCH STUDIES: ADVANCED*

*Students may replace French 2M06 with equivalent language courses taken during the summer through the Explore program, or with other pre-approved exchange or study abroad courses. No more than 6 units of the Certificate, however, can come from non-McMaster courses.

The Department of French strongly recommends that an immersion experience be part of the work towards the certificate.

2.3.1 Alternate Pathway to Certificate

A few students begin their French Studies at McMaster with French 2Z06. In order to avoid excluding such students from being able to complete the concurrent Certificate in Essential French, we have created the following pathway. The competencies achieved through this pathway are consistent with the proficiency ranges (2.2 International benchmarks) listed above.

Requirements (15 units)

- FRENCH 2Z06: BEGINNER INTENSIVE FRENCH II
- FRENCH 2M06: INTRODUCTION TO FRENCH STUDIES: ADVANCED*
- 3 units Level II French

*Students may replace French 2M06 with equivalent language courses taken during the summer through the Explore program, or with other pre-approved exchange or study abroad courses. No more than 6 units of the Certificate, however, can come from non-McMaster courses.

The Department of French strongly recommends that an immersion experience be part of the work towards the certificate.

3 Statement of Academic Responsibility

The Department of French and the Faculty of Humanities will oversee the administration of the concurrent Certificate in Essential French. The Department of French will review, evaluate and approve any non-McMaster French courses, as is currently the practice.

Various certificates in French competencies have been in discussion since 2014-15, and have been approved in principle in the Department of French and in the Faculty of Humanities.

---

2 Students completing a degree program in French (Hons BA, BA, minor) are not eligible for the concurrent Certificate in Essential French.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Fall Term (62 days)</th>
<th>Winter Term (62 days)</th>
<th>Courses Spanning both Terms (124 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration begins</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be announced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 4</td>
<td>Monday, January 7*</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for registration and changes in registration</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 12</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 15</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Recess(es)</td>
<td>Monday, October 8 to Sunday, October 14</td>
<td>Monday, February 18 to Sunday, February 24</td>
<td>Monday, October 8 to Sunday, October 14 and, Monday, February 18 to Sunday, February 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for cancelling courses without failure by default</td>
<td>Friday, November 9</td>
<td>Friday, March 15</td>
<td>Friday, March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Friday: No classes or examinations</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Friday, April 19</td>
<td>Friday, April 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Ban (See Undergraduate Course Management Policies)</td>
<td>Thursday, November 29 to Thursday, December 6</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 3 to Wednesday, April 10</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 3 to Wednesday, April 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
<td>Wednesday, December 5</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 9</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Tests Level (I)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Friday, December 7 to Thursday, December 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examinations 12 days</td>
<td>Friday, December 7 to Thursday, December 20</td>
<td>Thursday, April 11 to Monday, April 29</td>
<td>Thursday, April 11 to Monday, April 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred examinations</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 19 to Friday, February 22</td>
<td>Monday June 24 to Thursday June 27</td>
<td>Monday June 24 to Thursday June 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The University re-opens on Wednesday, January 2, 2019 after the December holidays; classes begin January 7.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Spring Session (34 days)</th>
<th>Summer Session (33 days)</th>
<th>Full-Term Courses (67 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes begin</td>
<td>Monday, May 6</td>
<td>Monday, June 24</td>
<td>Monday, May 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for registration and changes in registration</td>
<td>Monday, May 13</td>
<td>Tuesday, July 2</td>
<td>Monday, May 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Day: No classes</td>
<td>Monday, May 20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada Day: No classes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, July 1</td>
<td>Monday, July 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for cancelling courses without failure by default</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 5</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 24</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Holiday: No classes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, August 5</td>
<td>Monday, August 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
<td>Friday, June 21</td>
<td>Friday, August 9</td>
<td>Friday, August 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td>As arranged by instructor in class time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td>2019 Fall Mid-Term Recess Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule E  UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL COMMITTEES

1. The committees of Undergraduate Council shall include, but shall not be limited to:

   (a) the Executive Committee
   (b) the Awards Committee
   (c) the Curriculum and Admissions Committee
   (d) the Certificates and Diplomas Committee
   (e) the Quality Assurance Committee*, and
   (f) ad hoc committees and task forces as required

   Except for the Executive Committee, each committee should be chaired by an elected faculty representative, an Associate Dean, or a knowledgeable faculty member of the University. These appointments shall be made by the Executive Committee. Each committee will consist of at least five members, including the Chair of Undergraduate Council. A majority of the Committee members shall be members of Undergraduate Council.

2. (a) The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chairs of the Standing Committees of Undergraduate Council, the Chair of Undergraduate Council and the Vice-Chair of Undergraduate Council.

   (b) The Chair of the Committee shall be the Chair of Undergraduate Council.

   (c) The Committee shall act for Undergraduate Council between Council meetings on matters pertaining to Undergraduate Council. Such actions shall be reported for ratification at the next regular meeting of Undergraduate Council.

   (d) The Committee shall nominate members to the committees of Council and, where otherwise not expressly identified, shall nominate the Chairs thereof. The Committee may invite two committee membership people whose expertise is sought, but who are not members of Undergraduate Council.

3. The Awards Committee shall be responsible for reporting to Undergraduate Council all scholarships and academic awards winners and adjudicating recommendations for scholarship and academic award winners as necessary. The Committee shall act as the guardian of standards and non-discriminatory fairness in award descriptions and nominations, develop and enforce policy regarding academic awards and adjudicate petitions regarding variances in the terms of awards.

4. The Curriculum and Admissions Committee shall co-ordinate the curriculum changes from all Faculties with a view to fairness to students, avoidance of conflicts, and equity among Faculties. It shall also ensure that any new admissions policies or the revision of existing policies are consistent with general University guidelines. Dialogue with Institutions that seek unique University admission arrangements for their own students shall also be handled by the Curriculum and Admissions Committee.

5. The Certificates and Diplomas Committee shall scrutinize proposals for new certificate and diploma programs and ensure their conformity with the Senate Policy on Diplomas and Certificates**.

6. The Quality Assurance Committee is a joint committee of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, and shall assess cyclical program reviews and submit a report to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council, as applicable, as set out in the Policy on Academic Program Development and Review**.

* Approved by Senate, May 9, 2012
** Pending Senate approval of policy revisions
REPORT TO SENATE

FROM THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Open Session


At its May 8, 2017 meeting, the Executive Committee approved the recommendations in the report of the panel charged with reviewing the Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response Policy, as well as proposed hearing procedures.

The Executive Committee recommends:

"that the Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the recommendation of the panel to review the Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response Policy as set out in the attached, including the revised policy and the Hearing Procedures for the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence, effective June 8, 2017."

Senate: For Approval
May 17, 2017
Report of the 
Panel to Review the Policy on 
Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response 

The current *Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response* policy (DHSH) was approved by Senate and the Board of Governors in May 2015 and June 2015, respectively. As part of the approval process, a commitment was made that a detailed review of the policy would be undertaken after it had been in operation for two years. When the new *Sexual Violence Policy* was approved in December 2016, however, it became apparent that this new policy would have an impact on the scope of the current DHSH policy and would necessitate some revisions to that policy. It seemed prudent to move up the review by a few months so that the DHSH policy could be more quickly aligned with the new *Sexual Violence Policy*.

With that in mind, Senate and the Board of Governors approved the establishment of a Review Panel in December 2016, and asked that Panel to report back by May 2017.

The Panel's terms of reference were as follows:

1. Review the *Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response* policy in light of the new stand-alone policy on Sexual Violence and recommend any revisions to the policy required in order to avoid overlap or duplication between the two policies;

2. Complete the full review of the *Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response* policy recommended by the Anti-Discrimination/Sexual Harassment Policies and Procedures Review Panel in its 2015 report, in a process inclusive of all university constituencies. As envisaged by the previous Panel, through consultations with the university community and with the various units and University officers tasked with implementing and operating the policy, this review should include an assessment of the effectiveness of the policy, the need for any procedural adjustments, and consideration of any operational issues related to its implementation, including (but not limited to) the following matters:

   - the effectiveness and timeliness of the informal and formal complaints resolution process;
   - the effectiveness and timeliness of the formal investigations undertaken (whether internal or external);
   - the effectiveness and timeliness of the Hearing process (if utilized);
   - the effectiveness of the educational and training initiatives, and the need for any additional training to support the effective and consistent implementation of the policy across campus; and
   - any concerns arising from the implementation of the policy, or its practical application.
3. Recommend any revisions to the Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Harassment: Prevention and Response policy required as a result of the full review referred to above.

PANEL MEMBERSHIP
Dr. Gary Warner (Faculty - Retired)
Dr. Anne Niec (Faculty)
Dr. Vickie Galea (Faculty)
Ms. Angela Orash (Graduate Student) - latterly, this position was filled by Mr. Avijit Mallick
Mr. Justin Monaco-Barnes (Undergraduate Student) - latterly, this position was filled by Mr. Chukky Ibe
Ms Michelle Bennett (Staff - University Secretariat)
Ms Allison Drew-Hassling (Staff - Student Support & Case Management, Student Affairs)
Ms Pilar Michaud (Staff - Equity and Inclusion Office)
Ms Maggie Pooran (Staff - Employee/Labour Relations, HRS)
Ms Helen Ayre, University Secretary acted as consultant to the Review Panel.

The Panel's first meeting was on January 20, 2017, at which time Dr. Gary Warner was chosen to chair the Panel. The Panel's work on the policy has been informed by consultations with: representatives of University areas and offices involved with the existing policy, as well as the Sexual Violence Policy; student, staff and faculty constituencies of the campus community; and lawyers internal and external to McMaster. (See Appendix A for full list.)

INTERIM MEASURE
One of the first items of business for the Panel was consideration of the overlap between the current policy and the new Sexual Violence Policy. Both policies have been designed to deal with issues of sexual harassment, however, the most recent definition of sexual violence provided by the provincial government places sexual harassment firmly within the realm of sexual violence.

Given this, the Review Panel took the view that clear guidance should be provided to the community regarding the most appropriate avenue through which to seek redress when sexual harassment is the issue. To that end, the Review Panel recommended as an interim measure that Senate and the Board of Governors suspend the sexual harassment provisions of the DSHS Policy in favour of those contained in the Sexual Violence Policy. This recommendation was approved in March 2017.

REVIEW FINDINGS
As part of its fact-finding, the Panel met with representative Intake Coordinators from all the Intake Offices that are responsible for helping members of the community navigate the current process. The Panel also met with representatives of the MUFA Executive (President, and Special Enquiries and Grievances), the Ombuds, and with the Associate Vice-President (Students and Learning) and Dean of Students.
There was acknowledgement that the first iteration of the policy served an educational function for the community and that the inclusion of illustrative examples and other information was useful. However, the result is that the current policy is very long and not as user-friendly as it should be. Now that there is more information available on the Respectful Community website (developed with the assistance of Human Resources Services, Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office, and the Office of Equity and Inclusion) that helps explain the process and performs much of the educational function of the original policy, the Panel was advised to reduce the length and complexity of the policy to the extent possible. Many of those who met with the Panel pointed to the processes in the newly approved Sexual Violence Policy as an example of a more streamlined policy and procedure for dealing with issues.

They raised the issue of overlap between these two polices and expressed concern, either that community members may not know which policy to invoke, or may feel they can pursue complaints under both policies, either simultaneously or sequentially. The Panel was urged to consider this question of overlap carefully and to find a way of integrating the two policies and procedures as much as possible.

Also on the matter of overlap, the Panel is aware that other policies exist that may also involve some overlap with the new Policy on Discrimination and Harassment, such as the Policy on Group Conflict Resolution, and the Senate Mediation Procedures. It will be important, going forward, that all such policies are aligned to the extent possible.

One of the complexities in the current policy that was highlighted during consultations is the length of time involved in resolving a situation, particularly once an investigation has been commenced; this can result in the deterioration of relationships, making any recovery more difficult.

Going forward, when reviewing a complaint, the Assessment Team will consider the complexity of the particular case and will determine a reasonable timeframe for the investigation. The Complainant and Respondent will be informed of the timelines put in place by the Assessment Team.

Another common observation was that there needs to be more flexibility and discretion to allow those with expertise to explore the possibility of informal resolution before the matter proceeds to a more formal stage. While the principle of timeliness still applies to the entire process, some of the more rigid timelines have been relaxed or removed to allow for greater flexibility. Concerns were also expressed that Respondents in a complaint situation may not always receive the support they need, and that interim measures may be left in place for too long a period.

The current process includes a requirement that parties accept the findings and proposed sanctions before a matter can be resolved without a hearing. While admirable in theory, this requirement appears to prolong the process rather than lead to a swift resolution. More generally, the policy was seen as providing too few pathways for resolving issues without having recourse to formal investigations and hearings. In the revised policy, more emphasis has been placed on attempts at informal resolution.

Resources remain an issue. While there have been additional resources provided for training and education, much more needs to be done, as the current provision of appropriate training to those who need it appears inadequate. Additional resources have been made available in the Equity and Inclusion Office, but attention needs to be paid to the level of resources available in
Human Resources Services, Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office, and Student Support and Case Management, as demands on these areas have increased greatly with the introduction of this and the Sexual Violence Policy, while resources have remained static or diminished.

There was also a plea that more general training, education, web resources and tools be provided to those staff and faculty who act as supervisors of other employees. Relevant web resources and, where the need is identified, targeted training should also be made available to the University community at large. Managers of all kinds need the skills and training to help them manage performance issues appropriately and to deal with internal conflicts. It was suggested that these skills should form part of the selection criteria for those with oversight of other employees. Attention should be given also to offering support and specialised services, beyond those available as part of the complaint process, to assist in repairing relationships where these have broken down. The University would benefit from this in the long term, because a poor supervisor can cause real damage to an area; often people will simply move on to another position rather than try to resolve matters with a supervisor who is seen as a negative force in an area or unit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Panel recommends for approval by Senate and the Board of Governors the attached revised policy entitled Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention & Response, and the Hearing Procedures for the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence, to take effect June 8, 2017. Any case that has not proceeded to the level of an investigation by this date should be processed under the new policy; however, in those cases where an investigation has already commenced, the matter should be completed under the policy in place when the investigation was initiated.

The policy has been revised to mirror as much as possible the processes outlined in the Sexual Violence Policy. The two policies have been integrated to the extent possible, in order that any overlap can be addressed, thus streamlining the process for both complainants and respondents, and ensuring that everyone is treated in the same manner, regardless of which policy they initially engage.

Any complaint that involves an element of Sexual Harassment should be processed under the Sexual Violence Policy so that Complainants and Respondents will have access to the specialised supports and resources available under that policy. In those situations where it is not clear which policy should be used, an Assessment Team will review the details and determine the most appropriate route.

2. The Panel recommends that the policy be reviewed in two years, at the same time, and by the same group, as the initial review of the Sexual Violence Policy. Thereafter, the two policies should be reviewed together every three years, in a process that includes all university constituencies. In all cases, the review should assess the effectiveness of the policy, the need for any procedural adjustments, and the sufficiency of resources for its successful implementation.
3. The Panel recommends that the issue of resources and training be addressed by the Administration. Resources are needed to bolster the work of the Intake Offices, particularly in Student Support and Case Management, and the Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office. The Intake Offices are the front-line in the battle for an equitable community and need to be supported with meaningful resources.

Similarly, resources should be made available for the selection and training of managers, so that those with oversight of other employees can be provided with the tools and training necessary to manage performance issues appropriately, to effect conflict resolution, and to foster a healthy environment in their area of responsibility. Consideration should be given to developing mandatory training for senior managers and administration.

Additional resources also need to be directed towards support for group conflict resolution, mediation, and restorative justice processes.

4. The Panel recommends that the new position of Vice-Provost (Equity and Inclusion) undertake a review to ensure that there are no conflicts or inconsistencies among the various relevant policies currently in existence. Consideration might also be given to the development of a Civility Policy, something which has been adopted successfully by other institutions of higher education.
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SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

PREAMBLE

1. McMaster University is committed to fostering a respectful and inclusive organizational culture in which all members of the University community work, study, and live free of Discrimination and Harassment.

2. The University upholds a fundamental commitment to freedom of expression and association for all its members and to academic freedom for faculty. In exercising those freedoms, all its members are required to respect the rights and freedoms of others, including the right to freedom from Discrimination and Harassment.

3. Prevention of Discrimination and Harassment are matters of not only individual concern but of significance for the overall climate and welfare of the University community.

4. The University is committed to providing the policies, resources, and organizational structures required to support an environment free from Discrimination and Harassment.

5. Prevention through education is a fundamental aspect of the University’s commitment. As part of this commitment, the University provides a range of educational and community-building activities that foster understanding of human rights issues and of the harm incurred by their violation, and communicate the expectation of and support for a working, studying, and living environment free from Discrimination and Harassment.

6. The University has a legal and ethical responsibility to address issues, incidents, and Complaints of Discrimination and Harassment, to enable accessible processes for resolution, and to provide support to all Community Members involved in such processes. The Administration may also respond when it is identified that there is systemic/institutional Discrimination and/or Harassment that needs to be addressed. In fulfilling this responsibility, the University is committed to balancing the principles of fairness, thoroughness, timeliness, and confidentiality, as appropriate in each circumstance. See Appendix C: Glossary of Terms.

7. In seeking to prevent and address Discrimination and Harassment, the Policy is guided by the Human Rights Code and the Occupational Health and Safety Act, as well as by other legislation, policies, and collective agreements identified in Appendix A: Related Policies and Legislation.

8. For the purpose of interpreting this document, words in the singular may include the plural and words in the plural may include the singular.

9. In the University context, a member of the Administration may on occasion delegate responsibilities to another individual in the University. Any named positions in this Policy may delegate their authority where appropriate.

10. Links to more information may be found on the Equity and Inclusion Office website equity.mcmaster.ca or the Respectful Community website.
POLICY REVIEW

11. The Policy will be reviewed annually to ensure compliance with the Occupational Health and Safety Act. For all other purposes, the Policy will receive an initial review within two years. Thereafter it will be reviewed every three years at the same time as the Sexual Violence Policy.

PREVENTION, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING

12. Prevention through education is a fundamental aspect of the University’s commitment to addressing Discrimination and Harassment. The Equity and Inclusion Office, with the support of the Senior Administration, is responsible for coordinating the University’s preventive, educational and training initiatives and programs, which include:

a) prevention, education and training initiatives for the University Community, that will be attuned to the broader social context in which Discrimination and Harassment occurs; and

b) training to support those with particular responsibilities related to this Policy, which will be provided on an ongoing basis, integrating an anti-oppressive and trauma-informed analysis of Discrimination and Harassment.

13. The University Secretary, in consultation with the Director, Human Rights & Dispute Resolution (Equity and Inclusion Office), will ensure that the members of the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence receive training on Discrimination and Harassment.

SCOPE OF THE POLICY

14. Unless otherwise specified in this Policy, the Policy and its provisions apply to all acts of Discrimination and/or Harassment where the University has the jurisdiction (see Appendix B: Jurisdiction) to pursue, adjudicate, or take steps to safeguard the University community. The Policy applies to:

All Members of the University Community (“Community Members”)

a) Community Members include, but are not limited to: students (graduate, undergraduate, and continuing education), staff, faculty, postdoctoral fellows, adjunct professors, visiting professors, sessional faculty, teaching assistants, clinical faculty, librarians, medical residents\(^1\), volunteers, visitors, observers, and institutional administrators and officials representing McMaster University.

b) It is possible that members of the Administration may be the focus of Complaints concerned either with their conduct as individuals (in relation to incidents of Discrimination and Harassment), or with their conduct in their formal roles (e.g. Chair, Manager, Dean).

All University-Related Activities

c) University-related activities include events (authorized and non-authorized) that occur on University premises or on non-University premises where there is a clear nexus to the working or learning environment at the University (see also clause 44); and

\(^1\) Except where the medical resident’s employment relationship takes precedence.
All instances of Discrimination and/or Harassment

d) all instances of Discrimination and/or Harassment that have occurred or are occurring during University-related activities.

DEFINITIONS

15. This Policy prohibits Discrimination and/or Harassment on the grounds articulated in the *Human Rights Code*:

   a) age;
   b) ancestry, colour, race;
   c) citizenship;
   d) ethnic origin;
   e) place of origin;
   f) creed;
   g) disability;
   h) family status;
   i) marital status (including single status);
   j) gender identity, gender expression;
   k) receipt of public assistance (in housing only);
   l) record of offences (in employment only);
   m) sex (including pregnancy and breastfeeding); and
   n) sexual orientation.

16. This Policy expressly prohibits any discriminatory or harassing action and/or conduct, verbal or non-verbal, directed at or about one or more individuals or groups, that creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment (*poisoned environment*), or interferes with academic or work performance, in a manner that exceeds the bounds of freedom of expression and academic freedom.

Discrimination

17. Discrimination means an unjust or prejudicial form of unequal treatment, whether imposing extra burdens or denying benefits, based on any of the grounds articulated in the *Human Rights Code*. It may be intentional or unintentional. It may involve direct actions that are discriminatory on their face, or it may involve rules, practices or procedures that appear neutral, but disadvantage certain groups of people (*systemic discrimination*). Discrimination may take obvious forms, or it may happen in very subtle ways. Even if there are many factors affecting a decision or action, if Discrimination is one factor, then that is a violation of this Policy.²

18. Harassment means engagement in a course of vexatious comment or conduct that is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome. "Vexatious" comment or conduct is comment or conduct made without reasonable cause or excuse. Harassment includes Sexual and/or Gender-Based Harassment and Workplace Sexual Harassment.

19. A Poisoned Environment means an environment where harassing and/or discriminatory conduct is found to be sufficiently severe, intimidating, hostile, offensive, and/or pervasive to cause significant and unreasonable interference to a person’s study or work environment. A Poisoned Environment can interfere with and/or undermine work or academic performance and can cause emotional and psychological stress for some employees or students not experienced by other employees or students. As such, it results in unequal terms and conditions of employment or study and prevents or impairs full and equal enjoyment of employment or educational services, benefits, or opportunities. Although a person may not be the target of the conduct, a person may feel the effects of certain harassing or discriminatory conduct at their place of work or study.³

20. Sexual and/or Gender-Based Harassment, including Workplace Sexual Harassment, means engaging in a course of vexatious comment against an individual because of sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression where the course of comment or conduct is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome; or making a sexual solicitation or advance to an individual where the person making the solicitation or advance is in a position to confer, grant or deny a benefit or advancement to the individual and the person knows or ought reasonably to know that the solicitation or advance is unwelcome. Such Harassment may involve one incident or a series of incidents.

21. While allegations of Sexual Harassment are processed under the Sexual Violence Policy, there may be circumstances where the allegations in a Complaint may necessitate following the procedures under both this Policy and the Sexual Violence Policy. Where an individual files a Complaint that involves behaviour prohibited by this Policy, as well as behaviour more appropriately dealt with under the Sexual Violence Policy, the Complaint will be processed under the Sexual Violence Policy so as to ensure that the complainant has access to the specialized supports available under that Policy. However, any Investigation or hearing related to the Complaint will still determine if the complainant suffered unequal, discriminatory or harassing treatment in violation of this Policy, in addition to any findings related to the Sexual Violence Policy.

³ Ryerson University has kindly shared its definition of Poisoned Environment with McMaster University for use in this policy. Some language has been added to the definition.
SECTION II: OPTIONS FOR RESOLUTION

22. Community Members who raise an issue, report an incident or make a Complaint may pursue one or more of the options below. Prior to pursuing one of the options below Community Members should read Section IV: Confidentiality. When the University becomes aware of an issue or an incident it may be obliged to investigate.

23. Individuals may consult with an Intake Coordinator or with the Ombuds to receive advice and guidance on options that may be available to resolve the matter. Such options include:

INFORMAL RESOLUTION

24. Options for informal resolution may include some fact-finding discussion, clarification of the issues, facilitated conversations, informal dispute resolution, coaching, reconciliation, workplace restoration, settlement conferences, restorative justice measures, and mediation.

Communicate Directly

25. Community Members who have experienced unwelcome comment or conduct by another person are encouraged, although not obliged, to make it known to the other person that their behaviour is unwelcome. In situations where it is believed that addressing the other person could lead to an escalation of the comment or conduct, or to safety risks, this approach is not recommended. If the problem is not resolved, or if the Community Member feels they cannot speak directly to the other person, they should notify an appropriate supervisor within the University of the matter.

Resolve with Assistance of Supervisor

26. Individuals may inform/seek assistance from their supervisor or person who has formal oversight of their area to help address the situation.

Resolve with Assistance of Intake Office

27. Individuals may inform/seek assistance from an Intake Office to help address the situation.

FORMAL RESOLUTION

Complaint

28. A Complaint is made when an individual completes the relevant intake form notifying an Intake Coordinator of an allegation and seeking the University's formal response.

29. Informal resolution processes may continue after a Complaint is filed, and remains an option for resolution until the point when a final determination is made on whether or not there has been a violation of the Policy. A final determination under this Policy means the later of: (a) the date on which the appropriate decision-maker initially determines that a violation of the Policy has occurred and that sanctions and/or remedies are appropriate; or (b) the first date of a Hearing of student's appeal or faculty member's Hearing.
OTHER OPTIONS

30. Individuals may exercise other options external to this Policy (e.g. the grievance provisions of applicable collective agreements) or other options external to the University (e.g. through civil litigation or Human Rights Code provisions).

31. Individuals who file a Complaint, or pursue other options as outlined above, may be required to attend/participate in a hearing, either internal to the University, or external through arbitration or tribunal hearing, etc.

32. At any time, Community Members may also seek advice and support from: Human Resources Services, Union representative, relevant Student association, Faculty Association, Ombuds, and Chaplaincy Centre, etc.
SECTION III: SUPPORTS AND RESOURCES

33. Community Members who make a Complaint, or who are the subject of an allegation, are encouraged to contact any of the offices below to ensure that they are in receipt of relevant information and services:

- **Equity and Inclusion Office** (all Community Members)
- **Employee/Labour Relations** (faculty and staff)
- **Student Support & Case Management** (students)
- **Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office** (all Community Members in the Faculty of Health Sciences)

34. Community Members may also make use of available supports and resources below.

*For the University Community*

- **Equity and Inclusion Office**
- **Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office**
- **Security Services**
- **Chaplaincy Centre**

*For Students*

- **Student Wellness Centre** (personal counselling and medical services)
- **Student Support & Case Management** (support and guidance on the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities)
- **MSU Women and Gender Equity Network** (peer support and resources)
- **MSU Peer Support Line** (24 hour a day telephone support line, including legal advice and counselling)
- **MSU Queer Students Community Centre** (peer support and resources for sexual orientation and gender identity)
- **MSU Maccess** (peer support and resources for disabilities)
- **Graduate Students Association Health & Dental Plans** (health benefits include access to psychological counselling in the community)
For Staff and Faculty

- Union or Association
- Employee/Labour Relations
- Employee and Family Assistance Program (access to professional counsellors, legal guidance and other supportive services available to staff and faculty)

Broader Community

- Good2Talk (24/7 phone support for students offered by professional counsellors)
- John Howard Society (for individuals in conflict with the law)
- Elizabeth Fry Society (for individuals in conflict with the law)

Guidance about a Policy and/or Procedures

- University Secretariat
- Equity and Inclusion Office
- Employee/Labour Relations
- Student Support & Case Management
- Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office
- Ombuds Office

Independent Resource

- Ombuds Office

The Ombuds Office provides confidential advice and assistance to all members of the University community. The Ombuds Office reports directly to the President of the University and the President of the McMaster Students Union (MSU) and is otherwise not a University office as it is independent of all existing administrative structures. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Ombudsperson is not required to maintain confidentiality in cases involving the commission of a serious crime or where there is an imminent risk of physical harm or abuse.
SECTION IV: CONFIDENTIALITY AND PRIVACY

35. The University recognizes the importance of confidentiality for anyone coming forward with an issue, incident or Complaint of Discrimination and/or Harassment and for anyone named as an alleged Respondent, and will protect confidentiality to the extent permitted by its legal obligations.

36. The University and its employees and agents will protect personal information and handle records in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act and the Personal Health Information Protection Act, with the provisions of applicable collective agreements and, in the case of health care providers, in keeping with any professional obligations.

37. When discussing issues, incidents or reporting a Complaint to any University office, individuals should receive an explanation of, and are advised to clarify, the level of confidentiality that applies to the office/individual.

38. Individuals may speak in confidence to an Intake Coordinator or any University office, subject to the provisions of this section and the limitations below. In such cases, only the minimum amount of information needed to address the matter and/or meet requirements will be disclosed. Limitations to confidentiality exist when:
   a) an individual is at risk of harm to self;
   b) an individual is at risk of harming others;
   c) there are reasonable grounds to be concerned with risk of future violence or the safety of the University and/or broader community;
   d) disclosure is required by law or to comply with the Occupational Health and Safety Act or with human rights legislation;
   e) evidence of the disclosed incident of Discrimination or Harassment is available in the public realm (e.g. video shared publicly on social media); and/or
   f) where there is a need for notification in order to comply with the reporting requirements of regulatory bodies.

39. Individuals may also choose to speak with the Ombuds, an office that provides an independent, impartial, and confidential process through which members of the University community may pursue a resolution.

40. Some offices and Community Members have additional limitations to confidentiality because of their particular reporting requirements or professional obligations. For example:
   a) those faculty and staff etc. who are regulated health care providers (such as those in Student Wellness Centre) are required to maintain the confidentiality of patient information disclosed during a medical interaction. These health care providers are not permitted to share information except in very limited circumstances, such as with the express permission of the patient, or if the health care provider believes that disclosure is necessary to eliminate or reduce a significant risk of serious harm to a person or group of persons, in accordance with their professional obligations; and
b) those staff who are Special Constables in Security Services are required to investigate reports of domestic violence and to lay charges in all cases when there are reasonable grounds to believe such an offence has been committed, regardless of whether the individual wishes to have further involvement with the legal process.

41. Procedural limits to confidentiality may also occur if the University is subject to legal proceedings that, in the opinion of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) or the Vice-President (Administration), (in consultation with the President), require the disclosure of information.

42. As part of the University's internal responsibility to maintain an environment free from Discrimination and Harassment, information shall be shared on a need-to-know basis.

43. The Complainant will receive information about any sanctions/remedies taken by the University, within the constraints of relevant legislation. In all cases, information about any sanctions/remedies that have a direct impact on the Complainant will be provided to them.

44. Where required by a professional licensing body, the results of the Investigation may also be communicated to that professional licensing body.

45. The University's responsibility to address issues, incidents, and Complaints of Discrimination and/or Harassment extends to University-related activities such as the off campus experiential learning and working environment (including, but not limited to, off-campus coursework such as fieldwork, placement, clinical placement, internship and out-of-the-classroom learning experiences). However, this responsibility exists independently from the off-site/placement or third party entity. In order to address such issues, incidents, and Complaints, the University may need to disclose information to the off-site entity on a need-to-know basis. This could include notifying the off-site entity of the outcome of the Investigation or coordinating a joint Investigation. See Appendix B: Jurisdiction.
SECTION V: PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

ACCOMPANIMENT

46. Individuals coming forward with a Complaint (Complainants), individuals about whom allegations are made (Respondents), and witnesses may at any stage of any of the procedures outlined in this Policy be accompanied by an Advisor. The Advisor may be present during Investigation interviews but may not participate as a representative. The costs of any accommodation are to be borne by the party.

TIME LIMITATIONS FOR BRINGING FORWARD A COMPLAINT

47. Individuals are encouraged to report a Complaint at the earliest opportunity, but must do so within one year of the date on which the incident of Discrimination and/or Harassment is alleged to have occurred. If there was a series of incidents it must be reported within one year of the date of the last event. However, if the Assessment Team is satisfied there are compelling reasons and/or extenuating circumstances, or where a Complainant engages this Policy and the Sexual Violence Policy and the allegations cannot be separated from one another, Complaints may be pursued outside of this timeframe. When the Complainant is no longer a Community Member, the Assessment Team will review the Complaint and determine whether it is within the scope of the Policy and may decide to initiate a University Investigation.

PROTECTION FROM REPRISAL

48. The University specifically prohibits reprisal or threats of reprisal against any Community Member who, sincerely and in good faith, makes use of this Policy or participates in any process held under its jurisdiction. An individual who believes they are the subject of a reprisal or threat of reprisal shall report this to an Intake Office. Any individual or body found to be making such reprisals or threats will be subject to sanctions under the appropriate policy (including this Policy, the Sexual Violence Policy, and the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities) as circumstances dictate.

COOPERATION AND SELF-INCrimINATION

49. It is possible that individuals questioned as witnesses, informants or bystanders about an alleged violation of the Policy may, by cooperating responsibly with the University’s processes, reveal their own infraction of a University regulation or code (e.g. alcohol use, unsanctioned use of University facilities). In such instances, and given the University’s commitment to addressing Discrimination and Harassment, every effort will be made to support individuals coming forward and, if appropriate and possible, take their cooperation into account if any sanction applies to their conduct.

INTERIM MEASURES AND ONGOING SUPPORT OF ALL PARTIES

50. At any stage in the proceedings under this Policy it may be necessary to take Interim Measures in order to safeguard the environment of Complainants, and/or Respondents.

51. Interim Measures may include, but are not limited to, the rearrangement of academic/employment responsibilities or oversight, the rearrangement of residence location (where possible), adjustments in
University activities (e.g. attendance at guest lectures, social events), implementation of a No Contact Order, or implementation of a Persona Non Grata designation.

52. Interim Measures imposed on any party shall not be construed as evidence of either guilt or a finding of violation of this Policy, or as an affirmation of innocence/finding of non-violation of this Policy.

53. The Assessment Team considers, recommends, and/or coordinates, and reviews Interim Measures as they relate to the parties involved in the matter; facilitates any planning; and considers other University responses that may be necessary. The Assessment Team shall give due consideration to the effect that the filing of a Complaint may have on both parties in the case of any kind of supervisory relationship, as well as the need to preserve future working relationships, career progress/prospects, and/or academic program/studies.

54. The authority to approve Interim Measures will rest with the relevant Decision-Maker, in line with the reporting structure of the Complainant and/or the Respondent, as outlined in (clause 72-75).

55. In the event an Employee is directed to take an administrative leave as an Interim Measure, the conditions of the administrative leave shall accord with the terms of any applicable collective agreement. In the absence of an applicable collective agreement, (e.g. where the employee is faculty or The Management Group (TMG)) the leave shall be without loss of pay or benefits. It is understood that an administrative leave as an Interim measure is non-disciplinary and is designed to separate a person from a situation or another person until the matter has been resolved. During such period, the person can continue to access relevant University support services.

56. Interim Measures will be reviewed by the Assessment Team monthly throughout the process to ensure they remain necessary and appropriate in the circumstances. Interim Measures do not extend beyond the final resolution of a Complaint.

57. Should an Investigation extend beyond six months, there will be a full review by the Assessment Team in consultation with the Decision-Maker to assess progress, considering fairness to all parties, thoroughness, timeliness, and confidentiality, and to consider any necessary next steps.

DATA GATHERING & RECORD KEEPING

58. The Equity and Inclusion Office is responsible for providing a written, anonymized, annual statistical report to the Senate and the Board of Governors in order to ensure the identification of areas or issues of repeated concern. The report shall include statistical data on Complaints, resolution/mediation, Investigations, outcomes, sanctions, and Complaints dropped or withdrawn, as well as data on consultations.

59. All notes, materials, Investigation reports, and decisions, pertaining to Complaints will be kept by the relevant Intake Office for seven years. These records may be retained longer, subject to the discretion of the appropriate Director or Decision-Maker.
SECTION VI: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

INTAKE OFFICES

60. The Intake Offices share responsibility for addressing issues, incidents, and Complaints relating to Discrimination and Harassment. There are four Intake Offices:
   a) **Equity and Inclusion Office** (available to all Community Members)
   b) **Student Support & Case Management** (available to all Community Members, where the Respondent is a student)
   c) **Employee/Labour Relations** (available to staff and faculty)
   d) **Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office** (available to all Community Members in the Faculty of Health Sciences).

INTAKE COORDINATORS

61. Intake Coordinators are available in each of the four Intake Offices listed above, and will assist in exploring and facilitating resolution processes, as appropriate. The Intake Coordinators are also responsible for assessing issues and incidents in consultation with their Director, as well as the initial intake of Complaints. An Intake Coordinator’s referral activates the Assessment Team.

ALL COMMUNITY MEMBERS

62. All **Community Members** are responsible for:
   a) contributing to and maintaining an environment that is free of Discrimination and Harassment;
   b) participating in education and training programs when appropriate;
   c) handling issues and incidents through the **Options for Resolution** listed in Section II; and
   d) participating in Investigations under this Policy, if requested to do so.

FACULTY AND STAFF IN SUPERVISORY ROLES

63. Within the University Community it is recognized that there are various types of supervisors: **Academic Supervisors**, **Academic Administrators**, and **Workplace Supervisors**. All such supervisors are responsible for:
   a) modeling acceptable standards of behavior;
   b) supporting any employee or student who, in good faith, reports a potential violation of the Policy and protecting them from reprisal;
   c) cooperating with Intake Offices during Investigations, and in the implementation of Interim Measures, and/or Sanctions;
   d) completing all required training and ensuring that the people they are supervising are trained appropriately on the Policy and **RMM 300 Health and Safety Training Program**; and
e) being aware of their roles and responsibilities as set out in the *Occupational Health and Safety Act* with respect to workplace violence and workplace Harassment.

64. Faculty members and staff who become aware of an issue, incident, or Complaint of a potential violation of the Policy must:
   a) contact one of the Intake Offices for guidance and advice to address the matter as appropriate in the circumstances. In many cases matters may be adequately addressed through the fact-finding necessary to effect an informal resolution;
   b) inform individuals coming forward of the reporting requirements and limits to confidentiality that apply to them; and
   c) advise the individual of the Policy, the supports available and provide the option of referring them to an Intake Office.

**STUDENT LEADERS**

65. Students in designated positions of responsibility and/or leadership (Student Leaders) are responsible for modelling acceptable standards of behavior.

66. Student Leaders who become aware of an issue, incident, or Complaint of a potential violation of the Policy must:
   a) inform individuals coming forward of the reporting requirements and limits to confidentiality that apply to them;
   b) refer them to the faculty or staff person who has formal oversight of the designated area, and/or the appropriate Intake Office; and
   c) inform the person with formal oversight of the potential violation.

**ASSESSMENT TEAM**

67. The Assessment Team is responsible for assessing every Complaint of a potential violation of the Policy referred to them by an Intake Coordinator, and for reviewing issues and incidents of which they become aware.

68. The Assessment Team will include the Director, Human Rights & Dispute Resolution, and as necessary in the circumstances:
   a) the Director, Employee/Labour Relations;
   b) the Director, Student Support & Case Management;
   c) the Advisor, Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office; and/or
   d) the Intake Coordinator.

69. As necessary, and disclosing identities only on a need-to-know basis in order to appropriately respond to the matter, the Assessment Team may draw upon representatives of key services and/or departments (e.g. a Co-Chair of the Violence Risk Assessment Team, Director of Housing and Conference Services, Director of the Student Wellness Centre, Director of Security Services).
DIRECTOR, HUMAN RIGHTS & DISPUTE RESOLUTION

70. The Director, Human Rights and Dispute Resolution is responsible for working in close partnership with individuals and offices involved in implementing this Policy, including but not limited to: the Assessment Team, Investigators, Associate Vice-Presidents, Assistant Vice-Presidents, Senior Administration, and the University Secretariat.

71. The Director, Human Rights and Dispute Resolution is responsible for the analysis of data gathered by the Equity and Inclusion Office or provided to that office by Human Resources Services, Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office, and Student Support & Case Management.

INVESTIGATORS

72. All Investigators appointed under this Policy, whether internal or external to the University, will have training and expertise in the area of Discrimination and Harassment, and a trauma-informed, anti-oppressive approach to investigation processes.

DECISION-MAKERS FOR INTAKE AND INVESTIGATIONS

73. The Decision-Makers under the intake and Investigations procedures include, as applicable, the: Assistant Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer; Associate Vice-President (Students and Learning) & Dean of Students; and Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (or in the case of the Faculty of Health Sciences, an appropriate delegate).

74. Depending upon the constituency of the Respondent, Decision-Makers may be responsible for reviewing and responding to Investigation reports (see Section VIII: Adjudication and Decisions).

75. When the line of authority is unclear, the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) or the Vice-President (Administration), as appropriate, will determine the appropriate individual in the line of authority.

76. Should there be a conflict of interest with a Decision-Maker, the appropriate Vice-President shall assume the responsibilities of the Decision-Maker under this Policy. Similarly, if that Vice-President is in a conflict then another Vice-President or the President shall act.

SENIOR ADMINISTRATION

77. The Senior Administration [the President, Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Vice-President (Administration)] has overarching responsibility for maintaining an environment free from Discrimination and Harassment, for providing the resources required to support such an environment, and for ensuring the timely development and review of relevant policies through Senate and Board of Governors procedures.

78. In addition, the Senior Administration is responsible for promoting awareness of what constitutes an environment free from Harassment and Discrimination, and providing resources so that members of the University are able to function with the highest standards of integrity, accountability, and responsibility. The Equity and Inclusion Office, with the support of the Senior Administration, will carry out programs that may include disseminating information about the expectations for a University environment free from Discrimination and Harassment, and providing education to all members of the University community.
SECTION VII: INVESTIGATIONS

INTAKE OF COMPLAINTS

79. If an individual wishes to file a Complaint of Discrimination and/or Harassment for the University to address, they must contact an Intake Coordinator in one of the Intake Offices listed below:
   a) Equity and Inclusion Office (available to all Community Members)
   b) Student Support & Case Management (available to all Community Members, where the Respondent is a student)
   c) Employee/Labour Relations (available to staff and faculty)
   d) Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office (available to all Community Members in the Faculty of Health Sciences).

80. The Intake Coordinator is responsible for:
   a) continuing to explore and facilitate resolution processes, as appropriate;
   b) ensuring Complainants are aware of the additional options that may be available to them in seeking a response to the allegation(s) of Discrimination and/or Harassment, which include:
      • filing a grievance through their collective agreement;
      • filing an application with the Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario; or
      • other processes which, if appropriate and acceptable to the Complainant, may be recommended to address issues/incidents expeditiously without proceeding with a Complaint if what is described by the Complainant is not obvious Harassment or Discrimination as defined by this Policy;
   c) explaining this Policy and the sequential steps for processing a Complaint;
   d) assisting the Complainant, when necessary, with completing a Complaint Intake Form, which includes a description of the allegation: what happened; who was involved; when it happened; where it happened; who (if anyone) saw or heard it happen, or saw or heard something of relevance prior to or after the alleged incident(s) of Discrimination and/or Harassment;
   e) assessing issues and incidents in consultation with their Director and, where appropriate, referring such matters to the Assessment Team; and
   f) referring Complaints to the Assessment Team.

ASSESSMENT TEAM

81. Members of the Assessment Team will assess issues and incidents referred to them by an Intake Coordinator to determine whether any further is action is required.

82. Members of the Assessment Team will assess Complaints on a priority basis. Identities of the Complainant and/or Respondent will only be shared with the relevant Assessment Team members on a need-to-know basis. During this assessment, the Assessment Team may determine it is necessary to disclose identities on a need-to-know basis in order to administer the Policy.
83. The Assessment Team reviews the Complaint in order to:
   a) confirm that it fits within the scope of the Policy;
   b) determine, where necessary, if a Complaint should be investigated under the Sexual Violence Policy;
   c) consider requirements pursuant to the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*;
   d) in consultation with the appropriate Decision-Maker, determine if an Investigation is required and set parameters accordingly, including:
      (i) which University office to mobilize;
      (ii) scope and mandate for the Investigation;
      (iii) whether to engage an internal or external investigator;
      (iv) expected timelines for the Investigation;
      (v) an appropriate and respectful way to inform the Respondent about the Complaint, and ensure that written details of the Complaint are provided; and
      (vi) communicate to the parties the expected timelines for the Investigation;
   e) consider and coordinate appropriate Accommodations and/or Interim Measures as they relate to all parties involved in the matter; and
   f) as necessary, draw upon representatives of relevant services or departments in order to appropriately respond to the matter.

84. Interim Measures will be reviewed by the Assessment Team in accordance with clauses 55-56.

**Decision Not to Investigate**

85. In some circumstances a decision may be made not to investigate (e.g. a *frivolous, vexatious* Complaint, or a failure to establish a *Prima facie* case). The decision will be communicated in writing, with reasons, to the parties by the appropriate Decision-Maker. The Complainant will be informed of their right to make a written request for review of the decision to the appropriate Vice-President.

**UNIVERSITY INITIATED INVESTIGATION**

86. Through data gathering on issues, incidents, and Complaints, an Intake Office may become aware of situations where a University-initiated Investigation may be warranted, including, but not limited to circumstances where:
   a) repeated allegations are made about the conduct of the same individual and/or specific environment;
   b) none of those coming forward regarding an issue or incident have been willing to proceed with a Complaint;
   c) allegations are made about the conduct of a Community Member by an individual who is not, or is no longer, a Community Member;
d) the power differential in the alleged incident suggests the potential for a pattern of repeated Discrimination and/or Harassment;

e) the University has a duty to investigate pursuant to the Occupational Health and Safety Act;

f) available information suggests there may be a poisoned environment or systemic discrimination; and/or;

g) available information suggests there may be concerns about climate and/or conduct in an area of the University.

87. The Intake Office will refer the matter to the Assessment Team and the appropriate Decision-Maker to determine whether an Investigation is warranted.

INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

88. Investigations conducted under this Policy will follow the principles of procedural fairness. Respondents have the right to know the case against them, and to produce evidence and witnesses to the Investigator in response to any allegations.

89. The Investigator will impartially collect evidence and interview available witnesses deemed relevant by the Investigator. In consultation with the Assessment Team, the Investigator may adjust the scope and the manner in which the Investigation will be conducted in compliance with this Policy, the principles of procedural fairness, and balancing the principles of fairness, thoroughness, timeliness, and confidentiality.

90. All Community Members are expected to meet with the Investigator if requested to do so and to participate in good faith.

91. Respondents are expected to participate in the Investigation. Lack of participation will not stop the matter from proceeding under the Policy.

92. Complainants, Respondents and witnesses have the option of being accompanied by an Advisor.

93. Except for sharing information with their Advisor, pursuing options external this Policy or as otherwise required by law, all those who meet with an Investigator (including the Advisor) are required to keep confidential the meeting and any information shared to ensure the integrity of the proceedings. Failure to do so could be considered a breach of confidentiality/privacy, and may result in disciplinary action.

94. An individual who was not previously identified as a Respondent but who, during the course of an Investigation, is identified as a potential Respondent will be notified and given an opportunity to meet the Investigator and to respond to any allegations. These new allegations may invoke a new or separate Investigation, which may require the reactivation of the Assessment Team.

95. If during the course of the Investigation the Investigator believes the Complaint is frivolous (it does not have any serious purpose or value; is of little or no weight, worth, or importance), or is vexatious (instituted without sufficient grounds and only to cause annoyance) the Investigator shall refer the matter back to the Assessment Team to determine the next steps.
SECTION VIII: ADJUDICATION AND DECISIONS

96. At the conclusion of an investigation, the following procedures apply for adjudication and decision-making, dependent upon the constituency of the Respondent.

STUDENT RESPONDENT ADJUDICATION

97. The adjudication will be processed in accordance with the procedures in the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (the “Code”). If it is determined, on a balance of probabilities, that a violation of the Policy has occurred, remedies and/or sanctions will apply in accordance with the Code.

98. In matters where the sanctions do not include suspension, expulsion, or involuntary withdrawal, the Respondent may appeal the decision and/or the sanction(s) to the Associate Vice-President (Students and Learning) & Dean of Students.

99. In matters where the sanctions include a suspension, expulsion, or involuntary withdrawal, the Respondent may appeal the decision made by the Associate Vice-President (Students and Learning) & Dean of Students, as per the Hearing Procedures for the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence.

FACULTY RESPONDENT ADJUDICATION

100. The Investigation report will be reviewed by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (or delegate) to determine, on a balance of probabilities, if a violation of the Policy has occurred. If it is so determined, the Provost will make recommendations regarding sanctions and/or remedies, and initiate a disciplinary process.

101. If the Respondent accepts the sanction(s) and/or remedies recommended by the Provost, the recommendations will be implemented and the matter will be closed.

102. If the Respondent does not accept the recommendations, or the Provost believes that suspension from the University for a period of time is the appropriate sanction, the matter will be referred to a hearing before a Tribunal under the Hearing Procedures for the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence.

103. At the hearing the Provost has the burden of proof to present evidence, and on a balance of probabilities, to satisfy the Tribunal that a violation of the Policy has occurred.

104. If it is determined by the Provost that Removal Proceedings should be initiated, the matter will be referred directly to the Procedures for Removal under the Tenure and Promotion Policy.
STAFF RESPONDENT ADJUDICATION

105. The Investigation report will be reviewed by the Assistant Vice-President and Chief Human Resources Officer to determine, on a balance of probabilities, if Discrimination and/or Harassment has occurred. If it is so determined, the matter will be referred to the Director, Employee/Labour Relations to initiate corrective action which may include a disciplinary process to determine remedies and/or sanctions (in consultation with the appropriate supervisor in line with the Respondent’s reporting structure).

106. The corrective action, remedies and/or sanctions will be approved by the appropriate Vice-President (in line with the Respondent’s reporting structure) before being imposed.

107. In the case of a staff member who is a member of a union, the right to appeal the disciplinary decision is within the grievance and arbitration processes of the collective agreement.

108. In the case of a staff member who is not a member of a union (e.g., members of The Management Group, interim employees), and except in the case of termination, the staff member may submit a written appeal of the disciplinary decision to the Vice-President (Administration). In the case where the Respondent’s reporting line is through to the Vice-President (Administration), the appeal will be made to another Vice-President.

COMMUNITY MEMBER RESPONDENT ADJUDICATION (NOT STUDENT, STAFF OR FACULTY)

109. When the Respondent is a Community Member but is not currently a student, staff, or faculty member, the Investigation report will be reviewed by the Decision-Maker related to the Respondent’s area of activity at the University. The relevant Decision-Maker will determine, on a balance of probabilities, if a violation of the Policy has occurred. If it is so determined, the Decision-Maker will decide on the appropriate remedies and/or sanctions.

110. The Respondent may submit a written appeal of the decision and/or sanctions to the Vice-President to whom the Decision-Maker reports.

FINDINGS AND DECISIONS (FOR ALL RESPONDENTS)

No Finding of Violation of the Policy

111. The Complainant and Respondent will receive a written decision from the relevant Decision-Maker, that will include:
   a) the decision that there is No Finding of Violation of the Policy;
   b) reasons for the decision; and
   c) a summary outlining the findings.
Finding of Violation of the Policy

112. The Complainant and Respondent will receive a written decision from the relevant Decision-Maker, that will include:

a) the decision that there is a Finding of Violation of the Policy;

b) reasons for the decision;

c) a summary outlining the findings;

d) the Respondent will receive confirmation of any Interim Measures that will remain in place until remedies and/or sanctions are imposed;

e) the Complainant will receive information about any Interim Measures that have a direct impact on the Complainant, such as a no-contact order, that will remain in place until remedies and/or sanctions are imposed.

Impact Statement

f) the Complainant will be provided the opportunity to submit a written impact statement to the Decision-Maker, within five business days of receipt of the written decision, to be considered in determining the appropriate sanction(s).

DETERMINATION OF SANCTIONS AND REMEDIES

113. The Decision-Maker shall consider the Complainant's impact statement, any mitigating and/or contextual factors in determining/implementing appropriate remedies and/or sanctions, and the reasons shall be clearly articulated in writing to the Respondent and the Complainant as follows:

a) the Respondent will be informed of all sanctions/remedies imposed;

b) the Complainant will receive information about any sanctions/remedies taken by the University, within the constraints of relevant legislation. In all cases, information about any sanctions/remedies that have a direct impact on the Complainant will be provided to them.

114. Where required by a professional licensing body, the results of the Investigation may also be communicated to that professional licensing body.
SECTION IX: OUTCOMES

SYSTEMIC AND PREVENTIVE INTERVENTIONS

115. Investigations may reveal broader issues to be addressed whether or not a finding of Discrimination and/or Harassment has been found. In such instances, appropriate educational and preventive intervention measures and/or changes to policies or practices may be recommended by the Decision-Maker.

SANCTIONS

116. Sanctions are decided based on the merits of the case and shall be proportional to the severity of the offence. If there are mitigating and/or contextual factors in determining/implementing the sanction, the reasons shall be clearly articulated by the Decision-Maker.

117. The existence of any previous findings of Discrimination and/or Harassment will be taken into account when sanctions are determined, and the severity of sanctions may be greater as a result. Sanctions may be used independently or in combination for any single violation and may be varied.

118. Sanctions may include, but are not limited to:
   
a) written reprimand;

b) inclusion of the decision in a specified file(s) of the Respondent, for a specified period of time;

c) the exclusion of the Respondent from, or oversight during, one or more designated University activities or duties;

d) a No Contact Order, which may include restrictions on: registration for specific classes, other academic or non-academic activities, or attendance at specific meetings or events; direct or indirect contact (including but not limited to in person, by phone, email, text, social media, through a third party etc.) with a specific individual or group of individuals;

e) a Persona Non Grata (PNG) designation, which is given to an individual who is denied the privilege of entering designated portion(s) of the University’s buildings or grounds. If PNG individuals are found or seen in the area they are denied, they will be subject to a charge by Security Services under the Trespass to Property Act;

f) for student Respondents, all sanctions in the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities for findings of Discrimination and/or Harassment. These include, but are not limited to: behavioural contract, behavioural bond, suspension, expulsion, and for students in Residence: residence probation, room transfer, denial of readmission, eviction;

 g) for staff or faculty, Suspension or Recommendation for Suspension, as applicable;

h) for staff or faculty, Dismissal or Recommendation for Removal, as applicable.
REMEDIES

119. Remedies may include but are not limited to:

   a) mandatory referral to counselling;

   b) education;

   c) training;

   d) coaching (e.g. one-on-one remedial human rights coaching, conflict coaching);

   e) rearrangement or modification of the Complainant's study or employment arrangements to address
      the effects of Discrimination/Harassment found, e.g. permission to extend a program, leave or change
      in work responsibilities;

   f) ensuring individuals are referred to appropriate support resources, as necessary;

   g) group conflict resolution and mediation processes, focused on restoring productive and harmonious
      working and learning environments; and

   h) Restorative Justice processes, that are culturally relevant.
APPENDIX A: RELATED POLICIES AND LEGISLATION

This Policy is to be read in conjunction with the following policies, statements, and collective agreements. Any question of the application of this Policy or related policies shall be determined by the Provost and Vice President (Academic) or the Vice President (Administration) as appropriate, and in conjunction with the administrator of the other policy or policies. The University reserves the right to amend or add to the University’s policies and statements from time to time (this is not a comprehensive list):

- Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities
- Academic Freedom, Statement on
- Academic Integrity Policy
- Accessibility Policy
- Code of Conduct for Faculty
- Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities
- Complaint Resolution Procedure for TMG
- Conflict of Interest Guidelines: Undergraduate and Graduate Studies
- Employment Accommodation, Policy and Procedures on
- Employee/Labour Relations – Collective Agreements
- Faculty General Grievance Procedure
- Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
- Ontario Human Rights Code
- Occupational Health and Safety Act
- Personal Health Information Protection Act
- Petitions for Special Consideration – see the Undergraduate Calendar / Graduate Calendar
- Professional Behaviour Code for Graduate Learners, Health Sciences
- Professional Behaviour Code for Undergraduate Learners, Health Sciences
- Senate Resolutions re Group Conflict
- Senate Mediation Procedures
- Sexual Violence Policy
- Sexual Violence Response Protocol
- Statement on Building an Inclusive Community with a Shared Purpose
- Statement and Guidelines on Inclusive Communications
- Student Appeal Procedures
- Policy on Student Groups (Recognition, Risk Assessment and Event Planning)
- Tenure and Promotion Policy
- Violence in the Workplace, Policy on
APPENDIX B: JURISDICTION

1. Complaints may be made or Investigations initiated about any alleged violation of this Policy involving any Community Member, including members of recognized groups, teams and clubs. The Policy may extend to incidents that occur off campus where there is a clear nexus to the working and/or learning environment at the University, and recognizes that social media conduct may give rise to a violation of the Policy.

2. Normally Respondents in a Complaint procedure are Community Members. If a person alleged to have violated the Policy is not currently a Community Member, the University has no jurisdiction to adjudicate the incident. However, the University reserves the right to take whatever steps it considers appropriate to safeguard the University Community and Community Members.

3. The University's responsibility to address issues, incidents, and Complaints of Discrimination and/or Harassment extends to University-related activities such as the off campus experiential learning and working environment (including, but not limited to, off-campus coursework such as fieldwork, placement, clinical placement, internship and out-of-the classroom learning experiences). However, this responsibility exists independently from the off-site/placement entity. In order to address such issues, incidents, and Complaints, the University may need to disclose information to the off-site entity on a need-to-know basis. This could include notifying the off-site entity of the outcome of the Investigation or coordinating a joint Investigation. Ideally, the University and the off-site entity will work together to address the matter. However, in the event of a disagreement or misalignment of expectations (or where there is some conflicting third party policy etc.), the University cannot force or impose a sanction on a third party, without some contractual mechanism.

4. If a jurisdictional issue arises between the University and an off-site entity or other third party, a senior officer of the third party, and the University Provost or Dean and Vice-President (Health Sciences) in conjunction with the University Vice-President (Administration), will attempt a resolution, which may include a joint investigation or an agreement to share the findings and/or other relevant outcomes with the other party. In the absence of any agreement to the contrary, the University will proceed with the investigation according to University policy and procedures.

5. Nothing in this Policy is meant to supersede the terms and conditions of any collective agreement, or any other contractual agreement, entered into by the University and its employee groups. In the event that the provisions of this Policy contradict any such collective or contractual agreement, the collective or contractual agreement governs, to the extent of the contradiction.

6. To the extent that this Policy affects the terms and conditions of employment of faculty of the University, it may be subject to discussion and/or approval in accordance with the University policy entitled, The Joint Administration/Faculty Association Committee to Consider University Financial Matters and to Discuss and Negotiate Matters Related to Terms and Conditions of Employment of Faculty.

7. This Policy is not intended to supersede or interfere with the criminal justice system; all persons have the right to pursue legal avenues.
8. Should a Complainant, with respect to the subject matter of a Complaint dealt with under this Policy, seek redress under the Human Rights Code, the Criminal Code, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the provisions of an applicable collective agreement, or through civil litigation, or any other forum external to the University, the appropriate Decision-Maker, in consultation with the Director, Human Rights & Dispute Resolution, will determine in the circumstances whether proceedings under this Policy will be initiated. If proceedings under this Policy have already been initiated, the appropriate Decision-Maker, in consultation with the Director, Human Rights & Dispute Resolution, will determine in the circumstances whether or not the proceedings under this Policy will:

a) be permanently discontinued;

b) be disallowed; or

c) be suspended until proceedings in the external or other forum are concluded, although Interim Measures may be put in place to safeguard the environments of the parties involved.

9. Incidents of violence, Sexual Violence, or threats of violence are not covered by this Policy but will be responded to in accordance with the Policy on Violence in the Workplace, the Violence Program and Guidelines, the Sexual Violence Policy, and the Sexual Violence Response Protocol.

10. As part of the University's commitment to a Discrimination and Harassment free working, studying and living environment, all external agencies, third-party service providers, and independent contractors, who do business on the University campus and are considered agents of the University and will be informed of the existence of this Policy and of the University's expectation that these external entities shall govern themselves accordingly while doing business with the University. Information to this effect shall be included in all contracts.
APPENDIX C: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Academic Freedom
Please refer to the Statement on Academic Freedom.

Advisor
A person of the individual's choice who acts in an advisory role during the Complaint and Investigation process (e.g. friend, family member, union representative, legal counsel). The Advisor may be present during Investigation interviews but may not participate as a representative.

Agent
Anyone hired by the University or working on behalf of the University such as an external investigator or a physician or other health care professional.

Balance of Probabilities
Balance of Probabilities is the test to be met to show, by the weight of the evidence presented, that all of the facts necessary to make a Finding of Violation of the Policy have a greater likelihood of being true than not.

Community
Includes but is not limited to, faculty, staff, postdoctoral fellows, medical residents (except in certain circumstances), students, adjunct professors, librarians, visiting professors, volunteers, visitors, observers and institutional administrators and officials representing McMaster University.

Complainant
The individual who files a Complaint alleging a violation of the Policy for the University's response.

Complaint
A Complaint is made when an individual completes the relevant intake form notifying an Intake Coordinator of an allegation and seeking the University's formal response.

Confidentiality
Refers to the obligation of an individual or organization to safeguard entrusted information. The practice of confidentiality includes obligations to protect information from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, modification, loss or theft.

Creed
Under the Human Rights Code, creed includes, but is not necessarily limited to religious beliefs and practices. Creed may also include non-religious belief systems that, like religion, substantially influence a person's identity, worldview and way of life. The following characteristics are relevant when considering if a belief system is a creed under the Human Rights Code. A creed:
- is sincerely, freely and deeply held
- is integrally linked to a person's identity, self-definition and fulfilment
- is a particular and comprehensive, overarching system of belief that governs one's conduct and practices
- addresses ultimate questions of human existence, including ideas about life, purpose, death, and the existence or non-existence of a Creator and/or a higher or different order of existence
- has some "nexus" or connection to an organization or community that professes a shared system of belief.
Disability
Any degree of physical disability, infirmity, malformation or disfigurement that is caused by bodily injury, birth defect or illness and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, includes diabetes mellitus, epilepsy, a brain injury, any degree of paralysis, amputation, lack of physical co-ordination, blindness or visual impediment, deafness or hearing impediment, muteness or speech impediment, or physical reliance on a guide dog or other animal or on a wheelchair or other remedial appliance or device; a condition of mental impairment or a developmental disability; a learning disability, or a dysfunction in one or more of the processes involved in understanding or using symbols or spoken language; and a mental health disorder/illness; or an injury or disability for which benefits were claimed or received under the insurance plan established under the Workplace Safety and Insurance Act.

Employee
Where applicable, employee is used to refer to staff (see below) and faculty (see below).

Ethnic Origin
Statistics Canada states that “ethnic origin” refers to the cultural origins of a person’s ancestors. In the Human Rights Code, the ground of ethnic origin overlaps with a more commonly used term, “ethnicity,” which refers to a shared cultural heritage or nationality. Ethnic groups might be distinguished on the basis of cultural traits such as language or shared customs around family, food, dance and music. People who share an ethnic origin, ethnicity or ancestry may or may not share the same racial identity.

Event (Authorized)
Authorized events are University scheduled or University approved activities, occurring on or off University premises, e.g. public lectures, performances, placements (co-op or clinical), athletic events, work or study-related conferences/training sessions, etc. These events can include work or study-related travel. Events that are approved under the Policy on Student Groups (Recognition, Risk Assessment and Event Planning), or Field Trips and Electives Policy are also authorized events.

Event (Non-authorized)
Non-authorized events are events that are not scheduled or approved by the University and may occur on or off University premises e.g. group trips that have not been approved under the Policy on Student Groups (Recognition, Risk Assessment and Event Planning), drinking games in residence, house parties, etc.

Expulsion
Expulsion applies to student Respondents and is the loss of all academic privileges at the University for an indefinite period.

Faculty
Faculty are defined as those academic teaching staff and senior academic librarians who are eligible to be members of the McMaster University Faculty Association.

Frivolous, Vexatious Complaints
A Complaint may be considered frivolous if it does not have any serious purpose or value; is of little or no weight, worth, or importance. A Complaint may be considered vexatious if instituted without sufficient grounds and only to cause annoyance.

Incident
An occurrence or event.
Interim Measures
Steps that are taken in order to safeguard the environments of Complainants and Respondents. Interim Measures shall not be construed as evidence of either guilt or a finding of violation of the Policy, or as an affirmation of innocence or finding that no violation of the Policy has occurred.

Issue
A matter that may involve a dispute/disagreement, or a concern (a matter that engages a person's attention, interest, or care, or that affects a person's welfare or happiness).

Mediation
The act or process of mediating; especially: intervention between conflicting parties to promote reconciliation, settlement, or compromise.

Need-to-know
Access to information must be necessary for the performance of official responsibilities or to defend the University in any form of litigation.

No Contact Order
Includes restrictions on: registration for specific classes, other academic or non-academic activities, or attendance at specific meetings or events; direct or indirect contact (including but not limited to in person, by phone, email, text, social media, through a third party etc.) with a specific individual or group of individuals.

Persona Non Grata (PNG)
A designation which is given to an individual who is denied the privilege of entering designated portion(s) of the University's buildings or grounds. If PNG individuals are found or seen in the area they are denied, they will be subject to a charge by Security Services under the Trespass to Property Act;

Prima facie
A Prima facie case is one in which, if the information provided is assumed to be valid and credible, may be sufficient to find that Discrimination and/or Harassment has occurred.

Recommendation for Removal
A recommendation for removal of a faculty Respondent shall be dealt with in accordance with Section VI of the Tenure and Promotion Policy and the common law where applicable.

Recommendation for Suspension
A recommendation for suspension of a faculty Respondent shall be dealt with in accordance with Section V of the Tenure and Promotion Policy and the common law where applicable. Suspension involves relieving the Respondent of their University duties and denying them access to University facilities and services for a stated period of time, and may be with or without pay and/or benefits as recommended by a Tribunal and determined by the President.

Reprisal
An act of retaliation; this may include, but is not limited to, adverse actions by a person who has the authority to confer, grant or deny a benefit or advancement to the person filing a Complaint.
Respondent
Those about whom allegations have been made in a Complaint process.

Restorative Justice
Restorative Justice is an outcome following the determination of finding and focuses on restoring the losses suffered, holding Respondents accountable for the harm they have caused, and building peace within communities. This process can be facilitated by any of the Intake Offices.

Sexual and/or Gender-Based Harassment
Sexual and/or Gender-Based Harassment includes, but is not limited to:

a) any reward/promise of reward, whether explicit or implicit, for complying with a sexual solicitation or advance; demands for dates or sexual favours; or propositions of physical intimacy;
b) any reprisal or threat of reprisal, whether explicit or implicit, for refusing to comply with any sexual solicitation or advance;
c) any form of sexual exploitation, or conduct that takes non-consensual sexual advantage of someone;
d) unwelcome sex or gender-related comments about a person's physical characteristics, mannerisms, gender identity or expression;
e) sex or gender-related verbal abuse, threats or taunting;
f) Workplace Sexual Harassment; and
g) any other comment or conduct associated with sex, sexual orientation or gender (including gender identity or expression) that is known or should be known to be offensive, embarrassing, humiliating, demeaning, intimidating, or isolating to an individual or group.

Staff
Employees of the University including, but not limited to, The Management Group (TMG), Unionized Employees, Temporary/Casual, non-teaching staff, Sessional Faculty, Post-doctoral Fellows, Teaching Assistants, and part-time Clinical Faculty.

Students
A student is any individual recorded by the University Registrar as enrolled in an educational course of study recognised by the Senate and for whom the University maintains education records.

Supervisor
Within the University Community there are various types of supervisors, which include the following:

- **Academic Supervisor** who oversees the academic work of a student, the most common example being a faculty member overseeing a graduate student’s academic work;
- **Academic Administrator** is any faculty or staff member acting in their capacity as supervisor/administrator within a Faculty, Academic Department, etc., which includes, but is not limited to, Department Chairs, Deans, or other supervisors who oversee the work of a Community Member (e.g. a faculty member overseeing a Post-Doctoral fellow / technician / undergraduate or graduate student performing research in the faculty member's laboratory).
- **Workplace Supervisor** is "a person who has charge of a workplace or authority over a Worker" (Occupational Health and Safety Act). Supervisors are responsible for knowing the **Duties of Supervisors** under the Act.
Support
The provision of resources appropriate to the individual and the circumstances. This may include access to the Student Wellness Centre, Employee Family Assistance Program, McMaster Students Union (MSU). Support resources do not include the provision of legal counsel.

Suspension
Relieving the staff Respondent of their University duties and denying them access to University facilities and services for a stated period of time, and may be with or without pay and/or benefits. Suspensions shall be dealt with in accordance with established policies and procedures and by the terms of existing contracts of employment or collective agreements and the common law where applicable. For a student Respondent, suspension is the loss of all academic privileges at the University for a specified period of time and/or until imposed conditions are met. The student is eligible to return after this time but may be required to fulfill specified non-academic conditions upon return.

Systemic Discrimination
Policies, practices and institutional procedures which, deliberately or not, have the effect of creating or perpetuating disadvantage and discrimination against identifiable groups on grounds prohibited by the Human Rights Code.

University
"University" means McMaster University and its designates, the Board of Governors of McMaster University, or any officers authorized to act on behalf of the Board.

Violence Risk Assessment Team
The Violence Risk Assessment Team is a sub-committee of the Crisis Management Group. This team takes a multi-disciplinary approach to assessment, Investigation, and response to reports of behaviour that is of potential concern or threat to the University community. The team is made up a diverse population of the campus including representation from Human Resources, Health and Safety, Academics, Dean of Students and Student Affairs.

Worker
The definition of a Worker includes: a person who performs work or supplies services for monetary compensation; and a person who performs work or supplies services for no monetary compensation under a program approved by a college of applied arts and technology, university or other post-secondary institution. Unpaid students, learners and trainees who are workers under the Occupational Health and Safety Act have the same duties and rights as paid workers. Placement employers have the same duties to protect the health and safety of unpaid students, learners or trainees who are workers under the Occupational Health and Safety Act as they do to protect their paid workers. The definition of "worker" does not include a volunteer who works for no monetary payment of any kind.
COMPLAINT
Complainant notifies an Intake Coordinator (in the Equity and Inclusion Office, the Student Support & Case Management Office, Employee/Labour Relations, or Faculty of Health Sciences Professionalism Office) and seeks the University's response. The Intake Coordinator shall ensure the Complainant is aware of the options available to them and assist the Complainant in understanding what may be involved in, and what may result from, each of the options.

INTAKE COORDINATOR
Refers matters to the Assessment Team

ASSESSMENT TEAM
The Assessment Team will review the Complaint and confirm: that it fits within the scope of the Policy; consider requirements pursuant to the Occupational Health and Safety Act; determine in consultation with the appropriate Decision-Maker, if an investigation is required. The sharing of identifying information will be limited to only what is absolutely necessary in order to address concerns or to satisfy a legal reporting requirement.

Investigation will NOT be initiated.

Complainant may make a written appeal of the decision not to investigate. Appeal goes to the appropriate VP to decide.

Investigation WILL be initiated

ONGOING SUPPORT OF ALL PARTIES
Assessment Team: considers, recommends, and/or coordinates Accommodations and/or Interim Measures as they relate to the parties involved in the matter; facilitates any planning; and considers other University responses that may be necessary.

ASSESSMENT TEAM
Sets the Investigation parameters, in consultation with the appropriate Decision-Maker (including, for example, which University office to mobilize; internal or external investigator; timelines, mandate and scope for the Investigation).

INVESTIGATION

Policy Date: May 17, 2017
STUDENT RESPONDENT

INVESTIGATION
The Investigation and adjudication will be processed in accordance with the procedures in the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities ("the Code").

ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUDICATION

NO FINDING OF VIOLATION OF THE POLICY

FINDING OF VIOLATION OF THE POLICY

IMPACT STATEMENT
Complainant may submit a written impact statement to the Adjudicator to be included in the determination of the appropriate sanction(s).

SANCTIONS
DO NOT INCLUDE SUSPENSION, EXPULSION, OR WITHDRAWAL

APPEAL to the Associate Vice-President (Students And Learning) & Dean Of Students

SANCTIONS INCLUDE SUSPENSION, EXPULSION, OR WITHDRAWAL

APPEAL HEARING
Before a Tribunal of the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence
STAFF RESPONDENT

INVESTIGATION

INVESTIGATION REPORT
The Investigation report will be reviewed by the Assistant Vice-President and Chief Human Resources Officer to determine, on a balance of probabilities, if a violation of the Policy has occurred. If it is so determined, the matter will be referred to the Director, Employee/Labour Relations initiate corrective action.

NO FINDING OF VIOLATION OF THE POLICY

FINDING OF VIOLATION OF THE POLICY

IMPACT STATEMENT
Complainant may submit a written impact statement to the Director, Employee/Labour Relations, to be included in the determination of the appropriate sanction(s).

CORRECTIVE / DISCIPLINARY ACTION
Corrective / disciplinary action governed by the collective agreement where applicable, and in accordance with labour and employment laws.

(NON-UNION)
In the case of a staff member who is not a member of a union (e.g., members of The Management Group, Interim employees), and except in the case of termination, the staff member may submit a written appeal of the disciplinary decision to the Vice-President (Administration). In the case where the Respondent's reporting line is through to the Vice-President (Administration), the appeal will be made to another Vice-President.

(UNION)
In the case of a staff member who is a member of a union, the right to appeal the disciplinary decision is within the grievance and arbitration processes of the collective agreement.
FACULTY RESPONDENT

INVESTIGATION

INVESTIGATION REPORT
The Investigation report will be reviewed by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) (or delegate) to determine, on a balance of probabilities, if a violation of the Policy has occurred. If it is so determined, the Provost will initiate a disciplinary process.

NO FINDING OF VIOLATION OF THE POLICY

INITIATION OF DISCIPLINARY PROCESS

IMPACT STATEMENT
Complainant may submit a written impact statement to the Provost to be included in the determination of the appropriate recommended sanction(s).

REFERRAL TO A REMOVAL HEARING
Provost determines that removal proceedings should be initiated, the matter will be referred directly to the procedures for removal under the Tenure and Promotion Policy.

PROVOST REFERS TO HEARING
If the Respondent does not accept the recommendations, or the Provost believes that suspension from the University for a period of time is the appropriate sanction, the matter will be referred to Hearing.

RESPONDENT ACCEPTS SANCTIONS.

HEARING BEFORE A TRIBUNAL OF THE BOARD-SENATE HEARING PANEL FOR DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT, AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE
At the hearing the Provost has the onus/burden of proof to present evidence, and on a balance of probabilities, to satisfy the Tribunal that the alleged discrimination and/or harassment has occurred.
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SECTION I: BOARD-SENATE HEARING PANEL FOR DISCRIMINATION, HARASSMENT AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

1. The Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Violence shall consist of six faculty members, three undergraduate students and three graduate students appointed by the Senate; and six staff members appointed by the Board of Governors. Student members shall serve for staggered two-year terms and faculty and staff members for staggered three-year terms. No member shall serve for more than two consecutive terms, but on the expiration of two years after having served the second of two consecutive terms, such person may again be eligible for membership on the Hearing Panel. In addition, the Chair of the Panel has the authority to appoint, on an ad hoc basis, faculty, staff and students who are not members of the Panel to serve on Tribunals as auxiliary Panel members (see Appendix A: Glossary of Terms).

2. The Chair and one Vice-Chair shall be appointed by the Senate from among the faculty members appointed by the Senate and one Vice-Chair shall be appointed by the Board of Governors from among the members appointed by the Board of Governors.

3. The Chair of the Panel may delegate their authority under this Policy to one of the Vice-Chairs.

4. The Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Violence is responsible for the adjudication of Hearings under the Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention and Response and the Sexual Violence Policy, as well as for Appeal Hearings on matters related to those two policies that have been adjudicated under the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities.

5. Members of the Hearing Panel will receive generic training provided by the Equity and Inclusion Office in the particular sensitivities which surround Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence issues, in procedures which effect fair resolutions and in penalties and sanctions which are appropriate to the various breaches of Policy and which act as deterrents to further breaches of applicable Policy.

6. The University Secretary, in consultation with the Director, Human Rights & Dispute Resolution (Equity and Inclusion Office), will ensure that the members of the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence receive training in the particular sensitivities surrounding Sexual Violence.

7. Training will not deal with specific cases currently before any Tribunal established under this Policy and is in no way meant to fetter the independence of any Tribunal member to decide any case on the basis of the evidence presented in that case and according to his or her conscience. The University Secretary will provide those identified to serve as a Tribunal member with additional training regarding the hearing procedures.
SECTION II: INITIATION OF A HEARING

8. The Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence holds Hearings for matters that have been referred to Hearing by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), and for appeals that have been filed by a Student Responding Party.

FACULTY

9. Hearings for faculty are initiated under the Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention and Response and/or the Sexual Violence Policy by the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) when:
   a) the faculty member does not accept the recommendations of the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); or
   b) the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) believes that suspension from the University for a period of time is the appropriate sanction.

Parties to the Hearing

10. Parties to Hearings shall include the:
   a) Initiating Party (the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)); and
   b) Responding Party (the faculty member about whom allegations have been made).

Burden of Proof

11. At the hearing the Initiating Party (the Provost and Vice-President (Academic)) has the burden of proof to present evidence, and demonstrate on a balance of probabilities, to satisfy the Tribunal, that the alleged violation of the Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention and Response and/or the Sexual Violence Policy has occurred.

Submissions

12. Within five business days of making the decision to refer a matter to a Hearing, or confirming that the conditions for initiating a Hearing have been met, the Initiating Party shall deliver to the University Secretary:
   a) a cover letter referring the matter to a Hearing, that shall include:
      (i) preference for an open or closed Hearing;
      (ii) the recommended sanctions and/or remedies;
      (iii) the names of witnesses to be called; and
      (iv) the name of the Initiating Party's counsel/advisor (if applicable).
   b) any materials the Initiating Party wishes to submit to the Tribunal as evidence in support of their position.
STUDENTS

13. In matters related to the Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention and Response and/or the Sexual Violence Policy that have been adjudicated under the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and where the sanctions include a suspension, expulsion, or withdrawal (involuntary), a student may appeal the decision made by the Associate Vice-President (Students and Learning) & Dean of Students ("Dean of Students") to the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Violence.

14. The decision from a lower level stays in effect unless and until it is overturned on appeal. This means that submitting an appeal will not prevent the decision being appealed from being carried out.

Parties to the Hearing

15. Parties to Hearings shall include the:
   a) Initiating Party (the Student who is appealing the decision of the Dean of Students); and
   b) Responding Party (the Dean of Students, whose decision is being appealed).

Burden of Proof

16. At the hearing the Initiating Party has the burden of proof to present evidence, and demonstrate on a balance of probabilities, to satisfy the Tribunal, that the Dean of Students acted or decided the matter in an unfair, unreasonable or unjust way.

Submissions

17. Within three weeks of receipt of the relevant decision the Initiating Party shall complete an Appeal Form and deliver it to the University Secretary. The application shall include the following information:

   a) a copy of the decision being appealed;
   b) a statement (description) of the appeal;
   c) the precise grounds for the appeal;
   d) the relief sought;
   a) preference for an open or closed Hearing
   b) the names of witnesses to be called;
   c) the name of the Initiating Party’s counsel or advisor (if applicable); and
   d) any materials the Initiating Party wishes to submit as evidence in support of their position.
DISCLOSURE AND RESPONSE

18. Within ten business days of receipt of the Initiating Party's submission, the University Secretary shall forward a copy to the Responding Party.

19. Within fifteen business days of receipt, the Responding Party shall deliver to the University Secretary the following information:
   a) a written reply to the Initiating Party's submission;
   b) preference for open or closed Hearing;
   c) names of witnesses to be called;
   d) the name of Responding Party's counsel or advisor, if applicable; and
   e) any materials the Responding Party wishes to submit as evidence in support of their position.

20. The University Secretary shall within five business days of receipt forward a copy of this reply to the Initiating Party.

21. No matter shall be placed before the Tribunal unless the parties have completed, to the satisfaction of the University Secretary, the requisite submissions as outlined above. The University Secretary shall notify the party of any deficiencies in the submission.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A TRIBUNAL

22. When the University Secretary receives a referral to Hearing from the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), or an appeal is filed by a student, the University Secretary shall forward to the Initiating Party and the Responding Party a list of the members of the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Violence. The parties shall be given the opportunity to express, in writing, any objections they may have concerning any members of the Panel.

23. After careful consideration of any such objections, the Chair of the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Violence shall select the members of the Tribunal. The Chair shall approve the Tribunal Chair and Tribunal members and, through the University Secretary, shall so inform the Tribunal members, and the parties to the Hearing. When either party has objected to the Chair, a Vice-Chair shall rule on the objection and shall select the members of the Tribunal.

24. The Tribunal shall consist of three members who are without any reasonable apprehension of bias. The Tribunal shall be appointed by the Panel Chair and shall be chosen from among the relevant and/or appropriate association/constituency members of the Hearing Panel. If deemed necessary for Hearings involving multiple parties, the Panel Chair, in consultation with the Vice-Chairs (where appropriate), may appoint a five-member Tribunal.

25. A Tribunal Chair external to the University with legal training, expertise and experience in university matters may be appointed by the Panel Chair, in consultation with the Vice-Chairs (where appropriate), when the University has been named as a Responding Party, or a University Initiated Investigation has been referred to a Hearing.
SECTION III: PROCEDURAL RULES FOR HEARINGS

26. All Hearings convened under this Policy follow the procedures detailed below, subject to the Tribunal exercising its discretion to adhere to a variation of the procedures, in the interest of procedural fairness. Tribunals shall not be charged with investigative duties.

27. The Hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness, namely the right to receive notice, to be heard and to know the case against one. The Hearing shall follow the applicable procedural rules specified in the Statutory Powers Procedure Act, and set out in this Section.

28. The Tribunal shall have the right to control its own process, and, in this regard, if the Tribunal determines that variations to the procedures would lead to a fair, just and efficient resolution of the Hearing, it has the power to make any Order in furtherance of this objective. Where any procedural matter is not dealt with specifically in this Policy the Tribunal may, after hearing submissions from the parties, establish an appropriate procedure. Any procedural requirement contained in this Policy may be waived with the consent of the Tribunal and of all the parties.

29. A Hearing is the final step the parties may take within the University.

30. The Tribunal has sole jurisdiction to hear and to make a final adjudication for Hearings under this Policy. In some instances a Hearing may involve matters outside the Tribunal's jurisdiction and may require action by the President. In such instances, the Tribunal's decision may take the form of a recommendation to the President, with the President maintaining the discretion to accept or deny such a recommendation.

31. If two or more proceedings before the Hearings Panel involve the same or similar questions of fact or Policy, the Chair of the Panel, after seeking written input from the parties, may decide:
   a) to consolidate the proceedings or any part of them; or
   b) to hear the proceedings at the same time; or
   c) to hear the proceedings one immediately after the other.

PARTIES TO THE HEARING

32. Parties to Hearings shall include the Initiating Party and the Responding Party.

BURDEN OF PROOF AND BASIS OF DECISION

33. At the Hearing the Initiating Party has the burden of proof, as described in Section II (clauses 9 and 13).

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

34. Administrative support for the Tribunal will be provided by the University Secretary.
NOTICE OF HEARING

35. A Hearing shall be commenced as soon as possible following the appointment of the Tribunal.

36. An attempt shall be made to schedule the Hearing at a time and place convenient for the Tribunal and for the parties to the Hearing. However, any party whose reasons for absence are not considered valid by the Tribunal's Chair, or whose absence may cause unreasonable delay, shall be notified that the Tribunal will proceed in that party's absence.

37. The parties shall be given reasonable, written notice of the Hearing.

38. Parties to the Hearing shall be given the opportunity to submit written or other documentary evidence prior to the Hearing and any such evidence shall be made available or be accessible to the members of the Tribunal and to all parties prior to the Hearing.

39. Prior to the Hearing, members of the Tribunal shall be provided with the Hearing Record that includes all materials submitted by the parties.

40. Members of the Tribunal must not hear evidence or receive representations regarding the substance of the case other than through the procedures described in this Policy.

CLOSED HEARINGS

41. Hearings shall be held in camera unless either the Initiating Party or the Responding Party requests that the hearing, or some part of the hearing, should be held in public. In the event of such a request, the Hearings Committee shall hear representations from all parties. In making its ruling, the Hearings Committee shall consider whether matters of an intimate financial or personal nature are to be raised, whether there is an issue of public safety involved, the desirability of holding an open hearing and other relevant circumstances.

OTHER PARTIES

42. If other persons, in addition to the Initiating Party and the Responding Party, have been specified or added as parties to the proceedings, the procedure described above shall be altered by the Tribunal to provide an opportunity for such additional parties to be heard in accordance with the principles of natural justice and procedural fairness.

RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT

43. The Tribunal may consider and grant a recess or an adjournment at the request of either party to allow them to review written or documentary evidence submitted at the Hearing.

44. The Tribunal may grant an adjournment at any time during the Hearing to ensure a fair hearing.
EVIDENCE

45. Parties to the Hearing have the right to present evidence in support of their case to the Tribunal and to see any written or documentary evidence presented to the Tribunal.

46. The Tribunal has the power to require production of written or documentary evidence by the parties or by other sources.

47. The Tribunal has the power to rule on the admissibility of evidence.

WITNESSES

48. Parties to the Hearing and the Tribunal have the right to call and question witnesses.

49. Any person appearing before the Tribunal as a witness shall be required to give evidence under affirmation or oath.

50. The Tribunal has discretion to limit the testimony and questioning of witnesses to those matters it considers relevant to the disposition of the case.

51. Parties are responsible for contacting their own witnesses; for making all arrangements for witnesses to attend the Hearing; for paying any costs associated with their appearance before the Tribunal; and for absorbing the costs of any legal counsel attending on their behalf.

52. The Tribunal Chair has the power to compel an unwilling witness to attend, and parties may contact the University Secretary to request the Chair’s assistance in this regard. The power to compel a witness is derived from the Statutory Powers Procedure Act. An unwilling witness may be compelled by the Chair under summons to testify where the written request by the party for the summons demonstrates the witness’ testimony is relevant and related to the alleged facts of the case.

53. Other than parties, witnesses are present in the Hearing room only during the time they are testifying.

REPRESENTATION

54. Parties to the Hearing have the right to represent themselves, or be advised/represented by, for example, a friend, colleague, union representative, or advisor, or legal counsel. The costs of any representation are to be borne by the party retaining such representation.

55. The Tribunal shall have independent legal counsel arranged through the University Secretary.

RECORDING

56. The Hearing shall be recorded for convenience purposes only. Any malfunction of the recording device or subsequent loss of the recording shall not invalidate, in any way, the related Hearing. The recording shall be held in confidence by the University Secretary for the duration of the Hearing, and will be disposed of in a secure manner after the release of the Tribunal’s decision.
ORDER OF THE HEARING

57. The first item of business for the Tribunal shall be to determine whether the Hearing shall be closed.

58. At the outset of the Hearing, the Chair shall:
   a) identify the nature of the case;
   b) review the order of the Hearing;
   c) note for the record the documentary information submitted by the parties to the Hearing, including any preliminary or procedural orders;
   d) note the names of the witnesses for each party;
   e) confirm the likely dates for sitting and the projected length of the Hearing;
   f) raise, or request the parties to raise, any and all preliminary issues concerning composition of the Tribunal and other unaddressed procedural matters; and
   g) proceed to deal with any matters raised in (f) above before the commencement of the substantive portion of the Hearing, by either proceeding directly to the Hearing or considering and rendering a decision on matters raised in (f) above.

59. The Initiating Party is the first party heard. The Initiating Party’s opening statement shall contain a brief description of their case and the recommended sanctions and remedies or relief sought (as appropriate).

60. Following the completion of the Initiating Party’s opening statement, the Responding Party may present their opening statement at that time, or may defer until completion of the Initiating Party’s case.

61. Following the Responding Party’s opening statement (if presented) the Initiating Party presents their case.
   a) The Initiating Party’s case presents the evidence relating to their case, which may include any or all of the following:
      (i) Initiating Party’s oral testimony;
      (ii) oral testimony of Initiating Party’s witnesses; and
      (iii) documents or other evidence in support of this testimony (if admissible).
   b) Questioning of the Initiating Party and their witnesses by the Responding Party and/or by the Tribunal occurs at the close of each person’s testimony.

62. Following the completion of the Initiating Party’s case, the Responding Party may present their opening statement if they elected to defer until the completion of the Initiating Party’s case.

The Responding Party’s opening statement shall contain a brief reply to the Initiating Party’s case, outlining the main points of their case.
a) The Responding Party’s case presents the evidence to support their defence, which may include any or all of the following:
   (i) Responding Party’s oral testimony;
   (ii) oral testimony of Responding Party’s witnesses; and
   (iii) documents or other evidence in support of this testimony (if admissible).

b) Questioning of the Responding Party and their witnesses by the Initiating Party and/or by the Tribunal occurs at the close of each person’s testimony.

63. The Initiating Party and their witnesses may have the right to offer testimony or other evidence in reply to the issues raised in the Responding Party’s case.

64. After this point in the Hearing, no new evidence or witnesses may be introduced.

65. The parties are entitled to make closing arguments, and to summarize briefly the main points of their cases, in the following order:
   a) Initiating Party
   b) Responding Party
   c) Initiating Party (in reply)

66. The Tribunal may alter the order described above in the interest of fairness to any or all of the parties.

67. While procedural fairness is essential, the Tribunal reserves its right to direct, curtail or encourage the organisation of witnesses, testimony and evidence in the interests of enhancing the clarity, relevance and efficiency of the proceedings.

DELIBERATIONS BY THE TRIBUNAL

68. Following the formal Hearing, the Tribunal shall deliberate in closed session and shall reach a decision. After deliberation and decision in closed session solely with members of the Tribunal is complete, the Tribunal may solicit the assistance of the University Secretary and the Tribunal’s legal counsel regarding the precise form or wording of any order and reasons for judgement to support its decision.

69. The Tribunal shall consider the Complainant’s impact statement, and any mitigating and/or contextual factors in determining appropriate sanctions and remedies (found in the relevant Policy: Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention and Response, the Sexual Violence Policy, and/or the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities) and the reasons for the decision shall be clearly articulated in writing to the parties.

70. Sanctions are decided based on the merits of the case and shall be proportional to the severity of the offence. The Tribunal shall consider the Complainant’s impact statement, and any mitigating and/or contextual factors in appropriate sanctions and remedies, and the reasons for the decision shall be clearly articulated in writing to the parties.
71. The existence of any previous findings of violation of the relevant Policy will be taken into account when sanctions are determined, and the severity of sanctions may be greater as a result. Sanctions may be used independently or in combination for any single violation and may be varied.

TRIBUNAL DECISION

72. The Tribunal's decision shall be final and shall include:
   a) the membership of the Tribunal;
   b) the background of the file;
   c) a summary of the case of the Initiating Party and the Responding Party;
   d) the Tribunal's findings of fact;
   e) the Tribunal's decision and the reasons for the decision; and
   f) any sanctions and/or remedies recommended by the Tribunal, as applicable.

73. The Tribunal shall supply a written report of its decision with reasons to the University Secretary, who, in turn, shall distribute a complete copy thereof to:
   a) the parties;
   b) the President;
   c) the Director, Human Rights and Dispute Resolution;
   d) to such other individuals as the Tribunal deems appropriate and/or necessary

74. In accordance with the applicable sections on Confidentiality in the Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention and Response and/or the Sexual Violence Policy, the Complainant will receive information about any sanctions/remedies taken by the University, within the constraints of relevant legislation. In all cases, information about any sanctions/remedies that have a direct impact on the Complainant will be provided to them.

75. Where required by a professional licensing body, the results of the Hearing may also be communicated to that professional licensing body.

76. At the discretion of a tribunal, public reports or statements may be issued identifying the Responding Party: following a Hearing, when a Responding Party is exonerated and wishes that fact to be known publicly.

77. Hearing files shall be retained by the University Secretary for seven years after the completion of the hearing, after which they will be disposed of in a secure manner. The Tribunal's Decision shall be kept permanently.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE TRIBUNAL

78. Apart from its duty under these procedures to hear and decide the matters properly brought before it, any Tribunal may make recommendations or suggestions to University bodies or members. Such recommendations are offered for informational purposes and shall be distinct and separate from the decision.

Policy Date: May 8, 2017
APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Advisor
A person of the individual’s choice who acts in a supportive or advisory role during a Hearing (e.g. union representative, friend, family member, legal counsel). The Advisor may represent the individual at a Hearing before a Tribunal of the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual Violence.

Auxiliary Panel Members
The Chair of the Board-Senate Hearing Panel for Discrimination, Harassment and Sexual Violence has the authority to appoint, in exceptional circumstances and on an ad hoc basis, faculty, staff and students who are not members of the Board to serve on tribunals as supplementary Panel Members.

Balance of Probabilities
Balance of Probabilities is the test to be met to show, by the weight of the evidence presented, that all of the facts necessary to uphold the Initiating Party's case have a greater likelihood of being true than not.

Complainant
The individual who filed a Complaint alleging a violation of a Policy for the University’s response.

Confidentiality
Refers to the obligation of an individual or organization to safeguard entrusted information. The practice of confidentiality includes obligations to protect information from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, modification, loss or theft.

Hearing (Closed)
A closed hearing is closed to all but those who have a specific right to be present.

Initiating Party
The Initiating Party is the individual who is initiating the Hearing.

Responding Party
The individual or entity who is responding to the Initiating Party’s case.

Student
A student is any individual recorded by the University Registrar as enrolled in an educational course of study recognised by the Senate and for whom the University maintains education records.

Support Person
A person of the individual’s choice who acts in a supportive role but is not an active participant in the process (e.g. friend, Elder, parent, religious advisor).
APPENDIX B: RELATED POLICIES AND LEGISLATION

This Policy is to be read in conjunction with the following policies, statements, and collective agreements. Any question of the application of this Policy or related policies shall be determined by the Provost and Vice President (Academic) or the Vice President (Administration) as appropriate, and in conjunction with the administrator of the other policy or policies. The University reserves the right to amend or add to the University’s policies and statements from time to time (this is not a comprehensive list):

- Academic Freedom, Statement on
- Code of Conduct for Faculty
- Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities
- Conflict of Interest Guidelines: Undergraduate and Graduate Studies
- Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention and Response
- Employment Accommodation, Policy and Procedures on
- Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act
- Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities Act
- Human Rights Code
- Occupational Health and Safety Act
- Personal Health Information Protection Act
- Senate Resolutions re Group Conflict
- Senate Mediation Procedures
- Sexual Violence Policy
- Sexual Violence Response Protocol
- Statement on Building an Inclusive Community with a Shared Purpose
- Statement and Guidelines on Inclusive Communications
- Tenure and Promotion Policy
- Violence in the Workplace, Policy on
REPORT TO SENATE
FROM THE
UNIVERSITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

i. Proposal to Establish the McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies

At its meeting on April 19, 2017, the University Planning Committee approved a proposal to establish the McMaster Centre for Buddhist Studies. The Centre seeks to foster a dynamic research environment in Buddhist studies on campus, and to disseminate this work at the local, national, and international level. The creation of the Centre will also allow for a platform for fundraising in support of Buddhist studies at McMaster University. Details of the proposal are contained as Attachment I of the report from the University Planning Committee.

The University Planning Committee now recommends,

that Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies, as contained in the attached report.

ii. Proposal to Establish the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research

On April 19, 2017, the University Planning Committee approved the establishment of the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research. The Centre’s mission is to conduct high quality research seeking to understand the therapeutic potential and risks of cannabis in areas such as pain management, addiction, and psychiatric effects. Through its work, the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research seeks to become an international leader in medicinal cannabis research. Details of the proposal are contained in attachment II of the circulated report.

The University Planning Committee now recommends,

that Senate approve, for recommendation to the Board of Governors, the establishment of the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research, as contained in the attached report.

Senate: FOR APPROVAL
May 17, 2017
April 5, 2017

TO: University Planning Committee

FROM: Robert Baker

RE: Proposal - McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies

The Committee on Research Institutes has reviewed the attached Proposal for the establishment of the McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies, as per the policies and guidelines.

The proposal has the unanimous support of the Committee on Research Institutes.

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

RB:pb

Attch.

cc: David Wilkinson
   Jeremiah Hurley
   Doug Welch
   Helen Ayre
Proposal for McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies

March 21, 2017
James A. Benn

1-The name, objectives, and proposed activities of the Institute or Centre.

Name

“McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies”

Objectives

- Academic Research: to support a dynamic research environment in Buddhist Studies across the McMaster campus and beyond in order to expand scholarly understanding of the Buddhist tradition.
- Knowledge Mobilization: to disseminate academic research on Buddhism to a local, national, and international audience, through colloquia, workshops, and conferences.
- Curricular Development: to enhance teaching programs in Buddhist Studies at McMaster University at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Academic Training: to prepare the next generation of doctoral students for academic careers in Buddhist Studies. To provide high-quality mentorship in research, training, and experience to emerging Buddhist Studies scholars, including undergraduate and graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and visiting researchers from other universities.
- Fundraising: to act as a platform for fundraising for Buddhist Studies at McMaster.
- Public Outreach: to collaborate with local Buddhist communities of all ethnic and cultural backgrounds to help educate a broad populace about Buddhist beliefs, practices, and ways of life.
- Networking: to act as a research hub that interacts with other research centres in Buddhist Studies located at universities in North America, Europe, and Asia.
- Collaboration: to enhance existing research partnerships with other such centres, and to develop new opportunities for future partnerships.

Proposed Activities

- Host talks in Buddhist Studies by visiting scholars and local researchers including postdoctoral fellows and graduate students.
- Host conferences and workshops in Buddhist Studies.
- Host postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars.
- Enhance outreach and community engagement in the local area through public lectures.
Proposal for McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies

- Develop external funding applications for both individual and collaborative projects in Buddhist Studies through:
  ➢ Providing research assistants to Centre members for research project and grant development
  ➢ Regular workshops to brainstorm grant proposals and provide commentary
- Support graduate student travel and additional language training.
- Enhance existing partnerships with other universities in Buddhist Studies.
- Develop new partnerships in Buddhist Studies.
- Disseminate research in Buddhist Studies at McMaster and engage in knowledge mobilization through:
  ➢ Conferences and workshops related to ongoing research.
  ➢ News items on Centre for Buddhist Studies website on research activities, and regular updates via social media.
  ➢ Scholarly publications in the form of articles, book chapters, edited books, and monographs drawn from research projects.

2. A rationale for establishing the Institute or Centre.

While Buddhist Studies has long been an area of excellence in research and teaching in the University, recent factors have created an immediate need for a new Centre for Buddhist Studies. These factors include both major new resources and significant new opportunities. The grant from the Tianzhu Foundation provides assured infrastructure for advanced research and teaching in Buddhist Studies that was previously unavailable. A Centre would be the most effective way to direct and utilise these resources for the benefit of the Faculty of Social Sciences and the University. At the same time, the Centre would provide a focus and international profile to attract additional funding for researchers and students at McMaster. The current alignment of interests and ambitions of faculty members in Buddhist Studies also offers a unique opportunity to enhance the stature and profile of McMaster University in an area that is attracting significant global attention. For these reasons, it would be immediately advantageous to the Department of Religious Studies, the Faculty of Social Sciences, and the University as a whole to establish this new Centre.

Buddhist Studies has been an integral part of McMaster University’s research and teaching mission since the 1960s. No other university in Canada has such a longstanding and continuous commitment to the academic study of Buddhism. Internationally renowned scholars such as Jan Yün-hua, Robert Sharf, and Koichi Shinohara have taught at McMaster. Distinguished graduates of the program in Buddhist Studies include: Dr. Gregory Schopen (MA, 1974), Professor of Indian Buddhism, University of California, Los Angeles; Dr. Albert Welter (PhD, 1987), Professor of Chinese Buddhism, University of Arizona; Dr. Chen Jinhua (PhD, 1997), Professor of Chinese Buddhism, University of British Columbia; Dr. Kevin Bond (PhD, 2009), Associate Professor of Japanese Buddhism, University of Regina; Dr. Susan Andrews (MA, 2004) Assistant Professor of Asian Religions, Mount Allison University. Extensively reorganized since 2005, the current Buddhist Studies program is dedicated to training the next generation of Buddhist scholars and instilling an understanding of Buddhism in its multiple social and historical contexts.

McMaster University is currently fortunate to have three tenured faculty members
working in Buddhist Studies located within a single department (Religious Studies). This concentr ation of resources is highly unusual among leading North American institutions: UCLA has three in the department of Asian Languages and Cultures, while departments at Harvard, Yale and Stanford have two at most. No other university in Canada has this level of concentrated strength in Buddhist Studies (University of Toronto has three faculty members in Buddhist Studies, but in different departments).

All three faculty members obtained their PhDs within the last 16 years and are in the well-established and productive stages of their careers. Dr. Benn, Dr. Clarke, and Dr. Rowe are all highly active in disseminating their research through publications and conferences and have been consistently successful in gaining external research funding, including multiple awards from SSHRC. With their three areas of specialization (medieval Chinese Buddhism, monastic Buddhism in pre-modern India, Buddhism in modern and contemporary Japan), Buddhist Studies at McMaster offers students extensive geographical and historical coverage of the subject. Despite their range of interests, Drs. Benn, Clarke, and Rowe work in collaboration with each other and emphasize an understanding of Buddhism in its multiple social and historical contexts in their research and graduate training.

At McMaster, we train the future generation of scholars of Buddhism. There are about 10 graduate students in the program (MA and PhD) at any one time. For 2017-18 the Department of Religious Studies received more graduate applications in Buddhist Studies than any other area of study. Our students come from China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, the United States, and Canada. We have attracted postdoctoral fellows from within Canada and from Japan and Norway. Students are required to take seminars with all three faculty members so that they receive training in Chinese, Indian, and Japanese traditions as well as theories and methods relevant to the study of Buddhism. We expect the students we train to be able to carry out original research in Buddhist Studies using primary sources in Asian languages. All of our PhD students are therefore required to master two canonical languages (e.g. Sanskrit, Pali, literary Chinese, Japanese, Tibetan) and to be able to employ modern languages relevant for research in Buddhist Studies. Under our guidance, students learn how to read and understand written texts, and develop interdisciplinary research skills as they employ historical, art-historical, and ethnographic materials. The core faculty’s focus on preparing the next generation of Buddhist scholars with emphasis on an understanding of Buddhism in its multiple social and historical contexts, as well as their unique coverage of three major Buddhist traditions, makes this an exciting time in Buddhist Studies at McMaster.

Initial program funding for the new Centre will be provided by the grant from the Tianzhu foundation ($80,000 USD [$100,000 CAD] p.a. x 6 years). McMaster University is an institutional partner in the SSHRC-sponsored ($2.5 m CAD) project “From the Ground Up: Buddhism and East Asian Religions” (http://frogbear.org/); Dr. Benn is a co-investigator in that project and serves on its executive committee. Within the project is a network of six elite universities engaged in Buddhist Studies (UBC, McMaster University, Harvard University, UC Berkeley, École Practique des Hautes Études, and Ghent University) and funded by the Tianzhu Foundation by a grant of US $80,000 per annum to each institution for six years. In addition, faculty at McMaster University participate in a speaker series funded by Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai Canada that brings speakers in Buddhist Studies to the campuses of McMaster and University of Toronto each year and sponsors regular conferences and workshops.

The McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies will be primarily research-oriented, and will sponsor regular colloquia, symposia, workshops, and conferences in Buddhist Studies.
each year. Such events provide a means to present new and innovative research in Buddhist Studies to our faculty and students. They also significantly enhance the scholarly life of the Buddhist specialists on campus, and expose leaders in Buddhist Studies to McMaster University’s achievements in the field. Such activities would foster the intellectual vitality of Buddhist Studies at McMaster University and would promote national and international visibility for the McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies.

The Centre would also serve as a locus for obtaining additional external funding for Buddhist Studies at McMaster. We have already identified promising funding sources for Buddhist Studies in Japan, Hong Kong, and China, as well as within various local Buddhist communities in Southern Ontario. The University’s commitment to the development of a new Centre would catalyse our chances of success with these and other funding sources and agencies. We believe there is substantial potential funding for Buddhist Studies available from both domestic and international sources, and the McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies would provide a platform for securing such support by consolidating and strengthening our program in Buddhist Studies.

A stellar assemblage of graduate students are currently pursuing advanced degrees at McMaster University in the field of Buddhist Studies, and providing support for these students lies at the core of all that the University seeks to achieve. The Centre is therefore fundamentally committed to graduate student support. At the same time, our graduate students face increasing challenges in the near future, as funding for graduate student support has been generally declining in real terms. Securing adequate funding to support our graduate students, therefore, is a major priority of the McMaster University Centre for Buddhist Studies.

3-A list of participants and criteria for expanding the membership.

Faculty

Since 2006, there have been three faculty members working in Buddhist Studies in the Department of Religious Studies. All three have tenure and are likely to remain at McMaster in the foreseeable future. Since all are members of the same graduate fields, if one were to leave the university, any replacement would likely be in Buddhist Studies also. For this reason, this area of study is likely to remain sustainable.

James A. Benn (PhD, University of California, Los Angeles; MA, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London; MA, BA, University of Cambridge), Professor, Chinese Buddhism. At McMaster since 2005, his publications include: Tea in China: A Religious and Cultural History (University of Hawai‘i Press, 2015) and Burning for the Buddha: Self-immolation in Chinese Buddhism (University of Hawai‘i Press, 2007; paperback 2016). Web site: http://jamesabenn.ca

Shayne Clarke (PhD, University of California, Los Angeles; MA, BA, University of Canterbury [NZ]), Associate Professor, Indian Buddhism. At McMaster since 2006, his publications include: Vinaya Texts. Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India: Facsimile Edition. Volume I.
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(The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2014) and Family Matters in Indian Buddhist Monasticisms (University of Hawai‘i Press, 2014).

Web site: https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/people/clarke-shayne

Mark Rowe (PhD, Princeton University; MA, Princeton University; MA, Kyoto University; BA, McGill University), Associate Professor, Japanese Buddhism. At McMaster since 2006, his publications include: Bonds of the Dead: Temples, Burials, and the Transformation of Contemporary Japanese Buddhism (University of Chicago Press, 2011) and Figures of Buddhist Modernity in Asia, co-edited with Justin McDaniel and Jeffrey Samuels (University of Hawai‘i Press, 2016).

Web site: https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/people/rowe-mark

Criteria for expanding the membership

Any faculty member or postdoctoral fellow at McMaster University actively engaged in the academic study of Buddhism could be asked to join the Centre. Researchers working in the Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences may touch on topics related to Buddhism in their research and would be welcome to participate in the Centre’s activities.

4-Business plan

Financial Needs

The Centre for Buddhist Studies is intended to be financially self-sufficient, funded almost entirely by external grants or by gifts to the university specifically targeted on Buddhist Studies. The Centre would be funded initially by a grant from the Tianzhu Foundation via the University of British Columbia. The grant is for $100,000 CAD ($80,000 USD) per annum over six years commencing in 2017. Indirect costs are limited by the donor to 5%, so $95,000 CAD would be available to expend. See attached five-year Budget Plan for details.

Space needs

None. The Centre requires only a virtual presence at McMaster: letterhead, website and social media presence would suffice for its activities. Visiting scholars and postdoctoral fellows could be accommodated in space controlled by the Department of Religious Studies.

Human resources

Minimal. The Director of the Centre requires no stipend. There would be no permanent staff positions associated with the Centre. Administrative assistants could be hired as needed at an hourly rate to perform specific tasks.
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Initial startup costs

Minimal. Design of letterhead, design and maintenance of website could be accomplished using existing resources within the Faculty of Social Sciences.

Ongoing Operations

Yearly budget
See attached five-year Budget Plan.

Costs: $95,000 CAD
Income: $95,000 CAD

Major expenditures

Support for visiting scholar or postdoctoral fellow (6 months): $40,000 CAD
Support for graduate students in Buddhist Studies (travel, stipends etc.): $20,000 CAD
Support for workshops and conferences organized by the Centre: $20,000 CAD

As the Centre becomes established, we will seek other sources of funding from private donors and from external grants.

5-A description of the Institute's or Centre’s organizational structure, and its relationship (if any) with our affiliated hospitals or other institutions.

The Centre will be governed by the structures and processes outlined in McMaster University's Guidelines for the Governance and Review of Research Institutes, Centres and Groups (Dec. 15, 2011).

Governing Board

- Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences (or designate). Chair
- Associate Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, Faculty of Social Sciences (or designate).
- Chair, Department of Religious Studies (or designate).
- Director, Centre for Buddhist Studies

The Director will establish an Advisory Council, whose purpose is to provide advice to the Director with regard to scholarly priorities and direction. The Advisory Council will be consulted on an annual basis, and individual members may also be involved and consulted on Centre activities throughout the year as arranged by the Director. An annual report on activities and finances will be reviewed by the Advisory Council, and then submitted for approval to the Governing Board. Members of the Advisory Council will be appointed to a limited term (subject to renewal) of one to three years. The Advisory Council may be expanded on an ongoing basis, in consultation with Centre members.
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Provisional list of names [None of these people have yet been consulted]

- Drs. Benn, Clarke, Rowe (ex-officio)
- Dr. Rachel Zhou, Interim Director IGHC, McMaster
- Dr. Netina Tan, Political Science, McMaster
- Dr. Robert Sharf, UC Berkeley
- Dr. Frances Garrett, University of Toronto
- Dr. Susan Andrews, Mount Allison University
April 5, 2017

TO: University Planning Committee
FROM: Robert Baker
RE: Proposal – Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research

The Committee on Research Institutes has reviewed the attached Proposal for the establishment of the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research, as per the policies and guidelines.

The proposal has the unanimous support of the Committee on Research Institutes.

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

RB:pb

Attach.

cc: David Wilkinson
    Paul O’Byrne
    Doug Welch
    Helen Ayre
March 2017

Dr. Rob Baker  
Vice-President, Research  
Chair, Committee on Research Institutes  
c/o Gilmour Hall, Room 208  

Re: Proposed Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research  

Dear Dr. Baker,  

On behalf of the Faculty of Health Sciences at McMaster and St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton, we would like to recommend the approval of a proposed new joint centre, the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research. Please find a proposal for the Centre attached.  

If you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact us.  

Yours sincerely,  

Dr. Paul O’Byrne  
Dean and Vice-President  
Faculty of Health Sciences  
McMaster University  

cc:       S. Collins  
          J. Gauldie  
          J. Kelton  

Encl.  

PB/DH:rl  

Dr. David Higgins  
President  
St. Joseph's Healthcare Hamilton
Proposal for the Establishment of the
Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research

1. **Official Name**

   Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research

2. **Objectives / Proposed Activities**

   **Mission**

   To apply the highest standards of scientific research and evidence-based medicine to understanding the therapeutic potential and risks of cannabis and its derivatives. In particular, the Centre will focus on the potential for cannabis to improve pain management and to understand its adverse consequences, particularly in terms of addiction and other negative psychiatric and neurocognitive effects.

   **Objectives**

   The objectives of the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research are:

   - To advance the understanding of the role of cannabinoids in pain management and other therapeutic applications;
   - To advance the understanding of addiction to cannabis and other negative consequences of its use; and
   - To become an international leader in medicinal cannabis research.

   **Activities**

   The activities of the Michael G. DeGroote (MGD) Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research include:

   - Grow and support a team of McMaster medicinal cannabis researchers. This includes:
     - Expand and enrich existing research projects and programs that are compatible with the Centre’s objectives,
     - Support innovative pilot projects to accelerate existing research and generate preliminary data for grant proposals, and
     - Build research capacity through MGD Cannabis Centre Fellowships.
   - Establish a Scientific Advisory Board to monitor and review the scientific merit of the Centre’s research activity;
   - Hold an initial international conference on the science of cannabis and subsequently host 2-4 annual speakers;
   - Compete for research funding from national and other granting agencies;
   - Contribute to the literature and broader research community through scholarly activity in the areas of: 1) the therapeutic potential of cannabis in general, but particularly in the area of pain management; and 2) addiction to cannabis and other negative consequences of use;
- Establish a registry of patients using medicinal marijuana in Ontario;
- Develop and optimize public/private partnerships with universities, government, manufacturers, industry and other organizations;
- Establish effective communication channels to translate knowledge and evidence-based best practices about the medicinal potential of cannabis and its associated risks (e.g., systematic reviews, meta-analyses, best-practice guidelines, webpages, webinars, and social media activities); and
- Strengthen the relationship between the Peter Boris Centre for Addictions Research at St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton and the Michael G. DeGroote National Pain Centre at McMaster.

3. **Rationale**

The Federal government in Canada is actively pursuing the complete legalization and decriminalization of cannabis. There are both health risks and potential therapeutic benefits from cannabinoid use. Most of the research over the past five decades has focused on harms, with much less attention placed on potential therapeutic benefits. Only a limited amount of credible clinical evidence exists; these studies of medicinal cannabis suggest significant improvement in various types of pain and muscle spasticity. However, existing trials are typically small, follow patients for short time periods, and are of limited methodologic quality. Moreover, pooled effect estimates show substantial unexplained heterogeneity—potential contributors include method of delivery, drug composition and patient individuality. The need, therefore, is great to study the therapeutic potential of cannabis and minimize adverse consequences.

There are a small number of university-based scientists scattered across Canada who participate in cannabinoid research. The **Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research will be the first of its kind in Canada** – an organized structure to support a group of McMaster scientists, working in a concerted effort to advance understanding of medicinal cannabis through an evidence-based approach.

Michael G. DeGroote has been a long-time, generous donor to McMaster University and has allocated funds to support this research centre. We anticipate that the MGD Centre for Medical Cannabis Research will establish McMaster as a centre of excellence and hub for medicinal cannabis research. The Centre will further enhance the international reputation of the university and the MGD School of Medicine.

4. **Participants**

*Criteria for Membership*

Scientists and clinicians at McMaster University with research interests in medicinal cannabis are eligible for membership in the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal

---


Cannabis Research. These members will have academic appointments in academic departments along with the teaching, administration and research expectations of these appointments. The term of Full and Associate members is 5 years renewable.

Membership in the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research requires an active scholarly clinical or basic research program in an area relevant to the goals of the Centre (i.e., medicinal cannabis research, treatment of conditions that are pertinent to medicinal cannabis, evidence-based medicine, addiction research).

Membership in the Centre will determined by the Governing Board on the recommendation of the Co-Directors.

Current Members:

The physicians and scientists in the Centre hold full or part-time faculty appointments in the relevant University Departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Busse (co-Director)* pending approval by the University’s governing bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James MacKillop (co-Director)* pending approval by the University’s governing bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gurmit Singh (Pathology and Molecular Medicine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsha Shanthanna (Anesthesiology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Guyatt (HEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohit Bhandari (Surgery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira Price (Emergency Medicine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Van Ameringen (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catharine Munn (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael DeVillaer (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Levinson (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Archie (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Balodis (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zena Samaan (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Amlung (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Financial Resources

5.1 McMaster University
Salary support for members of the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research is provided by McMaster University. This is supplemented by endowed Chairs and other external career awards.

5.2 Peer-reviewed grants and research contracts
Research operating funds are largely derived from peer-reviewed operating grants. All members of the Michael G. DeGroote Centre for Medicinal Cannabis Research are expected to secure independent research funding.
5.3 Donations and Philanthropic Gifts
A gift from Michael G. DeGroot has provided both infrastructure and ongoing support through an expendable trust fund that will help fund the Centre’s initial years of operations (see attached budget).

6. Physical Resources

Faculty members who are members of the Centre will have appropriate office space and research space either at McMaster University or affiliated hospitals as assigned by the Department in which they have their primary academic appointment. Common research space and meeting rooms accessible by the members will be available at McMaster University and St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton. In the longer term, space for future development of the Centre may be forthcoming through discussion and negotiation between the Faculty of Health Sciences and St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton.

7. Staff Resources

Staff resources will come from Centre funds, allocated by one or both Co-Directors, extramural funding, or alternative sources.

8. Organizational Structure

8.1 Co-Directors
The Co-Directors will set the research and academic direction of the Centre, in consultation with the Governing Board and Advisory Committee. The Co-Directors will articulate the leadership of the Centre, set milestones and provide the business plan. The Co-Directors will report annually to the Governing Board.

The Co-Directors will be appointed for 5-year, renewable terms.

The Co-Directors will have accountability to the Governing Board (see section 8.2), as chaired by the Dean and Vice-President (or designate), Faculty of Health Sciences and President (or designate), St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton.

Pending approval by the University’s governing bodies, Dr. Jason Busse and Dr. James MacKillop are to be put forward for appointment as the inaugural Co-Directors for the Centre. Dr. Busse is a recognized expert in the field of chronic pain, and Dr. MacKillop is a recognized expert in the field of addictions. These two areas will be the initial focus of the research activities of the Centre.

8.2 Governing Board
The Governing Board (GB) will oversee the status, progress, and financial viability of the Centre. The composition of the GB is guided by the University’s Guidelines for the Governance and Review of Research Institutes, Centres and Groups, and relevant policies related to joint university-hospital institutes. The GB for this Centre, at minimum, will be comprised of:
- Dean and Vice-President (or designate), Faculty of Health Sciences – Co-chair
- President (or designate), St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton – Co-chair
• Associate Dean (Research), Faculty of Health Sciences
• Vice-President (Research), St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton
• Chair, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioural Neurosciences, Faculty of Health Sciences
• Director, Michael G. DeGroote Institute for Pain Research and Care
• Executive Director, Research Administration, St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton
• Chief of Psychiatry, St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton
• Executive Director, Michael G. DeGroote Initiative for Innovation in Healthcare (ex-officio)

The Centre Co-Directors will report to the GB on an annual basis.

8.3 Advisory Committee
The Advisory Committee (AC) will provide advice to the Co-Directors with regard to scientific or scholarly priorities and the direction for the Centre. The AC is chosen by the Co-Directors, and is consulted at least every two years, or more frequently at the discretion of the Co-Directors. The Governing Board will serve as the Advisory Committee during the initial two-year period when local considerations will be most pertinent.

9. Operational Review

9.1 Annual Review
The Centre Co-Directors will report to the Governing Board on an annual basis. This report should include updates on research productivity, researchers, educational initiatives, external affiliations, Centre administration and operations, financial status, grants-in-aid, strengths and weaknesses, objectives for the coming year and any other items of relevance to the operation of the Centre.

9.2 Periodic Review
According to the University’s Guidelines for the Governance and Review of Research Institutes, Centres and Groups, the Centre will undergo an external review every five to ten years at the request of the Governing Board (GB). The composition of the External Review Board (ERB) will be determined by the GB, as chaired by the Dean and Vice-President (or designate) of the Faculty of Health Sciences and the President (or designate) of St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton.

The composition of the ERB will be determined by the GB and should take into account the aspirations of the Centre and the availability of funds to support the review. The ERB would normally comprise three high-caliber scholars with an international perspective, who must be arms-length from the Centre. The ERB will assess the performance of the Centre’s Co-Directors and its scientific program. The ERB will be furnished with documents describing the University’s policy on Research Institutes and will be asked whether performance is compatible with expectations described in the policy.

The ERB is expected to use accepted measures of performance such as publication number and impact to assess the Centre’s contributions in comparison with those of (a) the Centre during the preceding 5 years and/or (b) with the performance of Centres of similar size in the same field of research.
The recommendations of the ERB will include the renewal of the Co-Directors, and whether the Centre’s performance is consistent with that of a joint Centre at St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton and McMaster University. Their report will be submitted in confidence to the GB via the Dean and Vice-President (or designate) of the Faculty of Health Sciences and the President (or designate) of St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton. Normally, the Dean and Vice-President (or designate) of the Faculty of Health Sciences and the President (or designate) of St. Joseph’s Healthcare Hamilton would share the ERB’s report or major recommendations from the ERB’s report with either the current Co-Directors, or the successors to the current Co-Directors, so that the leadership of the Centre benefits from the perspective of the ERB.