January 25, 2017

TO: Members of Undergraduate Council

FROM: Tamara Bates
Governance Advisor and Assistant University Secretary

RE: Notice of Meeting

The next meeting of Undergraduate Council will be held on **Tuesday, January 31, 2017 at 2:30 p.m., in the Council Room, Gilmour Hall (GH 111).** The items of business to be discussed are outlined on the agenda provided with this meeting notice.

Should you be unable to attend the meeting, please notify the University Secretariat at extension 24337 or e-mail univsec@mcmaster.ca
McMaster University
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Tuesday, January 31, 2017 at 2:30 p.m.
in the Council Room (GH 111)

AGENDA

I  MINUTES of the meeting of December 6, 2016 (attached – for approval)

II  BUSINESS ARISING

III  CHAIR’S REMARKS

IV  REPORT FROM CURRICULUM AND ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE (attached – for approval)
   i.  Faculty of Science - addenda
   ii. Faculty of Health Sciences - addenda
   iii. Faculty of Humanities - addenda

V  SESSIONAL DATES (attached – for approval)

VI  DISCOVERY CREDITS (attached – for approval)

VII  MCMASTER STANDARD CALCULATOR (attached – for information)

VIII  2014-15 AND 2015-16 IQAP CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS (attached – for review and comment)

IX  OTHER BUSINESS
McMaster University

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL
Tuesday, December 6, 2016 at 2:30 p.m.
Council Room (Room 111), Gilmour Hall

PRESENT: Dr. S. Searls Giroux (Chair), Dr. T. Alway, Dr. R. Cameron, Dr. L. Campbell, Dr. L. Carter, Dr. C. Churchill, Mr. T. Daly, Dr. M. Farquharson, Dr. D. Harnish, Mr. K. Hurst, Ms M. Khalid, Ms K. Kuhnert, Mr. J. Liu, Dr. J. McDermid, Dr. E. Mohammad, Ms M. Pool, Mr. A. Ramadori, Ms A. Recio-Greenwell, Dr. S. Sarkar, Mr. S. Van Koughnett, Dr. J. Wilson, Ms T. Bates (Governance Officer and Assistant University Secretary)

INVITED: Ms A. Thyret-Kidd

REGRETS: Dr. R. Chen, Ms V. Lewis, Dr. A. Moro

I MINUTES

On a motion duly moved and seconded, the minutes of the meeting held on October 4, 2016 were approved as circulated.

II BUSINESS ARISING

The minutes of the previous meeting indicate that the revisions to the Academic Accommodations Policy (Agenda Item IV) were to be brought forward to this meeting; however, the Policy is not quite ready and is expected to come forward in the new year.

III CHAIR’S REMARKS

The Chair had no remarks.

IV REPORT FROM THE CURRICULUM AND ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

Dr. Giroux presented the report.

i. Arts & Science Program (Appendix A)

Council reviewed the curriculum revisions recommended by the Arts & Science Program. A new Combined Honours Bachelor of Arts and Science in Arts and Science and Indigenous Studies program is proposed.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve, for recommendation to Senate, the establishment of the Combined Honours Bachelor of Arts and Science in Arts and Science and Indigenous Studies, for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as recommended by the Arts and Science Program, and outlined in Appendix A.
The motion was carried.

ii. Faculty of Business (Appendix B)

Council reviewed the curriculum revisions recommended by the Faculty of Business.

iii. Faculty of Engineering (Appendix C)

Council reviewed the curriculum revisions recommended by the Faculty of Engineering. The *Bachelor of Engineering in Software Engineering – Embedded Systems* and the *Honours Bachelor of Engineering in Electrical and Biomedical Engineering* are being closed. The latter is being closed following the establishment of the new Integrated Biomedical Engineering and Health Sciences program.

It was duly moved and seconded, 

that Undergraduate Council approve, for recommendation to the University Planning Committee, the closure of the *Honours Bachelor of Engineering in Software Engineering – Embedded Systems* program, effective September 2017, as recommended by the Faculty of Engineering, and outlined in Appendix C.

The motion was carried.

It was duly moved and seconded, 

that Undergraduate Council approve, for recommendation to the University Planning Committee, the closure of the Honours Bachelor of Engineering in Electrical and Biomedical Engineering program, effective September 2017, as recommended by the Faculty of Engineering, and outlined in Appendix C.

The motion was carried.

It was duly moved and seconded, 

that Undergraduate Council approve the change in names of the *Bachelor of Technology in Automotive and Vehicle Technology* to the *Bachelor of Technology in Automotive and Vehicle Engineering Technology*; the *Bachelor of Technology in Process Automation* to the *Bachelor of Technology in Automation Engineering Technology*; and the *Bachelor of Technology in Energy Engineering Technologies* to the *Bachelor of Technology in Power and Energy Engineering Technologies* programs effective September 2017 as recommended by the Faculty of Engineering, and outlined in Appendix C.

In response to questions, Council heard that the program names are being changed to include Engineering in the name of the program.

The motion was carried.
iv. Faculty of Health Sciences (Appendix D)

Council reviewed the curriculum revisions recommended by the Faculty of Health Sciences. Amendments to the *Honours Bachelor of Health Sciences (Physician’s Assistant)* program were circulated at the meeting.

v. Faculty of Humanities (Appendix E)

Council reviewed the curriculum revisions recommended by the Faculty of Humanities.

vi. Faculty of Science (Appendix F)

Council reviewed the curriculum revisions recommended by the Faculty of Science. The Faculty is proposing the closure of the *Honours Bachelor of Science in Medical Physics* program. This closure will facilitate the effective merger of the Medical Physics program with the existing *Honours Bachelor of Science in Biophysics* and its associated Co-op program. The name of the resulting program will be changed to *Honours Bachelor of Science in Medical and Biological Physics*.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve, for recommendation to the University Planning Committee, the closure of the *Honours Bachelor of Science in Medical Physics* program effective September 2018 as recommended by the Faculty of Science, and outlined in Appendix F.

The motion was *carried*.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve, the modifications to and changes in name of the *Honours Bachelor of Science in Biophysics* and *Honours Bachelor of Science in Biophysics Co-op programs* to the *Honours Bachelor of Science in Medical and Biological Physics* and *Honours Bachelor of Science in Medical and Biological Physics Co-op programs*, for inclusion in the 2017-2018 *Undergraduate Calendar*, as recommended by the Faculty of Science, and outlined in Appendix F.

The motion was *carried*.

vii. Faculty of Social Sciences (Appendix G)

Council reviewed the curriculum revisions recommended by the Faculty of Social Sciences. The proposal includes the establishment of a new Specialist option as a modification of the *Honours Bachelor of Arts in Sociology* and the *Combined Honours Bachelor of Arts in Sociology and Another Subject* programs. The Faculty is also introducing four new Minor programs: an *Interdisciplinary Minor in Muslim Studies*, an *Interdisciplinary Minor in Social Justice and Inclusive Communities*, a *Minor in the Social Studies of Mental Health and Addiction*, and a *Minor in Public Leadership*. 
It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve, the establishment of the *Honours Bachelor of Arts in Sociology (Specialist Option)* and *Combined Honours Bachelor of Arts in Sociology (Specialist Option) and Another Subject* programs as modifications to the existing *Honours Bachelor of Arts in Sociology* and *Combined Honours Bachelor of Arts in Sociology and Another Subject* programs for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as recommended by the Faculty of Social Sciences, and outlined in Appendix G.

The motion was carried.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve the establishment of an *Interdisciplinary Minor in Muslim Studies*, as recommended by the Faculty of Social Sciences, and outlined in Appendix G.

The motion was carried.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve the establishment of an *Interdisciplinary Minor in Social Justice and Inclusive Communities*, as recommended by the Faculty of Social Sciences, and outlined in Appendix G.

The motion was carried.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve the establishment of a *Minor in the Social Studies of Mental Health and Addiction*, as recommended by the Faculty of Social Sciences, and outlined in Appendix G.

The motion was carried.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve the establishment of a *Minor in Public Leadership*, as recommended by the Faculty of Social Sciences, and outlined in Appendix G.

The motion was carried.

viii. General Academic Regulations (Appendix H)

Council reviewed the revisions to the *General Academic Regulations* recommended by the Office of the Registrar. The report was amended at the meeting.

It was duly moved and seconded,
that Undergraduate Council approve curriculum revisions for inclusion in the 2017-
2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as outlined in Appendices A-H and amended at the
meeting.

The motion was carried.

V DISCOVERY CREDITS

Ms Thyret-Kidd joined the meeting.

The Chair noted that there are no materials to be circulated prior to discussion of the proposal
related to Discovery Credits.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve, in principle, the concept of the Discovery Credit
as a method by which undergraduate students may use elective credits to take courses
outside their degree area without an impact on their Grade Point Average, the precise
details to be determined by a working group to be struck by Undergraduate Council
for this purpose.

Ms Thyret-Kidd reminded members that there has been a lot of discussion at various
committees, including Undergraduate Council, the UGC Ad Hoc Committee on Academic
Structures for Student Success (CASS), the Committee on Programming in the Arts and
Science Faculties (PASF), and the Associate Deans Group. All groups are supportive,
however, there were some concerns expressed at the last Associate Deans Group meeting
about the designation of pass/fail and the ramifications on other areas, such as student
awards and financial aid. It is recommended that a working group is struck to set out the
parameters of the Discovery Credit and how such a program could work.

The motion was carried.

Following a request for volunteers the following people indicated interest in to be part of
the Working Group: Lynn Giordano, Mic Farquharson, Greg Rombough, Maria White,
Joanne Smith, Melissa Pool, Kieran Hurst, Tim Daly, and Kristina Kuhnert. Additional
faculty members will be recommended, preferably from the Faculties of Humanities and
Social Sciences.

VI REPORT FROM AWARDS COMMITTEE (Appendix I)

i. Terms of Award for New Awards
ii. Changes to Terms of Awards
iii. New Bursaries
iv. Changes to Terms of Bursaries

The Committee discussed these items together.

It was duly moved and seconded,

that Undergraduate Council approve the terms of award for three new awards,
changes to four terms of award, twelve new bursaries, and changes to terms of one bursary, as set out in Appendix I.

The motion was carried.

v. Award Name Changes
vi. Award Value Changes

The Committee reviewed these items together.

VII REPORT FROM THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Terms of New Awards (Appendix J)

Council heard that following the last meeting of the Awards Committee, the terms of two new awards had been proposed.

It was duly moved and seconded that the Undergraduate Council approves the terms of The Kevin A. Lockhart Family Scholarship and The David Feather Family Scholarship, as set out in Appendix J.

The motion was carried.

VIII REPORT FROM THE CERTIFICATES AND DIPLOMAS COMMITTEE – Closure of Technology Diploma and Technology Leadership Diploma (Appendix K)

Council was reminded that these two programs had intended to be closed last year.

It was duly moved and seconded, that Undergraduate Council approve the closure of the Technology Diploma and Technology Leadership Diploma programs, effective September 2017, as recommended by the Faculty of Engineering and set out in Appendix K.

The motion was carried.

IX SESSIONAL DATES (Appendix L)

Council reviewed the proposed Sessional Dates for 2017-2018.

It was duly moved and seconded, that the Undergraduate Council approve the 2017-2018 Sessional Dates, as set out in Appendix L.

The motion was carried.

A member noted that there has been some discussion among the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Structures for Student Success and the Committee on Programming in the Arts and Science Faculties about changes that may have an effect on sessional dates and asked
if it is still possible to revise the dates at this time. In particular, it has been suggested that the last date to drop a course without academic penalty could be moved later in the term. Members heard that there is still a lot of time before the final date to submit calendar changes and there are two more Undergraduate Council meetings before that deadline, so changes can still be made.

X OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:09 p.m.
FOR APPROVAL

I Curriculum Revisions from the Faculty of Science for Inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar

(a) Establishment of Two Life Sciences Specializations

At its meeting of January 17, 2017, the Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee approved, for recommendation to Undergraduate Council, the establishment of two specializations within the Life Sciences program: a Sensory Motor System Specialization and an Origins of Disease Specialization. These two new specialisations will promote the identification with a cohort for students in the Life Sciences program, improve the study of Life Sciences in greater depth, and to provide Life Sciences students with the opportunity to complete a thesis.

The Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee now recommends,

that Undergraduate Council approves, for recommendation to Senate, the establishment of the Honours Life Sciences – Sensory Motor Systems Specialization and the Honours Life Sciences – Origins of Disease Specialization, as modifications of the existing Honours Life Sciences program, for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as recommended by the Faculty of Science, and outlined in Attachment I.

(b) Suspension of Admission into Medical Radiation Sciences – Radiation Therapy Specialization

At the same meeting, the Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee approved, for recommendation to Undergraduate Council, the suspension of admission into Level II of the Medical Radiation Sciences – Radiation Therapy Specialization effective September 2018.

Employment opportunities in this field are in decline. The Program Steering Committee has reviewed the options and has determined that intake should be suspended and the situation will be reviewed annually for a period of three years, after which, a permanent decision about the future of the program will be made.

The Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee now recommends,

that Undergraduate Council approves the suspension of the suspension of admittance to the Level II of the Medical Radiation Sciences – Radiation Therapy Specialization, effective September 2018, with reinstatement to be reviewed annually for a maximum of three years and a final decision about the continuation of the specialization program to be made no later than September 2020, for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as outlined in Attachment I.

(c) Course Revision – HUMBEHV 2NV3 – Non-Violent Crisis Intervention

Also at the same meeting, the Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee approved, for recommendation to Undergraduate Council, revisions to the grading scale of HUMBEHV 2NV3 – Non-Violent Crisis Intervention. The course was offered for the first time
in September 2016. At the end of the course it was discovered that the course, which was meant to be graded on a pass/fail basis, was not approved as such. The course was taught as pass/fail and students were aware that this was the case throughout the offering. Because the course was not approved as pass/fail, it was not set up as such in Mosaic and the instructor was forced to give students a letter grade. Students have been made aware of the problem and that the grade will be changed. The 2016-2017 Undergraduate Calendar will not be changed retroactively, but the change will be made in the Calendar for next year.

The Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee now recommends,

that the Undergraduate Council approves the revision of the grading scale for HUMBEHV 2NV3 – Non-Violent Crisis Intervention to Pass/Fail, effective September 1, 2016 and for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as set out in Attachment I.

II Curriculum Revisions from the Faculty of Health Sciences for Inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar

At its meeting of January 17, 2017, the Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee approved, for recommendation to Undergraduate Council, revisions to the admission procedures and requirements for the Midwifery Education Program and the establishment of one new course, HLTHSCI 41D3 – Innovation by Design in the Faculty.

The Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee now recommends,

that Undergraduate Council approves the curriculum revisions for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as recommended by the Faculty of Health Sciences, and outlined in Attachment II.

III Curriculum Revisions from the Faculty of Humanities for Inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar

At the same meeting, the Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee approved, for recommendation to Undergraduate Council, curriculum revisions including the establishment of two new courses, CLASSICS 3MT3 – Advanced Ancient Roots of Medical Terminology and LINGUIST 2SL3 – Introduction to American Sign Language, and revisions to the requirements to the Specialized Minor in Commerce for Students Completing a Single Honours B.A. in Humanities. The revisions to the Specialized Minor are pending submission and approval of the corresponding revisions from the Faculty of Business.

The Undergraduate Council Curriculum and Admissions Committee now recommends,

that the Undergraduate Council approves curriculum revisions, for inclusion in the 2017-2018 Undergraduate Calendar, as recommended by the Faculty of Humanities, and with the revisions to the Specialized Minor in Commerce for Students Completing a Single Honours B.A. in Humanities pending approval of the corresponding revisions to be submitted by the Faculty of Business, as set out in Attachment III.

Undergraduate Council:
January 31, 2017
FACULTY OF SCIENCE

AMENDMENT to CURRICULUM CHANGES FOR 2017-2018 -

MAJOR REVISIONS:

1. Honours Life Sciences (B.Sc.) – Origins of Disease Specialization
   
   Admission
   
   Enrolment in this program is limited and possession of the published minimum requirements does not guarantee admission. Selection is based on academic achievement, but requires, as a minimum, completion of any Level I program with a Grade Point Average of at least 5.0 including:
   
   3 units from
   • MATH 1A03 - Calculus for Science I
   • MATH 1LS3 - Calculus for the Life Sciences I
   
   6 units
   • BIOLOGY 1A03 - Cellular and Molecular Biology
   • CHEM 1A03 - Introductory Chemistry I
   
   3 units from
   • PHYSICS 1A03 - Introductory Physics
   • PHYSICS 1C03 - Physics for the Chemical and Physical Sciences

   12 units from the following courses, including at least one of BIOLOGY 1M03, ENVIRSC 1C03, 1G03, PSYCH 1XX3
   • BIOLOGY 1M03 - Biodiversity, Evolution and Humanity
   • BIOPHYS 1S03 - Biophysics of Movement and the Senses: From Microbes to Moose
   • CHEM 1AA3 - Introductory Chemistry II
   • ENVIRSC 1C03 - Climate, Water And Environment
   • ENVIRSC 1G03 - Earth and the Environment
   • MEDPHYS 1E03 - Physics in Medicine and Biology
   • PHYSICS 1AA3 - Introduction To Modern Physics
   • PHYSICS 1CC3 - Modern Physics for the Chemical and Physical Sciences
   • PSYCH 1F03 - Survey of Psychology
   • PSYCH 1X03 - Introduction to Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour
   • PSYCH 1XX3 - Foundations of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour
   • SCIENCE 1A03 - Investigating Science: Opportunities & Experiences

   Program Notes
   1. Registration in an Honours Life Sciences program does not guarantee access to all courses. Some courses have program restrictions. Students are advised to check prerequisites carefully.
   2. Students interested in completing a thesis or independent study course should consider completing LIFESCI 3RP3 A/B in Level III.
   3. Students interested in graduate school may wish to consider completion of a thesis or independent study course (See LIFESCI 4A03, 4B06 A/B, 4C09 A/B).
   4. LIFESCI 2G03 does not substitute for BIOLOGY 2C03 or MOLBIOL 2C03 for prerequisite purposes.

   Life Sciences Course List
   Astronomy ASTRON 2B03
   Biochemistry Levels II, III, IV*
   Biology Levels II, III, IV*
Biophysics: BIOPHYS 3D03, 3G03
Chemistry: CHEM 2E03, 2OA3, 2OB3, 2P03, 3BC3
Chemical Biology: CHEMBIO 2A03, 2P03, 3BM3, 3OA3, 4OA3, 4OB3
Environmental Science: ENVIRSC 2E13, 2GI3, 3B03, 3EE3, 3GI3, 3GV3, 3L03, 3SR3, 4HH3
Geography: GEOG 2GI3, 2HI3, 3EC3, 3ER3, 3GI3, 3GV3, 3HH3, 3HP3, 4HH3
Health Sciences: HTHSC 2G03, 3DD3, 3I03, 3K03, 4DM3, 4I13, 4O03
Kinesiology: KINESIOL 2Y03, 2YY3
Life Sciences: Levels II, III, IV*
Mathematics: MATH 2UU3, 3MB3
Medical Physics: MEDPHYS 4B03, 4F03, 4U03
Molecular Biology: Levels III, IV*

Physics: PHYSICS 2G03, 3L03
Psychology: PSYCH Levels II, III, IV*
Science: Levels II, III, IV*

* All Levels II, III, IV courses for which the prerequisites have been met are acceptable.

Requirements

120 units total (Levels I to IV), of which no more than 48 units may be Level I

Level I: 30 Units
30 units
(See Admission above.)

Levels II-IV: 90 Units
6 units
- LIFESCI 2A03 - Research Methods in Life Sciences
- LIFESCI 2L03 - Living Systems Laboratory
3 units
- BIOLOGY 2B03 - Cell Biology
3 units
- STATS 2B03 - Statistical Methods for Science
3 units from
- BIOLOGY 2C03 - Genetics
- LIFESCI 2G03 - Genes, Genomes and Society
6 units
- BIOPHYS 2A03 - Biophysics of the Cell and Living Organisms
- BIOPHYS 2S03 – Explorations in Medical and Biological Physics
6 units
- CHEM 2OA3 – Organic Chemistry I
- CHEM 2OB3 – Organic Chemistry II
3 units from
- LIFESCI 3AA3 - Human Pathophysiology
- LIFESCI 3M03 - Cellular Dynamics
3 units from
- BIOLOGY 3AA3 – Fundamental Concepts of Pharmacology
- CHEMBIO 3BM3 – Implanted Biomaterials
- MOLBIOL 3B03 – Advanced Cell Biology
3 units from
- LIFESCI 3EP3 - Life Sciences Applied Placement
2. **Honours Life Sciences (B.Sc.) – Sensory Motor Systems Specialization**

   **Admission Notes**
   1. Completion of PSYCH 1XX3, BIOLOGY 1M03 and CHEM 1AA3 is strongly recommended as they serve as prerequisites for required courses in levels II & III.

   **Enrolment in this program is limited** and possession of the published minimum requirements does not guarantee admission. Selection is based on academic achievement, but requires, as a minimum, completion of any Level I program with a Grade Point Average of at least 5.0 including:

   3 units from
   - MATH 1A03 - Calculus for Science I
   - MATH 1LS3 - Calculus for the Life Sciences I

   6 units
   - BIOLOGY 1A03 - Cellular and Molecular Biology
   - CHEM 1A03 - Introductory Chemistry I

   3 units from
   - PHYSICS 1A03 - Introductory Physics
   - PHYSICS 1C03 - Physics for the Chemical and Physical Sciences

   12 units from the following courses, including at least one of BIOLOGY 1M03, ENVIRSC 1C03, 1G03, PSYCH 1XX3 (Please see Admission Note 1 above)
   - BIOLOGY 1M03 - Biodiversity, Evolution and Humanity
   - BIOPHYS 1S03 - Biophysics of Movement and the Senses: From Microbes to Moose
   - CHEM 1AA3 - Introductory Chemistry II
   - ENVIRSC 1C03 - Climate, Water And Environment
   - ENVIRSC 1G03 - Earth and the Environment
   - MEDPHYS 1E03 - Physics in Medicine and Biology
   - PHYSICS 1AA3 - Introduction To Modern Physics
   - PHYSICS 1CC3 - Modern Physics for the Chemical and Physical Sciences
   - PSYCH 1F03 - Survey of Psychology
   - PSYCH 1X03 - Introduction to Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour
   - PSYCH 1XX3 - Foundations of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour
• SCIENCE 1A03 - Investigating Science: Opportunities & Experiences

Program Notes
1. Registration in an Honours Life Sciences program does not guarantee access to all courses. Some courses have program restrictions. Students are advised to check prerequisites carefully.
2. Students interested in completing a thesis or independent study course should consider completing LIFESCI 3RP3 A/B in Level III.
3. Students interested in graduate school may wish to consider completion of a thesis or independent study course (See LIFESCI 4A03, 4B06 A/B, 4C09 A/B).
4. LIFESCI 2G03 does not substitute for BIOLOGY 2C03 or MOLBIOL 2C03 for prerequisite purposes.

Life Sciences Course List
Astronomy ASTRON 2B03
Biochemistry Levels II, III, IV*
Biology Levels II, III, IV*
Biophysics BIOPHYS 2A03, 2S03, 3D03, 3G03
Chemistry CHEM 2E03, 2OA3, 2OB3, 2P03, 3BC3
Chemical Biology CHEMBIO 2A03, 2P03, 3BM3, 3OA3, 4OA3, 4OB3
Environmental Science ENVIRSC 2EI3, 2GI3, 3B03, 3EE3, 3GI3, 3GV3, 3L03, 3SR3, 4HH3
Geography GEOG 2GI3, 2HI3, 3EC3, 3ER3, 3GI3, 3GV3, 3HH3, 3HP3, 4HH3
Health Sciences HTHSCI 2G03, 3DD3, 3I03, 3K03, 4DM3, 4I13, 4003
Kinesiology KINESIOL 2YY3
Life Sciences Levels II, III, IV*
Mathematics MATH 2UU3, 3MB3
Medical Physics MEDPHYS 4B03, 4F03, 4U03
Molecular Biology Levels III, IV*

Physics PHYSICS 2G03, 3L03
Psychology PSYCH Levels II, III, IV*
Science Levels II, III, IV*

* All Levels II, III, IV courses for which the prerequisites have been met are acceptable.

Requirements
120 units total (Levels I to IV), of which no more than 48 units may be Level I
Level I: 30 Units
30 units
(See Admission above.)
Levels II-IV: 90 Units

9 units
• LIFESCI 2A03 - Research Methods in Life Sciences
• LIFESCI 2CC3 – Fundamentals of Neuroscience
• LIFESCI 2L03 - Living Systems Laboratory

3 units
• STATS 2B03 - Statistical Methods for Science

3 units from
• BIOLOGY 2C03 - Genetics
• LIFESCI 2G03 - Genes, Genomes and Society

3 units
- **KINESIOL 2Y03** – Human Anatomy and Physiology
  - 3 units
- **PSYCH 2E03** – Sensory Processes
  - 6 units from
    - **PSYCH 3A03** – Audition
    - **PSYCH 3BN3** – Cognitive Neuroscience I
    - **PSYCH 3J03** – Visual Neuroscience
  - 3 units from
    - **LIFESCI 3J03** – Human Biomechanics
    - **LIFESCI 3K03** – Neural Control of Human Movement
  - 3 units
    - **LIFESCI 3BB3** - Neurobiology of Disease
  - 3 units from
    - **BIOLOGY 3U03** – Animal Physiology-Homeostasis
    - **BIOLOGY 3VV3** - Laboratory Methods in Molecular Biology
    - **BIOPHYS 2S03** - Explorations in Medical & Biological Physics
    - **LIFESCI 3L03** - Laboratory Methods in Life Sciences
    - **MOLBIOL 3D03** - Experimental Approaches in Cell Biology
    - **MOLBIOL 3M03** - Fundamental Concepts of Development
  - 3 units from
    - **LIFESCI 3EP3** - Life Sciences Applied Placement
    - **LIFESCI 3N03** – Human Nutritional Toxicology
    - **LIFESCI 3XX3** - Peer Mentoring in Science Communication
    - **LIFESCI 3YY3** - Peer Mentoring in Laboratory Skill Development
    - **LIFESCI 4A03** - Independent Study
    - **LIFESCI 4B06** - Independent Project
    - **LIFESCI 4C09** - Independent Thesis
    - **LIFESCI 4EP6** - Life Sciences Advanced Placement
    - **PSYCH 2NF3** – Basic & Clinical Neuroscience
    - **SCIENCE 2A03** - Peer Mentoring in Science
    - **SCIENCE 3IS3** - Interdisciplinary Sciences Field Camp
    - **SCIENCE 3M03** - Applied Curriculum Design in Science
  - 12 units from
    - **Life Sciences Course List**
  - 3 units
    - **LIFESCI 4XX3** - Structure and Function of the Synapse
  - 36 units
    - **Electives**

**Justification**

*Specializations have been introduced to provide Honours Life Sciences students the opportunity to focus their studies in an area of interest. Specializations will be limited as deemed necessary by the enrolment constraint of the Level 4 capstone course/lab. SIS will continue to work with Departments to develop other Specializations in relevant areas of student interest in subsequent years.*
Addendum to the Faculty of Science – School of Interdisciplinary Science –
Changes to Existing Programs section:

Medical Radiation Sciences - Radiation Therapy Specialization (B.M.R.Sc.)

Effective, September 2018, admission to Level II of the Medical Radiation Sciences - Radiation Therapy Specialization will be suspended. Reinstatement of the program will be reviewed on an annual basis. A decision regarding future continuation will be made no later than September 2020.

Program Notes
1. Students in this program pursue two qualifications simultaneously, and graduates receive the Ontario College Advanced Diploma in Medical Radiation Sciences from Mohawk and the McMaster Bachelor of Medical Radiation Sciences degree.
2. The timing of the Spring/Summer and the Level III and IV Fall/Winter sessions may not adhere to the Sessional Dates, as published in this Calendar.

Admission
Enrolment in this program is limited and admission is by selection but requires, as a minimum, completion of Medical Radiation Sciences I with a Fall-Winter Average (on a minimum of 24 units) of at least 5.0 and a Grade Point Average of at least 5.0 including:

12 units
- MEDRADSC 1B03 - Introduction to Pathology
- MEDRADSC 1C03 - Introduction to Physics for Medical Radiation Sciences
- MEDRADSC 1E03 - Inquiry in Medical Radiation Sciences
- MEDRADSC 1F03 - Professions in Medical Radiation Sciences

3 units
- BIOLOGY 1A03 - Cellular and Molecular Biology

6 units
- KINESIOL 1Y03 - Human Anatomy and Physiology I
- KINESIOL 1YY3 - Human Anatomy and Physiology II

3 units from
- MATH 1A03 - Calculus For Science I
- MATH 1LS3 - Calculus for the Life Sciences I

Requirements
150 units total (Levels I to IV), 45 units of clinical practicum are interspersed with 75 units of academic courses in Levels II to IV

Level I: 30 Units
30 units
(See Admission above.)

Level II
Fall and Winter Terms: 30 units:
27 units
- MEDRADSC 2A03 - Patient Care
- MEDRADSC 2D03 - Relational Anatomy I
- MEDRADSC 2RA3 - Relational Anatomy II
- MEDRADSC 2S03 - Clinical Oncology I
- MEDRADSC 2T03 - Clinical Oncology II
- MEDRADSC 2U03 - Radiation Therapy Skills I
- MEDRADSC 2W03 - Physics and Instrumentation for Radiation Therapy
- MEDRADSC 2X03 - Radiobiology and Protection
- MEDRADSC 2Z03 - Imaging Procedures in Radiation Therapy

3 units from the Faculty of Science courses

Spring/Summer Term: 15 units:
(See Program Note 2 above.)

15 units
- MEDRADSC 2V15 - Radiation Therapy Clinical Practicum I

Level III
Fall and Winter Terms: 30 units:

21 units
- MEDRADSC 3K03 - Computed Tomography
- MEDRADSC 3S03 - Treatment Planning I
- MEDRADSC 3U03 - Radiation Protection and Radiation Biology in Radiation Therapy
- MEDRADSC 3V03 - Treatment Planning II
- MEDRADSC 3W03 - Radiation Therapy Skills II
- MEDRADSC 3X03 - Research Methods in Medical Radiation Sciences
- MEDRADSC 3Y03 - Ethics for Medical Radiation Sciences

3 units
- STATS 2B03 - Statistical Methods for Science

3 units from
- PSYCH 1F03 - Survey of Psychology
- PSYCH 1X03 - Introduction to Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour

3 units
- Electives

Spring/Summer Term: 15 units:
(See Program Note 2 above.)

9 units
- MEDRADSC 3B03 - Quality Management in Medical Radiation Sciences
- MEDRADSC 3DH3 - Caring for the Palliative Patient
- MEDRADSC 3T03 - Applied Patient Care in Radiation Therapy

6 units from
- MEDRADSC 3C03 - Multidisciplinary Interventional Procedures
and three units from
- MEDRADSC 3DE3 - Subspecialties in Medical Radiation Sciences: Introduction to Magnetic Resonance Imaging
- MEDRADSC 3DI3 - Subspecialties in Medical Radiation Sciences: Image Guidance in Radiation Therapy

OR
- MEDRADSC 3Z06 - Research Project

Level IV
Fall and Winter Terms: 30 units:

30 units
- MEDRADSC 4E15 - Radiation Therapy Clinical Practicum II
- MEDRADSC 4F15 - Radiation Therapy Clinical Practicum III

Requirements for Students Who Entered Prior to September 2016
150 units total (Levels I to IV), 45 units of clinical practicum are interspersed with 75 units of academic courses in Levels II to IV

Level I: 30 Units
30 units
(See Admission above.)

Level II
Fall and Winter Terms: 30 units:
24 units
- MEDRADSC 2A03 - Patient Care
- MEDRADSC 2D03 - Relational Anatomy I
- MEDRADSC 2S03 - Clinical Oncology I
- MEDRADSC 2T03 - Clinical Oncology II
- MEDRADSC 2U03 - Radiation Therapy Skills I
- MEDRADSC 2W03 - Physics and Instrumentation for Radiation Therapy
- MEDRADSC 2X03 - Radiobiology and Protection
- MEDRADSC 2Z03 - Imaging Procedures in Radiation Therapy

3 units from
- the Faculty of Science courses

3 units from
- PSYCH 1F03 - Survey of Psychology
- PSYCH 1X03 - Introduction to Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour

Spring/Summer Term: 15 units:
(See Program Note 2 above.)
15 units
- MEDRADSC 2V15 - Radiation Therapy Clinical Practicum I

Level III
Fall and Winter Terms: 30 units:
24 units
- MEDRADSC 3I03 - Relational Anatomy II
- MEDRADSC 3K03 - Computed Tomography
- MEDRADSC 3S03 - Treatment Planning I
- MEDRADSC 3U03 - Radiation Protection and Radiation Biology in Radiation Therapy
- MEDRADSC 3V03 - Treatment Planning II
- MEDRADSC 3W03 - Radiation Therapy Skills II
- MEDRADSC 3X03 - Research Methods in Medical Radiation Sciences
- MEDRADSC 3Y03 - Ethics for Medical Radiation Sciences

3 units
- STATS 2B03 - Statistical Methods for Science

3 units
- Electives

Spring/Summer Term: 15 units:
(See Program Note 2 above.)
9 units
- MEDRADSC 3B03 - Quality Management in Medical Radiation Sciences
- MEDRADSC 3DH3 - Caring for the Palliative Patient
- MEDRADSC 3T03 - Applied Patient Care in Radiation Therapy

6 units from
- MEDRADSC 3C03 - Multidisciplinary Interventional Procedures
and three units from
- MEDRADSC 3DE3 - Subspecialties in Medical Radiation Sciences: Introduction to Magnetic Resonance Imaging
- MEDRADSC 3DI3 - Subspecialties in Medical Radiation Sciences: Image Guidance in Radiation Therapy

OR
- MEDRADSC 3Z06 - Research Project

Level IV
Fall and Winter Terms: 30 units:
- MEDRADSC 4E15 - Radiation Therapy Clinical Practicum II
- MEDRADSC 4F15 - Radiation Therapy Clinical Practicum III

Program Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FALL TERM (September to December)</th>
<th>WINTER TERM (January to April)</th>
<th>SPRING/SUMMER TERM (May to August)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>30 units from Academic Level II</td>
<td>Clinical Practicum I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>45 units from Academic Level III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>Clinical Practicum II</td>
<td>Clinical Practicum III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification:

Recently, it has been brought to the attention of the Medical Radiation Sciences program that employment opportunities for graduates of the Radiation Therapy Specialization are in decline. Understanding that employment in specialty health science sectors can be cyclical, the Program Steering Committee has been observing the provincial and national graduate employment rates in radiation therapy to ensure that any action taken is evidence based and informed. At this time, we believe that the job market in this profession is saturated and that Ontario programs are unable to provide reasonable employment prospects for graduates within their field of study. The vocational nature of this training limits opportunities for employment outside the scope of the radiation therapist position.

The impact of the competitive employment market is being felt in declining student and graduate satisfaction, decreased enrolment in the radiation therapy program, and an unusual pattern of attrition as upper level students transfer to other university programs.

We believe that a hiatus from producing graduates is an appropriate response to the current employment climate while maintaining the option of resuming the offering of the Radiation Therapy Specialization when the community needs change. This action allows for appropriate trend analysis concerning provincial and national employment projections, exploration of alternative pathways for graduates and a review of any responses/decisions of other radiation therapy programs in Ontario.

The employment rates in highly specialized areas experience significant fluctuations over time, by suspending the Radiation Therapy Specialization we are seeking to improve the professional opportunities for our current students while ensuring that we are prepared to respond to the needs of cancer care centers in Ontario in the future.
Appropriate notations will be included in other relevant sections of the Calendar, including the Level 1 Programs - Faculty of Science and Admissions sections (see below.) As well, throughout the recruitment/application process, the Faculty will correspond with all applicants to the Medical Radiation Sciences 1 program to advise of the impending change.

Addendum to the Faculty of Science Level I Programs Section (Item 2.7)

Medical Radiation Sciences I

Effective, September 2018, admission to Level II of the Medical Radiation Sciences - Radiation Therapy Specialization will be suspended. Reinstatement of the program will be reviewed on an annual basis. A decision regarding future continuation will be made no later than September 2020.

Note

Students considering the Medical Radiation Sciences I program should refer to the Regulations for License to Practice and Functional Demands in the Medical Radiation Sciences section of this Calendar.

Enrolment in this program is limited.

Program Notes

1. As places in the Medical Radiation Sciences program are limited, admission is by selection, and possession of published minimum requirements does not guarantee admission.
2. The University reserves the right to grant admission to a limited number of students and to refuse readmission to any student whose academic performance or general conduct has been unsatisfactory, or who has withdrawn from the program for a period in excess of one academic year.
3. WHMIS 1A00, a one-hour mandatory on-line Introduction to Health and Safety course, is a co-requisite to Level I courses with a lab component and must be completed prior to the first lab.
4. HTHSCI BIOSAFE 1BS0, a mandatory on-line introduction to bio-safety lab training is a co-requisite to BIOLOGY 1A03 and must be completed prior to the first lab.
5. Routine Practices, an on-line module available through Mosaic (Health and Safety Training), must be completed prior to attendance in the first labs KINESIOL 1Y03, 1YY3.
6. For consideration to a Level II Medical Radiation Specialization, Medical Radiation Sciences I students must complete at least 24 units during the Fall/Winter session, including BIOLOGY 1A03, KINESIOL 1Y03, 1YY3, MATH 1A03 or 1LS3, MEDRADSC 1B03, 1C03, 1E03, 1F03 and achieve a Grade Point Average of at least 5.0. Failure to complete these minimum requirements may compromise consideration for admission to a Specialization.

Requirements: 30 Units
3 units
• BIOLOGY 1A03 - Cellular and Molecular Biology
6 units
• KINESIOL 1Y03 - Human Anatomy and Physiology I
• KINESIOL 1YY3 - Human Anatomy and Physiology II
3 units from
• MATH 1A03 - Calculus For Science I
• MATH 1LS3 - Calculus for the Life Sciences I
12 units
• MEDRADSC 1B03 - Introduction to Pathology
• MEDRADSC 1C03 - Introduction to Physics for Medical Radiation Sciences
• MEDRADSC 1E03 - Inquiry in Medical Radiation Sciences
• MEDRADSC 1F03 - Professions in Medical Radiation Sciences
Electives

**Addendum to the Admission Requirements Section of the Calendar**

**MEDICAL RADIATION SCIENCES I**

Students considering the Medical Radiation Sciences I program should refer to the *Regulations for License to Practice and Functional Demands* in the Medical Radiation Sciences program in the *Faculty of Science* section of this calendar.

The following are the minimum Grade 12 U and M requirements:

1. English U
2. Advanced Functions U
3. Calculus and Vectors U
4. Biology U
5. Chemistry U
6. Completion of one additional U or M course to total six courses

**NOTE:** Effective, September 2018, admission to Level II of the Medical Radiation Sciences - Radiation Therapy Specialization will be suspended. Reinstatement of the program will be reviewed on an annual basis. A decision regarding future continuation will be made no later than September 2020.

**B. From Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology**

Most McMaster programs have enrolment limits and admission is by selection. Possession of the minimum admission requirements does not guarantee admission. Admission will be considered on a case by case basis and is not guaranteed.

See the minimum admission requirements for Level I programs as listed below. You are considered for admission on an individual basis.

For information regarding the amount of available transfer credits when transferring from a College of Applied Arts and Technology, refer to the heading *Transfer Credits* in this section.

**Medical Radiation Sciences**

Admission is not assessed based on CAAT achievement. It is based on high school or prior university degree study admission criteria only. Students with the appropriate admission criteria who have also completed a two or three-year college diploma program with a minimum Grade Point Average of at least 80% may be considered for up to 6 units of unspecified credits for the college work.

**Note:** Effective, September 2018, admission to Level II of the Medical Radiation Sciences - Radiation Therapy Specialization will be suspended. Reinstatement of the program will be reviewed on an annual basis. A decision regarding future continuation will be made no later than September 2020.
Addendum

Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour

CHANGES TO EXISTING COURSES:

HUMBEHV 2NV3 - Non-Violent Crisis Intervention
3 unit(s)
This course includes Non-Violent Crisis Prevention and Intervention training.
*This course is evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.*
Three lectures; one term
**Prerequisite(s):** Registration in Level II or above of the B.A.Sc. in Human Behaviour (Autism & Behavioural Science Specialization) program

Justification:

*HUMBEHV 2NV3 was offered for the first time in the Fall 2016 Term. At the time of grade submission, it was realized that the course had not been approved and/or set-up with the grading basis of Pass/Fail. Given the nature of the offering, it is not possible or appropriate to assess students on the alpha or numeric scale. The mandatory, specialized training module is required for students enrolled in the Honours Human Behaviour – Autism and Behavioural Science Specialization. The equivalent offering, available through Mohawk College, is also graded on the Pass/Fail basis. We are seeking approval, retroactive to the Fall 2016 Term.*
Programs- Midwifery
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Rationale: Deletion for accuracy

Admission Procedures and Requirements

Enrolment in the Midwifery Education Program is limited. Admission into the Midwifery Education Program is by selection (see Selection Procedure) and reserved for candidates who meet all requirements and who satisfy the academic regulations of the university. Possession of the minimum requirements does not guarantee an offer of admission. It is recommended that applicants have completed at least one year of university studies prior to application applying. All certified transcripts from secondary and post-secondary institutions previously attended must be forwarded to the Office of the Registrar by the application deadline. The application deadline is February 1 each year for the following September intake. Applications received after February 1 will not be considered. Please note that all required courses must be completed, with final grades available on any and all official transcripts at the time of
application, and applicable (excluding current Secondary School students). All official transcripts must be submitted with final grades, by the February 1 deadline (excluding current High School students). All documents submitted with the application become the property of the university.

**Rationale:** Reworded for clarity

### Applicants Directly from Ontario Secondary Schools

The following are the minimum Grade 12 U and M requirements under the Ontario Secondary School Curriculum for applicants directly from an Ontario Secondary School:

1. English 12 U
2. Biology 12 U
3. Chemistry 12 U
4. Completion of additional Grade 12 U or M courses to total six credits.

Students must obtain a minimum grade of 75% in each of the three (3) required courses listed in points 1, 2 and 3 above AND a minimum overall average acceptable to of 75% on Grade 12 U or M courses including the Faculty required courses.

Current Ontario Secondary School Students may apply if one or more of the three (3) required courses are in progress at the time of application; however, the grade 11 prerequisite(s) must be completed at the time of application so that a preliminary assessment of the subject area(s) can be made. Admission is based on in progress secondary school grades for current secondary students only if the grade 11 prerequisite in that subject area is at least 75%.

**Rationale:** Reworded and expanded for clarity

### Applicants with Prior Current or Completed College Diploma Studies

No Admissions will be based on College standing. For applicants with prior college/diploma studies who completed their college education within the last two years of applying to Midwifery, admission will be based on secondary school eligibility. (see Applicants Directly from Ontario Secondary Schools, above) or completion of the 3 prerequisite courses with a minimum grade of 75% in each and 6 university courses (minimum 18 units). If college education was completed more than 2 years ago at the time of applying to Midwifery, please refer to the Mature Applicants section for eligibility and admission requirements. A minimum of 75% must be obtained in each of the required Grade 12 U-level courses and a minimum overall average of 75%. (Refer to Midwifery Education program website for further information.).

**Rationale:** reworded for clarity with no substantive change..

### Applicants from Ontario Secondary Schools (within one year of obtaining OSSD) Prior/Current University Students

The following are the minimum grade 12 U and M requirements under the Ontario Secondary School Curriculum for applicants from an Ontario Secondary School who have obtained their OSSD in the previous calendar year and have never attended University:

1. English 12 U
2. Biology 12 U
3. Chemistry 12 U
Completion of additional grade 12 U or M courses to total six credits.

Applicants must have obtained a minimum grade of 75% in each of the three (3) required courses listed in points 1, 2 and 3 above AND a minimum overall average of 75% on grade 12 U or M courses including the required courses. All required courses must be completed at the time of application.

**Applicants with Qualifications Equivalent to Ontario Secondary School**

Applicants from out-of-province, with qualifications equivalent to Ontario Secondary School (i.e. Advanced Placement Students, American Style Curriculum Students, International Baccalaureate Students, General Certificate of Education Students, etc.) should refer to the Future McMaster website for general requirement and required course information.

**International Students**

*Note: Applicants must be Canadian Citizens or have Permanent Resident status prior to applying to the Midwifery program.*

**Rationale:** As per our agreement with the Ministry of Advanced Education and Skills Development, the Midwifery Education Program agrees to offer to students a program which will prepare practitioners for midwifery practice in Ontario.

Applicants with prior or current university studies at the time of application must have Grade 12 U or M courses from high school or equivalent university courses in three required subjects noted above. Applicants must have achieved a minimum of 75% in each of the three required subjects. In addition, the applicant's overall average from their most recent undergraduate coursework and the three required courses must be a minimum of 75%. (Refer to Midwifery Education program website for further information.)

**Rationale:** Reworded for clarity and conciseness

**Mature Applicants**

Applicants who have not attended secondary school or college on a full-time basis for at least two years; and, have never attended university cannot apply directly to the Midwifery Education Program.

A mature student is someone who has been out of full time secondary school or college for the past two years, and who has never attended university (http://future.mcmaster.ca/admission/admission-requirements/mature-applicants/). Midwifery does not offer mature admission directly to the program. However, students interested in Midwifery may be admitted as mature students to another program in order to complete university pre-requisite courses for later consideration for admission to Midwifery. Enrolment in this program is limited. Possession of the minimum admission requirements does not guarantee admission.

In order to apply for admission to the Midwifery Education program, mature applicants must complete a minimum of 18 units of university level course work with a minimum cumulative average of 75%.
Applicants must have a minimum of 75% in six Grade 12 U/M courses including the specified prerequisites from high school or equivalent full university courses in the three (3) required subject noted above: areas of Biology, Chemistry, and English with a minimum grade of 75% in each. A full university course is equivalent to 6 units or 1.0 credit, depending on the university.

In addition, applicants admitted on Mature Student basis to university must complete one academic year of university studies in their program of admission before applying to the Midwifery Education Program.

**Rationale:** Reworded for clarity with no substantive change.

**Prior Midwifery Education or Experience**
For applicants with prior Midwifery Education or Experience, Ryerson University, through the division of Continuing Education, offers the International Midwifery Pre-Registration Program. The purpose of this program is to provide internationally educated midwives with assessment and education which will prepare them to register as midwives in Ontario. (Refer to the Midwifery Education Program website for more information.)

**Rationale:** Expanded for clarity

**Aboriginal Applicants**

In order to address specific barriers and challenges that may disadvantage some First Nations, Inuit and Metis learners, applicants who wish to be considered under the Aboriginal (Indian, Inuit or Metis, as recognized in the Constitution Act, 1982) application process will also be required to provide a letter of recommendation from their First Nation, Band Council, Tribal Council, Treaty, community or organizational affiliation, in addition to the usual application to the Midwifery Program through the Ontario Universities’ Application Centre (OUAC).

Aboriginal applicants will be required to apply to the Midwifery Program Ontario Universities Application Centre (http://www.ouac.on.ca) by February 1 of the year in which they are applying. All appropriate transcripts from secondary and post-secondary education must be submitted to the Office of the Registrar by February 1.

Applicants must meet the same minimum academic criteria for admission as set out for the general pool of candidates.

**Rationale:** Reworded for clarity with no substantive change.

**Transfer Credit**
Students with previous university education may be eligible for transfer credits for non-clinical courses in Levels I and II. Transfer credits will be determined on an individual basis, after the admitted students have accepted their Offer of Admission.

**Rationale:** Expanded for clarity

**Selection Procedure**
The Midwifery Education Program has a limited number of placements and the admission process is very competitive. The admission requirements stated are minimum requirements. Preference will be given to applicants with the best qualifications. The actual standing required for admission in recent years has been an average in the mid to high 80s. The program has a two-step selection procedure:

1. Assessment of academic eligibility. Applicants must be successful at step one to be considered for step two.
2. Admission interview - 80 applicants will be invited to Hamilton for an interview. The interview process will consist of ten, ten-minute interviews. The interviews typically take place on a Saturday at the end of April, but this is subject to change. Candidates must attend on the date and at the time specified.

Applicants must be successful at stage one to be considered for stage two.

Offers of admission will be made following the interview process.

Offers based on interim grades will be conditional upon maintaining satisfactory performance on final grades, and are based on the results from step 2.

Rationale: Reworded and expanded for clarity

Application for Deferred Registration

Unsuccessful Applicants

Applications are not held over from one year to another; if an applicant is selected for admission, they cannot defer this to a future year and will be asked to reapply. If an unsuccessful applicant wishes to reapply to the Midwifery Education Program, a new application, including transcripts and supplementary materials must be submitted.

Rationale: Reworded and expanded for clarity

Unsuccessful Applicants Application for Deferred Registration

Deferred registrations are not normally granted in the Midwifery Education Program. If an unsuccessful applicant, or an applicant who refuses their offer of admission, wishes to reapply to the Midwifery Education Program, a new application, including transcripts and supplementary materials must be submitted.

Rationale: Reworded for clarity

Application Deadline

Submission of completed application forms to the Ontario Universities' Application Centre must be received by the University no later than February 1 of the year in which registration is expected. All certified transcripts from secondary and post-secondary education previously attended must be forwarded to the Office of the Registrar and received by February 1. Applications received after February 1 will not be considered.

Rationale: Punctuation
Changes in Courses

HTHSCI 1C06 A/B - Working Across Difference in Midwifery

6 unit(s)
This course draws on perspectives from sociology, anthropology, cultural studies and women's studies to explore the challenges and opportunities of working across differences of race, class, sexuality, ability (and other markers of difference) in midwifery care. The course will focus on developing and strengthening the skills required to work competently and compassionately across social and identity differences among and between midwives, midwifery clients and other health care providers.
Lectures/tutorials (three hours); both terms
Prerequisite(s): Registration in the Midwifery Education program
Rationale: Reworded for grammar
HTHSCI 4ID3 – Innovation by Design
3 unit(s)
This course will enable interdisciplinary student groups to engage in design thinking as a methodology to assess health area problems / challenges, collect meaningful data, iterate alternative design options, and build a prototype solution for validation with user groups. Students will learn conceptual approaches to ‘design thinking’ and develop capabilities with spotting, supporting and scaling up new innovative ideas explored using a user-centered empathy focus.
One lecture, one tutorial; one term
Prerequisite(s): Registration in Level IV or above

Rationale: This course is running in Winter 2017 on dean’s permission and was successful in drawing students from all faculties to enroll, resulting in an interdisciplinary cohort as desired.
Addendum

NEW COURSES:

CLASSICS 3MT3 - Advanced Ancient Roots of Medical Terminology
3 unit(s)
This course continues and develops the methods and materials introduced in Classics 2MT3, presenting advanced and specialized medical terms and an introduction to the major Latin corpus of anatomical phrases known as the *Terminologia Anatomica*.
Three hours; one term
Prerequisite(s): Classics 2MT3

Enrolment: 200 Reserve Cap: n/a
Rationale: 2MT3 has been a great success, meeting with large and ever-growing student demand year upon year. Many students have enquired about a 3rd-year continuation that would allow them to continue their study at an advanced level.

LINGUIST 2SL3 - Introduction to American Sign Language
3 unit(s)
This course introduces students to concepts related to people, places and things within the immediate environment, as well as the basic values and norms of the Deaf culture. Students will learn how to conduct simple, everyday conversations and will gain basic numeracy skills.
Three hours; one term

Enrolment: 50 Reserve Cap: n/a
Rationale: Students in Linguistics and in the Cognitive Science of Language programs have been asking for the American Sign Language courses for many years. We normally direct them to the Canadian Hearing Society but we believe that it would be of value to the Department to offer a 3 unit ASL course at McMaster in order to satisfy students’ demand and to see how students cope with learning a very different type of language. This may also open up research opportunities for undergraduate and graduate projects. An ASL course would contribute to the curriculum in both L&L Department and to the new graduate SLP program. 
A Registrar scheduled exam is not required.

REVISIONS TO FACULTY NOTES:

Specialized Minor in Commerce for Students Completing a Single Honours B.A. in Humanities
The Specialized Minor in Commerce for Humanities students is administered by the DeGroote School of Business. A maximum of 30 students will be admitted each year to this Specialized Minor.

Notes

1. For admission, Humanities students (Level 1) must complete an application for admission to the Minor by using the Service Request function in the Student Centre in Mosaic by April 30.
2. Students must also be admitted to a Single Honours B.A. in one of the following programs: Art History, Classics, Communication Studies, English, French, History, Justice, Political Philosophy and Law, Linguistics, Multimedia, Philosophy, or Theatre & Film Studies.
3. Students seeking the Specialized Minor in Commerce for Humanities must have completed ECON 1B03 with a grade of at least B-, and one of MATH 1M03 or ECON 1BB3.
4. Students must have a Grade Point Average of at least 6.0 to be considered for entry into the Minor.
5. Students planning to apply to the accelerated MBA program at McMaster are strongly encouraged to consult with MBA Admissions at the Ron Joyce Centre regarding admission requirements. In addition to meeting all other admission criteria students must complete, with a minimum grade of B-, the following courses:
   - all three of ECON 1B03, ECON 1BB3, and MATH 1M03;
   - all level 2 Commerce courses listed below;
   - COMMERCE 3FA3, and 3MC3

Requirements

33 units total

6 units

- COMMERCE 1AA3 - Introductory Financial Accounting
- COMMERCE 1BA3 - Organizational Behaviour

18 units

From

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 2QA3 - Applied Statistics for Business
- COMMERCE 2OC3 - Operations Management
- COMMERCE 3MC3 - Applied Marketing Management
- COMMERCE 3S03 - Management Skills Development
3 units
from

- HUMAN 4BU3 - Applied Arts and Commerce
- HUMAN 3LM3 or 4LM3 - The Art Of Leadership

6 units

- Level III or IV Commerce courses
McMASTER UNIVERSITY: SESSIONAL DATES 2017-2018

Fall and Winter Terms 2017-2018

<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 5</td>
<td>Thursday, January 4*</td>
<td>Tuesday, September 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for registration and changes in registration</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 13</td>
<td>Friday, January 12</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Recess(es)</td>
<td>Monday, October 9 to Sunday, October 15</td>
<td>Monday, February 19 to Sunday, February 25</td>
<td>Monday, October 9 to Sunday, October 15 and, Monday, February 19 to Sunday, February 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day for cancelling courses without failure by default</td>
<td>Friday, November 10</td>
<td>Friday, March 16</td>
<td>Friday, March 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Friday: No classes or examinations</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Friday, March 30</td>
<td>Friday, March 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Ban (See Undergraduate Course Management Policies)</td>
<td>Thursday, November 30 to Thursday, December 7</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 3 to Tuesday, April 10</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 3 to Tuesday, April 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes end</td>
<td>Wednesday, December 6</td>
<td>Monday, April 9</td>
<td>Monday, April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Tests Level (I)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Friday, December 8 to Thursday, December 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Examinations</td>
<td>Friday, December 8 to Thursday, December 21</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 11 to Thursday, April 26</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 11 to Thursday, April 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred examinations</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 20 to Friday, February 23</td>
<td>Monday June 18 to Thursday June 21</td>
<td>Monday June 18 to Thursday June 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The University re-opens on Tuesday, January 2, 2018 after the December holidays; classes begin January 4.*
## 2018 Spring/Summer Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring Session (34 days)</th>
<th>Summer Session (34 days)</th>
<th>Full-Term Courses (68 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classes begin</strong></td>
<td>Monday, April 30</td>
<td>Monday, June 18</td>
<td>Monday, April 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last day for registration and changes in registration</strong></td>
<td>Monday, May 7</td>
<td>Monday, June 25</td>
<td>Monday, May 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victoria Day: No classes</strong></td>
<td>Monday, May 21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, May 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada Day Observation: No classes</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, July 2</td>
<td>Monday, July 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last day for cancelling courses without failure by default</strong></td>
<td>Wednesday, May 30</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 18</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Holiday: No classes</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Monday, August 6</td>
<td>Monday, August 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classes end</strong></td>
<td>Friday, June 15</td>
<td>Friday, August 3</td>
<td>Friday, August 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Examinations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As arranged by instructor in class time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deferred Examinations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018 Fall Mid-Term Recess Period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCOVERY COURSE PROPOSAL

January, 2017

McMaster University encourages interdisciplinary study and would like to create a pathway for students to explore courses outside of their academic comfort zone while minimizing any academic penalty. The following proposal is suggested as a 2 – 2.5 year trial for undergraduate students, beginning no sooner than September 2017 and no later than September 2018. At the end of the trial, Undergraduate Council will review and determine whether to continue with Discovery Courses, and if so, make any necessary changes to the process. If the process continues, Undergraduate Council will also decide if the program should be expanded to include second degree students.

Proposed Calendar Language:

Discovery Course Option

McMaster University encourages interdisciplinary study and believes undergraduate studies is an excellent time to explore topics which are new and unfamiliar. Students, however, may be reluctant to take a course if they are unsure of their academic performance for fear of compromising their cumulative grade point average (GPA). The Discovery Course option is designed to encourage students to explore interests outside of their program without affecting their GPA.

A student can declare a Discovery Course to signify they want an elective course to be assessed on a Credit or No Credit (CR/NC) grading scale. To receive the grade of CR, the student must earn a final mark of at least 50%. Units earned from a Discovery Course will be counted in the units required for a student’s degree as applicable, however, the grade is not included in the calculation of the GPA or averages. Courses with a final grade of NC do not count as degree credits or as failures, nor are they included in the GPA calculation or averages. Please note, government student aid (e.g., OSAP) will consider a NC grade as a failure.

Students may declare a maximum of 3 units of Discovery Courses per term to a maximum of 12 units per four- or five-level degree or a maximum of 9 units per three-level degree. A maximum of 6 units of Discovery Courses may be used to satisfy requirements toward a Minor.

The Discovery Course option is available to undergraduate students registered in a program above Level I, with a cumulative GPA of at least 3.5, who are enrolled in a Program/Faculty which is participating in the Discovery Course option.

The Discovery Course option is not available to students who

- are enrolled in the School of Medicine, or
- are enrolled in a Program/Faculty which is not participating in the Discovery Course option (see Faculty Academic Regulations), or
- have graduated and are in a second degree or a non-degree program, e.g., continuing
The Discovery Course option is not available for any course that is considered a program requirement, independent study, thesis, field study or placement course. If a student has been charged with academic dishonesty in a course, they are not able to use the Discovery Course option for that course.

Students are responsible for ensuring the course is an elective course for their program. Engineering students should note the Discovery Course option is available only for complementary studies electives.

Students must carefully review any government (e.g., OSAP) and University aid and award eligibility rules which may be affected by the use of the Discovery Course option. If a percentage grade in a course is required for future applications to graduate or professional school, the Discovery Course option should not be selected for that course. Students may not subsequently request to have a Discovery Course grade recalculated to a numeric grade.

**Deadlines:**

1. Students must declare a course as a Discovery Course on Mosaic by the Last Day for Enrollment and Changes date. The student progresses in the course as per normal, and has the option to withdraw from the course as per the normal procedures and deadlines.

2. At the end of the course, the grade will be submitted, approved and visible to the student in Mosaic. The grade will be switched to CR or NC within 7 days of the last exam date. If the student would rather keep the numeric grade, they must indicate the course is no longer a Discovery Course on Mosaic by X date and the numeric grade will remain on their transcript.

Please note, once declared as Discovery Course, the course counts towards the maximum 12 unit limit regardless of whether or not the course is graded as a Discovery Course.

If the student changes their program of study and a course taken as a Discovery Course becomes a required course, the new Faculty office may accept the course grade of CR or NC or have the grade converted back into a numeric grade. If a grade is converted back into a numeric grade, there will be no retroactive reconsideration of aid and award.

**Administrative Processes:**

1. Students enroll in classes.

2. By the Last Day for Enrollment and Changes date each term, a student can indicate up to 3 units as a Discovery Course (DC). Mosaic will confirm the following:
   a. The Program/Faculty the student is registered in is participating in the DC option.
   b. The course is an elective course and eligible as a DC.
   c. The student has not exceeded the 3 unit limit for the term.
   d. The student has not reached the maximum 12 unit limit for DC courses.
If the student’s eligibility to select this course as DC is confirmed, the course will be identified as DC, visible to the student and administrators but not the instructor.

3. The area in Mosaic where students indicate a course is a DC course will include a statement saying DC courses can only be used for elective courses and if a student selects a required course, the course will not be graded as a DC course.

4. The Program/Faculty Offices will use the DC query to identify those students with a DC course in the term. Communications will be sent to students with reminders students can switch the course back to the normal grading scheme for the course.

5. The course is graded using the grading scale selected for the course. The grades are approved and visible to students on Mosaic.

6. The deadline by which students can remove the DC option will normally be set as 5 workings days after the end of Winter Term and Spring/Summer Term.

7. Students confirm on Mosaic if they want a DC course to be graded using the normal grading scale for the course.

8. The Registrar’s Office will query Mosaic to identify those students who continue to want their grading scale changed to the DC grading scale. The Registrar’s Office will verify there is no charge of academic dishonesty against the student in the DC courses. The list will be verified with the student’s Faculty Office and the Registrar’s Office will make the grade change to the student’s records before Standing is run. The Registrar’s Office will additionally capture the original approved grade.

9. If appropriate, at a later point, the Faculty Office has the authority to approve the return of the original grade.
To: Undergraduate Council Members  
Re: McMaster Standard Calculator Update  
Date: January 2017

In response to concerns raised regarding the use of communicating or connected calculators, a meeting was held to review the current McMaster Standard Calculator policy to understand if it still met the needs of the university. At the meeting were representatives from the Science and Engineering faculties, the Registrar’s Office, the Campus Store, and the Academic Integrity Office. The Business faculty had also provided its input in advance of the meeting.

Outcome: It is recommended that McMaster proceed with a reaffirmation of the status quo: that is, that the Casio fx991 is the university calculator, but to now specify that only models MS and MS Plus are acceptable models. These are the calculators currently sold through the Campus Store. Additionally, there is a process in place with the Campus Store for specific calculators designated by some instructors from the Business faculty. This can also continue on as it does now.

Implementation Timing: September 2017. It is recommend a notice would go out to instructors in the winter/spring in order to allow time to update course outlines for the Fall/Winter term. It is recommended the notice contain the following: communication of decision noting the specific acceptable models, timing for implementation and advisement to instructors about the “advent of communicating calculators”. The latter is intended to help inform instructors about the risks around the use of other calculators. This last piece was seen as important as there was concern that some instructors may not be aware that newer models of calculators have the ability to access the internet.

In addition to the notice provided to instructors, the Registrar’s Office will update the exam questionnaire to specify the MS and MS Plus models and will update the Registrar’s Office website. At this time, the Registrar’s Office website is the official location for communicating the calculator specifications. The current website address is https://registrar.mcmaster.ca/exams/requirements/ and will be updated as follows:
Use of Calculators For Examinations:

The McMaster Standard Calculator is designated by the appropriate Associate Vice-President on behalf of Undergraduate Council and may be specified as an aid for a final examination. If an instructor permits the use of the McMaster Standard calculator, the student will be informed and it will be included as part of the course outline.

The McMaster Standard Calculator is the Casio fx-991 MS or MS Plus. The Casio fx-991 is available with various letter configurations, however only the MS or MS Plus models are acceptable when the McMaster Standard Calculator has been designated for use. The McMaster Standard Calculator may be purchased at the Campus Store. Students who have accommodations with Student Accessibility Services (SAS) may use an equivalent accessible calculator.
January 2017

TO: Undergraduate Council

FROM: Susan Searls Giroux
Associate Vice-President, Faculty

RE: 2014-15 and 2015-16 IQAP Cyclical 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;

Undergraduate Council and/or Graduate Council will review this report 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 Final Assessment Reports for the reviews are attached.
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 Academic’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>Grades (in the context of electives, stress and external view of the program)</td>
<td>As far as we aware, there are no significant issues with grades and performance for BHSc students. There are two things that we would be concerned about; enrolment in professional programs</td>
<td>No proposed follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and graduate programs after their undergraduate studies and secondly, in course performance relative to other McMaster students and students who transfer to McMaster from other institutions. In the context of post-graduation performance, we hear that BHSc students are exemplary and are well accepted to other universities, programs and by employers. We have not heard anything else.

<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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</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>Agenda Item VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</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>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>Agenda Item VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce annual 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>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>
</tbody>
</table>

Agenda Item VIII
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Chair of Department</td>
<td>Ongoing</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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).

agreement that would recover costs associated with the Honours BA and BA programs in Psychology.

Department should be reallocated a teaching stream position with primary expertise in the area of Developmental Psychology to replace the recent departure

The department will advocate for a tenure-track appointment as it is eager to expand its research capacity as well as teaching capacity

Chair of Department

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

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.

Chair of Department

Update at progress report

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>Classroom</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Within 2 years</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 practcums 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>Agenda Item VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segregating such skills in special courses</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review faculty complement</td>
<td>Dean will work with the Chair and the Department on strategic complement planning</td>
<td>Department and Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>
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>Agenda Item VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder meetings etc.</strong> Keeping this maintained in a regular way and adjusting as required will require attention from the Department’s leadership team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>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.</strong> 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. Chair and Associate Chair (Undergraduate) To be completed before October 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop a program for enhanced TA training and best practices for faculty/TA interaction.</strong> 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 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. To be started in September 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explore the potential to better balance project workloads across terms.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To their TAs during the term – problems should be addressed directly and brought to the attention of the Departmental Chair if the issue is not resolved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explore the potential to cross list courses in other programs (e.g. Chemistry) for students in upper years.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhance the tracking of graduates from the program.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explore the potential to provide spaces for students to work on computers, including bookable computing facilities and/or exploring ways to</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair and Associate Chair (Undergraduate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair and Department Administrator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair and Associate Chair (Undergraduate)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting in September 2016 for a period of two years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Already started</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Already started and ongoing for 2 years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This is a problem for the ages.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ensure all students have a computer so that regular classrooms could be used.

laptop available and encourage students to bring laptops to tutorial rooms where possible.

Improve access to midterm examination facilities

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.

University level

Improve Math Department courses

The first year office has been working closely with the Math Department, and the Engineering Faculty as a whole recognises the need for improvements.

Dean, first year office and curriculum committee

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>
</tbody>
</table>
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. 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.

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). 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. Department Chair In progress

**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.
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
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 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 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 at 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.
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 Final Assessment Report was prepared by the Quality Assurance Committee to be submitted to Graduate Council (December 2016) and Undergraduate Council, and Senate (January 2017).

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

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>Agenda Item VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>within honours program</strong></td>
<td>consideration as part of ongoing broader undergraduate program review</td>
<td>Committee and department faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Careers workshop and additional steps to provide undergraduates with information concerning careers, skills, links with institutions offering vocational programs (e.g., Mohawk College)</strong></td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Undergraduate Committee, Department Chair and Sociology Students’ Society</td>
<td>March, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bringing community into the classroom</strong></td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Individual faculty</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Look into student complaints that social science counseling is not always informed and helpful to their concerns</strong></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><strong>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.</strong></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., 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitor distribution of graduate supervision among faculty</strong></td>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>Graduate Chair, Department Chair</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce graduate student-faculty ratio</strong></td>
<td>Underway - smaller PhD cohorts, larger MA cohorts</td>
<td>Graduate Committee</td>
<td>September, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardize expectations for dissertation proposal.</strong></td>
<td>This already exists in policy but is not enforced.</td>
<td>Graduate Chair, Department Chair</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.
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>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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.

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 an globalization have affected Canadian performance and media practices. We will consider whether this skill set should be separated out and taught as an

| 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. | 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 an globalization have affected Canadian performance and media practices. We will consider whether this skill set should be separated out and taught as an | Theatre & Film Studies Program Committee | To begin in 2016-2017 |
independent course at Level III.

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.

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 & 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.

Re-examine teaching duties in the program. Given the emphasis in the program on creative

Several course taught by faculty members who do not teach studio-based courses

Director of SOTA and Theatre & Film Studies Program Committee

To begin in 2016-2017 session

Director of SOTA and Theatre & Film Studies Program Committee

To begin in 2016-17 session
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?

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.

| 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 | Currently, there is an evaluative process in place for admission to the two central production courses: 3S03 Major Production Workshop and 4A06: Theatre and Society: A Performance Project. Our program is open by design to allow students | Theatre & Film Studies Program Committee | To begin in 2016-2017 session |
undertake. to explore a variety of processes involved in performance creation. As a BA program, rather than a BFA, we feel this is entirely appropriate.

| SOTA and Theatre & 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. | 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 & 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 | Some faculty members from the program; Director of SOTA; Associate Dean | To begin in 2016-17 session |
of the space (activities) and to determine its governance (staffing support).

<p>| The Theatre &amp; Film Studies program should be re-designated as the Theatre, Performance and Film Studies Program | 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 | Director of SOTA and Theatre &amp; Film Studies Program Committee | To begin in 2016-17 session |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Hub.</th>
<th>The program agrees with this recommendation and is in the process of submitting the change to the curriculum committee in Fall 2016</th>
<th>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</th>
<th>To begin in 2016-17 Faculty curricular sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The THTRFLM 3S03 Major Production Workshop should be developed from a 3-credit to a 6-credit one-term course</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>

| 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. | | | |

Agenda Item VIII
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.