



School of Graduate Studies

1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
L8S 4L8

Phone 905.525.9140
Ext. 23679
<http://graduate.mcmaster.ca>

To : Members of Graduate Council
From : Christina Bryce
Assistant Graduate Secretary

The next meeting of Graduate Council will be held on **Friday February 13th at 1:30 pm in Council Chambers (GH-111)**

Listed below are the agenda items for discussion.

Please email cbryce@mcmaster.ca if you are unable to attend the meeting.

A G E N D A

- I. Minutes of the meeting of December 9th 2014
- II. Business arising
- III. Report from the Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies
- IV. Report from the Graduate Associate Deans
- V. Report from the Associate Registrar and Graduate Secretary
- VI. Report from the Assistant Dean, Graduate Student Life and Research Training
- VII. IQAP Final Assessment Reports
- VIII. Faculty of Humanities Graduate Policy and Curriculum Committee Report
- IX. Proposal: Joint Undergraduate and Graduate Committee on Certificates and Diplomas
- X. Other Business



School of Graduate Studies

1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
L8S 4L8

Phone 905.525.9140
Ext. 23679
<http://graduate.mcmaster.ca>

Graduate Council
December 9th, 2014 – 9:30 am
GH 111

Present: Mr. P. Self, Ms. S. Baschiera, Ms. C. Chapman, Ms. T. Vanduzer, Dr. A. Holloway, Dr. A. Dean, Mr. T. van Boxtel, Ms. S. Nagle Smith, Mr. R. Morton, Dr. T. Adams, Dr. W. Wiesner, Dr. I. Zeytinoglu, Dr. A. Grenier, Dr. K. Bird, Dr. T. Kroeker, Dr. J. Richardson, Dr. M. Thompson, Dr. B. Ibhawoh, Dr. F. Franek (for Dr. A. Deza), Dr. C. Hayward

Regrets: Dr. V. Ignieski, Dr. T. Porter, Dr. S. Streeter, Ms. C. Brown, Dr. S. McCracken, Ms. E. McLean, Dr. A. Shi

By Invitation: Dr. C. Humphreys

A G E N D A

I. Minutes of the meeting of November 19th 2014

The minutes of the meeting of November 19th, 2014 were approved on a motion by Dr. Thompson, seconded by Dr. Dean.

II. Business arising

There was no business arising.

III. Report from the Acting Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies

There was no report as Dr. Welch was away.

IV. Report from the Graduate Associate Deans

Dr. Hayward reported that the Faculty of Health Sciences had conducted a survey of students and faculty to look at interest in Ph.D. programs and what goes into student decisions to pursue or not pursue the degree as well as what limits recruitment.

V. Report from the Associate Registrar and Graduate Secretary

Stephanie Baschiera reported that one new program had been successfully submitted to the ministry and noted that there are a number of new programs coming through in various stages from most of the faculties.

VI. Report from the Assistant Dean, Graduate Student Life and Research Training

Peter Self reported that a notice about the annual Three Minute Thesis Competition had been sent out.

VII. New Program Proposal: Child Life and Pediatric Psychosocial Care

Dr. Cathy Humphreys introduced the program. She noted that they had previously offered a program here at McMaster as a post-degree diploma program. A new strategic plan for the profession has indicated that a graduate degree will now be required in the field. They have proposed two streams the first is an entry level stream and the second is an upgrade for those already working in the field. The program will be delivered through a combination of residency and online coursework. The proposed coursework has been matched to certification eligibility requirements but also matches current practices in Ontario. The program has received letters of support for their internship component from organizations across Canada. They anticipate starting with 10 students in both streams.

Dr. Holloway moved and Dr. Adams seconded ‘that Graduate Council approve the proposed new M.Sc. program in Child Life and Pediatric Psychosocial Care, as described in the documents.’

The motion was **carried**.

VIII. Faculty of Health Science Graduate Policy and Curriculum Committee Report

Dr. Hayward presented the items for approval. The School of Biomedical Engineering proposed reducing their number of required courses beyond the baccalaureate degree from 6 to 5, based on a recommendation from their IQAP review. The School of Nursing proposed changing a number of existing research areas which no longer appropriately map to their faculty complement. Dr. Hayward noted that the Occupational Therapy program is a professional program to train people to become occupational therapists and so, students must pass all of the courses to successfully complete their degree. The issue that has arisen is that when a student failed a course, they weren’t able to complete the course until it was offered again the following year. A workaround had been put in place but the net result was that a student’s course failure didn’t show up on their transcript. The program has, therefore, proposed two remediation courses to allow students to complete remediation work and allow for there to be proper documentation for students who had failures in the program.

Dr. Hayward moved and Dr. Holloway seconded, ‘that Graduate Council approve the Faculty of Health Sciences curriculum changes as described in the documents.’

The motion was carried.

IX. Faculty of Science Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee Report

Dr. Milliken presented the two items for approval. Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour proposed reducing their course requirements from four half courses to three. This would allow students more time to focus on research, particularly in their first year of study which is important so they can be well-positioned for scholarship competitions in their second year. Mathematics proposed a change for their M-Phimac students, changing the required project course to an industrial project instead.

Dr. Wiesner moved and Dr. Hayward seconded, 'that Graduate Council approve the Faculty of Science curriculum changes as described in the documents.'

The motion was **carried**.

X. Faculty of Social Sciences Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee Report

Dr. Karen Bird presented the four items for approval on behalf of Dr. Porter. The first item proposed was from Anthropology. The change to specialization name proposed by the program will better reflect the change faculty complement. Economics proposed a change to their calendar information on waivers. Previously the language in the calendar explained there were a variety of courses that could be waived but in practice there has only ever been one course to which this applied. The change will reflect current practice. The third change, proposed by Health, Aging and Society would change the course requirements for the M.A. with the introduction of two methods courses and an option to choose between the two (rather than the single methods course that existed previously). The final change, proposed by Sociology, is a change to a field again reflecting change in faculty complement. The program proposed that Sociology of Education be deleted as faculty members in that area are no longer teaching at McMaster.

Dr. Bird moved and Dr. Adams seconded 'that Graduate Council approve the Faculty of Social Sciences curriculum changes as described in the documents.'

The motion was carried.

XI. Mosaics Revisions to Terminology

Stephanie presented an overview of changes coming as a result of the switch to Mosaic. Some changes are simply to language that will not affect process (eg. Session versus term). Courses will now be scheduled into the system differently than in the past. Units are now attributed to courses and the units associated with a course will appear throughout the system. With respect to admissions, there will be a new online application system and the system will allow students to upload documents associated with their application.

Dr. Hayward noted that it would be helpful if there was a best practice session scheduled to assist programs with updating their handbooks in light of the changes.

Committee members also discussed the implications of scanned documents and offers.

XII. New Scholarships

Dr. Hayward moved and Dr. Wiesner seconded,

‘that Graduate Council approve the proposed new scholarships as described in the documents.’

The motion was **carried**.

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review

Biomedical Engineering

Date of Review: April 1-2, 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 graduate programs delivered by **Biomedical Engineering**. 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 School of Biomedical Engineering submitted a self-study to the School of Graduate Studies February 2014. 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.

The external reviewers, one from Calgary and one from Ontario, Calgary, and one internal reviewer conducted a site visit April 2014. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Dean of the Faculty of Engineering; Dean of School of Graduate Studies; School of Biomedical Engineering leadership, and meetings with groups of current students, full-time and part-time faculty and support staff.

In their report the review team found the graduate programs in the School of Biomedical Engineering (SBME) to be very good, noting no major programmatic issues and substantial enthusiasm in the program and from senior management.

Strengths:

- The School has excellent programs at both the Master's and PhD levels, which are universally recognized as "very good"
- There is a high level of enthusiasm for the programs

Weaknesses:

- The reviewers noted that the School lacks a strategic plan; this is being implemented
- There is a number of minor issues surrounding the courses offered in the program; these need to be addressed in toto, perhaps as part of the strategic plan
- Concerns were raised around the process of Director succession; careful planning is needed in this area
- Student financial support, especially for foreign students, is not in line with other institutions; this may impact program enrolment

Summary of the Reviewers' Recommendations with the Department's Responses**Recommendations****1. Strategic Planning Exercise**

Suggestion is made that the SBME undergo an exercise to develop a vision, mission and strategic plan in consultation with the Deans of Engineering and Health Sciences. Articulation and discussion of the SBME strategic plan is critical to ensure best alignment with University and Faculty plans. A SBME strategic research plan will also ensure that the school has the appropriate impact and visibility at McMaster University. As part of this strategic planning process, additional thought should be given to the four self-identified research themes. The SBME should affirm that these are the most appropriate areas for robust future development and allocation of resources.

Program Response: SBME is planning a one-day faculty retreat for early fall or late summer if schedules permit. At this time a strategic plan, vision and mission statement will be created for the school. The administrative leadership of the school will use a collaborative, team-based approach in developing these statements. The four current research areas will be reviewed at the faculty retreat and in conjunction with the Deans of Engineering and Health Sciences to confirm the future direction the school wants to pursue.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

2. Admissions

It is suggested that SBME review their admission procedures and define a distinctive SBME admission culture, which is clearly articulated on the program web site.

Program Response: The current SBME application process and requirements will be clearly outlined on the website. This will also include details on the review and notification process for students.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

3. Curriculum

1) Reduction in number of required courses for Ph.D. students

Program Response: Requests for the curriculum to be updated will be submitted to change the requirements for students who transfer from MASC to PhD to be reduced from 3 to 2 courses at the PhD level.

2) A more comprehensive suite of courses should be developed and the SBMe should attempt to offer these elective courses on a predictable basis.

Program Response: A survey/questionnaire is being sent to all current students to obtain their input on what additional courses they would like to have permission to take. For those courses with high volume requests, submission will be made to The School of Graduate Studies and the departments offering these courses to have them cross-listed as BME courses also. A review of historical course activity will also take place to determine what areas have high demand for additional courses to be added.

3) The requirement to broaden knowledge to include one course from engineering/health science per degree be modified so that it is only a requirement at the PhD level.

Program Response: We agree with this recommendation and will submit the appropriate requests to the Graduate Curriculum and Policy Council to adjust the program requirements.

4) The program should consider formally providing instruction on how to communicate effectively (perhaps as part of BME701 and BME706) or at the annual workshop.

Program Response: Effective communication will be part of the newly proposed Medical Science course ("Research Methodology in Medical Sciences") course specifically designed for Medical Science and BME students. It is also being requested that this be cross-listed as a BME course.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

4. Comprehensive Exam Procedure

It is suggested that the PhD comprehensive exam procedure be revised to having students prepare and defend a research proposal for their intended thesis research.

Program Response: The program feels that the recommended method (above) is too similar to our current PhD transfer exam already in place. Numerous graduate programs at McMaster University use the policy currently in place, where the PhD comprehensive exam is on a topic similar to, but not the same as students' thesis topic. This approach enables the student to continue to develop a more comprehensive understanding of relevant research areas.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

5. Administrative Support

The program should consider funding additional administrative personnel.

Program Response: This will be reviewed in the future depending on the direction the SBME takes.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

6. Academic Workload and Chairs

The academic workload within the program could be spread amongst all faculty rather than a core group. Specifically this could ensure that more elective courses are offered on a regular basis (which would greatly benefit students). The program should also seek to develop and fill chair positions for new faculty in identified priority areas.

Program Response: This will be discussed in more detail at the faculty retreat. Hiring of new faculty and appointment of new research chair positions need to be discussed with Deans and Departmental chairs. As this is already covered in the Engineering Strategic Plan, SBME Directors will work with all parties to move forward on this.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs/Faculty Deans

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

7. Student Engagement and TA-ships

a) Strategies to attract more health and life science students to the SBME program should be developed and implemented.

Program Response: This will be discussed in more detail at the faculty retreat and with the Deans of both Faculties

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs/Faculty Deans

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

b) Biomedical Engineering should work with associated departments to identify a suite of courses in which TAs could be earmarked for SBME students.

Program Response: SBME works with the other departments but they cannot identify courses that will be specifically ear-marked for SBME students. As each department makes offers to their own graduate students that include a TAship, the allocation will go to covering their own commitments before they commit to another department. In previous years there was not a large issue in finding TA positions for all of our students. During the past year this has become more difficult due to the increase in graduate

students in other areas. If this continues to be an issue in the current year, we will discuss with the Deans the possibility of not reducing the other area TA allocation if they take on an additional BME TA, therefore assisting us in placing all SBME students.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs/Faculty Deans

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

8. Co-Director Model

It is strongly suggested that the program leadership will eventually be better served by having a single Director who can lead in both Engineering and Health Science, once the current co-Directors step down.

Program Response: This will be discussed further at the faculty retreat. There needs to be a strong linkage to both faculties and having a director from each area has allowed those linkages. Indeed, we believe this has strengthened engagement between the 2 faculties, relative to what was in place before the co-director model. To continue with this structure, the Terms of Reference will be updated and dispute resolution methods will be clearly outlined and agreed to by both faculties.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs in consultation with Faculty Deans

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

9. Graduate Program Requirements

a) Only those faculty who have shown a reasonable commitment to the program, through active involvement in service, teaching and/or graduate supervision, should be retained.

Program Response: This was done as part of the IQAP review and the membership was reduced to include only those faculty who are actively teaching courses and/or supervising SBME students. The review will continue on an ongoing basis for faculty requesting membership within the School.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

b) It is planned that SBME students will be able to take a statistics course offered by Medical Sciences. While this will provide statistics training, it may not be well oriented to Biomedical Engineering needs. It is suggested that SBME develop and offer its own course on statistical analysis for Biomedical Engineers. Until this course is ready, students can take the proposed course in Medical Sciences.

Program Response: This course ("Research Methodology in Medical Sciences") will be requested to be crosslisted as a SBME course. The course may also be provided partially by an SBME member, which will ensure that the curriculum covers the Biomedical engineering needs. This will be reviewed once the course has been run a couple of times to determine if a further course specific to BME is required.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

10. System of Governance

a) A significant portion of the day-to-day operations should be devolved to the Administrative Manager (provided this becomes a full time position per the earlier recommendation). This will allow the academic leadership more time for strategic activities. The impression is that the current Co-Directors are actively engaged in too much of “the administrative and supervisory workload.”

Program Response: The Co-Directors are not overly engaged in the administrative workload. The Co-Directors do have a larger supervisory role (of graduate students in the program) than some other members of BME. However, this is due to their active research programs. The remaining issues raised will be part of strategic plan and succession plan is also required for the current leadership. One of the co-directors has continued to take on more teaching responsibilities for the program. At the faculty retreat we will discuss more even distribution of course load.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

b) The SBME should consider developing an Executive Committee that would meet 6 to 12 times a year and provide guidance and support to the school’s leadership.

Program Response: The program agrees with this recommendation but feel that currently due to the size of the program it is not necessary to meet 6-12 times per year. We feel that once or twice per year should be adequate. An SBME Executive committee will officially be set up and we will also request one member from BMEGA to sit on this committee and participate in the management of SBME.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chairs

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

c) Research trainees (both graduate students and fellows) should be asked to play an active role in school governance, as deemed appropriate. The BMEGA should be asked to provide a representative to sit on the proposed SBME Executive Committee.

Program Response: Graduate students have been asked to play a partial role in school governance. Going forward, BMEGA will be asked to provide one member who will sit on departmental committees and attend the SBME faculty meetings. SBME students have also played an active role in the past few years on University Committees and this has typically been BMEGA members, including Faculty GSPC and University Senate.

Deans’ Response to Reviewers Recommendations and Program Response:

The reviewers commend the program, highlight a concern regarding succession of the current directors, and provide a vision of an autonomous, prestige school to consider for the future. Both faculties are aware of the importance of succession planning for graduate program leadership. Both faculties

support increased international recognition of the school and its faculty. The faculties will support the program's efforts to improve the school's outreach into the Faculty of Health Sciences as part of the efforts to achieve international excellence through strongly inter-linked biomedical research.

The Deans reviewed the detailed response provided by the co-Directors of the school and find their plans to improve the quality of the program satisfactory and practical. Some points made by the reviewers related to post-doctoral fellows were outside the scope of a graduate program review, in the view of the Deans. They look forward to the outcome of the School's faculty retreat this fall where it is hoped many of the 'future looking' recommendations will be discussed with development of a strategic plan for the program's evolution. The Deans agree that it is timely to re-evaluate the areas of research strength in the program. The program has appropriate plans for implementing the changes suggested to course work. They agree with the views of the program faculty, that the comprehensive examination changes that were suggested by the reviewers are not in keeping with McMaster University policies where the examination needs to have a focus that is distinct from the thesis work that is assessed at committee meetings. They feel that the program's responses to suggestions on resources and other issues were also thoughtful and appropriate. The current model of having co-Directors is working well at present, but the deans would not exclude the possibility of appointing a Director and an Associate Director in the future, should it become the preferred arrangement.

Quality Assurance Committee Recommendations

The Committee finds that the programs are of very high quality, and that the review raises a number of important but not critical points that could be addressed to improve the programs. Subject to satisfactory progress in addressing these issues being demonstrated in the 18-month follow-up report, the Committee recommends that the program proceed to the next review at the normal time, i.e. at 8 years after the present review.

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review

Health, Aging and Society (BA & MA Programs)

Date of Review: June 17 – 19, 2014

In accordance with McMaster's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the **Health, Aging and Society (Undergraduate & Graduate) BA and MA 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 Health, Aging and Society (Undergraduate & Graduate) Cyclical Program Review

The **Health, Aging and Society Program** operates through an interdisciplinary approach throughout its curriculum at both undergraduate and graduate levels. In accordance with the IQAP, the undergraduate and graduate programs submitted a joint self-study in February 2014. The self-study presented the program descriptions and learning outcomes, an analytical assessment of the program, including data collected from students 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 Program.

Two arm's-length reviewers, one from Ontario and one from California, and one internal reviewer participated in a three-day site visit organized by the School of Graduate Studies. The site visit consisted of meetings with faculty members, staff, as well as undergraduate and graduate students. The Review Team highlighted their findings in a report submitted in June 2014. The Review Team was genuinely impressed with the organization of the undergraduate program and the positive feedback received from students when discussing the program, faculty and staff. The only question that remains is about the viability of the three-year BA program given the university's focus on graduate student education. Overall, the review highlighted a very positive student experience and no other recommendations were put forth. The MA program in Health, Aging and Society is represented by students with very different disciplinary

backgrounds. Although the Review Team does agree that this is the basis for a rich graduate student experience they do note the challenges the program faces in ensuring the course content meets all students' needs and that students are provided with the appropriate level of direction in their present and anticipated careers.

The Chair of the Health, Aging and Society program and the Acting Dean of Social Science submitted responses to the Reviewers' Report. Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.

McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee determined that reviewers' comments and feedback were generally positive. QAC recommends that the program 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 next review.

The following program strengths and weakness were also noted:

- **Strengths**

The review team noted that the Health, Aging and Society faculty have developed an innovative undergraduate curriculum with a strong experiential component

The students in the undergraduate program have a close sense of community leading to a very positive student experience.

- **Weaknesses**

There is a heavy reliance on cross-appointed faculty. Although having cross-appointed faculty allows a diverse educational experience for both BA and MA students, this model is also associated with competing demands from other departments in the Faculty.

Summary of the Reviewers' Recommendations with the Department's and Acting Dean's Responses & Follow Up Process

Recommendation #1: Eliminate the three-year BA program.

Response: The Department expresses an interest in moving to an exclusively honors BA program or to direct entry degree programs.

Responsibility for following up: Department Chair and Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #2: Uneven interest in gerontology and health studies.

Response: The Department places an equal emphasis on both areas but attracting students into gerontology continues to pose challenges. Department can encourage students to take a combined honors degree.

Responsibility for following up: Department Chair

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #3: Address the diversity of student backgrounds in the MA program.

Response: The Department agrees with the Reviews' assessment and believes that the introduction of two PhD programs and new faculty with this degree may allow the Department to offer a greater range of courses that will meet the diverse needs to students. The Department has also conducted a labour market assessment, which will allow them guide students in careers relating to their degrees

Responsibility for following up: Department Chair & Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #4: Graduate students should have access to a greater number of courses in their areas of interest.

Response: The Department fully agrees and will begin to address this topic at the faculty retreat. They point out that the new PhD program will also make this a more viable option.

The Acting Dean adds that the Chairs and Directors in the Faculty of Social Sciences are discussing how to facilitate students who wish to register in courses in other departments. The Department is also speaking with units outside of the Faculty of Social Sciences to explore joint graduate courses.

Responsibility for following up: Department Chair & Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review

Kinesiology

Date of Review: April 10th and 11th 2014

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 programs delivered by Kinesiology. 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 Kinesiology program submitted a self-study to the School of Graduate Studies February 2014. 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.

Two external reviewers and one internal reviewer examined the materials and completed a site visit in April 2014. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Dean of the Faculty of Science; Dean of School of Graduate Studies; Chair of the Department, and meetings with groups of current students, full-time and part-time faculty and support staff.

Strengths

- In their report the review team found the graduate programs in the Department of Kinesiology, leading to the M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees to be very strong, noting that it has historically been and continues to be among the best in North America.
- They note that the combination of excellent facilities and faculty has allowed the program to flourish.
- The department attracts graduate students that are some of the best both nationally and internationally.

- The quality indicators tracked by the department are impressive, and it is great to see these indicators point to a healthy graduate studies program.
- It is impressive that the department ensures its graduate students have broad skills, such as communication of research findings and teaching skills, as well as awareness of career possibilities outside academia.

Weaknesses

The major weakness noted by the review team was that there has been a decline in the number of faculty, particularly in the areas of motor control and biomechanics which, if not addressed, will have a significant impact on the quality of the Kinesiology graduate programs.

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

Recommendations

1. Declining Faculty Complement

"There is really only one concern; however, it is major and its repercussions imminent. The faculty complement has dropped precipitously in recent years. In fact, both external reviewers were genuinely surprised to see how small the faculty complement was relative to the Department's impact and reputation. The loss of faculty has been 'unmanaged' in the sense that it has occurred due to departures and retirements for which there have been no replacements. The Department now finds itself in a situation where two areas, both of which are pillars in the field of kinesiology, are perilously close to becoming nonviable: motor control and biomechanics. Without these two foundational areas, the Department could no longer lay claim to being a department of 'kinesiology'."

Department Response: "Our Department is cognizant of the current financial challenges facing the University and the Faculty, and remains committed to the Academic Planning Process that is currently underway in Science. There is no denying, however, that continued erosion of our faculty complement is jeopardizing the longstanding reputational excellence of Kinesiology at McMaster, to the point where external assessors warn that the Department may not qualify to offer bona fide training in kinesiology, the discipline we ostensibly represent. The seriousness of the threat posed to our graduate and undergraduate programs has been clearly articulated in two quality assurance reviews conducted over the last two years."

Dean's Response: Dean Baker noted that the Faculty of Science is engaged in an Academic Planning exercise, the likely outcome of which will be the establishment of a Faculty committee that will evaluate proposals for faculty hires on an annual basis. He also noted that he was keenly aware of the importance of faculty renewal in Kinesiology to continued excellence in graduate education.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Faculty Dean/Department

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

2. Admissions

The reviewers suggested accepting all applications from interested students rather than pre-filtering potential candidates.

Department Response: They maintain that their current admission procedures are evidence of a high degree of due diligence on the part of graduate faculty that ultimately saves both the department and the student time and money. That said, we recognize the logic behind the reviewer's suggestion in this regard and we will certainly raise the issue for full discussion at our Graduate Management and Graduate C&P committees.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chair

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

3. Teaching Resources

The reviewers suggested streamlining the undergraduate program to allow for more attention to the graduate and research programs.

Department Response: The department appreciates the reviewer's suggestion that they revisit and refine the undergraduate curriculum in order to focus more directly on graduate supervision, teaching and research. The department takes great pride in the delivery of their undergraduate program and any path taken in such a revisiting would have to be undertaken in such a way as to ensure that the integrity and quality of their undergraduate courses is in no way undermined.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chair

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

4. Community Engaged

The reviewers note that some of the community engagement graduate TA placement may not be the best use of the TA's time and does not give them the teaching or research related experience that most require.

Department Response: With respect to the concern that graduate students assigned to the PACE are underutilized and perhaps inappropriately deployed, the department has begun drafting a best practices document, identifying appropriate tasks for grad student TAs in the PACE, and skills that students should expect to apply and develop.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chair

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

5. Non-academic Career Training for Graduate Students

Graduate students indicated they would like the opportunity for applied practical experience in non-academic careers coordinated by the department.

Department Response:The program is aware that not all of their students will seek/find positions in academia. They will bring the issue forward at their next Graduate Curriculum & Policy Committee meeting.

Responsibility for Leading Follow Up: Department/Department Chair

Timeline for Addressing Recommendation: Update at 18 month follow-up report

Quality Assurance Committee Recommendations

The Quality Assurance 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
School of Geography and Earth Sciences
Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

Date of Review: March 3 -5, 2014

*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 **School of Geography and Earth Sciences**. 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 Programs in the
School of Geography and Earth Sciences**

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the School of Geography and Earth Sciences submitted a self-study in January 2014 to the Associate Vice-President, Faculty and the 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 School.

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 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 3 - 5, 2014. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies; Associate Vice-President, Faculty, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies (Science), Director of the School and meetings with groups of current undergraduate, Ph.D. and MSc students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Director, School of Geography and Earth Sciences and the Dean of Science submitted responses to the Reviewers' Report (May/June 2014). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.

McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee noted that it is great to read that several of the issues identified in the report have already been addressed. Budget issues are in a wait-and-see mode for the University's new budget model; however, the School has successfully sought external support. Internal communication appears to be improving with more frequent faculty interaction being reported. It appears that the faculty teaching load assignments are under a wait-and-see mode, pending the outcome of an Academic Planning exercise.

The QAC also noted that the issues of antirequisites is currently being resolved. The TA issue is one that all departments and schools struggle with across campus, and their Curriculum Committee is working on resolving this with TA schedules and specifying TA requirements.

QAC 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.

The QAC recognized that the resolution of some issues and weaknesses in the department are dependent on greater clarity of direction from bodies outside the SGES. At the 18-month review point, the committee hopes that these external directions are clear and that SGES would have already proceeded to implement concrete steps to resolve some of the issues, which are currently in suspended mode.

The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the QAC to be submitted to Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council and Senate (February 2014).

In their report (March 2014), the Review Team provided feedback that describes how the graduate programs in the School of Rehabilitation Science meet the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) evaluation criteria and are consistent with the University's mission and academic priorities. In their report, the Review Team members highlighted that the quality of the school's faculty, staff, and graduate and undergraduate programs is exemplary and of very high quality. Overall, students expressed a high level of satisfaction with their learning experiences. Faculty and staff are highly committed to teaching and research. The reviewers noted that the key future challenge will be to maintain or minimize the erosion of the high standard of teaching and scholarship across the current breadth and depth of subject areas in the face of likely budget reductions.

The following program strengths and weaknesses were noted:

Strengths

The following strengths were identified: an innovative high quality learning environment is evident in the report using, for example, the problem-based learning approach. Related is the high level of student

satisfaction, evident by student comments at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The SGES is commended on going to great lengths to solicit student feedback. Of note as well, is the exemplary and high quality faculty in SGES.

Weaknesses

A key concern of the reviewers is the lack of specific details in fixing identified issues. For example, while there are mandatory field trips in the program, they appear to be insufficiently supported. Prior reviews identified rising costs and lack of spaces on these trips. Students have, apparently, been disappointed by not having appropriate field experience, and disadvantaged in terms of employment opportunities. The report indicates a co-op or internship plan might help. It should be an urgent focus of the SGES to demonstrate how this lack of field experience is being addressed, whether through internships, or other means. Intermediate actions should perhaps be considered, while waiting for the formal process to implement a 2016/17 co-op program. This school is favourably viewed by its students (both graduate and undergraduate) and hopefully this temporary issue can be resolved.

In a similar vein, taking action on the lack of coherence and availability of graduate students' course concerns should be addressed. Resolving this will be related to the issue of equitable spread of teaching load, which is pending the results of the Academic Plan.

The Dean of the Faculty of Science, in consultation with the Director of the School of Geography and Earth Science 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 School of Graduate Studies and in the Associate Vice-President, Faculty's office.

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

Recommendations

1. Provide for more flexibility while maintaining fairness in the allocation of the teaching responsibilities for regular faculty.

Response: The school advised that it would strike a committee to re-examine the allocation of teaching loads within the School after the Dean's Academic Plan has been released. This will allow the School to evaluate teaching duties within the context of the Faculty of Science Plan and the new budget realities.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of SGES

Timeline: Update at 18-month report

2. Review the current Teaching Assistant allocation to ensure an appropriate balance between effectiveness and efficiency in program delivery is met.

Response: Through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, SGES will examine how it allocates TAs to courses, particularly given that the number of TA positions will remain fixed. TA guidelines will also

be published so that both faculty and graduate students have a better understanding of how allocations are made.

The Dean noted that the recent Academic Planning exercise also identified TA allocation as an issue that merits study. The Faculty will look to address this issue in future.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of SGES and Dean of Faculty of Science

Timeline: Update at 18-month report

3. Introduce paid co-ops and internships as part of the undergraduate programs.

Response: In April 2014, SGES initiated discussions with the Faculty of Science's Science Career and Cooperative Education (SCCE) Office regarding the possibility of paid co-op opportunities, particularly with respect to earth and environmental students. SCCE will develop a prospectus on co-op opportunities over the summer of 2014, which will be brought forward to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the SGES Faculty during the Fall of 2014.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of SGES

Timeline: Follow up at 18-month report

4. Address budget constraints

Response: SGES will work with the Dean's office to implement plans, with the acknowledgement that the delivery of undergraduate and graduate programs, and the resources to do this, remain a priority. SGES will also proceed on its own in terms of addressing its budget issues. Beginning with the 2014/15 budget, the School has said that it will cut 'discretionary' spending by approximately 50%. SGES will also be looking carefully at teaching duties and the number/variety of courses taught. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will look at opportunities to teach courses in alternating years in order for faculty resources to teach other courses, and reduce the need to hire CLAs or sessional instructors to cover courses.

SGES will also actively seek out other funding opportunities. This will include Research Chair opportunities and working with Alumni Advancement. The School is currently having discussions with program alumni to fund a seminar series and/or field courses.

The Dean advised that one likely outcome of the Academic Planning process is the establishment of a Faculty-wide minimum undergraduate teaching load. Also, the Academic Planning Committee will likely recommend units review the necessity of offering very low enrolment courses.

Responsibility for following up: Director of SGES with Dean of Faculty of Science

Timeline: Update at 18-month follow up

5. Establish appropriate anti-requisites

Response: The School noted that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee would review anti-requisites as part of its yearly review of the undergraduate program.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of SGES along with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Timeline: Update at 18-month follow up

6. Improving Internal Communication

Response: SGES will continue discussions with faculty regarding budget issues throughout the year. Faculty groups in main areas in SGES will also be required to meet to work out teaching duties. More broadly, the School will explore ways to further improve internal communications within the School.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of SGES

Timeline: Update at 18-month follow up

7. Offer a BA from the Faculty of Science

Response: The School agreed that a funding agreement between the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Social Science is a priority. A substantial number of students originate from Social Sciences, while other students move from the B.Sc. in Environmental Science to the B.A. program in Environmental Studies. Many of the B.Sc. students participate in cross-listed classes, including classes in the GIS stream, and therefore benefit from the interdisciplinary environment these classes offer.

The Dean highlighted that a key issue going forward will be to address how the B.A. program can continue to operate within the constraints of the new budget model. Currently, the Faculty of Science delivers the majority of the teaching for this program but receives a relatively small proportion of the revenue. The Dean noted that the university's documentation on the new budget model recognizes this is an area of concern and proposes the relevant Deans reach an agreement on an appropriate way to share revenues and costs. The Dean acknowledged that the reviewers identified housing the B.A. program within the Faculty of Science as another solution to this challenge. The Dean stressed that it is unclear which path will be followed; however it is a high priority issue for the Faculty of Science to address in the near future.

Responsibility for Following Up: Dean, Faculty of Science

Timeline: Follow up at 18-month report

8. Ensure the best use of staff resources across the Department, Faculty and University.

Response: The School noted that the SGES is stretched and noted that it would look for opportunities to integrate aspects of the School's supports with the staff and services available at Faculty or McMaster levels. The School stressed that it was not aware of such opportunities at this time, but acknowledged that some may arise in the coming months with the Academic Plan.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director, SGES

Timeline: Follow up at 18-month report

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review

School of Nursing (B.ScN, MN, PhD)

Date of Review: April 2 – 3, 2014

In accordance with McMaster's Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the **School of Nursing (B.ScN, PhD) Programs**. 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 School of Nursing (B.ScN, MN, PhD) Cyclical Program Review

The McMaster **School of Nursing (B.ScN, MN, PhD) Program** is recognized by other Canadian Schools/Faculties of Nursing for leadership in undergraduate and graduate nursing education and the high caliber and output of nursing research. In accordance with the IQAP, the program submitted two individual reports: an undergraduate and a graduate self-study. The self-study presented the program descriptions and learning outcomes, an analytical assessment of the program, including data collected from students 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 Program.

Two arm's-length reviewers, one from Ontario and one from Newfoundland, and one internal reviewer participated in a two-day site visit organized by the School of Graduate Studies in which they reviewed the undergraduate and graduate nursing programs jointly. The reviewers reported that the goals and priorities of the Nursing Programs at McMaster University are consistent with the University's mission and academic plan. Specifically the University's mission to "foster discovery, communication and preservation of knowledge through teaching, research and scholarship" is evident in the nursing program's reputation for problem-based learning and evidenced-based practices. Administrators, faculty, and staff members within McMaster University School of Nursing voiced their commitment to the school, their students, and their work. Overall, undergraduate students, at all three collaborative sites (McMaster University, Mohawk College, and Conestoga College), were positive about the program and their instructors, as were graduate students at McMaster University. However, it was noted that there

is minimal inter-professional education within the program and given that McMaster University's School of Nursing is within a Faculty of Health Sciences, there are opportunities to strengthen this. The faculty and nursing administrators from all three sites said they had an effective committee structure for working together to develop, manage, and implement the undergraduate curriculum.

The following program strengths and weakness were also noted:

- **Strengths**
- The school has unique programs, including highly successful collaborations between McMaster, Mohawk and Conestoga, that are highly recognized by the reviewers and other Canadian schools alike
- The programs have strong foundations based on problem-based and evidence-based learning
- The innovative "Kaleidoscope" curriculum has met with success through the first cycle
- Research is of high quality and is well recognized by the nursing community

- **Weaknesses**
- The budget was identified as a key issue in the original report. This has largely been addressed in the follow-up, but funding will likely remain a key issue in on-going operations
- Faculty complement is at some degree of risk; this needs to be monitored closely
- The lack of extensive interprofessional education is identified as a key issue. Buy-in by the entire faculty will be needed in order for efforts in this direction to be truly successful
- The issue of common admission for Mohawk or Conestoga students is identified throughout the documents. Efforts to address this issue are on-going, and will need the collaborative input of several units, including the registrar's office

Quality Assurance Committee Recommendations

The School of Nursing has high quality programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels which are admired by other Schools in Canada. It is clear that considerable effort has already been placed on addressing the issues arising from the review. The committee therefore recommends that the next IQAP review occur on the regular cycle, subject to a satisfactory follow-up report after 18 months.

Summary of the Reviewers' Recommendations with the Department's and Dean's Responses & Follow Up Process

Recommendation #1: Develop a staffing plan for tenure stream positions that includes the percentage of theory courses in the undergraduate and graduate programs that are taught by tenure stream faculty members, as well as graduate student (thesis and PhD) supervision.

Response: During faculty career review meetings this spring the director of the School of Nursing determined an appropriate teaching load for all tenured faculty. This resulted in a minimal increase in teaching in the undergraduate nursing program. This will be an ongoing initiative for the School.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #2: Evaluate work processes and workload of staff members to rationalize all positions.

Response: A proposed plan has been developed to enhance support provided to faculty with a reduced staff complement. This has yet to be implemented.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #3: Clarify role of Assistant Dean of Research at McMaster University's School of Nursing and how this role can best be used to meet research needs of beginning and midcareer faculty members.

Response: The terms of reference and function of this role will be evaluated and reassessed by the new Director of the School of Nursing.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #4: Senior faculty members have just retired or are about to retire, reducing the expertise within the faculty to mentor new faculty members and supervise graduate students.

Response: The program agrees but has taken steps to try and address this concern. The program highlights the fact that there are mid-career researchers who are able to supervise students. SON has recommended three junior faculty for appointment in the graduate program to try and increase the numbers available to thesis committees. A large group of qualified and experienced 'clinical' faculty (adjunct) also serve as guest lecturers, on thesis committees, and as external examiners for masters and PhD students' oral defense sessions, scholarly paper reviews, or comprehensive examinations. While not included in the full- and part-time faculty numbers, the program states that these professionals enhance the high level of academic resources for our students.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #5: Ensure stipends for PhD students especially if faculty members may not have a grant/have a grant under review.

Response: Under the new budget model, the Nursing Graduate Program has the opportunity to access Scholarship Funding which will increase the direct support for students through entrance or departmental scholarships, and reduce the funding needed from faculty grant support. These measures will enhance the future recruitment of PhD students.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #6: Different streams are outlined in the calendar, however, courses related to these streams may not be offered because of low enrollment.

Response: The six fields described relate to the research expertise within the graduate faculty. A review of the fields has been discussed with the Nursing Graduate Faculty and a retreat is planned for September 2014 to review and consider revising them to areas of research excellence. Program has also developed cross listings with HRM and RS.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #7: Increase simulation lab opportunities including time when the labs are available for students to practice outside of their allocated lab time at the McMaster University site.

Response: There are plans to extend the stimulation lab for undergraduate students. Senior students have also been hired as peer students to provide support to students in CSBL. The use of standardized patients is being reviewed. The AVP, Academic agrees and states that faculty leadership will encourage the nursing undergraduate program to develop its curriculum for simulation learning to ensure that opportunities and experiences and use of simulation facilities are optimized.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #8: Students participate in clinical volunteer work in the community that is not supervised by clinical instructors during the first two years of the program.

Response: The program clarifies that in the first two years, this is not a volunteer experience but rather a service learning opportunity. Although a tutor is not present with the students, the program clarifies that the placements are carefully selected to meet course objectives and placement contacts are aware of the students' learning expectations.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #9: Need to have a common admissions process for undergraduate students at all three collaborative sites.

Response: Program notes that the Mohawk College has made a formal request to have their applicants use the University application system. Conestoga College has indicated that they do

not wish to use this system and wish to stay with OCAS. Mohawk and McMaster are currently working with the McMaster registrar's office to move this forward process.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #10: Monitor CNRE (or NCLEX starting in 2015) pass rates to determine impact of strengthened pre-health courses and common admission process.

Response: Program concurs that careful review of the impact of changes will be important.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #11: Consider ways to improve cross institution transfer of information.

Response: SON is awaiting the full roll-out of MOSAIC prior to developing sustainable information transfer processes.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #12: Interprofessional education (IPE) is minimal in the undergraduate program and can be enhanced at all three sites.

Response: The program concurs that this is an area that requires further development. Some steps that have already been taken to promote interprofessional education include:

- Nursing faculty member is on the planning group for Program for Interprofessional Practice, Education and Research.
- McMaster Interprofessional Student Collaborative (MISC) is a student-initiated group created as part of PIPER. They host a facebook page and Blog and plan IP events throughout the year.
- Curriculum mapping for IPE competencies was conducted in 2012, looking for opportunities to implement shared IPE experiences between all our health-related programs.
 - i.e. "Crisis on the Ward" SIMulation event that involves all Level 4 students from Practical Nursing and BScN, Respiratory Therapy and Paramedic programs.

The AVP, Academic agrees with this recommendation also and states that the Health Sciences Faculty leadership will work with the School and undergraduate nursing program to ensure there is a strong faculty lead for PIPER from the school to work on enhancing the IPE.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #13: Feedback from undergraduate students at the three sites.

Response: Curriculum Quality Sustainability and Innovation Committee (CQSIC) reviews year end reports, which include student feedback and makes modifications to the expectations of individual courses as necessary. Faculty development offered throughout the year addresses issues of inconsistency among tutors.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #14: Consider supporting access to the McMaster library resources for students at Conestoga College and Mohawk College.

Response: College site libraries were provided with funding to upgrade resources to University level when collaboration began. All college site students are registered as McMaster University students and have online access to McMaster University library resources. It is true however that they cannot access the librarians for support. Should all students enter through the University admissions process, this may change.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #15: Consider bursaries for students who cannot afford to do an outpost or low income clinical experience in the 4th year of the course.

Response: The program suggests they might work with the advancement office to establish an ongoing bursary/scholarship program to support the students for this experience.

The AVP, Academic supports the program's plan to work with advancement so students may pursue an outpost or international clinical experience.

Responsibility for following up: Associate Dean

Timeline: Update at 18 month report

FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Institutional Quality Assurance Program (IQAP) Review
Social Work (BSW, MSW and Ph.D.)

Date of Review: April 7 - 8, 2014

*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 Social Work programs delivered by the **School of Social Work**. This report identifies the significant strengths of the program, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out 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 BSW, MSW and Ph.D. Programs in Social Work in the School of Social Work

In accordance with the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), the School of Social Work submitted a self-study in March 2014 to the Associate Vice-President (Faculty) and Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies to initiate the cyclical program review of its 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 arms-length reviewers, one from British Columbia and one from Calgary, and one internal reviewer, selected from a set of proposed reviewers, examined the materials and completed a site visit on April 7 - 8, 2014. The visit included interviews with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic); Associate Vice-President (Faculty); Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies; and meetings with a group of current Ph.D. and MSc students, full-time faculty and support staff.

The Director of the School of Social Work and the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences submitted responses to the Reviewers' Report (July/August 2014). Specific recommendations were discussed and clarifications and corrections were presented. Follow-up actions and timelines were included.

McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) reviewed the above documentation and the committee determined that all the programs that were reviewed were of excellent quality. The QAC recommend

that, subject to a satisfactory 18-month interim report, the programs should next be reviewed according to the regular cycle. The Final Assessment Report was prepared by the QAC in February 2015, to be submitted to Graduate Council and Senate.

In their report (May 2014), the Review Team provided feedback that describes how the BSW, MSW and Ph.D. programs in Social Work meet the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) evaluation criteria and are consistent with the University's mission and academic priorities. The Review Team wrote that the School of Social Work at McMaster University is a well-run, innovative academic unit that offers high quality programs across all levels of education. Based upon a review of the School's self-study and site visit discussions, the review team was confident in saying it remains a leader in social work education on a national level.

The School of Social Work is closely aligned with McMaster University's mandate and direction. It is also a School that receives strong support by senior university administration, and its fit in the Faculty of Social Sciences appears to a good fit. It was the Reviewers' sense that the School of Social Work is a leader within the institution in terms of community engagement, student experience and community-based research. It demonstrates the potential to be a "flagship" school for McMaster University in these areas.

The reviewers' report noted that a recent accreditation review conducted by the Canadian Association of Social Work Education (CASWE) concluded that the School's BSW and MSW programs are of the highest quality. The IQAP review team concurred with this conclusion. The social work PhD program at McMaster University was started in 2008 so it is still evolving. At this point, however, the PhD program appears to be solid. The curriculum focus is typical of social work PhD programs across Canada, and expectations for students are appropriate for a high quality PhD program.

The Reviewers further noted that the School enjoys the contributions of a strong faculty and staff complement. It has an experienced and competent Director and the current transition to a new Director is being managed very capably and smoothly. Other administrators in the Faculty, such as those who manage field placements, are also very experienced and skillful. There is a strong, collective commitment to the School demonstrated by faculty, staff, students and community constituents. Together these elements have created an academic unit that functions well internally, with a culture of inclusiveness and openness that would be envied by any school across the country. These elements have also helped establish the School as a highly respected organization in the community, and many external human service agencies in the region express a particular affiliation to McMaster University as a result.

There are of course current challenges faced by the School. The Reviewers' report noted that the School appears to be at a crossroad in terms of making decisions about its identity and future directions. The combined BA/BSW program is undoubtedly going to be impacted by the dwindling three-year BA reality in Ontario. The School could choose to focus on a four-year honours BSW program in response. There is also opportunity to create a two-year MSW program for post-BA students. This, however, would shift the unique nature of the School and create some challenges in managing diverse student populations. The review team also identified options for other Master's degrees that the School could lead within the institution.

The Review Team's general conclusion is that the School of Social Work is an academic unit marked by a remarkable culture of trust, collegiality, respect, excitement, critical consciousness, and ethical

responsibility. These attributes have profoundly shaped the School. Moreover, what makes the School stand out with regard to these qualities is the embeddedness of these qualities across the School's constituencies; in teaching, administration, and scholarship; and in everyday social relations. In short, McMaster University should rightfully be very proud of the School of Social Work for its people, programs and position within the community.

The following program strengths and weaknesses were noted:

Strengths

- The School offers an outstanding program at the bachelor's level, with many unique features that are envied by the reviewers
- There is a strong sense of collegiality within the School
- The graduate programs are of excellent quality

Weaknesses

- At the time of the review, several issues were raised around the combined BA/BSW program. These are however being addressed, as this program is phased out and a 4-year BSW program is being put in place
- Issues around the School's practicum database were raised; however these have been addressed by new funding that has been provided for new software
- There were several suggested enhancements to the MSW program, including potential for expansion by introducing (a) new program(s) that require further careful analysis and implementation
- Questions were raised around the adequacy of the faculty complement to provide necessary mentorship for PhD students and ongoing coordination of field placements. The faculty complement will require careful attention as several retirements are expected in the near future
- The reviewers noted that graduate student funding rates are not competitive with other similar institutions; this issue is to some extent beyond the School's control, but several initiatives are under way to address some of these concerns
- Increased diversity of the student body would be desirable; several initiatives have been implemented in this direction

The Director of the School of Social Work submitted a response to the Reviewers' Report (July 2014). The (Acting) Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences submitted his response to the Reviewers' Report and the Program's Response in September 2014. Specific recommendations were discussed, along with follow-up actions to aid in addressing the recommendations.

The Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, in consultation with the Director of the School shall be responsible for monitoring the recommendation 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 in the School of Graduate Studies.

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

Recommendations for Undergraduate Programs

1. Decisions around the implementation of a new practicum database need to be settled.

Response: The School noted that the limitations of the current "community connections" database system are well known at the School and well understood at the Faculty level. Program staff have identified a very promising system, designed specifically for managing field education programs and well tested and reviewed by field staff and faculty at the University of Calgary. A description and budget for initial and ongoing costs is currently being prepared and will be presented to the Acting Dean.

The Dean has advised that since the Review Team's visit, the School requested funding from the Faculty of Social Sciences for a new database system and the Faculty has been able to provide the funds to replace the practicum database.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of the School

Timeline: Update at 18-month follow up report

2. Ensure that practice-focused classes are of sizes that permit the integration of skills and theory necessary for professional practice.

Response: The School noted that this recommendation will be taken up in the planned transition from the BA/BSW to the Honours BSW.

The Dean advised that the Faculty supports the School's efforts to review the structure of the undergraduate program and that an honours four-year BSW would be in keeping with the direction being explored by other academic units in the Faculty.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director, School of Social Work

Timeline: Update at 18-month follow up report

3. Increase the flexibility in the undergraduate program

Response: The School anticipates that the upcoming reorganization of the BA/BSW into an honours BSW will directly address the concerns surrounding workload and scheduling for students. The undergraduate education committee will also consider suggestions from the reviewers to introduce further flexibility.

The Dean noted that the reorganization to an honours BSW will allow for greater flexibility in the undergraduate program.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of the School with the undergraduate education committee

Timeline: Update at 18-month report

4. Diversity Initiatives: Increase attention to diversity in the curriculum and increase the diversity of the student body

Response: The School highlights that alongside ongoing activities of School committees and caucuses, the recently awarded Forward with Integrity grant for Faculty Development will enhance instructors' capacities for teaching and learning about Indigenous-Settler relations. The project will also support

instructors to appropriately integrate Indigenous practices of healing, helping, community building and activism into the social work curriculum. This project will be implemented over the 2014-2015 academic year.

Faculty members and School staff have recently initiated discussions with Human Rights and Equity Services to develop a plan for further diversifying the Social Work study body. An early initiative will involve a review of the Social Work Admissions Test (SWAT) and testing process, with the aim of introducing principals of universal design. Easily managed changes will be introduced in 2015, and a more long-term plan for changes in admissions, program structure and student supports developed over the following years. This work will necessarily occur in concert with campus partners, particularly Student Accessibility Services.

The Dean noted that the School is also currently reviewing ways to diversify its student body through changes to its admissions process and to better integrate anti-oppressive content across the curriculum in its undergraduate and graduate programs.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of the School

Timeline: Follow up at 18-month report

Recommendations for MSW Program

5. Improve research course sequencing and make logic of courses more visible

Response: The Director of the School advised that the instructors of the MSW research courses are meeting with the School's Director and Chair of Graduate Studies to review the issue highlighted by some MSW students about the merits of having two research focused courses, and to consider changes to better support all students in designing, implementing and writing up their thesis research. The reviewers noted that the conversation about the research courses is linked in part to admissions requirements (especially the requirement for work experience), a topic that will also be considered in the planned meeting.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of the School

Timeline: Follow up at 18-month report

6. Opportunities for expansion at the Master's level (suggestions: A two-year MSW (either alongside or replacing the current post-degree BSW), an MA in Community-Engaged Research & Evaluation or an MA/MSW in Ethical Leadership)

Response: The school advised that a task group has been struck to move forward with planning at the MA level. They are currently developing curriculum models, and exploring costs, for a Master's in Ethical Human Service Leadership. At the same time the task group is exploring models of 2-year (and 2+ year) MSWs. The group is considering whether and how it might be possible to sustain the unique and valued character of the School's current graduate program while at the same time preparing students well for advanced social work practice.

The Dean noted that the introduction of a new MA in Ethical Human Service Leadership would help maintain the unique nature of the School and ensure that it does not directly compete with neighbouring schools of social work.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of the School with task force

Timeline: Update at 18-month report

Recommendations for Ph.D. Program

7. Ensure senior faculty are replaced so that supervisory capacity and experience is not eroded.

Response: The School noted that with respect to supervisory supports, students drew reviewers' attention to the School's relatively small faculty complement. The recent hire of a CLA will go some distance to easing this concern. At the same time reviewers again flagged upcoming retirements at the School, and indicated that at minimum the current faculty-student ratio needs to be maintained in order to support the quality of instruction and supervision at the PhD level.

8. Improve access to wider range of scholarship funding

Response: The School advised that this topic will be taken up by the School's Graduate Studies in the fall.

The Dean highlighted that the notable success of doctoral applications for external funding may help free up some scholarship resources that can be used to support other Ph.D. students.

Responsibility for Following Up: Director of the School

Timeline: Follow up at 18-month report

9. Student supports: Increase flexibility in program structure and make funding rates more competitive.

Response: The School acknowledged that students raised concerns with reviewers about the expectation to complete in four years, and the limits placed on paid work hours. The School noted that the expectation for completion in four years is especially ill suited to the School's doctoral students, who typically enter the program with substantial practice and/ or research experience, established professional careers and ongoing community engagements. While the School has strategies in place to support students through varied trajectories, policies set elsewhere in the University and beyond are not immediately amenable to intervention by the School. The School also mentioned that the reviewers commented favourably on the high levels of support provided to students on their fellowship applications, a practice the School intends to continue.

The Dean suggested that reducing the flexibility in the timing of comprehensive examinations may be one way to help move students through the program in a timely manner. The Dean noted that the Faculty will continue to work with the School of Graduate Studies to ensure that graduate student funding is adequate and competitive.

Quality Assurance Committee Recommendations

The Committee finds that the programs are of excellent quality, and that the review raises a number of important but not critical points that could be addressed to improve the programs. Subject to satisfactory progress in addressing these issues being demonstrated in the 18-month follow-up report, the Committee recommends that the program proceed to the next review at the normal time, i.e. at 8 years after the present review.



School of Graduate Studies

1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
L8S 4L8

Phone 905.525.9140
Ext. 23679
<http://graduate.mcmaster.ca>

To : Graduate Council
From : Christina Bryce
Assistant Graduate Secretary

Via e-ballot on November 25th 2014 and January 8th 2015 the Faculty of Humanities Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee approved the following graduate curriculum recommendations.

Please note that these recommendations were approved by the Faculty of Humanities Council at its meeting on January 26th.

FOR APPROVAL OF GRADUATE COUNCIL:

English and Cultural Studies

-Change to Calendar Section

French

-Change to Course Requirements

FOR INFORMATION OF GRADUATE COUNCIL:

For Information of Graduate Council

English and Cultural Studies

-New Course: *751 / Between Indigeneity and Diaspora

-Course Cancellation: *760 / White Civility

French

-Course Cancellation

Philosophy

-Course Cancellation: *706 / Basic Symbolic Logic

-Course title changes:

-6F03 / Recent European Philosophy

-756 / Selected Topics in 20th Century European Philosophy

RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGE IN GRADUATE CURRICULUM - FOR CHANGE(S) INVOLVING DEGREE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS / PROCEDURES

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM:								
<p>1. This form must be completed for ALL changes involving degree program requirements/procedures. All sections of this form must be completed.</p> <p>2. An electronic version of this form (must be in MS WORD not PDF) should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies.</p> <p>3. A representative from the department is required to attend the Faculty Curriculum and Policy Committee meeting during which this recommendation for change in graduate curriculum will be discussed.</p>								
DEPARTMENT		English and Cultural Studies						
NAME OF PROGRAM		Ph.D. in English						
PROGRAM DEGREE	PhD (X)	M.A. ()	M.A.Sc. ()	M.B.A. ()	M. Eng. ()	M.Sc. ()	Diploma Program ()	Other (Specify)
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)								
CHANGE IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS			CHANGE IN COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION PROCEDURE			CHANGE IN COURSE REQUIREMENTS		
CHANGE IN THE DESCRIPTION OF A SECTION IN THE GRADUATE CALENDAR			X	EXPLAIN: We are changing the <i>description</i> to match our practice in what was called a Bibliography Course and is now called our Research and Bibliography Requirement				
OTHER CHANGES		EXPLAIN:						
DESCRIBE THE EXISTING REQUIREMENT/PROCEDURE:								

PROVIDE A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE (*Attach additional pages if space is not sufficient.*)

RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

PROVIDE IMPLEMENTATION DATE: (*Implementation date should be at the beginning of the academic year*)

September 2015

ARE THERE ANY OTHER DETAILS OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE THAT THE CURRICULUM AND POLICY COMMITTEE SHOULD BE AWARE OF? IF YES, EXPLAIN.

N/A

PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO BE INCLUDED IN THE CALENDAR:

Research Methods & Bibliography Requirement

In addition, each Ph.D. candidate is required to attend a set of research presentations and workshops during their second year. Research presentations will take place during Terms 1 & 2, while the workshops during which students will present on their own research projects are scheduled in May. The aim of this course is to provide students with the opportunity to discuss a range of contemporary research models and methodologies in literary and cultural studies. Students must attend all of the workshops and presentations in order to receive a passing grade.

These workshops are meant to complement two other sets of professionalization programs in the Department: 1) pedagogical instruction conducted in the teaching workshops offered at the beginning of each year for all teaching assistants, in preparation for supervised tutorial work throughout the program; 2) the Professionalization Workshops given each year on writing grant proposals, writing thesis proposals, publishing articles and giving conference papers, CVs, job applications and interviews.

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

Name: Mary Silcox Email: silcox@mcmaster.ca Extension: 27314 Date submitted: Nov. 13, 2014

If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies, cbryce@mcmaster.ca

SGS/2013



RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGE IN GRADUATE CURRICULUM - FOR CHANGE(S) INVOLVING DEGREE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS / PROCEDURES

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM:								
<p>1. This form must be completed for ALL changes involving degree program requirements/procedures. All sections of this form must be completed.</p> <p>2. An electronic version of this form (must be in MS WORD not PDF) should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies.</p> <p>3. A representative from the department is required to attend the Faculty Curriculum and Policy Committee meeting during which this recommendation for change in graduate curriculum will be discussed.</p>								
DEPARTMENT		French						
NAME OF PROGRAM		Francophonie et diversité						
PROGRAM DEGREE	Ph.D. (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	M.A. (<input type="checkbox"/>)	M.A.Sc. (<input type="checkbox"/>)	M.B.A. (<input type="checkbox"/>)	M. Eng. (<input type="checkbox"/>)	M.Sc. (<input type="checkbox"/>)	Diploma Program (<input type="checkbox"/>)	Other (Specify)
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)								
CHANGE IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS		<input type="checkbox"/>	CHANGE IN COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION PROCEDURE		<input type="checkbox"/>	CHANGE IN COURSE REQUIREMENTS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CHANGE IN THE DESCRIPTION OF A SECTION IN THE GRADUATE CALENDAR			EXPLAIN: Course deletion of French 710 for Ph.D class requirements					
OTHER CHANGES		EXPLAIN:						
DESCRIBE THE EXISTING REQUIREMENT/PROCEDURE: They will take six half courses, including two required courses, one that will expose them to various literary theories, and the other that will be a more hands-on course on research methods and professional practices (How to write articles and for which journals? How to prepare for a job interview?)								

PROVIDE A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE (*Attach additional pages if space is not sufficient.*)

They will take six half courses, including ~~two~~ **one** required course that will expose them to various literary theories, and the other that will be a more hands-on course on research methods and professional practices (How to write articles and for which journals? How to prepare for a job interview).

RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

The Department feels that the Research Methods and Professional Practices could be done in informal sessions that need not be a full half-course. The course moreover was not a credit class but a pass/fail class

PROVIDE IMPLEMENTATION DATE: (*Implementation date should be at the beginning of the academic year*)

The implementation date would be the academic year 2015/2016

ARE THERE ANY OTHER DETAILS OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE THAT THE CURRICULUM AND POLICY COMMITTEE SHOULD BE AWARE OF? IF YES, EXPLAIN.

PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO BE INCLUDED IN THE CALENDAR:

see above

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

Name: Jane Rush Email: jrush@mcmaster.ca Extension: 24774 Date submitted: 12/19/2014

If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies,
cbryce@mcmaster.ca

SGS/2013



SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGE IN GRADUATE CURRICULUM - FOR CHANGE(S) INVOLVING COURSES

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM:

1. This form must be completed for ALL course changes. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
2. An electronic version of this form (must be MS WORD not PDF) should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies.
3. A representative from the department/program is required to attend the Faculty Curriculum and Policy Committee meeting during which this recommendation for change in graduate curriculum will be discussed.

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM		English & Cultural Studies		
COURSE TITLE		Between Indigeneity and Diaspora		
COURSE NUMBER	ENG 751/CSCT 751	COURSE CREDIT		
		FULL COURSE ()	HALF COURSE (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>)	QUARTER (MODULE) ()
INSTRUCTOR(S)		Dr. Daniel Coleman		
PREREQUISITE(S)				
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)				
NEW COURSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DATE TO BE OFFERED (FOR NEW COURSES ONLY): September 2015	WAS THE PROPOSED COURSE OFFERED ON DEAN'S APPROVAL?	
WILL THE COURSE BE <u>CROSS-LISTED</u> WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT? IF YES, PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT:				
ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S). NOTE: CROSS-LISTING OF COURSES REQUIRES WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM <u>EACH</u> DEPARTMENT AND FACULTY CONCERNED. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO REMOVE A CROSS-LISTING YOU MUST INCLUDE A WRITTEN EXPLANATION AGREED UPON BY BOTH DEPARTMENTS AFFECTED.				
*FOR ALL NEW CROSS-LISTINGS PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT OWNS THE COURSE: This new course is to be cross-listed with CSCT				
CHANGE IN COURSE TITLE		PROVIDE THE <u>NEW</u> COURSE TITLE:		
CHANGE IN COURSE DESCRIPTION		600-LEVEL COURSE (Undergraduate course for graduate credit) Please see #4 on page 2 of this form		
CHANGE TO FULL COURSE		CHANGE TO HALF COURSE		CHANGE TO QUARTER COURSE

COURSE CANCELLATION		PROVIDE THE REASON FOR COURSE CANCELLATION: PLEASE NOTE: CROSS-LISTED COURSES CAN ONLY BE CANCELLED BY THE DEPARTMENT WHO OWNS THE COURSE.
OTHER CHANGES		EXPLAIN:
BRIEF DESCRIPTION FOR CALENDAR - Provide a brief description (<i>maximum 6 lines</i>) to be included in the Graduate Calendar. This class explores the tensions between the land-and-place orientation of Indigenous ways of knowing and being, and the mobile cultural formations that have arisen from histories of displacement. Indigeneity and Diaspora are deeply related, yet solidarities between their scholars and political groups have been few and fraught. Through a study of literary and cultural texts produced in Canada, this class will not only examine how these two cultural formations outline limit cases for each other's claims, but also what potentials might exist between them for new dialogue and shared purpose.		
CONTENT/RATIONALE - Provide a brief description, i.e., outline the topics or major sub-topics, and indicate the principal texts to be used. This class will explore the conflicted terrain between Indigeneity and Diaspora in the context of Canadian literary and cultural texts that give voice to these tensions. The overall purpose in organizing a seminar that sets these worlds and texts in dialogue is to stimulate us to consider potential dialogues and solidarities that can carry us past some of the impasses that block our imaginations in contemporary settler colonial societies such as Canada.		

1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (How does the course fit into the department's program?) This course adds to the current English & CSCT offerings in the field of Canadian Literature.
2. EXPECTED ENROLMENT: 15
3. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF PRESENTATION OF COURSE MATERIAL (i.e., lectures, seminars): Seminars & Presentations Through a study of literary and cultural texts produced in Canada, this class will not only examine how these two cultural formations outline limit cases for each other's claims, but what potentials might exist between them for new dialogue and shared purpose.
4. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF EVALUATION (percentage breakdown, if possible): (For 600-level course, indicate the <u>Extra Work</u> to be required of graduate students, i.e., exams, essays, etc.) Presentation papers 30% (3 X 10%) Response papers 20% (2 X 10%) Participation 10% Final Paper 40% (conference-length paper of 10-15 pages)

**5. TO PREVENT OVERLAP, IS A COURSE IN THE SAME OR A RELATED AREA OFFERED IN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT?
IF YES, PLEASE ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S).**

N/A

**6. IF THE COURSE IS INTENDED PRIMARILY FOR STUDENTS OUTSIDE YOUR DEPARTMENT, DO YOU HAVE THE
SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM CONCERNED?**

N/A

PLEASE PROVIDE THE CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

Name: Dr. Peter Walmsley Email: Walmsley@mcmaster.ca Extension: 24732 Date submitted: November 14, 2014

If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies,
cbryce@mcmaster.ca.

SGS /2013



SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGE IN GRADUATE CURRICULUM -
FOR CHANGE(S) INVOLVING COURSES

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM:

1. This form must be completed for ALL course changes. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
2. An electronic version of this form (must be MS WORD not PDF) should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies.
3. A representative from the department/program is required to attend the Faculty Curriculum and Policy Committee meeting during which this recommendation for change in graduate curriculum will be discussed.

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM		English & Cultural Studies		
COURSE TITLE		White Civility		
COURSE NUMBER	ENG 760	COURSE CREDIT		
		FULL COURSE ()	HALF COURSE (X)	QUARTER (MODULE) ()
INSTRUCTOR(S)		Dr. Daniel Coleman		
PREREQUISITE(S)				
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)				
NEW COURSE	DATE TO BE OFFERED (FOR NEW COURSES ONLY):	WAS THE PROPOSED COURSE OFFERED ON DEAN'S APPROVAL?		
		If YES, PROVIDE THE DATE:		
WILL THE COURSE BE <u>CROSS-LISTED</u> WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT? If YES, PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT: ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S). NOTE: CROSS-LISTING OF COURSES REQUIRES WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM EACH DEPARTMENT AND FACULTY CONCERNED. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO REMOVE A CROSS-LISTING YOU MUST INCLUDE A WRITTEN EXPLANATION AGREED UPON BY BOTH DEPARTMENTS AFFECTED. *FOR ALL NEW CROSS-LISTINGS PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT OWNS THE COURSE:				
CHANGE IN COURSE TITLE		PROVIDE THE <u>NEW</u> COURSE TITLE:		
CHANGE IN COURSE DESCRIPTION		600-LEVEL COURSE (Undergraduate course for graduate credit) Please see #4 on page 2 of this form		
CHANGE TO FULL COURSE		CHANGE TO HALF COURSE		CHANGE TO QUARTER COURSE
COURSE CANCELLATION	X	PROVIDE THE REASON FOR COURSE CANCELLATION:		
		Instructor is not interested in teaching this course any longer.		
PLEASE NOTE: CROSS-LISTED COURSES CAN ONLY BE CANCELLED BY THE DEPARTMENT WHO OWNS THE COURSE.				
OTHER CHANGES		EXPLAIN: (Please remove from English & CSCT Course Listings)		
BRIEF DESCRIPTION FOR CALENDAR - Provide a brief description (maximum 6 lines) to be included in the Graduate Calendar.				
CONTENT/RATIONALE - Provide a brief description, i.e., outline the topics or major sub-topics, and indicate the principal texts to be used.				

1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (How does the course fit into the department's program?)
2. EXPECTED ENROLMENT:
3. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF PRESENTATION OF COURSE MATERIAL (i.e., lectures, seminars):
4. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF EVALUATION (<u>percentage breakdown, if possible</u>): (For 600-level course, indicate the <u>Extra Work</u> to be required of graduate students, i.e., exams, essays, etc.)
5. TO PREVENT OVERLAP, IS A COURSE IN THE SAME OR A RELATED AREA OFFERED IN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT? IF YES, PLEASE ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S).
6. IF THE COURSE IS INTENDED PRIMARILY FOR STUDENTS OUTSIDE YOUR DEPARTMENT, DO YOU HAVE THE SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM CONCERNED?
PLEASE PROVIDE THE CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE: Name: Dr. Peter Walmsley Email: Walmsley@mcmaster.ca Extension: 23728 Date submitted: October 15, 2014

If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies, cbryce@mcmaster.ca.



SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGE IN GRADUATE CURRICULUM - FOR CHANGE(S) INVOLVING COURSES

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM:

1. This form must be completed for ALL course changes. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
2. An electronic version of this form (must be MS WORD not PDF) should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies.
3. A representative from the department/program is required to attend the Faculty Curriculum and Policy Committee meeting during which this recommendation for change in graduate curriculum will be discussed.

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM		French		
COURSE TITLE		Research Methods and Professional Practices		
COURSE NUMBER	710	COURSE CREDIT		
		FULL COURSE ()	HALF COURSE (x)	QUARTER (MODULE) ()
INSTRUCTOR(S)		All members of the Department		
PREREQUISITE(S)				
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)				
NEW COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	DATE TO BE OFFERED (FOR NEW COURSES ONLY):	WAS THE PROPOSED COURSE OFFERED ON DEAN'S APPROVAL?	
WILL THE COURSE BE CROSS-LISTED WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT?		IF YES, PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT:		
<p>ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S). NOTE: CROSS-LISTING OF COURSES REQUIRES WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM EACH DEPARTMENT AND FACULTY CONCERNED. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO REMOVE A CROSS-LISTING YOU MUST INCLUDE A WRITTEN EXPLANATION AGREED UPON BY BOTH DEPARTMENTS AFFECTED.</p> <p>*FOR ALL NEW CROSS-LISTINGS PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT OWNS THE COURSE:</p>				
CHANGE IN COURSE TITLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	PROVIDE THE NEW COURSE TITLE:		
CHANGE IN COURSE DESCRIPTION		600-LEVEL COURSE (Undergraduate course for graduate credit) Please see #4 on page 2 of this form		
CHANGE TO FULL COURSE		<input type="checkbox"/>	CHANGE TO HALF COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>
			CHANGE TO QUARTER COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>

COURSE CANCELLATION	<p>PROVIDE THE REASON FOR COURSE CANCELLATION:</p> <p>Research Methods and Professional Practices will be integrated into French 705</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE: CROSS-LISTED COURSES CAN ONLY BE CANCELLED BY THE DEPARTMENT WHO OWNS THE COURSE.</p>
OTHER CHANGES	EXPLAIN:
<p>BRIEF DESCRIPTION FOR CALENDAR - Provide a brief description (<i>maximum 6 lines</i>) to be included in the Graduate Calendar.</p>	
<p>CONTENT/RATIONALE - Provide a brief description, i.e., outline the topics or major sub-topics, and indicate the principal texts to be used.</p>	

<p>1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (How does the course fit into the department's program?)</p>
<p>2. EXPECTED ENROLMENT:</p>
<p>3. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF PRESENTATION OF COURSE MATERIAL (i.e., lectures, seminars):</p>
<p>4. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF EVALUATION (<u>percentage breakdown, if possible</u>): (For 600-level course, indicate the <u>Extra Work</u> to be required of graduate students, i.e., exams, essays, etc.)</p>
<p>5. TO PREVENT OVERLAP, IS A COURSE IN THE SAME OR A RELATED AREA OFFERED IN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT? IF YES, PLEASE ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S).</p>

6. IF THE COURSE IS INTENDED PRIMARILY FOR STUDENTS OUTSIDE YOUR DEPARTMENT, DO YOU HAVE THE SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM CONCERNED?

PLEASE PROVIDE THE CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

Name: jane Rush

Email: jrush@mcmaster.ca

Extension: #24774

Date submitted: Nov.14,, 2014

If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies, cbryce@mcmaster.ca.

SGS /2013



SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGE IN GRADUATE CURRICULUM - FOR CHANGE(S) INVOLVING COURSES

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM:

1. This form must be completed for ALL course changes. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
2. An electronic version of this form (must be MS WORD not PDF) should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies.
3. A representative from the department/program is required to attend the Faculty Curriculum and Policy Committee meeting during which this recommendation for change in graduate curriculum will be discussed.

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM		Philosophy		
COURSE TITLE		Basic Symbolic Logic		
COURSE NUMBER	PHILOS 706	COURSE CREDIT		
		FULL COURSE (x)	HALF COURSE ()	QUARTER (MODULE) ()
INSTRUCTOR(S)		N/A		
PREREQUISITE(S)		N/A		
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)				
NEW COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	DATE TO BE OFFERED (FOR NEW COURSES ONLY):	WAS THE PROPOSED COURSE OFFERED ON DEAN'S APPROVAL?	
WILL THE COURSE BE CROSS-LISTED WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT?		IF YES, PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT:		
<p>ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S). NOTE: CROSS-LISTING OF COURSES REQUIRES WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM EACH DEPARTMENT AND FACULTY CONCERNED. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO REMOVE A CROSS-LISTING YOU MUST INCLUDE A WRITTEN EXPLANATION AGREED UPON BY BOTH DEPARTMENTS AFFECTED.</p> <p>*FOR ALL NEW CROSS-LISTINGS PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT OWNS THE COURSE:</p>				
CHANGE IN COURSE TITLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	PROVIDE THE NEW COURSE TITLE:		
CHANGE IN COURSE DESCRIPTION		600-LEVEL COURSE (Undergraduate course for graduate credit) Please see #4 on page 2 of this form		
CHANGE TO FULL COURSE		<input type="checkbox"/>	CHANGE TO HALF COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>
			CHANGE TO QUARTER COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>

COURSE CANCELLATION	x	PROVIDE THE REASON FOR COURSE CANCELLATION: The Department decided that it is not appropriate for a course that is designed to help graduate students acquire a competence in logic to count as a graduate philosophy course. Satisfaction of a logic requirement could and should be achieved in other ways, as is the satisfaction of a language requirement.
OTHER CHANGES		EXPLAIN:
BRIEF DESCRIPTION FOR CALENDAR - Provide a brief description (<i>maximum 6 lines</i>) to be included in the Graduate Calendar. (Delete)		
CONTENT/RATIONALE - Provide a brief description, i.e., outline the topics or major sub-topics, and indicate the principal texts to be used.		

1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (How does the course fit into the department's program?)
2. EXPECTED ENROLMENT:
3. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF PRESENTATION OF COURSE MATERIAL (i.e., lectures, seminars):
4. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF EVALUATION (percentage breakdown, if possible): (For 600-level course, indicate the <u>Extra Work</u> to be required of graduate students, i.e., exams, essays, etc.)
5. TO PREVENT OVERLAP, IS A COURSE IN THE SAME OR A RELATED AREA OFFERED IN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT? IF YES, PLEASE ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S).

6. IF THE COURSE IS INTENDED PRIMARILY FOR STUDENTS OUTSIDE YOUR DEPARTMENT, DO YOU HAVE THE SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM CONCERNED?

PLEASE PROVIDE THE CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

Name: Richard Arthur Email: rarthur@mcmaster.ca Extension: 23470 Date submitted: November 14, 2014

If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies, cbryce@mcmaster.ca.

SGS /2013



SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGE IN GRADUATE CURRICULUM - FOR CHANGE(S) INVOLVING COURSES

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM:

1. This form must be completed for ALL course changes. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
2. An electronic version of this form (must be MS WORD not PDF) should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies.
3. A representative from the department/program is required to attend the Faculty Curriculum and Policy Committee meeting during which this recommendation for change in graduate curriculum will be discussed.

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM		Philosophy			
COURSE TITLE		Recent European Philosophy			
COURSE NUMBER	PHILOS 6F03	COURSE CREDIT			
		FULL COURSE (x)	HALF COURSE ()	QUARTER (MODULE) ()	
INSTRUCTOR(S)	N/A				
PREREQUISITE(S)	N/A				
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)					
NEW COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	DATE TO BE OFFERED (FOR NEW COURSES ONLY):	WAS THE PROPOSED COURSE OFFERED ON DEAN'S APPROVAL?		
WILL THE COURSE BE CROSS-LISTED WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT?		IF YES, PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT:			
<p>ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S). NOTE: CROSS-LISTING OF COURSES REQUIRES WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM EACH DEPARTMENT AND FACULTY CONCERNED. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO REMOVE A CROSS-LISTING YOU MUST INCLUDE A WRITTEN EXPLANATION AGREED UPON BY BOTH DEPARTMENTS AFFECTED.</p> <p>*FOR ALL NEW CROSS-LISTINGS PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT OWNS THE COURSE:</p>					
CHANGE IN COURSE TITLE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PROVIDE THE NEW COURSE TITLE: Issues in Continental Philosophy			
CHANGE IN COURSE DESCRIPTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	600-LEVEL COURSE (Undergraduate course for graduate credit) Please see #4 on page 2 of this form			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CHANGE TO FULL COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	CHANGE TO HALF COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	CHANGE TO QUARTER COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>

COURSE CANCELLATION		<p>PROVIDE THE REASON FOR COURSE CANCELLATION:</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE: CROSS-LISTED COURSES CAN ONLY BE CANCELLED BY THE DEPARTMENT WHO OWNS THE COURSE.</p>
OTHER CHANGES	x	<p>EXPLAIN: The title is changed to accord with the change in the title of 4F03, a change that has already been made in the undergraduate calendar.</p>
<p>BRIEF DESCRIPTION FOR CALENDAR - Provide a brief description (<i>maximum 6 lines</i>) to be included in the Graduate Calendar.</p> <p>(Delete)</p>		
<p>CONTENT/RATIONALE - Provide a brief description, i.e., outline the topics or major sub-topics, and indicate the principal texts to be used.</p>		

<p>1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (How does the course fit into the department's program?)</p>
<p>2. EXPECTED ENROLMENT:</p>
<p>3. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF PRESENTATION OF COURSE MATERIAL (i.e., lectures, seminars):</p>
<p>4. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF EVALUATION (percentage breakdown, if possible): (For 600-level course, indicate the <u>Extra Work</u> to be required of graduate students, i.e., exams, essays, etc.)</p>
<p>5. TO PREVENT OVERLAP, IS A COURSE IN THE SAME OR A RELATED AREA OFFERED IN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT? IF YES, PLEASE ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S).</p>

6. IF THE COURSE IS INTENDED PRIMARILY FOR STUDENTS OUTSIDE YOUR DEPARTMENT, DO YOU HAVE THE SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM CONCERNED?

PLEASE PROVIDE THE CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

Name: Richard Arthur Email: rarthur@mcmaster.ca Extension: 23470 Date submitted: November 14, 2014

If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies, cbryce@mcmaster.ca.

SGS /2013



SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

RECOMMENDATION FOR CHANGE IN GRADUATE CURRICULUM - FOR CHANGE(S) INVOLVING COURSES

IMPORTANT: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING NOTES BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM:

1. This form must be completed for ALL course changes. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
2. An electronic version of this form (must be MS WORD not PDF) should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies.
3. A representative from the department/program is required to attend the Faculty Curriculum and Policy Committee meeting during which this recommendation for change in graduate curriculum will be discussed.

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM		Philosophy		
COURSE TITLE		Selected Topics in 20th Century European Philosophy		
COURSE NUMBER	PHILOS 756	COURSE CREDIT		
		FULL COURSE (x)	HALF COURSE ()	QUARTER (MODULE) ()
INSTRUCTOR(S)	N/A			
PREREQUISITE(S)	N/A			
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)				
NEW COURSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	DATE TO BE OFFERED (FOR <u>NEW</u> COURSES ONLY):	WAS THE PROPOSED COURSE OFFERED ON DEAN'S APPROVAL?	
WILL THE COURSE BE <u>CROSS-LISTED</u> WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT?		IF YES, PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT:		
<p>ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S). NOTE: CROSS-LISTING OF COURSES REQUIRES WRITTEN APPROVAL FROM <u>EACH</u> DEPARTMENT AND FACULTY CONCERNED. IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO REMOVE A CROSS-LISTING YOU MUST INCLUDE A WRITTEN EXPLANATION AGREED UPON BY BOTH DEPARTMENTS AFFECTED.</p> <p>*FOR ALL NEW CROSS-LISTINGS PLEASE NOTE WHICH DEPARTMENT OWNS THE COURSE:</p>				
CHANGE IN COURSE TITLE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PROVIDE THE <u>NEW</u> COURSE TITLE: Selected Topics in Recent European Philosophy		
CHANGE IN COURSE DESCRIPTION		600-LEVEL COURSE (Undergraduate course for graduate credit) Please see #4 on page 2 of this form		
CHANGE TO FULL COURSE		CHANGE TO HALF COURSE	CHANGE TO QUARTER COURSE	

COURSE CANCELLATION		PROVIDE THE REASON FOR COURSE CANCELLATION: PLEASE NOTE: CROSS-LISTED COURSES CAN ONLY BE CANCELLED BY THE DEPARTMENT WHO OWNS THE COURSE.
OTHER CHANGES	x	EXPLAIN: Time moves on; more recent European philosophy is treated than just 20 th century in recent offerings of this course.
BRIEF DESCRIPTION FOR CALENDAR - Provide a brief description (<i>maximum 6 lines</i>) to be included in the Graduate Calendar. (Delete)		
CONTENT/RATIONALE - Provide a brief description, i.e., outline the topics or major sub-topics, and indicate the principal texts to be used.		

1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE (How does the course fit into the department's program?)
2. EXPECTED ENROLMENT:
3. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF PRESENTATION OF COURSE MATERIAL (i.e., lectures, seminars):
4. DESCRIBE IN DETAIL THE METHOD OF EVALUATION (percentage breakdown, if possible): (For 600-level course, indicate the <u>Extra Work</u> to be required of graduate students, i.e., exams, essays, etc.)
5. TO PREVENT OVERLAP, IS A COURSE IN THE SAME OR A RELATED AREA OFFERED IN ANOTHER DEPARTMENT? IF YES, PLEASE ATTACH TO THIS FORM ANY RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE OTHER DEPARTMENT(S).

6. IF THE COURSE IS INTENDED PRIMARILY FOR STUDENTS OUTSIDE YOUR DEPARTMENT, DO YOU HAVE THE SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM CONCERNED?

PLEASE PROVIDE THE CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

Name: Richard Arthur Email: rarthur@mcmaster.ca Extension: 23470 Date submitted: November 14, 2014

If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies, cbryce@mcmaster.ca.

SGS /2013

JOINT CERTIFICATES AND DIPLOMAS COMMITTEE

The Joint Certificates and Diplomas Committee is a joint committee of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council. The Joint Committee should be chaired by an elected faculty representative, an Associate Dean, or other knowledgeable faculty member of the University. The Joint Committee will consist of at least nine members, including the Chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council. These appointments shall be made by the Executive Committees of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council. A majority of the members of the Joint Committee, excepting the Chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council, shall constitute a quorum.

The Joint Certificates and Diplomas Committee shall scrutinize proposals for new certificate and diploma programs and ensure their conformity with the *Policy on Certificates and Diplomas*.

Membership

Chair: An elected faculty member, Associate Dean, or other knowledgeable faculty member (ideally alternating annually from Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council)

Chair of Undergraduate Council

Chair of Graduate Council

University Registrar

At least three members of Undergraduate Council

At least three members of Graduate Council

When appointing members to the Joint Committee maintaining a balance of students, faculty members and administrators, as well as representation from all Faculties should be taken into consideration.

Consultants:

Director of the Centre for Continuing Education

Director of the McMaster Institute for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning

Associate Registrar and Graduate Secretary

(Administration for the Joint Committee will be provided by the University Secretary.)