

To : Members of Graduate Council

From : Christina Bryce
Assistant Graduate Secretary

The next meeting of Graduate Council will be held on **Tuesday February 21st at 9:30 am 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. **Opening Remarks**
- II. **Minutes of the meeting of January 17th, 2023**
Approval
- III. **Business arising**
- IV. **Task Force on Graduate Funding Draft**
For Discussion
- V. **IQAP Policy**
Approval
- VI. **Report from the Graduate Associate Deans**
- VII. **Report from the Associate Registrar and Graduate Secretary**
- VIII. **Faculty of Business Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee report**
Approval
- IX. **Faculty of Health Sciences Graduate Policy and Curriculum Committee Report**
Approval
- X. **Faculty of Social Sciences Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee report**
Approval
- XI. **2023-2024 Sessional Dates**
Approval
- XII. **New Awards**
Approval

Tuesday January 17th at 9:30 am in Council Chambers (GH 11) and via Zoom

Present: S. Hranilovic (Chair), S. Hanna, M. Thompson, M. Heath, M. Horn, M. Verma, T. Chamberlain, N. Kuhathasan, S. Raha, C. Ching, V. Kuperman, T. McDonald, M. Parlar, P. Guo, Z. Samaan, S. Han, B. Trigatti, P. Nyers, N. Malik, D. Emslie, L. Romane, V. Lewis, S. Bouma, M. McDonald, S. Baschiera (Associate Registrar and Graduate Secretary), C. Bryce, (Assistant Graduate Secretary)

Regrets: M. Young, M. Ragany

I. Minutes of the meeting of December 6th, 2022

It was duly moved and seconded, **'that Graduate Council approve the minutes of the meeting of December 6th, 2022.'**

The motion was **carried**.

II. Business arising

There was no business arising.

III. Report from the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Dr. Hranilovic reported on the following items:

- The upcoming School of Graduate Studies review taking place on March 22nd and 23rd
- Graduate Funding, noting an ad hoc committee had been established and that they are working to collect data (which is present in multiple locations) first and then to propose a structure for ongoing review, noting there would be a new standing subcommittee of Graduate Council;
- The 25th annual Graduate Student Recognition awards taking place at the Phoenix.

IV. Report from the Graduate Associate Deans

Dr. Gupta (Faculty of Science) reported on the following item:

- The Faculty of Science Graduate Research Symposium, noting a successful day and the hope that this was the start of a new tradition;

Dr. Thompson (Faculty of Engineering) reported on the following item:

- A successful joint workshop between Engineering and Science on the topic of EDI in research

Dr. Verma (Faculty of Business) reported on the following items:

- A successful PhD awards night;

- Two upcoming events for the MBA program an alumni reception event and an MBA award event;
- Graduate programs working through their applications.

Drs. Hanna, Heath and Horn had no report.

V. Report from the Associate Registrar and Graduate Secretary

Ms. Baschiera reported on the following items:

- SGS and UTS are working together to review McMaster's system for graduate payments;
- They're also looking at records and systems optimization generally, noting great success with Slate and the hope for a similar solution for in-course students on the records and payments side.

Dr. Hranilovic emphasized the need for improvement in the system for these two key administrative tasks.

In response to a question from a member about finances for graduate students, wondering if they're looking at the supervisor's contribution, Dr. Hranilovic drew a distinction between the update from Ms. Baschiera regarding the system to process payments and the discussion of graduate student support. With respect to the ad hoc committee, he noted that as they're seeing in the process of data collection the sources of funding are very diverse.

VI. New Program Proposal – Master of Biomedical Innovation

Dr. Hanna presented the item, noting that the Faculty is proposing a new one year Masters, that had been in development for quite some time. The program had been approved at the Faculty of Health Sciences Executive Council and had had a successful IQAP review. He invited Dr. MacDonald to provide some additional information.

Dr. MacDonald described the program, noting that it focused on innovation in the biomedical sphere, excluding from pharmaceuticals. She highlighted the experiential component of the program, noting that placements are a key part of the proposal. The program is primarily delivered in virtual modules but is also anchored by boot camps. Coaching and mentoring are a key part of the design of the program.

In response to a question about whether the program is self-funded Dr. MacDonald confirmed it was.

Members discussed the stage of approval the proposal was at and a recommendation from the external reviewers report. Dr. MacDonald noted that they interpreted that recommendation as being a prime example of the need for the program. Dr. Hanna confirmed that from his point of view the proposal addresses it.

It was duly moved and seconded **‘that Graduate Council approve the new program as described in the documents.’**

The motion was **carried**.

VII. Faculty of Social Sciences Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee report

Dr. Heath presented two items for approval:

- The department of political science currently has two areas of specialization and they would like to add additional areas of specialization to reflect current faculty expertise and to benefit students interested in studying in those areas;
- The School of Social Work offers a graduate diploma in community engaged research and evaluation and they want to change the mode of instruction from in person to virtual, noting there are many people who would benefit from the diploma being more broadly accessible.

In response to questions Dr. Heath confirmed that students taking the diploma courses from another program would also take the course online and that the diploma had been running remote through the pandemic and continued to do so successfully.

Dr. Hranilovic noted a friendly amendment to the document, to approve for January 2023.

It was duly moved and seconded **‘that Graduate Council approved the changes proposed by the Faculty of Social Sciences as described in the documents.’**

The motion was **carried**.

VIII. Faculty of Business Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee report

Dr. Verma presented the report, including the following changes:

- A proposal from the Information Systems are of the Ph.D. program to replace an outdated elective course with a more current course.
- The Blended Learning Part-Time MBA program is making an existing course available as an elective to the program.

In response to a question, Dr. Verma noted that he understood P721 to be located at the Burlington Campus. In response to another question he said the new Ph.D. course was not cross-listed.

It was duly moved and seconded, **‘that Graduate Council approved the changes proposed by the Faculty of Business as described in the documents.’**

The motion was **carried**.

IX. New Award

It was duly moved and seconded, **‘that Graduate Council approved the new award as set out in the document.’**

The motion was **carried.**

TO: Kim Dej,
Vice-Provost (Teaching & Learning)

FROM: Lori Goff
Director, Paul R. MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching

RE: Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) – Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance Ratification

In 2020 the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (Quality Council) announced a change to the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) that required all Ontario universities to revise their institutional quality assurance process policies to comply with the QAF. Revised institutional policies were required to be approved internally and then submitted to Quality Council for ratification.

- McMaster revised its IQAP policy over 2020-21 and McMaster's Senate approved the revised policy in January 2022.
- McMaster submitted this revised policy to Quality Council in January 2022 for consideration and feedback.
- Quality Council responded with feedback in April 2022 that required further conversation and minor revisions.
- Over the summer and fall of 2022 McMaster and Quality Council worked to finalize the revisions to the IQAP policy.
- On December 21, 2022, Quality Council ratified (approved) McMaster's revised IQAP policy approving its compliance with the Quality Assurance Framework.

With the IQAP policy now ratified and with minor changes made throughout the revision process with Quality Council, the 2022 IQAP policy is presented here again for McMaster governance approval; one copy is included with revisions indicated, and also one clean copy.

Questions may be directed to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning Kim Dej or to staff at the Paul R. MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching who led the effort to update and ratify the policy.

Complete Policy Title

Policy on Academic Program Development and Review

Policy Number (if applicable)

Commented [CB1]: Grey highlighting indicates text additions; strikethrough-indicates text deletion.

Approved by

Senate

Date of Most Recent Approval

TBA

Date of Original Approval(s)

May 11, 2011 (*effective July 1, 2011*)

Supersedes/Amends Policy dated

- January 12, 2022
- December 9, 2020
- May 17, 2017
- February 13, 2013 (*effective July 1, 2013*)
- May 11, 2011 (*effective July 1, 2011*) Procedures for Undergraduate Program Reviews, 2004,
- New and Revised Undergraduate Programs Policy, 2009
- Policy on Steps for Creation of New Graduate Programs or New Fields in Existing Doctoral Programs, 2009

Responsible Executive

Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning

Policy Specific Enquiries

[MacPherson Institute](#)

General Policy Enquiries

[Policy \(University Secretariat\)](#)

DISCLAIMER:

If there is a discrepancy between this electronic policy and the written copy held by the policy owner, the written copy prevails.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION.....	4
DEFINITIONS	4
PREAMBLE	4
Cyclical Audit	5
CONTACT	5
PURPOSE	6
DEFINITION OF NEW PROGRAMS	6
SECTION II: NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS.....	7
BEGINNING A NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL.....	7
BROAD CONSULTATION	7
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL	8
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL: EVALUATION CRITERIA	8
Program Overview	8
Admission Requirements	8
Structure	8
Program Content, Curriculum, and Teaching.....	9
Assessment of Teaching and Learning.....	9
Resources.....	9
Quality and Other Indicators	10
EXTERNAL EVALUATION: REVIEW TEAM	11
REVIEWERS' REPORT.....	12
INTERNAL RESPONSE	13
INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL.....	13
QUALITY COUNCIL SECRETARIAT	14
ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS	15
APPROVED NEW PROGRAMS.....	15
SECTION III: EXPEDITED APPROVALS	16
SECTION IV: CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS	17
SELF-STUDY: INTERNAL PROGRAM PERSPECTIVE	18
Program Description and Overview	18
Admission Requirements	18
Curriculum	18
Teaching and Assessment.....	19
Resources.....	19
Graduate Programs Only	19
Quality Indicators	19
Quality Enhancement.....	20
System of governance.....	21

Academic Services	21
Self-Study Participation.....	21
External Participation	21
EXTERNAL EVALUATION: REVIEW TEAM AND REPORT.....	21
INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE AND FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT	24
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.....	25
USE OF ACCREDITATION AND OTHER EXTERNAL REVIEWS IN THE INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS.....	25
SECTION V: INSTITUTIONAL IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS.....	27
APPENDIX A: McMASTER UNIVERSITY'S STATEMENT ON DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS.....	29
UNDERGRADUATE	29
Baccalaureate / Bachelor's Degree	29
Baccalaureate / Bachelor's Degree: Honours	29
GRADUATE.....	31
Master's Degree	31
Doctoral Degree.....	31

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

DEFINITIONS

McMaster University uses the term “program goals” to mean clear and concise statements of the goals of the program. “Program goals” are therefore synonymous with what the Quality Assurance Framework refers to as “program objectives.”

PREAMBLE

1. McMaster University is widely recognized for innovation in teaching and learning and for the quality of its programs. Nevertheless, knowledge of our disciplines and the scholarship of teaching and learning are constantly evolving. Our reputation can only be maintained and improved if we, as academics and educators, critically review what we do in our programs and seek opinions and advice from colleagues at McMaster and at other institutions.
2. Although the primary objective for these reviews is the improvement of our academic programs, the processes that we adopt is also designed to meet our responsibility to the government on quality assurance. Every publicly assisted Ontario university that grants degrees and diplomas is responsible for ensuring the quality of all of its programs of study, including modes of delivering programs and those academic and student services that affect the quality of the respective programs under review, whether or not the program is eligible for government funding.
3. The process by which institutions meet this accountability to the government is outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF), developed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice- Presidents (OCAV), and approved by Executive Heads. Institutions’ compliance with the QAF is monitored by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance, also known as the Quality Council, which reports to OCAV and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU).
4. As part of the Quality Assurance Framework, McMaster was required to develop an Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), which is contained within this Policy. In addition to the 15 guiding principles contained within the QAF, McMaster determined the following internal principles to guide the development of the IQAP Policy:
 - a) curriculum development and improvement is an ongoing, iterative process that is initiated, developed and controlled at the departmental level;
 - b) McMaster’s IQAP incorporates input from all principal stakeholders; and
 - c) McMaster’s IQAP is designed primarily to help improve programs and shape them to have characteristics that are most valued at our University, while also meeting the responsibility for quality assurance.
5. Thus, the goal of McMaster’s IQAP is to facilitate the development and continued improvement of our undergraduate and graduate academic programs, and to ensure that McMaster continues to lead internationally in its reputation for innovation in teaching and learning and for the quality of its programs.

McMaster's IQAP is intended to complement existing mechanisms for critical assessment and enhancement, including departmental reviews and accreditation reviews. The uniqueness of each program at McMaster will emerge in the IQAP self-study.

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

Cyclical Audit

7. One-year prior to the scheduled Cyclical Audit, McMaster's key contact to the Quality Council (or their delegate) will participate in a half-day briefing by the Quality Council Secretariat and an Audit Team member.
8. In advance of the cyclical audit, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, or their delegates, will prepare a self-study of McMaster's Institutional Quality Assurance Process, highlighting its strengths as well as areas for improvement and enhancement. The self-study will also identify the institutional response to any issues identified in the previous audit. To prepare this self-study, consultation with Faculty representatives as well as key stakeholders from central university supports, such as the Registrar's Office, the MacPherson Institute, Institutional Research and Analysis and the Library will take place, as appropriate. The self-study will be submitted to the Quality Council's Secretariat as part of the Cyclical Audit process.
9. The Cyclical Audit provides accountability to the principal stakeholders of Ontario's university education system. The purpose of the Cyclical Audit is to evaluate the alignment of past and current practice with policy as well as the university's approach to continuous improvement. Cyclical Program Reviews that were undertaken within the period since the previous Cyclical Audit are eligible for selection for the university's next Cyclical Audit. Any new undergraduate and graduate programs that have been approved since the previous Cyclical Audit are eligible for selection in the next university's cyclical audit. Graduate Diplomas that were approved through the expedited approvals process as well as major modifications to existing academic programs are not normally subjected to the institution's cyclical audit.
10. Excluding any confidential information, the Audit Report and any follow up response report will be posted on McMaster's Quality Assurance webpage. If an area of concern is identified during the Cyclical Audit, the Quality Council may determine that a focused audit of a specific process is necessary. Reports related to a Focused Audit will be posted on McMaster's Quality Assurance webpage.

CONTACT

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

12. The person responsible for all contact between the University and the Quality Council is the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning.
13. Throughout this Policy, the Chair refers to the head of the academic unit (usually a Department, sometimes a School or an interdisciplinary group) that is proposing a new program or is responsible for an existing program, although we recognize that the official title of such person varies across programs and Faculties. Similarly, the Dean refers to the head of the Faculty or equivalent individual responsible for the program, again recognizing that official titles vary.
14. In the case of joint academic programs (e.g., a combined honours program or a collaborative program with another educational institution), the relevant Chair and Dean shall be those at McMaster University who have the administrative responsibility for the program.

PURPOSE

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

DEFINITION OF NEW PROGRAMS

16. A new program is considered to be any new degree or degree program that has not been previously offered at McMaster University. In contrast to the normal evolution of academic programs, a new program will generally involve some combination of new courses, new learning outcomes, and new or re-allocated resources, and will be meant to provide students with an academic path that was previously not available to them.
17. Although not new, a program that has been offered at McMaster University without funding from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and for which a request for funding is to be made, will follow the procedures for new programs that are outlined in § II.

SECTION II: NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

BEGINNING A NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

18. Proponents of a new program may begin by preparing a Statement of Intent and acquiring endorsement from the relevant Dean(s) and Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies.

BROAD CONSULTATION

19. The Chair, in consultation with the Dean, is responsible for ensuring that there is broad consultation. Broad consultation is required as part of the proposal process. It will also be essential to have appropriate discussions with other institutions when the proposed programs are to be offered in collaboration with those institutions.
20. Whenever faculty members from several departments will be involved in a proposed program, these proponents must have the opportunity to discuss the proposal with their respective Dean(s) and Chair(s). Similarly, if there is a proposal to cross-list a course, or to recommend or require students in the new program to take existing courses, the teaching Department(s) must be consulted and agreement obtained, in writing, from the appropriate Chair/Dean. Approvals of the relevant Curriculum Committees are required.
21. Discussions are to be held with central support units such as, but not limited to, the Library, the Registrar, the MacPherson Institute, and other relevant units, to assess the impact of the introduction of the new program. Input also should be sought from relevant groups of students for whom there is a potential impact of the proposal and consideration given to the demographics of the student market for the program.
22. Broad consultation is especially important when proposing interdisciplinary programs, particularly when the initiators of the proposed plan are unfamiliar with all disciplines involved in the proposed program or individual faculty members who might potentially be interested or have expertise. A proposal for a new interdisciplinary program must be presented to any related Faculty/Program to ensure that there is widespread awareness of the program and of its potential impact. If a new interdisciplinary program utilizes or cross-lists one or several new courses from other Departments, the Department(s) offering the course(s), rather than the new interdisciplinary group, must submit those courses for approval. Prior written agreement also must be obtained from Chairs of participating Departments for teaching, graduate supervision and other resources required for interdisciplinary programs. Departments must be given adequate time to consider these requests. The program proponents, in consultation with the appropriate Dean(s), or their delegate(s), will consult and obtain proposed administrative and governance structures from the Faculties involved in interdisciplinary program proposals for inclusion in the new program proposal.

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

23. The Chair is responsible, in collaboration with relevant groups and/or individuals, for the preparation of a New Program Proposal. Both the Chair and the Dean, or Dean's delegate, ensure that the proposal has met all of the New Program Proposal criteria outlined below and both will sign off on the completeness of the proposal. For an interdisciplinary program, all affiliated program Chairs and appropriate Deans, or the Deans' delegates, sign off on the completeness of the proposal.

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL: EVALUATION CRITERIA

24. Program proponents are to complete McMaster's New Program Proposal template and address the evaluation criteria for the New Program Proposal as outlined below.

Program Overview

- a) Description of the extent and method of the consultation process undertaken during the development of the proposal, including the diversity of groups and /or individuals who were engaged in and informed the preparation of the proposal;
- b) Consistency of the program's goals with the University's tripartite research, teaching, and service excellence mission, its values and purpose, and its academic priorities and plans;
- c) Ways in which the program addresses the institution's current Strategic Mandate Agreement;
- d) Ways in which the program addresses the institution's current strategies, frameworks and/or principles regarding equity, diversity and inclusion, and how the program advances EDI-related academic goals (e.g., Indigenous perspectives, international relevance, interdisciplinarity, intercultural competencies, social and environmental equity and sustainability); and
- e) Clarity and appropriateness of the program's requirements and the Program Learning Outcomes in meeting the University's Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) or Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLEs), as outlined in Appendix A;
- f) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature and program's goals.

Admission Requirements

- a) Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for meeting its goals and the Program Learning Outcomes established for completion of the program;
- b) Alternative requirements, if any, for admission into the program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience; and
- c) Consideration of accessible and equitable admissions processes and practices.

Structure

- a) Appropriateness of the administrative, governance, and communication processes proposed in support of the program;
- b) Appropriateness of the program's structure and requirements to meet specified Program Learning Outcomes;

- c) Appropriateness of the program's structure and requirements to meet Degree Level Expectations; and
- d) For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length, which ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

Program Content, Curriculum, and Teaching

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

Assessment of Teaching and Learning

- a) Plans to monitor and assess the overall quality of the program and whether the program is achieving its proposed goals, ensuring evaluation methods are accessible and inclusive and audiences are diverse;
- b) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the instruction and assessment of student achievement of the intended Program Learning Outcomes. The Program Learning Outcomes must meet the Degree Level Expectations;
- c) Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the Degree Level Expectations; and
- d) Description of how the resulting information from level of student performance will be documented and used to inform continuous program improvement.

Resources

25. For all programs:
- a) Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources including any implications for the impact on other existing programs at the University and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources to support the program;

- b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program in order to achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;
 - c) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students, as well as graduate students' scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;
 - d) If applicable, discussion/explanation of the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience;
 - e) If applicable, provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities; and
 - f) If applicable, additional institutional resource commitments to support the program in step with its ongoing implementation.
26. For undergraduate programs:
- a) Evidence of plans for adequate numbers of faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program;
 - b) Evidence of plans to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program;
 - c) Planned/anticipated class sizes; and
 - d) Provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities, if applicable.
27. For graduate programs:
- a) Evidence that full-time tenured/tenure-track/CAWAR faculty have the recent research and/or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation, foster an appropriate intellectual climate, and provide excellent supervision of students in academic and research components of the program;
 - b) Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students;
 - c) For programs with a research component, evidence that faculty research supervisors have current and ongoing research programs and funding, and space and relevant research infrastructure appropriate to support students' research in the program;
 - d) Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision; and
 - e) Evidence of prior experience in graduate teaching and research supervision for faculty participating in the program.

Quality and Other Indicators

28. Specify how program quality and other metrics will be measured, particularly:
- a) Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program);

- b) Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;
- c) If applicable, any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;

EXTERNAL EVALUATION: REVIEW TEAM

- 29. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean will select a diverse team of reviewers to assess the proposal. The Review Team will consist of two external reviewers and one internal reviewer. Additional members may be added to the team, if appropriate, for instance when evaluating professional programs or interdisciplinary programs.
- 30. External reviews of new undergraduate, Master's and PhD program proposals must incorporate a site visit. Site visits are conducted on-site. All PhD programs must have an on-site visit. Only professional or fully online Master's programs may be allowed an exception to an on-site visit; all other Master's programs must have an on-site visit. Exceptions to on-site visits for new undergraduate program reviews are determined by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of new professional and fully online Master's programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the appropriate Dean or Dean's delegate and agreed to by the Review Team prior to the commencement of the review. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of new graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will provide clear justification for the decision for an exception to an on-site visit.
- 31. If it is determined that a site visit can take place virtually, the virtual site visit will require all elements of the Review Team's site visit using videoconferencing software and/or other suitable platforms. A virtual site visit will still include elements such as virtual meetings with students, faculty, and other stakeholders. It may also include remote attendance at performances or events, and virtual facilities tours.
- 32. As appropriate, the Review Team shall meet with the following:
 - a) Chair or Director;
 - b) Full-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
 - c) Part-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
 - d) Program students (a broad cross section of students is to be invited by the program to participate in a meeting with the review team);
 - e) Departmental/Program support staff;
 - f) Associate Dean;
 - g) Dean;
 - h) For graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies;
 - i) For undergraduate programs, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning; and
 - j) Provost and Vice-President (Academic), if available.

33. External members of the Review Team will be individuals who are in the same discipline as the program under review (or across disciplines for interdisciplinary programs) and who are distinguished senior academics of broad experience, with an established commitment to higher education. External reviewers will not be faculty members from McMaster University. Internal reviewers are faculty members from McMaster but from outside of the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the proposed program. Non-academics with relevant expertise and experience are permitted to serve as reviewers in addition to the two academic reviewers when it would enhance the diversity of relevant disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspectives, or in community-engaged or professional programs. Reviewers must have an impartial, arm's-length relationship to the program. For example, reviewers should not have been a research supervisor or student of members of the proposed program; and should not have collaborated with members of the proposed program within the past six years or have made plans to collaborate with those individuals in the immediate future. There also should be no other potential conflicts of interest (e.g., personal or financial). Wherever possible the review team will represent broad institutional categories and/or geographic regions.
34. External reviewers will be selected from a list of at least six suggested individuals compiled by the Department and endorsed by the Dean. An internal reviewer will be selected from a list of at least three suggested individuals compiled by the Department and endorsed by the Dean.
35. The lists shall include, for each proposed external reviewer:
 - a) Name;
 - b) Rank and position;
 - c) Institution or company and current address, telephone, e-mail address, and URL if available;
 - d) Professional (including administrative) experience or expertise relevant to the Program under review;
 - e) Details of any previous or current affiliation with the University, and any association with individual members of the Program under review (e.g., co-author, previous student/supervisor, close relationship); and
 - f) For graduate programs, a description of research expertise, and a partial listing of recent scholarly publications.
36. The New Program Proposal, all relevant faculty CVs, the McMaster's Review Team Guidelines and other materials specific to the review will be provided to all members of the review team no less than two weeks prior to their visit.

REVIEWERS' REPORT

37. Excepting when contrary circumstances apply, the Review Team will submit a co-authored report, including an Executive Summary, for the program(s) under review within four weeks of the visit to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. The report will be written primarily by the external reviewer(s), and then sent to the internal reviewer for their review and comment. The report will appraise the standards and quality of the proposed program, and address the criteria set out in § III. 24-28 above, including the associated faculty and the

adequacy of existing physical, human, and financial resources. Reviewers also will be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program, together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to the program. The report may include a confidential section (e.g., where personnel issues can be addressed). The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will review the reviewers' report for completeness. If satisfactory, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will approve the reviewers' report and disseminate it to the Chair. If there are concerns with the completeness of the report, the Review Team will be asked to provide more clarity.

INTERNAL RESPONSE

38. **Separate responses** to the reviewers' report from both the Chair and the Dean, or their delegates, should be prepared, as per the New Program Response template, and attached to the reviewers' report. Any substantive revisions (e.g., revisions to Program Learning Outcomes; modes of delivery; curriculum and/or assessment practices) to the New Program Proposal required by the Reviewers' Report and agreed to by the Chair and Dean must be made to the proposal prior to submission for approval at Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council.

INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL

39. In addition to the completion of the external review, approval of new program proposals by the following University bodies, in the order listed below, is required:
 - a) The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will review the New Program Proposal to ensure that the program is consistent with McMaster's principles and priorities and existing strengths of the University, the program is of high academic quality; there is convincing evidence of student demand and societal need for the program; and, sufficient financial support, infrastructure, and human resources can be made available to initiate and support the program either within the Faculty budget or based on the program being a full revenue generating program;
 - b) The Faculty Curriculum Committee(s), representing a diversity of faculty members and equipped to consider EDI principles, reviews the New Program Proposal to ensure that the new program adds sufficient value to the programs already offered in the Faculty;
 - c) the Faculty(ies) reviews the New Program Proposal to ensure that the program is consistent with the Faculty's strategic plans and that the necessary resources are available if these are to be provided from within the Faculty's envelope;
 - d) the Executive Director of Finance and Planning reviews the Resource Implications and Financial Viability document to ensure that all potential University resource requirements are captured, and the program is properly costed. In addition, for interdisciplinary or partnership programs, ensures that an MOU is properly completed;
 - e) for Undergraduate programs, the Undergraduate Curriculum and Admissions Committee reviews the New Program Proposal to assess the impact of the new program on students enrolled in other Faculties;

- f) the University Student Fees Committee reviews the proposed Resource Implications and Financial Viability document and ensures that Ministry and University fee policies are adhered to, are reasonable relative to market and that fee collection can be properly administered within existing systems;
- g) Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council reviews the New Program Proposal to provide a venue for a broad discussion on the new program by elected faculty and student members with specific knowledge of and expertise in undergraduate or graduate programming, and ensure that the program is consistent with University-wide goals and criteria specifically related to undergraduate or graduate programming;
- h) University Planning Committee reviews the New Program Proposal and the Resource Implications and Financial Viability documents to understand the financial implications of the new program, evaluate the impact University-wide, and assess value-for-money for the intended student; and
- i) Senate reviews the New Program Proposal and Resource Implications and Financial Viability documents to ensure that the program is consistent with the University's general strategic plans with respect to academic programs.

These bodies should consider the criteria outlined in § III. 24-28 above when evaluating the proposal.

40. The site visit with external reviewers will be held after the Faculty Curriculum Committee(s) and prior to approval at Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council and Senate.
41. Special considerations, such as collaboration agreements or non-standard distribution and full revenue generating programs are to refer to the *Academic Revenue Generating Activity Policy for Revenue Generating Certificate and Diploma Programs Administered through a Faculty* and other relevant University policies, as applicable.

QUALITY COUNCIL SECRETARIAT

42. Once all approvals outlined in § III. 39 above are obtained, the institution will submit the New Program Proposal, together with the Reviewers' Report, the internal response to the Report, and a brief commentary on the two external reviewers selected to review the proposed program in regard to their qualifications, to the Quality Council Secretariat. The submission template will require information on whether or not the proposed program will be a cost-recovery program. The same standards and protocols apply regardless of the source of funding.
43. The Quality Council Appraisal's Committee will review the new program proposal submission and determine if additional information is required. If sufficient, the Quality Council will review the new program proposal submission and will make one of the following decisions:
 - a) Approved to commence.
 - b) Approved to commence, with report.
 - c) Deferred for up to one year during which time the university may address identified issues and report back.
 - d) Not approved.
 - e) Or such other action as the Quality Council considers reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

Within 30 days of being notified, the university may appeal Quality Council's decision.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS

44. Following its submission to the Quality Council, the University may announce, per guidelines within the New Program Proposal Guidebook, its intention to offer the program, provided that clear indication is given that approval by the Quality Council is pending, and that no offers of admission will be made until the program has been approved by the Quality Council. Ministry approval may also be required. When such announcements are made at this stage, they must contain the following statement: "Prospective students are advised that the program is still subject to formal approval."

APPROVED NEW PROGRAMS

45. After a new program is submitted to the Quality Council, the University may seek Provincial funding for the program. Once Quality Council has approved the new program, the program must begin within thirty-six months of the date of approval; otherwise, the approval will lapse. If program approval lapses, the program must begin the new program proposal process again.
46. Between eighteen and twenty-four months after onset of the program, the Chair will provide the Dean and Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate studies, with a brief progress report on the program, that assesses the program's success in realizing its goals; addresses any concerns from the program reviewers' report and notes from the Appraisal Committee; and highlights any unanticipated changes in curriculum, resources, enrollment, funding mechanisms, or governance structure. If, after consultation with the Dean, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, it is deemed appropriate, an informal internal assessment of the program may be undertaken, including interviews with current faculty, students, and staff, to determine if a more complete, early cyclical review is warranted.
47. The first cyclical review for any new program must be conducted no more than eight years after the date of the program's initial enrolment. Outcomes identified in the program progress report, described above, must be included in the programs first cyclical review.
48. New undergraduate and graduate programs that have been approved are eligible for selection in the university's next cyclical audit.

SECTION III: EXPEDITED APPROVALS

49. The Protocol for Expedited Approvals applies when one or more of the following applies:
- an institution requests endorsement of the Quality Council to declare a new Field or to revise Fields in a graduate program (note: there is no requirement to declare fields in either master's or doctoral programs);
 - there are proposals for new for-credit graduate diplomas; including new graduate diplomas (Type 2) offered in conjunction with a Master's or Doctoral degree program and usually represent an additional interdisciplinary qualification; and
 - new graduate diplomas (Type 3) as a stand-alone, direct-entry program, generally developed by a unit already offering a related master's or doctoral degree
 - situations where although the changes to the program meet the definition of a major modification, the changes are of such significance that a more immediate review is desirable. In such cases, the Department, the Faculty, Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council may, if it deems it advisable after consultation with the relevant Dean(s) and Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and/or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, initiate an expedited program review and request that the Quality Council review the Expedited Proposal.
50. The Expedited Proposal will describe the new graduate field or graduate diploma (including, as appropriate, reference to Program Learning Outcomes, Degree Level Expectations, faculty and resource implications), or provide a brief account of the rationale for the changes, addressing the evaluation criteria where they apply (e.g., program goals, program requirements, assessment of teaching and learning, admission requirements, resources, quality and other indicators) for the program.
51. The Expedited Approvals process requires all the approvals listed in § III. 39 above and the submission to the Quality Council of an Expedited Proposal. Expedited approvals do not require external reviewers be involved in the approval process and provides for a faster turn-around on decisions by the Quality Council. Common decisions by Quality Council are: a) approved to commence b) approved to commence, with a report or c) not approved.
52. Type 3 graduate diplomas are included in the schedule for cyclical reviews and will be subject to external review during the cyclical program review process. Graduate Diplomas not associated with a parent program are reviewed by desk audit. A desk audit is conducted independently of the university (i.e., does not typically include interviews or in-person or virtual site visits). Graduate Diplomas that were approved through the expedited approvals process as well as major modifications to existing academic programs are not normally subjected to the institution's cyclical audit.

SECTION IV: CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

53. All academic programs are scheduled to be reviewed on a seven-year cycle and must be reviewed no more than eight years from the previous review. New programs must be reviewed no more than eight years after the date of the program's first enrolment. The steps taken to address any issues that have been identified in monitoring reports of the new program or in follow up by Quality Council are to be identified in first cyclical review self-study.
54. The primary purpose for cyclical program reviews is continuous improvement of existing academic programs. An academic program is defined as a complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice as outlined by the university for the fulfillment of the requirements for either undergraduate or graduate degrees. Combined programs do not require review if their constituting programs are reviewed separately. Undergraduate diplomas, Emphases, Options and Minors are not required to undergo the cyclical program review process outlined in this policy; however, Chairs are to consult with the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning to determine if other review processes are required. The list of programs that require review including those that are joint/inter-institutional, multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and at multiple sites, as well as the schedule of such reviews, will be maintained by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. Programs that are closed or that have suspended admissions are not subject to cyclical program review. Program Chairs will be notified of a scheduled review by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or their delegate. Each of the specific programs to be reviewed will be listed in the notification.
55. Departments can choose to review undergraduate and graduate programs jointly or separately. If the reviews are done jointly, the evaluation criteria and quality indicators described below must be applied to each program included in the self-study and there must be sections within the report to address different situations that apply to each program. Program reviews may also be done jointly with accreditation reviews, at the discretion of the Chair, in consultation with the Dean (see § IV. 86-89 below). Where programs seek to combine previously separate undergraduate and graduate reviews, they shall adopt the timeline of the earliest scheduled program review. For academic programs delivered in partnership with other educational institutions, the Chair must ensure that representatives from all educational institutions in the partnership are consulted during all key stages of the cyclical review process, including self-study, site visit, implementation, and monitoring. For professional programs, the Chair must ensure the views of employers and professional associations are solicited and included in the self-study and site visit.
56. The key outcome of a cyclical program review is the Final Assessment Report and its associated Implementation Plan which become the basis of a continuous improvement process through monitoring of key performance indicators. It is the primary responsibility of the program Chair to ensure that the implementation plan is achieved and to provide clear timelines and communication requirements throughout the process.
57. The review consists of the following steps, outlined below.

SELF-STUDY: INTERNAL PROGRAM PERSPECTIVE

58. The Chair is responsible, in collaboration with relevant groups and/or individuals such as faculty, students and staff, for preparing a self-study document that is broad-based, reflective, forward-looking, and inclusive of critical analysis. The self-study must address and document the consistency of the program's learning outcomes with the University's mission and Degree Level Expectations, and how its graduates achieve those outcomes. Both the Chair and the Dean, or the Dean's delegates, ensure that the self-study has met all of the self-study criteria and sign off on the completeness of the self-study. For interdisciplinary programs, all affiliated program Chairs and appropriate Deans, or the Deans' delegates, sign off on the completeness of the self-study.
59. The self-study criteria and quality indicators are as follows:

Program Description and Overview

- a) Program goals are consistent with the University's tripartite research, teaching, and service excellence mission, its values and purpose, and its academic priorities and plans;
- b) Ways in which the program addresses the institution's current strategies, frameworks and/or principles regarding equity, diversity and inclusion, and how the program advances EDI-related academic goals (e.g., Indigenous perspectives, international relevance, interdisciplinarity, intercultural competencies, social and environmental equity and sustainability, etc.);
- c) Program structure and requirements are appropriate to meet the program's goals and Program Learning Outcomes; and
- d) Program Learning Outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the Degree Level Expectations.

Admission Requirements

- a) Admission requirements are appropriately aligned with the program's goals and the Program Learning Outcomes established for completion of the program;
- b) Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if applicable, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, e.g., minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, and how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience; and
- c) Consideration of the demographics of the student market for the program, and accessible and equitable admissions processes and practices.

Curriculum

- a) How the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study, and extent to which a comparative review of the state of the discipline informs the curriculum;
- b) Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs, with attention to experiential and community-engaged pedagogy;
- c) How the mode(s) of delivery are appropriate and effective at meeting the Program Learning Outcomes, including infrastructure and technologies for accessible education; and

- d) Ways in which the program addresses current institutional, faculty, or departmental priorities (e.g., experiential learning, equity, diversity and inclusion, accessibility, community engagement, entrepreneurship) and the current Strategic Mandate Agreement.

Teaching and Assessment

- a) Methods for assessing the overall effectiveness of the program quality are appropriate and effective, ensuring evaluation methods are accessible and inclusive, and audiences are diverse;
- b) Methods for assessing student achievement of the defined Program Learning Outcomes and Degree Level Expectations are appropriate and effective;
- c) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the means of assessment, especially in the students' final year of the program, in clearly demonstrating achievement of the Program Learning Outcomes and the Degree Level Expectations and the program's goals; and
- d) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the plans to monitor and assess the overall quality of the program; achievement of the program's goals and a description of how the information will be documented and used to inform continuous program improvement.

Resources

- a) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering and maintaining the quality of its program(s), in relation to the University's priorities for and constraints on funding, space, and faculty allocation;
- b) Given the program's class sizes and cohorts, as well as its program level learning outcomes, describe the participation of a sufficient number of qualified core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;
- c) If applicable, discuss the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience; and
- d) If applicable, outline the supervision of experiential learning opportunities.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS ONLY

- a) Given the program's class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes, provide evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to foster an appropriate intellectual climate, sustain the program, and promote innovation;
- b) Evidence of how supervisory loads are distributed, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty; and
- c) If appropriate, evidence that financial assistance for students is sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.

Quality Indicators

- 60. Information on the quality of the program under review. Standard quality indicators, outlined in the McMaster's Self-Study Guidebook, are available to Chairs from the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, the Office of the Registrar, the School of Graduate Studies, or from the departments themselves.

Chairs will be expected to provide context and commentary on the data. When possible and appropriate, Chairs will also refer to applicable professional standards.

61. Evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the program and commitment to student mentoring).
62. For students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills, and times-to-completion and retention rates.
63. Any other evidence that the program and faculty ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.
64. Additional graduate program criteria:
 - a) Evidence that students' time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program's defined length and program requirements;
 - b) Quality and availability of graduate supervision;
 - c) Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;
 - d) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion;
 - e) Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:
 - (i) Faculty: funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student mentoring;
 - (ii) Students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards;
 - (iii) Program: evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience, and commitment to development of professional and transferable skills; evidence of sufficient and regular graduate level course offerings to ensure that students will be able to meet university requirements in terms of the minimum number of courses required, the level of courses required, and the timely completion of other required elements appropriate for the degree level (e.g., transfer exams, comprehensive exams).

Quality Enhancement

65. Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews especially those detailed in the Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan, and subsequent monitoring reports from the previous Cyclical Review of the program and how concerns and recommendations raised in the previous reviews have been addressed.
66. Initiatives that have been undertaken to enhance the teaching, learning and/or research environments thus far, the quality of the program, and how these will be sustained.

67. Areas identified through the conduct of the self-study as requiring improvement.
68. Areas that hold promise for continued enhancement.

System of governance

69. Evidence that a consultative and inclusive system of governance has been used on an ongoing basis to assess the program and implement changes as appropriate.

Academic Services

70. Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

Self-Study Participation

71. Describe participation of program faculty, staff, and students in the self-study and provide commentary on how their views were obtained and taken into account. A description of how the self-study was developed and written will also be included. For professional programs, the Chair must ensure the views of employers and professional associations are solicited and included in the self-study and site visit.

External Participation

72. The input of others deemed by the Chair to be relevant and useful, such as graduates of the program, representatives of industry, the professions, practical training programs, and employers is to be included in the self-study.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION: REVIEW TEAM AND REPORT

73. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean (or the Dean's designate), will select a diverse team of reviewers to evaluate the program. The Review Team shall consist of two external reviewers. If appropriate, additional members are to be added to the review team, such as when evaluating professional programs or interdisciplinary programs. The team will also include one internal reviewer from outside the discipline selected by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean (or the Dean's designate).
74. External members of the Review Team shall be individuals in the same discipline as the Program under review (or across disciplines for interdisciplinary programs) who are distinguished senior academics of the rank of associate or full professor of broad experience, with an established commitment to higher education. Where it would enhance the diversity of relevant disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspectives, or in community-engaged or professional programs, non-academics with relevant expertise and experience are permitted to serve as reviewers in addition to the two academic reviewers with the approval of the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. Reviewers must have an impartial, arm's-length relationship to the Program (as defined in § III. 29-36, above). Wherever possible the Review Team shall represent broad institutional categories and/or geographic regions.

75. External reviewers will be selected from a list of at least six suggested individuals compiled by the Program/Department under review and endorsed by the Dean. An internal reviewer will be selected from a list of at least three suggested individuals compiled by the Department Chair and endorsed by the Dean. The lists shall include, for each proposed reviewer:
- a) Name;
 - b) rank and position;
 - c) institution or company and current address, telephone, and e-mail address, and URL if available;
 - d) professional (including administrative) experience or expertise relevant to the Program under review;
 - e) details of any previous or current affiliation with the University, and any association with individual members of the Program under review (e.g., co-author, previous student/supervisor, close relationship); and
 - f) for graduate program or combined reviews, a description of research expertise, and a partial listing of recent scholarly publications.
76. Cyclical Program Reviews must incorporate a site visit. Site visits are conducted on-site. All PhD programs must have an on-site visit. Only professional or fully online Master's programs may be allowed an exception to an on-site visit; all other Master's programs must have an on-site visit. Exceptions to on-site visits for undergraduate program reviews are determined by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, for professional Master's or fully online graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean or Dean's delegate prior to the commencement of the review and agreed to by the Review Team prior to the commencement of the review. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will provide clear justification for the decision for an exception to an on-site visit.
77. If it is determined that a site visit can take place virtually, the virtual site visit requires all elements of the external reviewers' site visit using videoconferencing software and/or other suitable platforms. A virtual site visit will still include elements such as virtual meetings with students, faculty, and other stakeholders. It may also include remote attendance at performances or events, and virtual facilities tours.
78. The Self-Study, the Guidelines for Review Team, and other materials specific to the current review will be provided to all members of the Review Team no less than two weeks prior to their visit. If applicable, the results of the previous accreditation review also will be made available to the Review Team to provide them with the views of the relevant professional association(s). The Guidelines for Review Team describes the review process and the roles and obligations of the Review Team, which include:
- a) to identify and comment on the program's notably strong and creative attributes;
 - b) to describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
 - c) to recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take with existing resources and those that require external action;

- d) to recognize the University's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation; and
- e) to respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

79. As appropriate, the Review Team shall meet with the following:

- a) Chair or Director;
- b) Full-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
- c) Part-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
- d) Program students (a broad cross section of students is to be invited by the program to participate in a meeting with the review team);
- e) Departmental/Program support staff;
- f) Associate Dean;
- g) Dean;
- h) for graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies;
- i) for undergraduate programs, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning; and
- j) Provost and Vice-President (Academic), if available.

80. The Review Team will submit a co-authored report, including an Executive Summary, for the program(s) under review within four weeks of the visit to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. The report will be written primarily by the external reviewer(s), and then sent to the internal reviewer for their review and comment. The Review Team's report is to describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement, as well as address the substance of both the self-study report and the evaluation criteria set out in § IV. 58-72 above. The report should comment on the adequacy of existing physical, human and financial resources; and the report should acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it. The report may include a confidential section (e.g., where personnel issues can be addressed). In the case that the self-study addresses more than one program, for example when a self-study describes both an undergraduate and graduate program or multiple undergraduate programs, reviewers in their report must make specific reference to each program described in the self-study. The intent of these reports is to be formative and constructive. Reviewers are required to make at least three recommendations for specific steps to be taken that will lead to the continuous improvement of the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action. Any commentary on issues such as faculty complement and/or space requirements made by the reviewers must be directly tied to issues of program quality and/or sustainability. The reports are intended to provide counsel rather than prescriptive courses of action. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will review the Review Team's report for completeness. If satisfactory, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-

Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will approve the reviewers' report and disseminate it to the Chair. If there are concerns with the completeness of the report, the Review Team will be asked to provide more clarity.

81. ~~Separate responses~~ to the reviewers' report from both the Chair and the Dean, or the Dean's delegate, are prepared, as per the Program Response template, and attached to the reviewers' report.

INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE AND FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

82. The self-study, reviewers' report excluding the confidential section, and responses from the Chair and Dean, will be submitted as a package to McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee, a joint committee of Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. The Quality Assurance Committee will assess the review and will submit a Final Assessment Report (FAR) ~~including the associated Implementation Plan~~ to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council that:
- a) provides an Executive Summary;
 - b) identifies significant strengths of the program;
 - c) addresses the appropriateness of resources for the success of the program;
 - d) identifies opportunities for program improvement and enhancement ~~with a view to continuous improvement~~;
 - e) lists all recommendations of the external reviewers and the associated separate internal responses and assessments from the unit and from the Dean(s);
 - f) includes any additional recommendations that the unit, the Dean(s), and/or the university may have identified as requiring action as a result of the program review;
 - g) includes an Implementation Plan that: prioritizes recommendations that will be implemented; identifies who is responsible for acting on each recommendation; ~~includes specific timelines related to each recommendation; and, as necessary, identifies the unit or individual responsible for providing resources needed to address each recommendation. If any of the external reviewers' recommendations are not selected for further action in the Implementation Plan, there must be a clear explanation for why the recommendations have not been selected. The Implementation Plan may include additional recommendations or comments from the unit, the Dean(s), and/or the University, with commentary as to why these additional recommendations have been made. to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). Recommendations could include, for example, requiring a detailed update report that will describe progress towards addressing major concerns or scheduling an additional cyclical review sooner than specified by the normal 8-year cycle.~~
 - h) ~~The Final Assessment Report (FAR)~~ may include a confidential section.
83. The Final Assessment Report from the Quality Assurance Committee along with any recommendations or comments is sent to the Chair and presented to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council for approval, as appropriate, and then to Senate for information. These governing bodies will consider if additional recommendations or comments are necessary. If so, these recommendations or comments will be presented to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). These will be communicated to the Chair, the

Commented [CB2]: Deleted text

Commented [CB3]: Deleted text

Dean and the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, to the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. Any such additional recommendations or comments from the governing bodies are above and beyond those included in the FAR and are included for comment and information. Once approved, the FAR including an Executive Summary and the associated Implementation Plan is posted on the institution's Quality Assurance webpage. Programs are strongly encouraged to post their FAR and Implementation Plans on their program's webpage as well. As the Final Assessment Report is the synthesis of the cyclical review process and as such is an important tool for a program's continuous improvement it is posted to the institution's Quality Assurance webpage; the information made available for the self-study, the self-study report, the reviewer's report and program and Dean's responses are not made publicly available.

84. Eighteen months after receiving the report from Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council, the Chair will submit a progress report on the program to the Dean. The Dean will provide commentary and response to the progress report and submit the progress report along with their commentary to the Quality Assurance Committee summarizing the status of any actions taken or being taken. The Quality Assurance Committee, in some circumstances, will request follow up reporting on specific components if not satisfactorily addressed in the 18-month report. These reports are posted on the institution's Quality Assurance webpage as an addendum to the program's FAR and Implementation Plan. The Quality Assurance Committee will present progress reports to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council, if deemed necessary by the Chairs of the Quality Assurance Committee.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

85. The Final Assessment Reports, which include the Implementation Plans, and subsequent Progress Reports are posted on the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) section of the University's website. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning provides an annual report to Quality Council that lists the past year's completed Final Assessment Reports and attests that all IQAP-required Cyclical Program Review processes have been followed. This report will also provide the link to the institution's Quality Assurance webpage which houses the completed Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Plans completed during the past year. The annual report of Final Assessment Reports and their related Cyclical Program Review processes will occasionally be reviewed for compliance by the Quality Council and that if issues are found, the Quality Council may decide to initiate a Focused Audit.

USE OF ACCREDITATION AND OTHER EXTERNAL REVIEWS IN THE INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

86. Programs that periodically undergo accreditation reviews are permitted to request that the associated accreditation documentation serve to meet some of the elements required of the IQAP cyclical review self-study when these elements are fully consistent with the requirements outlined within this policy. The program chair will submit a request form that has been endorsed by the Dean (or the Dean's delegate) and all required supporting documentation to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs.

87. If permitted by the accreditation authorities, the site visit by the Review Team is permitted to be performed at the same time as the accreditation review, however there must be at least two external reviewers and one internal reviewer dedicated to the Cyclical Program Review.
88. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs will review the request and decide if an accreditation review can be substituted in part for a cyclical review. The program will be notified in writing of the decision. A record of substitutions or additions, and the grounds on which they were made, will be eligible for audit by the Quality Council.
89. Approval for substitution is only applicable for the cyclical review year related to the request. The remaining steps in the cyclical review will then take place. Programs must participate in all reporting related to the cyclical review. If desired by the program, a request to substitute some accreditation documentation in order to meet partial requirements of their program's Quality Assurance review must be submitted for every subsequent cyclical review.

SECTION V: INSTITUTIONAL IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS

90. As part of the continuous improvement of McMaster's academic programs, existing programs are expected to routinely undergo revisions with the aim of improving student experience and quality enhancement. Such revisions and subsequent monitoring provide an opportunity for ensuring the student experience is engaging, rigorous and reflective of the current discipline of study.
91. The revisions must be submitted through the university's curriculum approval process. This is the same approval process as outlined for New Program Proposals in § III. 39 above (excluding the University Planning Committee and University Fees, unless there are significant resource implications).
92. Once per year, the MacPherson Institute and School of Graduate Studies consults with the Registrar's Office and prepares a report of major modifications to existing programs including program closures and submits the report to the Quality Council.
93. In situations where it is unclear or where disagreement exists on whether a planned change constitutes a minor modification, a major modification, or a new program, the determination will be made by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs, in consultation with McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee, where appropriate. Quality Council has the final authority to decide if a major modification constitutes a new program and, therefore, must follow the Protocol for New Program Approvals. A record of any decision will be kept with McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee.
94. Minor modifications include: changes to course titles or codes; the addition or deletion of a single course; weighting of courses; creating or closing a minor; and creating or closing an undergraduate certificate.
95. Major modifications are defined as significant changes that have program-wide impact through either change to curriculum and/or program requirements. Such change must last more than one academic year and differ from what was outlined in the last cyclical program review or, if a program review has not taken place yet, from the new program proposal.
96. Major modifications include the following program changes:
 - a) Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review or, if a program review has not taken place yet, from the new program proposal. For undergraduate programs, it would be considered a major modification when more than 30% of the program requirements are being changed from one academic year to the next. For graduate programs, it would be considered a major modification when more than 50% of the program requirements (including requirements such as courses, major exams, and research) are being changed from one year to the next.
 - b) Changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (such as different campus, online delivery and inter-institutional collaboration)

- c) Significant changes to the Program Learning Outcomes that are made outside of the cyclical program review process. Significant changes to Program Learning Outcomes are defined as: changes to the majority of the Program Learning Outcomes such that they differ from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review (or, if a program review has not taken place yet, from the new program proposal) but do not, however, meet the threshold of a new program
 - d) Change in program name and/or degree nomenclature, when this results in a change in program learning outcomes
 - e) Program closure
 - f) The inclusion of a new program of specialization where another with the same degree designation already exists
 - g) The addition of a single new field to an existing graduate program. The creation of more than one field at one time or over consecutive years may be required to complete the Expedited Approvals process. This process is outlined in § III.
 - h) A new collaborative specialization, or the addition of a new unit to an existing collaborative specialization
97. Chairs are responsible for ensuring any major modifications align with the Program Learning Outcomes and that the impact of the modification on students has been assessed, where appropriate.
98. Changes to an existing Emphasis, Option, or Minor Program; the creation of a new micro-credential(s); undergraduate certificate(s); and laddering, stacking or similar options, or comparable elements do not require Quality Council appraisal or approval. Micro-credentials are approved using the same internal approval process outlined in § III. 39 above. This approval process is subject to change and proponents of micro-credentials are encouraged to consult with the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies prior to seeking institutional approval for a micro-credential.
99. There may be situations where although the changes to the program meet the definition of a major modification, the changes are of such significance that a more immediate review is desirable. This situation may occur, for example, when the fundamental goals of the program change; or there are significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources. In such cases, the Department, the Faculty, Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council may, if it deems it advisable after consultation with the relevant Dean(s) and Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and/or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, initiate a program review and request that the Quality Council review the proposal. The proposal must include: a description and rationale for the proposed changes and how they will improve the student experience, and inclusion of a selection of criteria most relevant to the Proposal from the following list, taken from Section 2.1.2 of the Quality Assurance Framework, as approved by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, or in the case of graduate programs, Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies: program goals, program requirements, assessment of teaching and learning, admission requirements, resources, quality and other indicators. The proposal will include input from current students and recent graduates of the program.
100. Major modifications to existing academic programs are not normally subjected to the institution's cyclical audit.

APPENDIX A: MCMASTER UNIVERSITY’S STATEMENT ON DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

1. A McMaster education enables students to develop sets of life and learning skills that promote a continuing ability and desire to learn, and a set of technical and professional skills that permit a range of career choices. Degree level expectations elaborate the intellectual and creative development of students and the acquisition of relevant skills that are usually widely, yet implicitly, understood.
2. McMaster University has adopted the following Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) or Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLEs) that were developed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents and endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities in December 2005. These degree level expectations are to be viewed as a minimum threshold for all degree programs at McMaster.

UNDERGRADUATE

	<u>Baccalaureate / Bachelor’s Degree</u> This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:	<u>Baccalaureate / Bachelor’s Degree: Honours</u> This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:
1. Depth and breadth of knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) General knowledge and understanding of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline b) Broad understanding of some of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines c) Ability to gather, review, evaluate and interpret information relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline d) Some detailed knowledge in an area of the discipline e) Critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline f) Ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline b) Developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines c) Developed ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and (ii) compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline d) Developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline e) Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline

		f) Ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline
2. Knowledge of methodologies	An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; and b) devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods. 	An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; b) devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and c) describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.
3. Application of knowledge	The ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop lines of argument; b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; and The ability to use a basic range of established techniques to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) analyze information; b) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study; c) propose solutions; and d) make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources. 	The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop lines of argument; b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; c) apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; d) where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and The ability to use a range of established techniques to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; b) propose solutions; c) frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; d) solve a problem or create a new work; and e) to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.
4. Communication skills	The ability to communicate accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.	The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.

5. Awareness of limits of knowledge	An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and how this might influence their analyses and interpretations.	An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.
6. Autonomy and professional capacity	Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring: a) the exercise of personal responsibility and decision- making; b) working effectively with others; c) the ability to identify and address their own learning needs in changing circumstances and to select an appropriate program of further study; and d) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.	Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring: a) the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; b) working effectively with others; c) decision-making in complex contexts; d) the ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; e) and behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.

GRADUATE

	<u>Master's Degree</u> This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:	<u>Doctoral Degree</u> This degree extends the skills associated with the Master's degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:
1. Depth and breadth of knowledge	A systematic understanding of knowledge, including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.	A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline.

2. Research and scholarship	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; b) Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and c) Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and, <p>On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or b) Originality in the application of knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems; b) The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and c) The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.
3. Level of application of knowledge	Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in the critical analysis of a new question or of a specific problem or issue in a new setting.	<p>The capacity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and b) Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.
4. Professional capacity/autonomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and (ii) Decision-making in complex situations; b) The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations; b) The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current; c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines

	<p>c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</p> <p>d) The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>	<p>and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</p> <p>d) The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>
5. Level of communications skills	The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly, orally and in writing, to a range of audiences.	The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively, orally and in writing, to a range of audiences.
6. Awareness of limits of knowledge	Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.	An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

Complete Policy Title

Policy on Academic Program Development and Review

Policy Number (if applicable)

Approved by

Senate

Date of Most Recent Approval

TBA

Date of Original Approval(s)

May 11, 2011 (*effective July 1, 2011*)

Supersedes/Amends Policy dated

- January 12, 2022
- December 9, 2020
- May 17, 2017
- February 13, 2013 (*effective July 1, 2013*)
- May 11, 2011 (*effective July 1, 2011*) Procedures for Undergraduate Program Reviews, 2004,
- New and Revised Undergraduate Programs Policy, 2009
- Policy on Steps for Creation of New Graduate Programs or New Fields in Existing Doctoral Programs, 2009

Responsible Executive

Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning

Policy Specific Enquiries

[MacPherson Institute](#)

General Policy Enquiries

[Policy \(University Secretariat\)](#)

DISCLAIMER:

If there is a discrepancy between this electronic policy and the written copy held by the policy owner, the written copy prevails.

FORMAT:

If you require this document in an accessible format, please email policy@mcmaster.ca.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
DEFINITIONS	1
PREAMBLE	1
Cyclical Audit	2
CONTACT	2
PURPOSE	3
DEFINITION OF NEW PROGRAMS	3
SECTION II: NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS.....	4
BEGINNING A NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL.....	4
BROAD CONSULTATION	4
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL	5
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL: EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	5
Program Overview	5
Admission Requirements	5
Structure	5
Program Content, Curriculum, and Teaching.....	6
Assessment of Teaching and Learning.....	6
Resources.....	6
Quality and Other Indicators	7
EXTERNAL EVALUATION: REVIEW TEAM	8
REVIEWERS' REPORT.....	9
INTERNAL RESPONSE	10
INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL.....	10
QUALITY COUNCIL SECRETARIAT	11
ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS	12
APPROVED NEW PROGRAMS.....	12
SECTION III: EXPEDITED APPROVALS.....	13
SECTION IV: CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS	14
SELF-STUDY: INTERNAL PROGRAM PERSPECTIVE	15
Program Description and Overview	15
Admission Requirements	15
Curriculum	15
Teaching and Assessment.....	16
Resources.....	16
Graduate Programs Only	16
Quality Indicators	16
Quality Enhancement.....	17
System of governance	18

Academic Services	18
Self-Study Participation.....	18
External Participation	18
EXTERNAL EVALUATION: REVIEW TEAM AND REPORT.....	18
INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE AND FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT.....	21
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.....	22
USE OF ACCREDITATION AND OTHER EXTERNAL REVIEWS IN THE INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS	22
SECTION V: INSTITUTIONAL IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS....	24
APPENDIX A: McMASTER UNIVERSITY’S STATEMENT ON DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS.....	26
UNDERGRADUATE	26
Baccalaureate / Bachelor’s Degree	26
Baccalaureate / Bachelor’s Degree: Honours	26
GRADUATE	28
Master’s Degree	28
Doctoral Degree.....	28

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

DEFINITIONS

McMaster University uses the term “program goals” to mean clear and concise statements of the goals of the program. “Program goals” are therefore synonymous with what the Quality Assurance Framework refers to as “program objectives.”

PREAMBLE

1. McMaster University is widely recognized for innovation in teaching and learning and for the quality of its programs. Nevertheless, knowledge of our disciplines and the scholarship of teaching and learning are constantly evolving. Our reputation can only be maintained and improved if we, as academics and educators, critically review what we do in our programs and seek opinions and advice from colleagues at McMaster and at other institutions.
2. Although the primary objective for these reviews is the improvement of our academic programs, the processes that we adopt is also designed to meet our responsibility to the government on quality assurance. Every publicly assisted Ontario university that grants degrees and diplomas is responsible for ensuring the quality of all of its programs of study, including modes of delivering programs and those academic and student services that affect the quality of the respective programs under review, whether or not the program is eligible for government funding.
3. The process by which institutions meet this accountability to the government is outlined in the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF), developed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice- Presidents (OCAV), and approved by Executive Heads. Institutions’ compliance with the QAF is monitored by the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance, also known as the Quality Council, which reports to OCAV and the Council of Ontario Universities (COU).
4. As part of the Quality Assurance Framework, McMaster was required to develop an Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), which is contained within this Policy. In addition to the 15 guiding principles contained within the QAF, McMaster determined the following internal principles to guide the development of the IQAP Policy:
 - a) curriculum development and improvement is an ongoing, iterative process that is initiated, developed and controlled at the departmental level;
 - b) McMaster’s IQAP incorporates input from all principal stakeholders; and
 - c) McMaster’s IQAP is designed primarily to help improve programs and shape them to have characteristics that are most valued at our University, while also meeting the responsibility for quality assurance.
5. Thus, the goal of McMaster’s IQAP is to facilitate the development and continued improvement of our undergraduate and graduate academic programs, and to ensure that McMaster continues to lead internationally in its reputation for innovation in teaching and learning and for the quality of its programs.

McMaster's IQAP is intended to complement existing mechanisms for critical assessment and enhancement, including departmental reviews and accreditation reviews. The uniqueness of each program at McMaster will emerge in the IQAP self-study.

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

Cyclical Audit

7. One-year prior to the scheduled Cyclical Audit, McMaster's key contact to the Quality Council (or their delegate) will participate in a half-day briefing by the Quality Council Secretariat and an Audit Team member.
8. In advance of the cyclical audit, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, or their delegates, will prepare a self-study of McMaster's Institutional Quality Assurance Process, highlighting its strengths as well as areas for improvement and enhancement. The self-study will also identify the institutional response to any issues identified in the previous audit. To prepare this self-study, consultation with Faculty representatives as well as key stakeholders from central university supports, such as the Registrar's Office, the MacPherson Institute, Institutional Research and Analysis and the Library will take place, as appropriate. The self-study will be submitted to the Quality Council's Secretariat as part of the Cyclical Audit process.
9. The Cyclical Audit provides accountability to the principal stakeholders of Ontario's university education system. The purpose of the Cyclical Audit is to evaluate the alignment of past and current practice with policy as well as the university's approach to continuous improvement. Cyclical Program Reviews that were undertaken within the period since the previous Cyclical Audit are eligible for selection for the university's next Cyclical Audit. Any new undergraduate and graduate programs that have been approved since the previous Cyclical Audit are eligible for selection in the next university's cyclical audit. Graduate Diplomas that were approved through the expedited approvals process as well as major modifications to existing academic programs are not normally subjected to the institution's cyclical audit.
10. Excluding any confidential information, the Audit Report and any follow up response report will be posted on McMaster's Quality Assurance webpage. If an area of concern is identified during the Cyclical Audit, the Quality Council may determine that a focused audit of a specific process is necessary. Reports related to a Focused Audit will be posted on McMaster's Quality Assurance webpage.

CONTACT

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

12. The person responsible for all contact between the University and the Quality Council is the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning.
13. Throughout this Policy, the Chair refers to the head of the academic unit (usually a Department, sometimes a School or an interdisciplinary group) that is proposing a new program or is responsible for an existing program, although we recognize that the official title of such person varies across programs and Faculties. Similarly, the Dean refers to the head of the Faculty or equivalent individual responsible for the program, again recognizing that official titles vary.
14. In the case of joint academic programs (e.g., a combined honours program or a collaborative program with another educational institution), the relevant Chair and Dean shall be those at McMaster University who have the administrative responsibility for the program.

PURPOSE

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

DEFINITION OF NEW PROGRAMS

16. A new program is considered to be any new degree or degree program that has not been previously offered at McMaster University. In contrast to the normal evolution of academic programs, a new program will generally involve some combination of new courses, new learning outcomes, and new or re-allocated resources, and will be meant to provide students with an academic path that was previously not available to them.
17. Although not new, a program that has been offered at McMaster University without funding from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and for which a request for funding is to be made, will follow the procedures for new programs that are outlined in § II.

SECTION II: NEW GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

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

BEGINNING A NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

18. Proponents of a new program may begin by preparing a Statement of Intent and acquiring endorsement from the relevant Dean(s) and Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies.

BROAD CONSULTATION

19. The Chair, in consultation with the Dean, is responsible for ensuring that there is broad consultation. Broad consultation is required as part of the proposal process. It will also be essential to have appropriate discussions with other institutions when the proposed programs are to be offered in collaboration with those institutions.
20. Whenever faculty members from several departments will be involved in a proposed program, these proponents must have the opportunity to discuss the proposal with their respective Dean(s) and Chair(s). Similarly, if there is a proposal to cross-list a course, or to recommend or require students in the new program to take existing courses, the teaching Department(s) must be consulted and agreement obtained, in writing, from the appropriate Chair/Dean. Approvals of the relevant Curriculum Committees are required.
21. Discussions are to be held with central support units such as, but not limited to, the Library, the Registrar, the MacPherson Institute, and other relevant units, to assess the impact of the introduction of the new program. Input also should be sought from relevant groups of students for whom there is a potential impact of the proposal and consideration given to the demographics of the student market for the program.
22. Broad consultation is especially important when proposing interdisciplinary programs, particularly when the initiators of the proposed plan are unfamiliar with all disciplines involved in the proposed program or individual faculty members who might potentially be interested or have expertise. A proposal for a new interdisciplinary program must be presented to any related Faculty/Program to ensure that there is widespread awareness of the program and of its potential impact. If a new interdisciplinary program utilizes or cross-lists one or several new courses from other Departments, the Department(s) offering the course(s), rather than the new interdisciplinary group, must submit those courses for approval. Prior written agreement also must be obtained from Chairs of participating Departments for teaching, graduate supervision and other resources required for interdisciplinary programs. Departments must be given adequate time to consider these requests. The program proponents, in consultation with the appropriate Dean(s), or their delegate(s), will consult and obtain proposed administrative and governance structures from the Faculties involved in interdisciplinary program proposals for inclusion in the new program proposal.

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL

23. The Chair is responsible, in collaboration with relevant groups and/or individuals, for the preparation of a New Program Proposal. Both the Chair and the Dean, or Dean's delegate, ensure that the proposal has met all of the New Program Proposal criteria outlined below and both will sign off on the completeness of the proposal. For an interdisciplinary program, all affiliated program Chairs and appropriate Deans, or the Deans' delegates, sign off on the completeness of the proposal.

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL: EVALUATION CRITERIA

24. Program proponents are to complete McMaster's New Program Proposal template and address the evaluation criteria for the New Program Proposal as outlined below.

Program Overview

- a) Description of the extent and method of the consultation process undertaken during the development of the proposal, including the diversity of groups and /or individuals who were engaged in and informed the preparation of the proposal;
- b) Consistency of the program's goals with the University's tripartite research, teaching, and service excellence mission, its values and purpose, and its academic priorities and plans;
- c) Ways in which the program addresses the institution's current Strategic Mandate Agreement;
- d) Ways in which the program addresses the institution's current strategies, frameworks and/or principles regarding equity, diversity and inclusion, and how the program advances EDI-related academic goals (e.g., Indigenous perspectives, international relevance, interdisciplinarity, intercultural competencies, social and environmental equity and sustainability); and
- e) Clarity and appropriateness of the program's requirements and the Program Learning Outcomes in meeting the University's Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) or Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLEs), as outlined in Appendix A;
- f) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature and program's goals.

Admission Requirements

- a) Appropriateness of the program's admission requirements for meeting its goals and the Program Learning Outcomes established for completion of the program;
- b) Alternative requirements, if any, for admission into the program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience; and
- c) Consideration of accessible and equitable admissions processes and practices.

Structure

- a) Appropriateness of the administrative, governance, and communication processes proposed in support of the program;
- b) Appropriateness of the program's structure and requirements to meet specified Program Learning Outcomes;

- c) Appropriateness of the program's structure and requirements to meet Degree Level Expectations; and
- d) For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length, which ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

Program Content, Curriculum, and Teaching

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

Assessment of Teaching and Learning

- a) Plans to monitor and assess the overall quality of the program and whether the program is achieving its proposed goals, ensuring evaluation methods are accessible and inclusive and audiences are diverse;
- b) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the instruction and assessment of student achievement of the intended Program Learning Outcomes. The Program Learning Outcomes must meet the Degree Level Expectations;
- c) Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the Degree Level Expectations; and
- d) Description of how the resulting information from level of student performance will be documented and used to inform continuous program improvement.

Resources

25. For all programs:

- a) Adequacy of the administrative unit's planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources including any implications for the impact on other existing programs at the University and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources to support the program;

- b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program in order to achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;
- c) Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship produced by undergraduate students, as well as graduate students' scholarship and research activities, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access;
- d) If applicable, discussion/explanation of the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience;
- e) If applicable, provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities; and
- f) If applicable, additional institutional resource commitments to support the program in step with its ongoing implementation.

26. For undergraduate programs:

- a) Evidence of plans for adequate numbers of faculty and staff to achieve the goals of the program;
- b) Evidence of plans to provide the necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program;
- c) Planned/anticipated class sizes; and
- d) Provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities, if applicable.

27. For graduate programs:

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

Quality and Other Indicators

28. Specify how program quality and other metrics will be measured, particularly:

- a) Definition and use of indicators that provide evidence of quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the proposed program);

- b) Evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;
- c) If applicable, any other evidence that the program and faculty will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;

EXTERNAL EVALUATION: REVIEW TEAM

- 29. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean will select a diverse team of reviewers to assess the proposal. The Review Team will consist of two external reviewers and one internal reviewer. Additional members may be added to the team, if appropriate, for instance when evaluating professional programs or interdisciplinary programs.
- 30. External reviews of new undergraduate, Master's and PhD program proposals must incorporate a site visit. Site visits are conducted on-site. All PhD programs must have an on-site visit. Only professional or fully online Master's programs may be allowed an exception to an on-site visit; all other Master's programs must have an on-site visit. Exceptions to on-site visits for new undergraduate program reviews are determined by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of new professional and fully online Master's programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the appropriate Dean or Dean's delegate and agreed to by the Review Team prior to the commencement of the review. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of new graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will provide clear justification for the decision for an exception to an on-site visit.
- 31. If it is determined that a site visit can take place virtually, the virtual site visit will require all elements of the Review Team's site visit using videoconferencing software and/or other suitable platforms. A virtual site visit will still include elements such as virtual meetings with students, faculty, and other stakeholders. It may also include remote attendance at performances or events, and virtual facilities tours.
- 32. As appropriate, the Review Team shall meet with the following:
 - a) Chair or Director;
 - b) Full-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
 - c) Part-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
 - d) Program students (a broad cross section of students is to be invited by the program to participate in a meeting with the review team);
 - e) Departmental/Program support staff;
 - f) Associate Dean;
 - g) Dean;
 - h) For graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies;
 - i) For undergraduate programs, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning; and
 - j) Provost and Vice-President (Academic), if available.

33. External members of the Review Team will be individuals who are in the same discipline as the program under review (or across disciplines for interdisciplinary programs) and who are distinguished senior academics of broad experience, with an established commitment to higher education. External reviewers will not be faculty members from McMaster University. Internal reviewers are faculty members from McMaster but from outside of the discipline (or interdisciplinary group) engaged in the proposed program. Non-academics with relevant expertise and experience are permitted to serve as reviewers in addition to the two academic reviewers when it would enhance the diversity of relevant disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspectives, or in community-engaged or professional programs. Reviewers must have an impartial, arm's-length relationship to the program. For example, reviewers should not have been a research supervisor or student of members of the proposed program; and should not have collaborated with members of the proposed program within the past six years or have made plans to collaborate with those individuals in the immediate future. There also should be no other potential conflicts of interest (e.g., personal or financial). Wherever possible the review team will represent broad institutional categories and/or geographic regions.
34. External reviewers will be selected from a list of at least six suggested individuals compiled by the Department and endorsed by the Dean. An internal reviewer will be selected from a list of at least three suggested individuals compiled by the Department and endorsed by the Dean.
35. The lists shall include, for each proposed external reviewer:
 - a) Name;
 - b) Rank and position;
 - c) Institution or company and current address, telephone, e-mail address, and URL if available;
 - d) Professional (including administrative) experience or expertise relevant to the Program under review;
 - e) Details of any previous or current affiliation with the University, and any association with individual members of the Program under review (e.g., co-author, previous student/supervisor, close relationship); and
 - f) For graduate programs, a description of research expertise, and a partial listing of recent scholarly publications.
36. The New Program Proposal, all relevant faculty CVs, the McMaster's Review Team Guidelines and other materials specific to the review will be provided to all members of the review team no less than two weeks prior to their visit.

REVIEWERS' REPORT

37. Excepting when contrary circumstances apply, the Review Team will submit a co-authored report, including an Executive Summary, for the program(s) under review within four weeks of the visit to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. The report will be written primarily by the external reviewer(s), and then sent to the internal reviewer for their review and comment. The report will appraise the standards and quality of the proposed program, and address the criteria set out in § III. 24-28 above, including the associated faculty and the

adequacy of existing physical, human, and financial resources. Reviewers also will be invited to acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program, together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to the program. The report may include a confidential section (e.g., where personnel issues can be addressed). The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will review the reviewers' report for completeness. If satisfactory, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will approve the reviewers' report and disseminate it to the Chair. If there are concerns with the completeness of the report, the Review Team will be asked to provide more clarity.

INTERNAL RESPONSE

38. Separate responses to the reviewers' report from both the Chair and the Dean, or their delegates, should be prepared, as per the New Program Response template, and attached to the reviewers' report. Any substantive revisions (e.g., revisions to Program Learning Outcomes; modes of delivery; curriculum and/or assessment practices) to the New Program Proposal required by the Reviewers' Report and agreed to by the Chair and Dean must be made to the proposal prior to submission for approval at Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council.

INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL

39. In addition to the completion of the external review, approval of new program proposals by the following University bodies, in the order listed below, is required:
 - a) The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will review the New Program Proposal to ensure that the program is consistent with McMaster's principles and priorities and existing strengths of the University, the program is of high academic quality; there is convincing evidence of student demand and societal need for the program; and, sufficient financial support, infrastructure, and human resources can be made available to initiate and support the program either within the Faculty budget or based on the program being a full revenue generating program;
 - b) The Faculty Curriculum Committee(s), representing a diversity of faculty members and equipped to consider EDI principles, reviews the New Program Proposal to ensure that the new program adds sufficient value to the programs already offered in the Faculty;
 - c) the Faculty(ies) reviews the New Program Proposal to ensure that the program is consistent with the Faculty's strategic plans and that the necessary resources are available if these are to be provided from within the Faculty's envelope;
 - d) the Executive Director of Finance and Planning reviews the Resource Implications and Financial Viability document to ensure that all potential University resource requirements are captured, and the program is properly costed. In addition, for interdisciplinary or partnership programs, ensures that an MOU is properly completed;
 - e) for Undergraduate programs, the Undergraduate Curriculum and Admissions Committee reviews the New Program Proposal to assess the impact of the new program on students enrolled in other Faculties;

- f) the University Student Fees Committee reviews the proposed Resource Implications and Financial Viability document and ensures that Ministry and University fee policies are adhered to, are reasonable relative to market and that fee collection can be properly administered within existing systems;
- g) Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council reviews the New Program Proposal to provide a venue for a broad discussion on the new program by elected faculty and student members with specific knowledge of and expertise in undergraduate or graduate programming, and ensure that the program is consistent with University-wide goals and criteria specifically related to undergraduate or graduate programming;
- h) University Planning Committee reviews the New Program Proposal and the Resource Implications and Financial Viability documents to understand the financial implications of the new program, evaluate the impact University-wide, and assess value-for-money for the intended student; and
- i) Senate reviews the New Program Proposal and Resource Implications and Financial Viability documents to ensure that the program is consistent with the University's general strategic plans with respect to academic programs.

These bodies should consider the criteria outlined in § III. 24-28 above when evaluating the proposal.

40. The site visit with external reviewers will be held after the Faculty Curriculum Committee(s) and prior to approval at Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council and Senate.
41. Special considerations, such as collaboration agreements or non-standard distribution and full revenue generating programs are to refer to the *Academic Revenue Generating Activity Policy for Revenue Generating Certificate and Diploma Programs Administered through a Faculty* and other relevant University policies, as applicable.

QUALITY COUNCIL SECRETARIAT

42. Once all approvals outlined in § III. 39 above are obtained, the institution will submit the New Program Proposal, together with the Reviewers' Report, the internal response to the Report, and a brief commentary on the two external reviewers selected to review the proposed program in regard to their qualifications, to the Quality Council Secretariat. The submission template will require information on whether or not the proposed program will be a cost-recovery program. The same standards and protocols apply regardless of the source of funding.
43. The Quality Council Appraisal's Committee will review the new program proposal submission and determine if additional information is required. If sufficient, the Quality Council will review the new program proposal submission and will make one of the following decisions:
 - a) Approved to commence.
 - b) Approved to commence, with report.
 - c) Deferred for up to one year during which time the university may address identified issues and report back.
 - d) Not approved.
 - e) Or such other action as the Quality Council considers reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances.

Within 30 days of being notified, the university may appeal Quality Council's decision.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW PROGRAMS

44. Following its submission to the Quality Council, the University may announce, per guidelines within the New Program Proposal Guidebook, its intention to offer the program, provided that clear indication is given that approval by the Quality Council is pending, and that no offers of admission will be made until the program has been approved by the Quality Council. Ministry approval may also be required. When such announcements are made at this stage, they must contain the following statement: "Prospective students are advised that the program is still subject to formal approval."

APPROVED NEW PROGRAMS

45. After a new program is submitted to the Quality Council, the University may seek Provincial funding for the program. Once Quality Council has approved the new program, the program must begin within thirty-six months of the date of approval; otherwise, the approval will lapse. If program approval lapses, the program must begin the new program proposal process again.
46. Between eighteen and twenty-four months after onset of the program, the Chair will provide the Dean and Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate studies, with a brief progress report on the program, that assesses the program's success in realizing its goals; addresses any concerns from the program reviewers' report and notes from the Appraisal Committee; and highlights any unanticipated changes in curriculum, resources, enrollment, funding mechanisms, or governance structure. If, after consultation with the Dean, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, it is deemed appropriate, an informal internal assessment of the program may be undertaken, including interviews with current faculty, students, and staff, to determine if a more complete, early cyclical review is warranted.
47. The first cyclical review for any new program must be conducted no more than eight years after the date of the program's initial enrolment. Outcomes identified in the program progress report, described above, must be included in the programs first cyclical review.
48. New undergraduate and graduate programs that have been approved are eligible for selection in the university's next cyclical audit.

SECTION III: EXPEDITED APPROVALS

49. The Protocol for Expedited Approvals applies when one or more of the following applies:
- a) an institution requests endorsement of the Quality Council to declare a new Field or to revise Fields in a graduate program (note: there is no requirement to declare fields in either master's or doctoral programs);
 - b) there are proposals for new for-credit graduate diplomas; including new graduate diplomas (Type 2) offered in conjunction with a Master's or Doctoral degree program and usually represent an additional interdisciplinary qualification; and
 - c) new graduate diplomas (Type 3) as a stand-alone, direct-entry program, generally developed by a unit already offering a related master's or doctoral degree
 - d) situations where although the changes to the program meet the definition of a major modification, the changes are of such significance that a more immediate review is desirable. In such cases, the Department, the Faculty, Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council may, if it deems it advisable after consultation with the relevant Dean(s) and Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and/or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, initiate an expedited program review and request that the Quality Council review the Expedited Proposal.
50. The Expedited Proposal will describe the new graduate field or graduate diploma (including, as appropriate, reference to Program Learning Outcomes, Degree Level Expectations, faculty and resource implications), or provide a brief account of the rationale for the changes, addressing the evaluation criteria where they apply (e.g., program goals, program requirements, assessment of teaching and learning, admission requirements, resources, quality and other indicators) for the program.
51. The Expedited Approvals process requires all the approvals listed in § III. 39 above and the submission to the Quality Council of an Expedited Proposal. Expedited approvals do not require external reviewers be involved in the approval process and provides for a faster turn-around on decisions by the Quality Council. Common decisions by Quality Council are: a) approved to commence b) approved to commence, with a report or c) not approved.
52. Type 3 graduate diplomas are included in the schedule for cyclical reviews and will be subject to external review during the cyclical program review process. Graduate Diplomas not associated with a parent program are reviewed by desk audit. A desk audit is conducted independently of the university (i.e., does not typically include interviews or in-person or virtual site visits). Graduate Diplomas that were approved through the expedited approvals process as well as major modifications to existing academic programs are not normally subjected to the institution's cyclical audit.

SECTION IV: CYCLICAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

53. All academic programs are scheduled to be reviewed on a seven-year cycle and must be reviewed no more than eight years from the previous review. New programs must be reviewed no more than eight years after the date of the program's first enrolment. The steps taken to address any issues that have been identified in monitoring reports of the new program or in follow up by Quality Council are to be identified in first cyclical review self-study.
54. The primary purpose for cyclical program reviews is continuous improvement of existing academic programs. An academic program is defined as a complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice as outlined by the university for the fulfillment of the requirements for either undergraduate or graduate degrees. Combined programs do not require review if their constituting programs are reviewed separately. Undergraduate diplomas, Emphases, Options and Minors are not required to undergo the cyclical program review process outlined in this policy; however, Chairs are to consult with the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning to determine if other review processes are required. The list of programs that require review including those that are joint/inter-institutional, multi-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and at multiple sites, as well as the schedule of such reviews, will be maintained by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning in consultation with the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. Programs that are closed or that have suspended admissions are not subject to cyclical program review. Program Chairs will be notified of a scheduled review by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or their delegate. Each of the specific programs to be reviewed will be listed in the notification.
55. Departments can choose to review undergraduate and graduate programs jointly or separately. If the reviews are done jointly, the evaluation criteria and quality indicators described below must be applied to each program included in the self-study and there must be sections within the report to address different situations that apply to each program. Program reviews may also be done jointly with accreditation reviews, at the discretion of the Chair, in consultation with the Dean (see § IV. 86-89 below). Where programs seek to combine previously separate undergraduate and graduate reviews, they shall adopt the timeline of the earliest scheduled program review. For academic programs delivered in partnership with other educational institutions, the Chair must ensure that representatives from all educational institutions in the partnership are consulted during all key stages of the cyclical review process, including self-study, site visit, implementation, and monitoring. For professional programs, the Chair must ensure the views of employers and professional associations are solicited and included in the self-study and site visit.
56. The key outcome of a cyclical program review is the Final Assessment Report and its associated Implementation Plan which become the basis of a continuous improvement process through monitoring of key performance indicators. It is the primary responsibility of the program Chair to ensure that the implementation plan is achieved and to provide clear timelines and communication requirements throughout the process.
57. The review consists of the following steps, outlined below.

SELF-STUDY: INTERNAL PROGRAM PERSPECTIVE

58. The Chair is responsible, in collaboration with relevant groups and/or individuals such as faculty, students and staff, for preparing a self-study document that is broad-based, reflective, forward-looking, and inclusive of critical analysis. The self-study must address and document the consistency of the program's learning outcomes with the University's mission and Degree Level Expectations, and how its graduates achieve those outcomes. Both the Chair and the Dean, or the Dean's delegates, ensure that the self-study has met all of the self-study criteria and sign off on the completeness of the self-study. For interdisciplinary programs, all affiliated program Chairs and appropriate Deans, or the Deans' delegates, sign off on the completeness of the self-study.
59. The self-study criteria and quality indicators are as follows:

Program Description and Overview

- a) Program goals are consistent with the University's tripartite research, teaching, and service excellence mission, its values and purpose, and its academic priorities and plans;
- b) Ways in which the program addresses the institution's current strategies, frameworks and/or principles regarding equity, diversity and inclusion, and how the program advances EDI-related academic goals (e.g., Indigenous perspectives, international relevance, interdisciplinarity, intercultural competencies, social and environmental equity and sustainability, etc.);
- c) Program structure and requirements are appropriate to meet the program's goals and Program Learning Outcomes; and
- d) Program Learning Outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the Degree Level Expectations.

Admission Requirements

- a) Admission requirements are appropriately aligned with the program's goals and the Program Learning Outcomes established for completion of the program;
- b) Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if applicable, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, e.g., minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, and how the program recognizes prior work or learning experience; and
- c) Consideration of the demographics of the student market for the program, and accessible and equitable admissions processes and practices.

Curriculum

- a) How the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study, and extent to which a comparative review of the state of the discipline informs the curriculum;
- b) Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs, with attention to experiential and community-engaged pedagogy;
- c) How the mode(s) of delivery are appropriate and effective at meeting the Program Learning Outcomes, including infrastructure and technologies for accessible education; and

- d) Ways in which the program addresses current institutional, faculty, or departmental priorities (e.g., experiential learning, equity, diversity and inclusion, accessibility, community engagement, entrepreneurship) and the current Strategic Mandate Agreement.

Teaching and Assessment

- a) Methods for assessing the overall effectiveness of the program quality are appropriate and effective, ensuring evaluation methods are accessible and inclusive, and audiences are diverse;
- b) Methods for assessing student achievement of the defined Program Learning Outcomes and Degree Level Expectations are appropriate and effective;
- c) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the means of assessment, especially in the students' final year of the program, in clearly demonstrating achievement of the Program Learning Outcomes and the Degree Level Expectations and the program's goals; and
- d) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the plans to monitor and assess the overall quality of the program; achievement of the program's goals and a description of how the information will be documented and used to inform continuous program improvement.

Resources

- a) Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit's use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering and maintaining the quality of its program(s), in relation to the University's priorities for and constraints on funding, space, and faculty allocation;
- b) Given the program's class sizes and cohorts, as well as its program level learning outcomes, describe the participation of a sufficient number of qualified core faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in and achieve the goals of the program and foster the appropriate academic environment;
- c) If applicable, discuss the role and approximate percentage of adjunct and part-time faculty/limited term appointments used in the delivery of the program and the associated plans to ensure the sustainability of the program and quality of the student experience; and
- d) If applicable, outline the supervision of experiential learning opportunities.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS ONLY

- a) Given the program's class sizes and cohorts as well as its program-level learning outcomes, provide evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to foster an appropriate intellectual climate, sustain the program, and promote innovation;
- b) Evidence of how supervisory loads are distributed, in light of qualifications and appointment status of the faculty; and
- c) If appropriate, evidence that financial assistance for students is sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.

Quality Indicators

- 60. Information on the quality of the program under review. Standard quality indicators, outlined in the McMaster's Self-Study Guidebook, are available to Chairs from the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, the Office of the Registrar, the School of Graduate Studies, or from the departments themselves.

Chairs will be expected to provide context and commentary on the data. When possible and appropriate, Chairs will also refer to applicable professional standards.

61. Evidence of the quality of the faculty (e.g., qualifications, funding, honours, awards, research, innovation and scholarly record; appropriateness of collective faculty expertise to contribute substantively to the program and commitment to student mentoring).
62. For students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills, and times-to-completion and retention rates.
63. Any other evidence that the program and faculty ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience.
64. Additional graduate program criteria:
 - a) Evidence that students' time-to-completion is both monitored and managed in relation to the program's defined length and program requirements;
 - b) Quality and availability of graduate supervision;
 - c) Evidence that each graduate student in the program is required to take a minimum of two-thirds of the course requirements from among graduate level courses;
 - d) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion;
 - e) Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:
 - (i) Faculty: funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student mentoring;
 - (ii) Students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards;
 - (iii) Program: evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience, and commitment to development of professional and transferable skills; evidence of sufficient and regular graduate level course offerings to ensure that students will be able to meet university requirements in terms of the minimum number of courses required, the level of courses required, and the timely completion of other required elements appropriate for the degree level (e.g., transfer exams, comprehensive exams).

Quality Enhancement

65. Concerns and recommendations raised in previous reviews especially those detailed in the Final Assessment Report, Implementation Plan, and subsequent monitoring reports from the previous Cyclical Review of the program and how concerns and recommendations raised in the previous reviews have been addressed.
66. Initiatives that have been undertaken to enhance the teaching, learning and/or research environments thus far, the quality of the program, and how these will be sustained.

67. Areas identified through the conduct of the self-study as requiring improvement.
68. Areas that hold promise for continued enhancement.

System of governance

69. Evidence that a consultative and inclusive system of governance has been used on an ongoing basis to assess the program and implement changes as appropriate.

Academic Services

70. Evidence that there are adequate resources to sustain the quality of scholarship and research activities produced by students, including library support, information technology support, and laboratory access.

Self-Study Participation

71. Describe participation of program faculty, staff, and students in the self-study and provide commentary on how their views were obtained and taken into account. A description of how the self-study was developed and written will also be included. For professional programs, the Chair must ensure the views of employers and professional associations are solicited and included in the self-study and site visit.

External Participation

72. The input of others deemed by the Chair to be relevant and useful, such as graduates of the program, representatives of industry, the professions, practical training programs, and employers is to be included in the self-study.

EXTERNAL EVALUATION: REVIEW TEAM AND REPORT

73. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean (or the Dean's designate), will select a diverse team of reviewers to evaluate the program. The Review Team shall consist of two external reviewers. If appropriate, additional members are to be added to the review team, such as when evaluating professional programs or interdisciplinary programs. The team will also include one internal reviewer from outside the discipline selected by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean (or the Dean's designate).
74. External members of the Review Team shall be individuals in the same discipline as the Program under review (or across disciplines for interdisciplinary programs) who are distinguished senior academics of the rank of associate or full professor of broad experience, with an established commitment to higher education. Where it would enhance the diversity of relevant disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspectives, or in community-engaged or professional programs, non-academics with relevant expertise and experience are permitted to serve as reviewers in addition to the two academic reviewers with the approval of the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. Reviewers must have an impartial, arm's-length relationship to the Program (as defined in § III. 29-36, above). Wherever possible the Review Team shall represent broad institutional categories and/or geographic regions.

75. External reviewers will be selected from a list of at least six suggested individuals compiled by the Program/Department under review and endorsed by the Dean. An internal reviewer will be selected from a list of at least three suggested individuals compiled by the Department Chair and endorsed by the Dean. The lists shall include, for each proposed reviewer:
- a) Name;
 - b) rank and position;
 - c) institution or company and current address, telephone, and e-mail address, and URL if available;
 - d) professional (including administrative) experience or expertise relevant to the Program under review;
 - e) details of any previous or current affiliation with the University, and any association with individual members of the Program under review (e.g., co-author, previous student/supervisor, close relationship); and
 - f) for graduate program or combined reviews, a description of research expertise, and a partial listing of recent scholarly publications.
76. Cyclical Program Reviews must incorporate a site visit. Site visits are conducted on-site. All PhD programs must have an on-site visit. Only professional or fully online Master's programs may be allowed an exception to an on-site visit; all other Master's programs must have an on-site visit. Exceptions to on-site visits for undergraduate program reviews are determined by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, for professional Master's or fully online graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, in consultation with the Dean or Dean's delegate prior to the commencement of the review and agreed to by the Review Team prior to the commencement of the review. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will provide clear justification for the decision for an exception to an on-site visit.
77. If it is determined that a site visit can take place virtually, the virtual site visit requires all elements of the external reviewers' site visit using videoconferencing software and/or other suitable platforms. A virtual site visit will still include elements such as virtual meetings with students, faculty, and other stakeholders. It may also include remote attendance at performances or events, and virtual facilities tours.
78. The Self-Study, the Guidelines for Review Team, and other materials specific to the current review will be provided to all members of the Review Team no less than two weeks prior to their visit. If applicable, the results of the previous accreditation review also will be made available to the Review Team to provide them with the views of the relevant professional association(s). The Guidelines for Review Team describes the review process and the roles and obligations of the Review Team, which include:
- a) to identify and comment on the program's notably strong and creative attributes;
 - b) to describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
 - c) to recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take with existing resources and those that require external action;

- d) to recognize the University's autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation; and
- e) to respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

79. As appropriate, the Review Team shall meet with the following:

- a) Chair or Director;
- b) Full-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
- c) Part-time faculty members (a broad cross section, in groups);
- d) Program students (a broad cross section of students is to be invited by the program to participate in a meeting with the review team);
- e) Departmental/Program support staff;
- f) Associate Dean;
- g) Dean;
- h) for graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies;
- i) for undergraduate programs, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning; and
- j) Provost and Vice-President (Academic), if available.

80. The Review Team will submit a co-authored report, including an Executive Summary, for the program(s) under review within four weeks of the visit to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. The report will be written primarily by the external reviewer(s), and then sent to the internal reviewer for their review and comment. The Review Team's report is to describe the program's respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement, as well as address the substance of both the self-study report and the evaluation criteria set out in § IV. 58-72 above. The report should comment on the adequacy of existing physical, human and financial resources; and the report should acknowledge any clearly innovative aspects of the proposed program together with recommendations on any essential or otherwise desirable modifications to it. The report may include a confidential section (e.g., where personnel issues can be addressed). In the case that the self-study addresses more than one program, for example when a self-study describes both an undergraduate and graduate program or multiple undergraduate programs, reviewers in their report must make specific reference to each program described in the self-study. The intent of these reports is to be formative and constructive. Reviewers are required to make at least three recommendations for specific steps to be taken that will lead to the continuous improvement of the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action. Any commentary on issues such as faculty complement and/or space requirements made by the reviewers must be directly tied to issues of program quality and/or sustainability. The reports are intended to provide counsel rather than prescriptive courses of action. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will review the Review Team's report for completeness. If satisfactory, the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, the Vice-

Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, will approve the reviewers' report and disseminate it to the Chair. If there are concerns with the completeness of the report, the Review Team will be asked to provide more clarity.

81. Separate responses to the reviewers' report from both the Chair and the Dean, or the Dean's delegate, are prepared, as per the Program Response template, and attached to the reviewers' report.

INSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVE AND FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

82. The self-study, reviewers' report excluding the confidential section, and responses from the Chair and Dean, will be submitted as a package to McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee, a joint committee of Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. The Quality Assurance Committee will assess the review and will submit a Final Assessment Report (FAR) to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council that:
 - a) provides an Executive Summary;
 - b) identifies significant strengths of the program;
 - c) addresses the appropriateness of resources for the success of the program;
 - d) identifies opportunities for program improvement and enhancement with a view to continuous improvement;
 - e) lists all recommendations of the external reviewers and the associated separate internal responses and assessments from the unit and from the Dean(s);
 - f) includes any additional recommendations that the unit, the Dean(s), and/or the university may have identified as requiring action as a result of the program review;
 - g) includes an Implementation Plan that: prioritizes recommendations that will be implemented; identifies who is responsible for acting on each recommendation; includes specific timelines related to each recommendation; and, as necessary, identifies the unit or individual responsible for providing resources needed to address each recommendation. If any of the external reviewers' recommendations are not selected for further action in the Implementation Plan, there must be a clear explanation for why the recommendations have not been selected. The Implementation Plan may include additional recommendations or comments from the unit, the Dean(s), and/or the University, with commentary as to why these additional recommendations have been made.
 - h) may include a confidential section.
83. The Final Assessment Report from the Quality Assurance Committee along with any recommendations or comments is sent to the Chair and presented to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council for approval, as appropriate, and then to Senate for information. These governing bodies will consider if additional recommendations or comments are necessary. If so, these recommendations or comments will be presented to the Provost and Vice-President (Academic). These will be communicated to the Chair, the Dean and the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or, in the case of graduate programs, to the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. Any such additional recommendations or comments from the governing bodies are above and beyond those included in the FAR and are included for comment and

information. Once approved, the FAR including an Executive Summary and the associated Implementation Plan is posted on the institution's Quality Assurance webpage. Programs are strongly encouraged to post their FAR and Implementation Plans on their program's webpage as well. As the Final Assessment Report is the synthesis of the cyclical review process and as such is an important tool for a program's continuous improvement it is posted to the institution's Quality Assurance webpage; the information made available for the self-study, the self-study report, the reviewer's report and program and Dean's responses are not made publicly available.

84. Eighteen months after receiving the report from Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council, the Chair will submit a progress report on the program to the Dean. The Dean will provide commentary and response to the progress report and submit the progress report along with their commentary to the Quality Assurance Committee summarizing the status of any actions taken or being taken. The Quality Assurance Committee, in some circumstances, will request follow up reporting on specific components if not satisfactorily addressed in the 18-month report. These reports are posted on the institution's Quality Assurance webpage as an addendum to the program's FAR and Implementation Plan. The Quality Assurance Committee will present progress reports to Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council, if deemed necessary by the Chairs of the Quality Assurance Committee.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

85. The Final Assessment Reports, which include the Implementation Plans, and subsequent Progress Reports are posted on the Provost and Vice-President (Academic) section of the University's website. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning provides an annual report to Quality Council that lists the past year's completed Final Assessment Reports and attests that all IQAP-required Cyclical Program Review processes have been followed. This report will also provide the link to the institution's Quality Assurance webpage which houses the completed Final Assessment Reports and Implementation Plans completed during the past year. The annual report of Final Assessment Reports and their related Cyclical Program Review processes will occasionally be reviewed for compliance by the Quality Council and that if issues are found, the Quality Council may decide to initiate a Focused Audit.

USE OF ACCREDITATION AND OTHER EXTERNAL REVIEWS IN THE INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

86. Programs that periodically undergo accreditation reviews are permitted to request that the associated accreditation documentation serve to meet some of the elements required of the IQAP cyclical review self-study when these elements are fully consistent with the requirements outlined within this policy. The program chair will submit a request form that has been endorsed by the Dean (or the Dean's delegate) and all required supporting documentation to the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs.
87. If permitted by the accreditation authorities, the site visit by the Review Team is permitted to be performed at the same time as the accreditation review, however there must be at least two external reviewers and one internal reviewer dedicated to the Cyclical Program Review.

88. The Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs will review the request and decide if an accreditation review can be substituted in part for a cyclical review. The program will be notified in writing of the decision. A record of substitutions or additions, and the grounds on which they were made, will be eligible for audit by the Quality Council.
89. Approval for substitution is only applicable for the cyclical review year related to the request. The remaining steps in the cyclical review will then take place. Programs must participate in all reporting related to the cyclical review. If desired by the program, a request to substitute some accreditation documentation in order to meet partial requirements of their program's Quality Assurance review must be submitted for every subsequent cyclical review.

SECTION V: INSTITUTIONAL IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS

90. As part of the continuous improvement of McMaster's academic programs, existing programs are expected to routinely undergo revisions with the aim of improving student experience and quality enhancement. Such revisions and subsequent monitoring provide an opportunity for ensuring the student experience is engaging, rigorous and reflective of the current discipline of study.
91. The revisions must be submitted through the university's curriculum approval process. This is the same approval process as outlined for New Program Proposals in § III. 39 above (excluding the University Planning Committee and University Fees, unless there are significant resource implications).
92. Once per year, the MacPherson Institute and School of Graduate Studies consults with the Registrar's Office and prepares a report of major modifications to existing programs including program closures and submits the report to the Quality Council.
93. In situations where it is unclear or where disagreement exists on whether a planned change constitutes a minor modification, a major modification, or a new program, the determination will be made by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning for undergraduate programs or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies for graduate programs, in consultation with McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee, where appropriate. Quality Council has the final authority to decide if a major modification constitutes a new program and, therefore, must follow the Protocol for New Program Approvals. A record of any decision will be kept with McMaster's Quality Assurance Committee.
94. Minor modifications include: changes to course titles or codes; the addition or deletion of a single course; weighting of courses; creating or closing a minor; and creating or closing an undergraduate certificate.
95. Major modifications are defined as significant changes that have program-wide impact through either change to curriculum and/or program requirements. Such change must last more than one academic year and differ from what was outlined in the last cyclical program review or, if a program review has not taken place yet, from the new program proposal.
96. Major modifications include the following program changes:
 - a) Requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review or, if a program review has not taken place yet, from the new program proposal. For undergraduate programs, it would be considered a major modification when more than 30% of the program requirements are being changed from one academic year to the next. For graduate programs, it would be considered a major modification when more than 50% of the program requirements (including requirements such as courses, major exams, and research) are being changed from one year to the next.
 - b) Changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (such as different campus, online delivery and inter-institutional collaboration)

- c) Significant changes to the Program Learning Outcomes that are made outside of the cyclical program review process. Significant changes to Program Learning Outcomes are defined as: changes to the majority of the Program Learning Outcomes such that they differ from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review (or, if a program review has not taken place yet, from the new program proposal) but do not, however, meet the threshold of a new program
 - d) Change in program name and/or degree nomenclature, when this results in a change in program learning outcomes
 - e) Program closure
 - f) The inclusion of a new program of specialization where another with the same degree designation already exists
 - g) The addition of a single new field to an existing graduate program. The creation of more than one field at one time or over consecutive years may be required to complete the Expedited Approvals process. This process is outlined in § III.
 - h) A new collaborative specialization, or the addition of a new unit to an existing collaborative specialization
97. Chairs are responsible for ensuring any major modifications align with the Program Learning Outcomes and that the impact of the modification on students has been assessed, where appropriate.
98. Changes to an existing Emphasis, Option, or Minor Program; the creation of a new micro-credential(s); undergraduate certificate(s); and laddering, stacking or similar options, or comparable elements do not require Quality Council appraisal or approval. Micro-credentials are approved using the same internal approval process outlined in § III. 39 above. This approval process is subject to change and proponents of micro-credentials are encouraged to consult with the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning or the Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies prior to seeking institutional approval for a micro-credential.
99. There may be situations where although the changes to the program meet the definition of a major modification, the changes are of such significance that a more immediate review is desirable. This situation may occur, for example, when the fundamental goals of the program change; or there are significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources. In such cases, the Department, the Faculty, Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council may, if it deems it advisable after consultation with the relevant Dean(s) and Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning and/or Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, initiate a program review and request that the Quality Council review the proposal. The proposal must include: a description and rationale for the proposed changes and how they will improve the student experience, and inclusion of a selection of criteria most relevant to the Proposal from the following list, taken from Section 2.1.2 of the Quality Assurance Framework, as approved by the Vice-Provost, Teaching and Learning, or in the case of graduate programs, Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies: program goals, program requirements, assessment of teaching and learning, admission requirements, resources, quality and other indicators. The proposal will include input from current students and recent graduates of the program.
100. Major modifications to existing academic programs are not normally subjected to the institution's cyclical audit.

APPENDIX A: MCMASTER UNIVERSITY'S STATEMENT ON DEGREE LEVEL EXPECTATIONS

1. A McMaster education enables students to develop sets of life and learning skills that promote a continuing ability and desire to learn, and a set of technical and professional skills that permit a range of career choices. Degree level expectations elaborate the intellectual and creative development of students and the acquisition of relevant skills that are usually widely, yet implicitly, understood.
2. McMaster University has adopted the following Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLEs) or Graduate Degree Level Expectations (GDLEs) that were developed by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents and endorsed by the Council of Ontario Universities in December 2005. These degree level expectations are to be viewed as a minimum threshold for all degree programs at McMaster.

UNDERGRADUATE

	<u>Baccalaureate / Bachelor's Degree</u> This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:	<u>Baccalaureate / Bachelor's Degree: Honours</u> This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:
1. Depth and breadth of knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) General knowledge and understanding of many key concepts, methodologies, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline b) Broad understanding of some of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines c) Ability to gather, review, evaluate and interpret information relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline d) Some detailed knowledge in an area of the discipline e) Critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline f) Ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Developed knowledge and critical understanding of the key concepts, methodologies, current advances, theoretical approaches and assumptions in a discipline overall, as well as in a specialized area of a discipline b) Developed understanding of many of the major fields in a discipline, including, where appropriate, from an interdisciplinary perspective, and how the fields may intersect with fields in related disciplines c) Developed ability to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) gather, review, evaluate and interpret information; and (ii) compare the merits of alternate hypotheses or creative options, relevant to one or more of the major fields in a discipline d) Developed, detailed knowledge of and experience in research in an area of the discipline e) Developed critical thinking and analytical skills inside and outside the discipline

		f) Ability to apply learning from one or more areas outside the discipline
2. Knowledge of methodologies	An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; and b) devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods. 	An understanding of methods of enquiry or creative activity, or both, in their primary area of study that enables the student to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems using well established ideas and techniques; b) devise and sustain arguments or solve problems using these methods; and c) describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship.
3. Application of knowledge	The ability to review, present, and interpret quantitative and qualitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop lines of argument; b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; and The ability to use a basic range of established techniques to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) analyze information; b) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study; c) propose solutions; and d) make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources. 	The ability to review, present and critically evaluate qualitative and quantitative information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) develop lines of argument; b) make sound judgments in accordance with the major theories, concepts and methods of the subject(s) of study; c) apply underlying concepts, principles, and techniques of analysis, both within and outside the discipline; d) where appropriate use this knowledge in the creative process; and The ability to use a range of established techniques to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) initiate and undertake critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and information; b) propose solutions; c) frame appropriate questions for the purpose of solving a problem; d) solve a problem or create a new work; and e) to make critical use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.
4. Communication skills	The ability to communicate accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.	The ability to communicate information, arguments, and analyses accurately and reliably, orally and in writing to a range of audiences.

<p>5. Awareness of limits of knowledge</p>	<p>An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and how this might influence their analyses and interpretations.</p>	<p>An understanding of the limits to their own knowledge and ability, and an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits to knowledge and how this might influence analyses and interpretations.</p>
<p>6. Autonomy and professional capacity</p>	<p>Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the exercise of personal responsibility and decision- making; b) working effectively with others; c) the ability to identify and address their own learning needs in changing circumstances and to select an appropriate program of further study; and d) behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility. 	<p>Qualities and transferable skills necessary for further study, employment, community involvement and other activities requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the exercise of initiative, personal responsibility and accountability in both personal and group contexts; b) working effectively with others; c) decision-making in complex contexts; d) the ability to manage their own learning in changing circumstances, both within and outside the discipline and to select an appropriate program of further study; e) and behaviour consistent with academic integrity and social responsibility.

GRADUATE

	<p><u>Master’s Degree</u> This degree is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</p>	<p><u>Doctoral Degree</u> This degree extends the skills associated with the Master’s degree and is awarded to students who have demonstrated the following:</p>
<p>1. Depth and breadth of knowledge</p>	<p>A systematic understanding of knowledge, including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.</p>	<p>A thorough understanding of a substantial body of knowledge that is at the forefront of their academic discipline or area of professional practice including, where appropriate, relevant knowledge outside the field and/or discipline.</p>

<p>2. Research and scholarship</p>	<p>A conceptual understanding and methodological competence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Enables a working comprehension of how established techniques of research and inquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; b) Enables a critical evaluation of current research and advanced research and scholarship in the discipline or area of professional competence; and c) Enables a treatment of complex issues and judgments based on established principles and techniques; and, <p>On the basis of that competence, has shown at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The development and support of a sustained argument in written form; or b) Originality in the application of knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The ability to conceptualize, design, and implement research for the generation of new knowledge, applications, or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the research design or methodology in the light of unforeseen problems; b) The ability to make informed judgments on complex issues in specialist fields, sometimes requiring new methods; and c) The ability to produce original research, or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, and to merit publication.
<p>3. Level of application of knowledge</p>	<p>Competence in the research process by applying an existing body of knowledge in the critical analysis of a new question or of a specific problem or issue in a new setting.</p>	<p>The capacity to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Undertake pure and/or applied research at an advanced level; and b) Contribute to the development of academic or professional skills, techniques, tools, practices, ideas, theories, approaches, and/or materials.
<p>4. Professional capacity/autonomy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The exercise of initiative and of personal responsibility and accountability; and (ii) Decision-making in complex situations; b) The intellectual independence required for continuing professional development; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex situations; b) The intellectual independence to be academically and professionally engaged and current; c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines

	<p>c) The ethical behavior consistent with academic integrity and the use of appropriate guidelines and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</p> <p>d) The ability to appreciate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>	<p>and procedures for responsible conduct of research; and</p> <p>d) The ability to evaluate the broader implications of applying knowledge to particular contexts.</p>
5. Level of communications skills	The ability to communicate ideas, issues and conclusions clearly, orally and in writing, to a range of audiences.	The ability to communicate complex and/or ambiguous ideas, issues and conclusions clearly and effectively, orally and in writing, to a range of audiences.
6. Awareness of limits of knowledge	Cognizance of the complexity of knowledge and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.	An appreciation of the limitations of one's own work and discipline, of the complexity of knowledge, and of the potential contributions of other interpretations, methods, and disciplines.

To : Graduate Council

From : Christina Bryce
Assistant Graduate Secretary

At its meeting on November 8th the Faculty of Business Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee approved the following recommendations.

Please note that these recommendations were approved by the Faculty of Business.

For Approval of Graduate Council:

- a. **Business Ph.D.**
 - i. **Finance**
 - 1. **Change to Comprehensive Exam Requirements**

Recommendation for Change in Program Requirements/Procedures

Please note the following:

- This form must be completed for all changes involving degree program requirements and procedures. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
- An electronic version of this form should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies (cbryce@mcmaster.ca). Questions about the form can also be directed to this address.
- 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: Finance and Business Economics

Name of Program and Plan: PhD in Business Administration, Finance Field

Degree: PhD

Nature of Recommendation (Please complete appropriate field(s))

Is this change the result of an IQAP Review: Yes No

Creation of New Milestone

Change in Admission Requirements

Change in Comprehensive Examination Procedure

Change in Course Requirements

Change in the Description of a Section of the Graduate Calendar

Please explain:

Other Changes

Please explain:

Describe the existing requirement/procedure: Currently, the comprehensive examination in the Finance field consists of a two-part exam taken over two days (with rest day in between) in June of year 2 of the program (with second try, if needed, in August).

Provide a detailed description of the recommended change: The two parts of the comprehensive examination will be spread over two years: Part 1 in June of year 1 of the program and Part 2 in June/July of year 2 of the program. In addition, a research paper proposal requirement is added. The proposal is evaluated with Part 2 of the exam and needs to be satisfactory for the student to pass the comprehensive exam. A second chance will be provided for any student failing Part 1 or Part 2 of the Comp. A student failing either Part 1 or Part 2 twice will be required to withdraw from the program

Rationale for the recommended change (How does the requirement fit into the department's program and/or tie to existing Program Learning Outcomes from the program's IQAP cyclical review?): By taking Part 1 earlier, this frees up time for the students to work on a research proposal for year 2, which is intended to get students to start their research sooner and reduce the completion time for the PhD.

Provide Implementation Date: (Implementation date should be at the beginning of the academic year): Immediately.

That is, Part 1 of the comprehensive exam for the class starting September 2022 would be taken in June 2023. The new students are aware of this possibility.

Are there any other details of the recommended change that the curriculum and policy committee should be aware of? If yes, please explain: Scheduling part of the comprehensive exam in year 1 will imply that students who are obviously poorly qualified will be eliminated from the program earlier, even if they manage to pass their course work.

Provide a description of the recommended change to be included in the calendar (please include a tracked-changes version of the calendar section affected):

No change to the calendar may be needed. The current calendar specifies that the comprehensive exam for the finance field is "a written examination". While in two parts and including a research proposal, the exam remains a written examination. If more specificity is desired, the sentence in red could be added:

Comprehensive Examination: All doctoral candidates must pass a comprehensive examination in their chosen field of study to demonstrate knowledge of the field and preparation for research. The comprehensive examination will test each student's knowledge of core material, familiarity with the relevant literature and knowledge of methodology required to do research in the field. The comprehensive examinations in the Accounting, MOBHR and Marketing fields include a written examination followed by an oral examination. **The comprehensive exam in Finance consists of a written exam (in two parts) and a research paper proposal.** The comprehensive examination in all other fields includes only a written examination.

Contact Information for the recommended change:

Name: Ron Balvers

Email: balvers@mcmaster.ca

Date Submitted: September 19, 2022



School of Graduate Studies 1280 Main Street West Phone 905.525.9140
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada Ext. 23679
L8S 4L8 <http://graduate.mcmaster.ca>

To : Graduate Council
From : Christina Bryce
Assistant Graduate Secretary

At its meetings on September 19th and December 12th the Faculty of Health Sciences Graduate Policy and Curriculum Committee approved the following graduate curriculum recommendations.

Please note that these recommendations were approved by the Faculty of Health Sciences.

For Approval of Graduate Council:

- i. Speech Language Pathology**
 - i. Change to Calendar Copy**

For Information of Graduate Council:

- i. Global Health***
 - ii. New Course**
 - 1. 717 Circumpolar Health
- ii. Midwifery**
 - iii. New Course**
 - 1. 715 Advanced midwifery-led sexual and reproductive health care
- ii. Speech Language Pathology**
 - i. Change to Course Evaluations**
 - 1. 711 Problem-based Tutorial I
 - 2. 721 Problem-based Tutorial II
 - 3. 731 Problem-based Tutorial III
 - 4. 741 Problem-based Tutorial IV
 - 5. 751 Problem-based Tutorial V

*Also approved by the Faculties of Business and Social Sciences.

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

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 (cbryce@mcmaster.ca).</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	School of Rehabilitation Science		
NAME OF PROGRAM and PLAN	Speech-Language Pathology Program		
DEGREE	MSc (SLP)		
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)			
Is this change a result of an IQAP review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
CREATION OF NEW MILESTONE <input type="checkbox"/>			
CHANGE IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS	<input type="checkbox"/>	CHANGE IN COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION PROCEDURE	<input type="checkbox"/>
CHANGE IN THE DESCRIPTION OF A SECTION IN THE GRADUATE CALENDAR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EXPLAIN: Update to course calendar to reflect already approved Black Equity Stream. Updates to better align with SLP Program website, and PT & OT programs.	
OTHER CHANGES	EXPLAIN:		

DESCRIBE THE EXISTING REQUIREMENT/PROCEDURE:

1. **Admission Requirements** section: one human anatomy or human physiology course at any level with a grade of B or higher
2. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: Virtual interview fee is not included.
3. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: In addition to the academic requirements, all students are required to meet certain requirements of the Public Hospitals Act, and submit a Police Vulnerable Sector Screen.
4. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: use of term GPA instead of sub-GPA.
5. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: approximately 125 applicants invited for interview
6. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: Education equity section is not included
7. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: Old website link used.

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

1. **Admission Requirements** section: Update Academic Calendar to state "one relevant human anatomy or human physiology course at any level with a grade of B or higher (must focus on anatomy and physiology related to speaking, hearing, voice and/or swallowing)"
2. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: Update Academic Calendar to state "The top-ranked (approximately 150) applicants will be invited to pay the \$55 interview fee and participate in a virtual mini multiple interview (MMI)".
3. **Admission Requirements** section: Move VSC information to this section and Update Academic Calendar wording. Please see attached document for recommended changes.
4. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: Update Academic Calendar to state "sub-GPA" where applicable.
5. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: Update Academic Calendar to state approximately 150 applicants invited for interview.
6. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: SRS has sought guidance from relevant departments/committees regarding the language to be used for the Facilitated Indigenous Admission Program and the Black Equity Steam. Please see attached document for recommended changes.
7. **Application Policy & Procedure** section: New website link in attached document.

RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE (How does the requirement fit into the department's program and/or tie to existing Program Learning Outcomes from the program's IQAP cyclical review?):

1. Align with wording posted on the Program website and ORPAS application guide.

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. On February 14, 2022 the Fees Committee approved the virtual interview fee of \$55.00 for the 2023 admissions cycle. The fee is to cover the operating cost of the KIRA platform and SRS Moneris payment processing fee. 3. Align with wording posted on the OT and PT Academic Calendar. 4. Align with wording posted on the Program website and ORPAS application guide. 5. Align with wording posted on the Program website and ORPAS application guide. 6. The inclusion of the Facilitated Indigenous Admission Program section and Black Admission Stream section (approved Jan 12, 2022, at GPCC) is to better align with the University's commitment to equity, diversity, inclusion, and social justice. 7. Old link no longer works.
<p>PROVIDE IMPLEMENTATION DATE: (<i>Implementation date should be at the beginning of the academic year</i>)</p> <p>For the 2022-2023 graduate calendar for applicants who are seeking admissions in the Fall of 2023</p>
<p>ARE THERE ANY OTHER DETAILS OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE THAT THE CURRICULUM AND POLICY COMMITTEE SHOULD BE AWARE OF? IF YES, EXPLAIN.</p> <p>Changes are consistent with the processes among all SRS programs (OT & PT).</p>
<p>PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO BE INCLUDED IN THE CALENDAR (please include a tracked changes version of the calendar section affected if applicable):</p> <p>Please see the attached document with tracked changes for a detailed description of the changes to be included in the calendar (changes highlighted in yellow).</p>
<p>CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:</p> <p>Name: Justine Hamilton Email: hamilj13@mcmaster.ca Extension: N/A Date submitted: November 23, 2022</p>

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

SGS/2013

Speech-Language Pathology, M.Sc.

Program Description

The Master of Science in Speech-Language Pathology is a full-time course-based professional Master's program. It prepares students with knowledge, skills, and professional behaviours to practice as entry level speech-language pathologists. The program utilizes a problem-based, self-directed learning philosophy. Students will complete course work and clinical placements during their two study years. All courses are required.

Admission Requirements

Applicants must achieve a four-year baccalaureate degree (120 units/credits), and must have a minimum average of B+ or 3.3/4.0 or 9/12, calculated over the last 60 units of their university course work. Applicants may apply in the 4th year of their degree.

The SLP program has 4 pre-requisite courses. Applicants will require a minimum of:

- one linguistics course at any level with a grade of B or higher;
- one relevant course in psychology at a second-year level or higher (e.g., child development, developmental psychology, aging and perception, cognition) with a grade of B or higher;
- one **relevant** human anatomy or human physiology course at any level with a grade of B or higher. **[must focus on anatomy and physiology related to speaking, hearing, voice and/or swallowing];** and
- one research methods or statistics course at any level with a grade of B or higher.

Applicants must be enrolled in the specified prerequisite courses by the application deadline date (i.e. the course must be listed on an official transcript).

Applicants whose first language is not English and who did not attend an English-speaking university for their undergraduate degree must achieve at least a score of 100 (iBT) (reading-24, speaking-26, listening-24, writing-26) on the TOEFL.

The number of seats in the Speech-Language Pathology program is limited, therefore, possession of published minimum requirements does not guarantee admission.

Vulnerable Sector Checks are required as a condition of continued registration with a FHS Health Professional Program. An original Vulnerable Sector Check must be submitted on an annual basis and meet the directives of the current FHS Police Records Check Policy approved June 26, 2019. Click here for the full policy.

Application Policy & Procedure

All applicants (domestic and international) must apply through the Ontario Rehabilitation Science Programs (ORPAS) online application service <http://www.ouac.on.ca/orpas/>. Application deadline is available on the ORPAS website. Applicants who are academically eligible will be ranked on the basis of their preadmission **sub-GPA**. The top-ranked (approximately **150/26**) applicants will be invited to **pay the \$55 interview fee and** participate in an online mini multiple interview (MMI). Personal qualities and life experiences are assessed at these "mini" interviews, two of which are written stations. These interviews will take place online. Final offers of admission will be based on a combination of pre-admission **sub-GPA** and MMI score. Interview dates and Offer dates can be found on the program's website <https://srs-slp.healthsci.mcmaster.ca/education/future-students/admissions/> <https://healthsci.mcmaster.ca/srs-slp/education/future-students>.

~~In addition to the academic requirements, all students are required to meet certain requirements of the Public Hospitals Act, and submit a Police Vulnerable Sector Screen.~~

Applicants should understand that where it is discovered that any application information is false or misleading, or has been concealed or withheld, the application will be deemed invalid, and the matter will be forwarded to the Office

of Academic Integrity. If the student has already been admitted and registered, withdrawal from the university may be required, pending a university investigation.

Professionalism is an important requirement of the McMaster Speech-Language Pathology Program. In keeping with the standard of excellence required in our program, we expect applicants to the MSc(SLP) program to conduct themselves in a professional manner throughout all phases of the application process. Any and all interactions throughout the admissions process, where applicants are engaged with Speech-Language Pathology program staff, faculty, students, and/or community volunteers may be taken into consideration in making admissions decisions. Admission may be denied to applicants who, among other critical determinants, behave in a manner that is considered below the level of professionalism expected of similarly situated candidates, regardless of their academic standing or interview performance.

Education Equity

The Faculty of Health Sciences at McMaster University acknowledges the barriers and challenges of students accessing post graduate education programs and opportunities. The MSc(SLP) Program has a Facilitated Admissions program for individuals who self-identify as Indigenous, and for individuals who self-identify as Black. These processes were developed to provide equitable access to under-represented students and aligns with the School of Rehabilitation Science (SRS) commitment to the principles of equity, diversity, inclusion and social justice in all that we do, and McMaster University's statement on Building an Inclusive Community with a Shared Purpose.

Indigenous Applicants

Indigenous applicants wishing to apply are encouraged to self-identify when completing an application in ORPAS, and to complete an application with the Facilitated Indigenous Admissions Program (FIAP), to access the Indigenous specific criteria for admissions. The deadline for application through FIAP is the same as the application to the Program. Support for individuals applying to FIAP is available through the Indigenous Health Learning Lodge: ishsapc@mcmaster.ca. See MSc(SLP) Program website for details.

Black Applicants

Applicants wishing to apply to this stream must self-identify for the Black Equity stream at the time of the application (i.e., indicate that you are applying through the Facilitated Black Admissions Program), and follow the program-specific application process. See MSc(SLP) Program website for details.

Enquiries: 905 525-9140 Ext. 27857, SLP Program Coordinator

Fax: 905 524-0069

Email: askslp@mcmaster.ca

Website: <https://srs-slp.healthsci.mcmaster.ca/http://srs.mcmaster.ca>

Review of Student Progress

All students seeking to practice as a speech-language pathologist are expected to demonstrate clinical performance consistent with the minimum standards and clinical competencies of graduate study. This performance is expected to be developmental, reflecting increasing levels of clinical skill and independence. Only those students whose clinical performance is consistent with such standards will be recommended to graduate.

Graduate student progress is overseen by McMaster faculty and registered therapists. Student progress includes progress in academic coursework, clinical skills, and professional attributes required of all students at graduation. Student progress in the program is regularly reviewed by a Program Academic Study Committee (PASC). The PASC is responsible for determining if a student may proceed to the next term of study.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 9 pt, Bold, Highlight

The program may, in appropriate circumstances, defer or remove a student from a clinical placement if the student fails to meet program requirements, including but not limited to requirements for professionalism, ethical behaviour, knowledge and skills, and communication. Failure to meet any requirement may result in restrictions or termination of a practicum placement or other program experience. In most cases termination of the clinical placement constitutes a failure, which will result in the student receiving a grade of F in the course, and may result in dismissal from the program.

Accreditation

The MSc(SLP) Program is accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Canadian University Programs in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology and was awarded a full 7-year term of accreditation in April 2022.

Regulation of Practice

To practice in Canada, speech-language pathologists must be registered with the appropriate provincial or territorial regulatory organization, if such an organization exists, or with an equivalent regulatory body determined by that province or territory. Each regulatory body has a separate and distinct registration process; however, in all circumstances, an approved degree in speech-language pathology is required. Graduates from the MSc(SLP) Program will be eligible for registration with the College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario (CASLPO). Students may choose to seek registration in other provinces or territories. While standards for registration in Ontario are generally similar to those in other provinces or territories, there may be some differences. Students planning to practice outside of Ontario must notify the Director of Clinical Education in their first semester of study of any requirements that differ from those in Ontario.

To : Graduate Council

From : Christina Bryce
Assistant Graduate Secretary

At its meeting on January 26th and via e-ballot on January 27th the Faculty of Social Sciences Graduate Curriculum and Policy Committee approved the following recommendations.

Please note that these recommendations were approved by the Faculty of Social Science.

For Approval of Graduate Council:

- i. **Public Policy**
 - i. **Change to Mode of Delivery**

- ii. **Social Work**
 - i. **Addition of Scheduled Break**

- iii. **Religious Studies**
 - i. **Change to Program Requirements**
 - ii. **Change to Comprehensive Exam Procedure**

For Information of Graduate Council:

- i. **Public Policy**
 - iii. **Course Name Changes**
 - 1. 701 Public Policy Foundations I: Legislative, Regulatory and Judicial Dynamics
 - 2. 702 Public Policy Foundations II: Market Fundamentals
 - 3. 703 Public Policy Foundations III: Digital Governance
 - iv. **New Courses**
 - 1. 711 Law and Public Policy
 - 2. 759 Special Topics



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

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 (cbryce@mcmaster.ca).</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		Social Sciences	
NAME OF PROGRAM and PLAN		Master of Public Policy (MPP) in Digital Society ("PUBPOL" + "DIGISOC")	
DEGREE	MPP		
NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION (PLEASE CHECK APPROPRIATE BOX)			
Is this change a result of an IQAP review? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
CREATION OF NEW MILESTONE <input type="checkbox"/>			
CHANGE IN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS		CHANGE IN COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION PROCEDURE	CHANGE IN COURSE REQUIREMENTS
CHANGE IN THE DESCRIPTION OF A SECTION IN THE GRADUATE CALENDAR		EXPLAIN:	
OTHER CHANGES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EXPLAIN: The MPP in Digital Society is seeking approval for a modification in the delivery mode of the program, confirming that the program will be delivered primarily online now and in the future.	

DESCRIBE THE EXISTING REQUIREMENT/PROCEDURE:

The program was initiated in the pandemic (2021-2022) was the inaugural cohort) and thus the initial delivery model was online by default. This delivery model continued for the second cohort (2022-2023) and now we are seeking to formally establish this as the delivery mode on a go-forward basis.

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

The recommended change affirms the delivery mode that was adopted during the pandemic due to the mostly remote nature of learning in 2020 and 2021. Given that the standard Ontario lease is for a period of 12 months, and that the MPP program takes place over a period of 12 months, the MPP program did not compel students to campus mid-way through YR 1 or YR 2 of the program as campus re-opened. At the time of recruitment, it was unclear what the severity of the pandemic would be, so we continued to advertise an online-first model.

RATIONALE FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE (How does the requirement fit into the department's program and/or tie to existing Program Learning Outcomes from the program's IQAP cyclical review?):

The change is complementary to the MPP's policy focus on a digital context, and mirrors the flexible delivery mode of many workplaces post-pandemic which provides the opportunity to develop skills and competencies for communicating effectively in a distributed environment.

This change also enshrines accessibility into the program through the online delivery model. We have found that the online delivery mode is an accessible option for many students who seek to continue their learning into graduate studies. In-person learning can be barrier to entry to graduate scholarship as it introduces additional expenses in the form of rent and living costs. The MPP has been successful in recruiting from historically marginalized communities and have had two classes that are quite diverse as a result.

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

2023-2024 academic year (with a spring/summer term start, as the MPP is an off-cycle program).

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

Additional benefits of the digital delivery model relate to the practitioner voices that we are able to access and infuse into the classroom. It is not likely that we would be able to engage these voices otherwise given McMaster's geography.

**PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE TO BE INCLUDED IN THE CALENDAR
(please include a tracked changes version of the calendar section affected if applicable):**

No text is required to be changed in the Graduate Calendar.

CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THE RECOMMENDED CHANGE:

Name: Vass Bednar Email: vass.bednar@mcmaster.ca Extension: 647.801.5856 Date submitted:
December, 2022

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 Program Requirements/Procedures

Please note the following:

- This form must be completed for all changes involving degree program requirements and procedures. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
- An electronic version of this form should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies (cbryce@mcmaster.ca). Questions about the form can also be directed to this address.
- 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: School of Social Work

Name of Program and Plan: Critical Leadership , Academic Plan: CRTLEADMSW

Degree: MSW

Nature of Recommendation (Please complete appropriate field(s))

Is this change the result of an IQAP Review: Yes No

Creation of New Milestone

Change in Admission Requirements

Change in Comprehensive Examination Procedure

Change in Course Requirements

Change in the Description of a Section of the Graduate Calendar

Please explain:

Other Changes

Please explain: Change to part-time pacing; sequencing of courses. Part-time students need to take Socwork 742 in Year 3.

Describe the existing requirement/procedure: Part-time students may take Socwork 742 in Yrs. 1 or 2 so able to take three half courses per year.

Provided a detailed description of the recommended change: Part-time students must take Socwork 742 in Yr. 3.

Rationale for the recommended change (How does the requirement fit into the department's program and/or tie to existing Program Learning Outcomes from the program's IQAP cyclical review?):
Socwork 742 must be taken in Yr. 3 as discussion and assignments centred around placement course, Socwork 751 (half course) which runs over all three terms.

Provide Implementation Date: (Implementation date should be at the beginning of the academic year)

May 1, 2023

Are there any other details of the recommended change that the curriculum and policy committee should be aware of? If yes, please explain:

Part-time students will receive "part-time pacing in the MSW Critical Leadership program" document before registration opens each year.

Provide a description of the recommended change to be included in the calendar (please include a tracked-changes version of the calendar section affected): **Critical Leadership in Social Services and Communities**

This stream in the M.S.W. program is grounded in a recognition of the contemporary conditions of social service and community work, and in expansive and critical definitions of leadership. The degree aims to foster progressive leadership in the community and social service sectors.

Students will engage foundational conceptual frameworks underpinning critical practice and policy in social work. They will build on existing knowledge and work experience to identify and analyze how contemporary social, political and economic forces are (re)shaping social services and communities, and particularly how these forces shape leadership and leadership practices, including practices of research and evaluation.

This M.S.W. degree prepares students for formal and informal leadership roles in social and community services. Students will consider a range of theories of critical leadership and of social and organizational change, and demonstrate a capacity to apply coursework knowledge and concepts in practice by undertaking a leadership practicum in a social or community service setting.

Candidates may be enrolled on a full-time or part-time basis. Full-time students will complete the degree in twelve consecutive months of study, beginning in September. Part-time students will normally complete the degree in three years. [A scheduled break will occur in the Spring/Summer term in either Year 1 or 2.](#)

Contact Information for the recommended change:

Name: Ameil Joseph

Email: ameilj@mcmaster.ca

Date Submitted: November 21, 2022

Recommendation for Change in Program Requirements/Procedures

Please note the following:

- This form must be completed for all changes involving degree program requirements and procedures. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
- An electronic version of this form should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies (cbryce@mcmaster.ca). Questions about the form can also be directed to this address.
- 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: Religious Studies

Name of Program and Plan: Religious Studies

Degree: Ph.D and MA

Nature of Recommendation (Please complete appropriate field(s))

Is this change the result of an IQAP Review: Yes No

Creation of New Milestone

Change in Admission Requirements

Change in Comprehensive Examination Procedure

Change in Course Requirements

Change in the Description of a Section of the Graduate Calendar

Please explain:

Under “Admission” for the M.A. delete:

All incoming students should have completed the equivalent of six units (one full year course) of undergraduate work in Asian religions. Students who do not meet this requirement will be expected to fulfill their breadth requirement by taking six units of undergraduate courses, or by writing two Breadth Requirement examinations, or by taking a three unit undergraduate course and writing one Breadth Requirement examination.

All incoming students should have completed the equivalent of six units (one full year course) of undergraduate work in Western religions. Students who do not meet this requirement will be expected to fulfill their breadth requirement by taking six units of undergraduate courses, or by writing two Breadth Requirement examinations, or by taking a three unit undergraduate course and writing one Breadth Requirement examination.

Under Ph.D “Minimum Requirements” delete:

1. Completion of the breadth requirement: Students who have not completed the equivalent of six units (one full year course) of undergraduate work in Asian religions may fulfill their breadth requirement by taking six units of undergraduate courses, or by writing two Breadth Requirement examinations, or by taking a three unit undergraduate course and writing one Breadth Requirement examination early in their Ph.D. program. Students who have not completed the equivalent of six units (one full year course) of undergraduate work in Western religions may fulfill their breadth requirement by taking six units of undergraduate courses, or by writing two Breadth Requirement examinations, or by taking a three unit undergraduate course and writing one Breadth Requirement examination early in their Ph.D. program.

Other Changes

Please explain:

Describe the existing requirement/procedure:

Please see the existing requirement as described above in the relevant sections of the Graduate Calendar.

Provided a detailed description of the recommended change:

The M.A. and Ph.D programs will not require the completion of the Asian/Western breadth requirement.

Rationale for the recommended change (How does the requirement fit into the department’s program and/or tie to existing Program Learning Outcomes from the program’s IQAP cyclical review?): The breadth requirement may hinder students’ progress through their graduate degree programs; does not necessarily achieve its stated goal of breadth training; and may not be the most relevant “breadth” training needed by

students who will search for jobs both within and outside of academia (i.e., coursework addressing gender and EDI-related issues may be of greater relevance for today's job market).

Provide Implementation Date: (Implementation date should be at the beginning of the academic year)

September 2023

Are there any other details of the recommended change that the curriculum and policy committee should be aware of? If yes, please explain:

Students are strongly encouraged to take seminars outside of their area of specialty to achieve greater breadth.

Provide a description of the recommended change to be included in the calendar (please include a tracked-changes version of the calendar section affected):

Deletion of sections referred to above.

Contact Information for the recommended change:

Name: Professor Celia Rothenberg

Email: rothenb@mcmaster.ca

Date Submitted: November 24, 2022

Recommendation for Change in Program Requirements/Procedures

Please note the following:

- This form must be completed for all changes involving degree program requirements and procedures. Sections of this form pertaining to your requested change must be completed.
- An electronic version of this form should be emailed to the Assistant Secretary, School of Graduate Studies (cbryce@mcmaster.ca). Questions about the form can also be directed to this address.
- 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: Religious Studies

Name of Program and Plan: Religious Studies

Degree: PhD

Nature of Recommendation (Please complete appropriate field(s))

Is this change the result of an IQAP Review: Yes No

Creation of New Milestone

Change in Admission Requirements

Change in Comprehensive Examination Procedure

Change in Course Requirements

Change in the Description of a Section of the Graduate Calendar

Please explain:

Other Changes

Change in comprehensive exam format.

Describe the existing requirement/procedure:

Ph.D students choose major and minor specialty areas. Each of the Department's areas of study requires comprehensive exams, although the format differs depending on whether the area is designated as the student's major or minor area. Currently, while there is variation among the fields as to the sources to be examined (areas may have established bibliographies and/or bibliographies tailored to each student), all areas require their exams to be written in a test format: major area examinations usually have two parts and each part is written by the student during a five hour exam window (each part on a different day); minor area examinations typically have two parts written by the student during a four-hour exam window (each part on a different day).

Provided a detailed description of the recommended change:

The Islamic Studies area, the Department's newest area of specialization, proposes that students who choose the area as their major area will complete (1) a general knowledge exam and (2) specialist exam. The general knowledge exam will be based upon a list of key readings addressing five standard topics in Islamic Studies and two additional topics agreed upon by the supervisor and student based on the student's broad area of research interests. The supervisor will create a question, approved by the student's committee, based on this list of readings and allow the student six weeks to answer in essay format. The maximum length of the essay is 25 pages. As close as possible to two weeks after the student submits the essay, the supervisor will schedule an oral exam (approximately one to two hours) with the student and committee members. The student's generalist comprehensive exam mark will be based on a combination of the written essay and oral exam.

The student's specialist exam will be based upon a list of readings on a topic of relevance to the student's area of research agreed upon by the student, supervisor, and committee. The student will write a paper of no more than 25 pages within six weeks of the approval of the reading list and topic. As close as possible to two weeks after the student submits the paper, the supervisor will schedule an oral exam (approximately one hour) with the student and committee members. The student's specialist comprehensive exam mark will be based on a combination of the written essay and oral exam.

Students who designate Islamic Studies as a minor area will read the sources for topics one through five on the generalist exam. Similar to the major exam, the supervisor will author a question (approved by the committee) and the student will have six weeks to write an essay response no longer than 20 pages. An oral exam (maximum one hour) will be scheduled within approximately two weeks of receiving the essay. The student's minor area comprehensive exam mark will be based on a combination of the written essay and oral exam.

Rationale for the recommended change (How does the requirement fit into the department's program and/or tie to existing Program Learning Outcomes from the program's IQAP cyclical review?):

The comprehensive exam procedure outlined here ties directly into the program's PhD Program Learning Outcomes 1, 3, and 4:

PhD1. Graduates of the PhD Program will have a thorough knowledge of a scholarly field within Religious Studies and will demonstrate a comprehensive, in-depth engagement with that field.

PhD3. They are in a position to independently initiate further research projects in their field.

PhD4. They are able to present themselves and their expertise effectively to position themselves as leaders in the academic world and in the larger community.

Provide Implementation Date: (Implementation date should be at the beginning of the academic year)

September 2023

Are there any other details of the recommended change that the curriculum and policy committee should be aware of? If yes, please explain:

Provide a description of the recommended change to be included in the calendar (please include a tracked-changes version of the calendar section affected):

There is no recommended change for the SGS calendar, which currently states:

Comprehensive examinations in the major and minor areas of study, which are chosen according to the regulation given above.

Contact Information for the recommended change:

Name: Professor Celia Rothenberg

Email: rothenb@mcmaster.ca

Date Submitted:

Sessional Dates ~~2022~~2023-2023~~2024~~

DEADLINE DATES FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS	FALL TERM	WINTER TERM	SUMMER TERM
	September - December 2022 <u>2023</u> September - October, 2022 <u>2023</u> (1HF) November - December 2022 <u>2023</u> (2HF)	January - April, 2023 <u>2024</u> January - February, 2023 <u>2024</u> (1HF) March - April, 2023 <u>2024</u> (2HF)	May - August, 2023 <u>2024</u> May - June 2023 <u>2024</u> (1HF) July-August 2023 <u>2024</u> (2HF)
On-Time Registration	Tuesday, July 5 <u>4</u> to Tuesday, August 2 <u>1</u>	Thursday, November 24 <u>23</u> to Thursday, December 8 <u>7</u>	Thursday, March 30 <u>28</u> to Thursday, April 13 <u>11</u>
Class Start Dates *	Classes begin on or after September 1, 2022 <u>2023</u> - check with program for details	Classes begin on or after January 3 <u>2</u> , 2023 <u>2024</u> - check with program for details	Class start dates vary - check with program for details
Late Registration (late fees apply)	August 3 <u>2</u> to September 7 <u>6</u>	December 9 <u>8</u> to January 3 <u>2</u>	April 14 <u>12</u> to April 28 <u>27</u>
Final Dates to Add Courses:			
Multi-term Courses	September 23 <u>22</u>		
Single-term or 1HF Courses	September 23 <u>22</u>	January 20 <u>19</u>	May 10 <u>2</u>
2HF Course	October 21 <u>20</u>	February 23 <u>4</u>	June 21 <u>13</u>
Final Dates to Drop Courses: **			
Multi-term Courses	February 24 <u>23</u>	July 28 <u>26</u>	
Single-term Courses	November 11 <u>10</u>	March 17 <u>15</u>	July 14 <u>12</u>
1HF Courses	October 7 <u>6</u>	February 10 <u>9</u>	June 9 <u>7</u>
2HF Courses	December 9 <u>8</u>	April 6 <u>5</u>	August 4 <u>2</u>
Final Dates to Submit Grades:			
Multi-term Courses		May 1	September 1
Single-term Courses	January 5	May 1	September 1
1HF Courses	October 21 <u>20</u>	February 24 <u>23</u>	September 1
2HF Courses	January 5	May 1	September 1

Final Date to Submit Results of Incomplete (INC) Grades for Previous Term with Permission of Associate Dean	March 31	July 75	November 31
Deadline for Term Work to Be Submitted	December 2322	April 2826	August 3130

Thesis

	FALL 20222023 <u>Convocation</u>	SPRING 20232024 <u>Convocation</u>	FALL 20232024 <u>Convocation</u>
Final Date to Initiate Thesis Defence in Mosaic***	June 2423	January 2019 (Health Sci.) February 12 (All others)	June 2321
Final Date to Submit Master's Theses to Departments (Prior to Defense)	August 54	March 31	August 42
Final Date to File Theses with Graduate Studies and Complete Degree Requirements****			
- Faculty of Health Sciences	September 2729	March 31 April 5	September 2627
- All Other Faculties	September 2729	April 2826	September 2627

The University welcomes and includes students, staff, and faculty from a wide range of cultural, traditional, and spiritual beliefs. As per the Policy on Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous and Spiritual Observances, the University will arrange reasonable accommodation of the needs of students who observe religious holy days other than those already accommodated by ordinary scheduling and statutory holidays. For more information, please refer to <https://www.mcmaster.ca/policy/Students-AcademicStudies/AcademicAccommodation-Observances.pdf>

Graduate students may only enroll in undergraduate courses with the approval of their supervisor or graduate program. Students are responsible for meeting the deadlines and requirements of the undergraduate course as presented in class and in the undergraduate calendar. Graduate students will be graded under the graduate grading scale.

Programs may establish earlier deadlines to add/drop courses but these dates must clearly be communicated to students. Students taking courses outside of their home program of study, must follow the rules of the program in which the course is offered. Please note that the last date to cancel a course or registration with no academic penalty is not the same as the last date to be eligible for a refund.

*The precise dates of commencement of courses are determined by the program; students are urged to contact their program for details. SGS maintains the 13-week graduate instruction period; however, if a course does not fall into the traditional 13-week period, the graduate program will inform students of important dates and deadlines in the course syllabus. There is no official fall break or reading week for graduate students (except MBA). Students should check with their program and their course

instructor(s) as to whether classes will be held during these periods. Please see sections 1.3 (Responsibilities of Graduate Students to the University) and 2.5.6 (Vacations) of the calendar for more information.

**All courses on a student's record after these dates will require a grade. Exceptions require submission of an In-Program Request Form. Graduate programs may establish earlier deadlines for completion of course work and may prescribe penalties for late completion of work and for failure to complete work, provided that these penalties are announced at the time the instructor makes known to the class the methods by which student performance shall be evaluated.

***Please note the following black-out periods in which standard Ph.D. defences cannot be scheduled: December 14th to January 8th inclusive and August ~~16th-19th~~ to ~~20th-23rd~~ inclusive. Please refer to the SGS website for information about the timeline for scheduling your defence with these dates in mind.

****A final thesis is the corrected, approved version of the thesis which is uploaded to MacSphere following the Final Oral Examination. Note there is no grace period at the end of December or April for final thesis submission and completion of degree requirements.

Convocation Dates

Please consult the link below for convocation dates:

<https://registrar.mcmaster.ca/dates-and-deadlines/#tab-3>

February 2023 Graduate Council

New Awards for Approval

Name of Fund: The Gaia Power's Dr. Ajay & Mamta Sharma Scholarship at McMaster

Terms of Reference for Fund:

Established in 2022 by Gaia Power Inc. founder Samit Sharma in honour & appreciation of its past board director Dr. Ajay Sharma & his wife. An outstanding leader, Dr. Sharma graduated from IIT-Roorkee in India, culminating with PhD (1969) in Electrical Engineering from University College London, retired with distinguished career as Rear Admiral from the Indian Navy, & pioneered establishing engineering colleges in North India. To be awarded by the School of Graduate Studies, at the recommendation of the Program Chair, to students on alternating years, who demonstrate outstanding academic achievement and research excellence. On odd years, to a graduate student enrolled in Electrical & Computer Engineering, and on even years, to a student enrolled in the MBA program who demonstrates an interest in intellectual property & knowledge management. Preference will be given to International Students.

Name of Fund: The John Whelen Family MBA Scholarship

Terms of Reference for Fund:

Established in 2022 by John Whelen, MBA (Class of '88) and his wife, Stormie Stewart, in celebration of the 60th Anniversary of the MBA program at the DeGroot School of Business. To be awarded to an incoming full time or co-op MBA student who demonstrates both outstanding academic achievement and significant extra-curricular and/or professional achievements.