## OPEN SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>1. Conflict of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35</td>
<td><strong>Consent Agenda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Motion:</strong> To approve or receive for information by consent items 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Minutes of the 20 April 2015 Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reports from Committees and Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Graduate &amp; Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Undergraduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Report of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Recognition and Commendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Reports from the Faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Business Arising from the Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:40</td>
<td>7. Presentation on the Centre for Applied Cryptographic Research –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Jao, director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55</td>
<td>8. Reports from Committees and Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Membership and Composition Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Executive Committee – Bylaw Second Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Finance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Graduate &amp; Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Long Range Planning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Undergraduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05</td>
<td>b. Graduate &amp; Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>c. Undergraduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>9. Report of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Advisory Committee on Sustainability: Progress and Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25</td>
<td>10. Q&amp;A Period with the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Roster of Graduands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>12. Report of the Vice-President, University Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:55</td>
<td>13. Other Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Agenda Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>14. Conflict of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05</td>
<td>15. Minutes of the 20 April 2015 Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10</td>
<td>16. Business Arising from the Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>17. Other Business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12 May 2015

Logan Atkinson
University Secretary & General Counsel
Secretary to Senate
University of Waterloo
SENATE
Minutes of the Monday 20 April 2015 Meeting


Guests: Nello Angerilli, Mario Coniglio, Donna Ellis, Rocco Fondacaro, Stephane Hamade, Lyndon Jones, Rachel Mitchell, Catherine Newell Kelly, Ellen Rethore, Erin Sargeant Greenwood, Daniela Seskar-Hencic, Allan Starr, Brandon Sweet, Dave Wallace, Rebecca Wickens

Secretariat & Office of General Counsel: Logan Atkinson, Karen Jack


*regrets

Organization of Meeting: Feridun Hamdullahpur, chair of Senate, took the chair, and Logan Atkinson, secretary of Senate, acted as secretary. Atkinson advised that due notice of the meeting had been given, a quorum was present, and the meeting was properly constituted.

OPEN SESSION

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST
Senators were asked to declare any conflicts they may have in relation to the items on the agenda. No conflicts were declared.

1A. AGENDA
By consensus, the agenda was amended to delete items 6.a, 8.a (to the extent of the second reading of a proposed bylaw amendment) and 11. Atkinson advised that Executive Committee would try to bring items 6.a and the proposed bylaw amendment referred to in 8.a to the May meeting of Senate.

Consent Agenda
Senate heard a motion to approve or receive for information by consent items 2-5 below.

Porreca asked about the report on the Master of Public Service, wondering how a program can have enrolments below target while space is indicated as a challenge to growth. Frank advised that space limitations are preventing the program from growing in accordance with its projections.

The two year progress report on the BSc in Pharmacy program refers to a school constitution that has not been approved by Senate. Atkinson advised that the Director of the School will bring the constitution forward for Senate approval in due course.
2. **MINUTES OF THE 23 MARCH 2015 MEETING**
Senate approved the minutes of the meeting as distributed.

3. **REPORTS FROM COUNCILS**
**Graduate & Research.** Senate received the report for information.

**Undergraduate**
- **Adding and Dropping Courses, Faculty of Science.** Senate approved amendments to the Faculty regulations on adding and dropping courses as presented in the report.

The remaining items in the report were received for information.

4. **REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**
**Recognition and Commendation.** Senate received the report for information.

5. **REPORT FROM THE FACULTIES**
Senate received the reports for information.

Freeman and Richter. Carried.

**Regular Agenda**

6. **BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**
**Report from the Executive Committee.** The item was removed from the agenda.

7. **CENTRE FOR CONTACT LENS RESEARCH**
Hamdullahpur introduced Lyndon Jones, professor at the School of Optometry and Vision Science and director of the Centre for Contact Lens Research. Jones presented a report on the work of the Centre, some of the conditions generating prominent clinical research in the Centre, and some of the research at the Centre related to biological sciences. In response to a question, Jones advised that about 60% of the work done at the Centre relates to clinical trials, although much of this work does generate work suitable as a basis for publication. Jones also offered comment on the multi-disciplinary collaborations at work in the Centre.


8. **REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES AND COUNCILS**
**Executive Committee**
- **Elections to Senate Committees and Councils and to the Board of Governors.** Senate heard a motion to acclaim the membership of Senate committees and councils and the Board of Governors as follows:
  - **Executive Committee.** 2015-16 – Richard Staines (applied health sciences), James Skidmore (arts), Karim S. Karim (engineering), Mark Seasons (environment), Tong Eui Chang (mathematics), Paul Murphy (science), Susan Schultz Huxman (AFIW), Chris Lolas (undergraduate student), Maya D’Alessio and Rachel Mitchell (graduate students).
  - **Senate Finance Committee.** 2015-16 – Craig Janes (applied health sciences), Lutz-Alexander Busch (arts), Samir Elhedhli (engineering), Olaf Weber (environment), Michele Mosca (mathematics), Bernard Duncker (science), Graham Brown (AFIW),
Alanna Benson and Tristan Potter (undergraduate students), Robert Henderson (graduate student).

- **Senate Long Range Planning Committee.** 2015-16 – Diana Parry (applied health sciences), Tara Collington (arts), Mario Ioannidis (engineering), Johanna Wandel (environment), Paul Marriott (mathematics), David Rose (science), Wendy Fletcher (AFIW), Pallavi Hukerikar and Alexander Wray (undergraduate students), Samantha Shortall (graduate student), Barbara Veale (alumni).

- **Senate Nominating Committee for Honorary Degrees.** 2015-16 – John Garcia (applied health sciences), Greta Kroeker (arts), Gordon Stubley (engineering), Michael Drescher (environment), Bruce Richter (mathematics), Mike Hudson (science), Katherine Bergman (AFIW), Mohammad Nasif and Chanakya Ramdev (undergraduate students), Anna Brousseau (graduate student).

- **Senate Graduate & Research Council.** 2015-17 – Lowell Ewert (AFIW), Anna Brousseau (arts), Sepehr Mohaddes (engineering), Samantha Shortall (science).

- **Senate Undergraduate Council.** 2015-17 – Linda Jessup (applied health sciences), Kathy Acheson (arts), Judy Jewinski (affiliated institutions).

- **University Committee on Student Appeals.** 2015-17 – John Mielke (applied health sciences), Goretty Dias (environment), David Wagner (mathematics), Christine Dupont (science), James Koo (undergraduate student, applied health sciences), Hannah Beckett (graduate student, arts), Nathalie Moon (graduate student, mathematics).

- **Board of Governors.** 2015-17 – Tara Collington, David DeVidi, Fraser Easton, Karim S. Karim (faculty), Triston Potter (undergraduate student), Robert Henderson (graduate student); 2015-16 – Sally Gunz (faculty), Maya D’Alessio (graduate student).

Hamdullahpour and Skidmore. Carried.

- **Senate Bylaw 4.** The item was removed from the agenda.

**Graduate & Research Council**

- **PhD Comprehensive Examinations and Seminar, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering.** Senate heard a motion to approve amendments to the department regulations on comprehensive examinations and seminar milestones as presented in the report.

Frank and Sullivan. Carried.

- **Graduate Diploma in Planning, School of Planning, Faculty of Environment.** Senate heard a motion to approve the new type 3 graduate diploma as presented in the report.

Frank advised that a “type 3 graduate diploma” means that the diploma can be done as a standalone program, that is, not in conjunction with a degree program.

A question was asked about the capacities for the School of Planning to launch the courses intended to be offered, when no new teaching resources are intended to be added. Andrey advised that many of the courses have been developed online over the last several years, such that
the new diploma will take advantage of that existing online suite of offerings. Projections of the numbers of students were derived through contacts with professional affiliations and accreditation programs. The diploma will assist international students in gaining the proper credentials to practice in Canada, and the School will be very clear about the representations to be made in this regard. Quality assurance will be observed through diligent observation of assessment tools as online courses are delivered. Tuition will follow the same standard as other regular part-time programs, and it is not accurate that the university recovers a greater return than with live courses. Senators discussed residency requirements for online programs, and Andrey advised that there is no residency requirement for this proposed new diploma. The program does require provincial government approval and will be submitted shortly.

Frank and Andrey. Carried.

9. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Senators’ Last Meeting. Hamdullahpur thanked those senators completing terms for their role in university governance: faculty – Kieran Bonner, Bernard Duncker (reelected), Bruce Frayne, George Freeman, Peter Frick, Paul Guild, Theresa Libby, Brian McNamara, Markus Moos, Bill Power, David Porreca, Bruce Richter (reelected), Manoj Sachdev, Mary Wells, Frank Zorzitto; undergraduate students – Danielle Burt, Allyson Francis (reelected), Nickta Jowhari, Christos Lolas (incoming president, Federation of Students), Tristan Potter (reelected); graduate students – Coleen Even, Boyd Panton, Maryam Shahtaheri; alumni – Carol Cressman.

The president presented a wide ranging report, speaking to: the pending federal budget, the prospect that the tri-council budgets will be unaffected and CFI funding will be enhanced; the commitment of the federal government to the telescope project in Hawaii; having attended meeting of Canadian Council of Chief Executives, part of roundtable going forward to discuss the perceived talent gap in Canada; new board leadership about to take office with William Watson coming in as chair and Catherine Booth as vice-chair; his thoughts on discussions around the provincial government funding formula and the impact of differentiation on how this will change in the future; Sue Herbert being appointed to MTCU to conduct further consultations before proposals on change are made; compensation questions at Western University, and these questions do touch on every institution in the province, the situation at Western being unique according to both AUCC and COU; an alumni event in Toronto drew capacity crowd, with 400 attendees and showcasing several student startup enterprises.

Policy 11 – University Risk Management.

Rebecca Wickens presented a report based on the proposed University Risk Management Policy 11, summarizing the history of the proposed policy and guideline, the consultation path, the aims of the policy, the tools designed to be available through the policy and guideline, the roles and responsibilities associated with implementation of the policy, differences in reporting to the Audit & Risk Committee once the policy is in place, the strength of the proposed policy as a tool to assist in decision-making, and the plan to regularly refresh the top institutional risks.

In response to a question about the relationship between academic programming as a risk and academic freedom as a value, Wickens advised that any attempt to limit academic freedom would constitute a greater risk (to reputation and internal relations) than anything that might be identified through the risk assessment process. Further, the values embedded in our policies and agreements necessarily override any specific risk management decisions.

10. Q&A PERIOD WITH THE PRESIDENT

A senator asked whether it would be possible to see the agreements by which the Confucius Institute was established. Angerilli advised that we have consent from the other parties to share the agreements and will do so forthwith. Campus consultation has been completed and a summary will be prepared. Recommendations will be made to the president by next week.

On the compensation issue, those entitled to administrative leave following executive level service do cash out their administrative leave entitlements when they change jobs, and Hamdullahpur expects the COU to make some recommendations in this respect.

On the prospects for employment among university graduates, it is true that this group does succeed at a greater rate than other groups, and that it succeeds with higher rates of pay through our co-op programs. Hamdullahpur commented on partnership opportunities in research with private industry, and the employability of University of Waterloo graduates as compared to those from other institutions.

11. REPORT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC & PROVOST

This item was removed from the agenda.

12. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

Senate convened in confidential session.

21 April 2015

Logan Atkinson
University Secretary & General Counsel
Secretary to Senate
Senate Graduate & Research Council met on 13 April 2015, and agreed to forward the following items to Senate for information. These items are recommended for inclusion in the consent agenda.

Further details are available at: https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/committees-and-councils/senate-graduate-research-council

FOR INFORMATION

RENEWAL OF CENTRES AND INSTITUTES
Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies (WIHS)
Under the current direction of Riemer Faber, the institute is the first and only research centre in North America dedicated to the interdisciplinary study of the Hellenistic era. The WIHS harnesses a wealth of research and teaching expertise from the Department of Classical Studies, where faculty members approach the period from their individual disciplines of history, languages, sociology, literature, art, and archaeology. WIHS acts as an important networking hub through which scholars from all over the world come together to explore and share ideas about the Hellenistic Age. At present, the WIHS complement comprises of close to 100 research associates and ten graduate students.

WIHS was founded in 2010 by six members in the Department of Classical Studies with the support of six international collaborators who are leaders in the field. Since its inception, the WIHS has made tremendous strides and progress including overall growth in membership, participation in seminars and conferences, publications and peer reviews of publications, international recognition of the institute’s initiatives and contributions, generation of funding for the WIHS activities, invitation to visiting scholars and recruitment of post-doctoral fellows, and enhanced utilization of the WIHS’s digital resources.

In recognition of the solid track record and growing reputation of the centre, on behalf of Senate council approved its renewal for a five-year term ending April 2020.

PROGRAM REVIEWS
Nuclear Engineering
On behalf of Senate, council reviewed the Master of Nuclear Engineering plan offered by the University Network of Excellence in Nuclear Engineering in accordance with the university’s Institutional Quality Assurance Framework. Based on the material presented in the Final Assessment Report (Attachment 1), and the report of the reading subcommittee formed by council to review in depth the self-study and program materials, as well as to request additional information and provide recommendations, the program was found to be of good quality.

AMENDMENT TO GRADUATE REGULATIONS
On behalf of Senate, council reviewed and approved minor changes to graduate regulations pertaining to allowing professional references for admission to master’s and doctoral plans where the requirement for those references is permitted or required by the program.

CURRICULAR MODIFICATIONS
On behalf of Senate, council reviewed and approved new courses, course changes and course inactivations for the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences (social work) and the Faculty of Arts (anthropology; psychology; School of Accounting & Finance; sociology).

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS
On behalf of Senate, council approved the creation of the Gage-Babcock Graduate Fire Safety Award.

Jim Frank
Associate Provost, Graduate Studies

George Dixon
Vice President, University Research
Final Assessment Report
Master’s of Nuclear Engineering (UNENE)
February 2015

Date of Review: November 12 – 13, 2013

In accordance with McMaster’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP), this final assessment report provides a synthesis of the external evaluation and the internal response and assessments of the University Network of Excellence in Nuclear Engineering (UNENE) Master’s of Nuclear Engineering program. This report identifies the significant strengths of the program, together with opportunities for program improvement and enhancement, and it sets out and prioritizes the recommendations that have been selected for implementation.

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

Executive Summary of the UNENE Master’s of Nuclear Engineering Cyclical Program Review

The UNENE Master’s of Nuclear Engineering is a cooperative program among five degree-granting institutions, namely McMaster University, Queen’s University, University of Ontario Institute of Technology, University of Waterloo and University of Western Ontario (now Western University). In accordance with the IQAP, the Master’s of Nuclear Engineering program submitted a self-study to the School of Graduate Studies on November 4, 2013. The self-study presented the program descriptions and learning outcomes, an analytical assessment of the program, including data collected from students along with the standard data package prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Appended were the course outlines for all courses in the program and the CVs for each full-time faculty member in the Program.

Two arm’s-length reviewers from Texas and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and one internal reviewer participated in a two-day site visit organized by the School of Graduate Studies. The visit consisted of meetings with the Provost and Vice-President (Academic), Associate Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies, UNENE President, UNENE Director, UNENE Administrator, UNENE Secretary/Treasurer, Dean of Engineering and Associate Dean (Engineering) in addition to separate meetings with students and faculty members. The Review Team highlighted their findings in a report submitted on December 2, 2013. The Review Team found that program goals align quite closely with the academic plan and mission of McMaster University, and all the universities that are part of the UNENE Master’s
of Nuclear Engineering. They reported that the program was well run and has been developed to meet the needs of industry. They were impressed by the quality of instructors who come from the five participating universities and are well recognized leaders in their respective fields. The students who participated in a conference call with the Review Team expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the program and felt that it considerably expanded their knowledge base and is valuable in their professional development and career progression. The following program strengths and weakness were also noted:

- **Strengths**
  - Instructors are leader in their fields and several hold UNENE/NSERC Industrial Research Chairs or are recipients of collaborative research grants
  - Courses are delivered over two days on alternate weekends in Whitby, Ontario to make it possible for full-time employees to attend
  - Lectures available to other more remote sites by distance delivery technology
  - UNENE has the capability to accommodate fluctuations in enrollments to sustain program
  - Courses are regularly updated with current events
  - High level of student satisfaction with program

- **Weaknesses**
  - ADMI courses could be enhanced to strengthen the participant’s background in the organizational and human performance aspects relevant to the safe operation of the power reactors
  - New course could be added on the regulations, protection of the environment, security and safeguards
  - Expanding certain courses to cover types of reactors other than CANDU which could serve the initiative for UNENE to expand in the international arena
  - Clarifying learning outcomes that relate to the development of communication skills

The reviewers did not raise any serious concerns about the operation of the program, but did put forward several recommendations for improvements. The response from the UNENE Director indicates that some of these suggestions such as adding a new course on uses of energy in society and the associated environment and security safeguards may be relatively straightforward, while others will require negotiation with other parties (see below). This Final Assessment Report was prepared by the Quality Assurance Committee. The 18 month report will show progress against items addressed in this review. The program has been approved to continue and is scheduled for its next full review in eight years.

**Summary of the Reviewers’ Recommendations with the Program Director and Dean’s Responses & Follow Up Process**

**Recommendation #1:** Some of the ADMI courses could be realigned and new courses could be added to strengthen the participant’s background in the organizational and human performance aspects relevant to the safe operation of the power reactors.
Response: The program responded by stating that they do not have control over ADMI courses. ADMI courses are designed for a broad engineering audience. The UNENE Programme Director has, however, written to ADMI to see if ADMI has any interest in covering human factors.

Responsibility for following up: Programme Director
Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #2: A new course could be added on the regulations, protection of the environment, security and safeguards.
Response: The Programme Director will design and propose such a course. UNENE has also started to discuss with COG, OPG, CNSC and UOIT to make sure the new course does not duplicate existing academic or industry material.

Responsibility for following up: Programme Director
Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #3: Expanding certain courses to cover types of reactors other than CANDU.
Response: UNENE states that the UNENE M.Eng. already covers non-CANDU reactors in some courses, and believes it is sufficient for the M.Eng for now.

Responsibility for following up: N/A
Timeline: N/A

Recommendation #4: Expanding certain courses to include issues with nuclear engineering applicable to the whole fuel cycle.
Response: UNENE states that this is already covered somewhat in the Fuel Management course. The Programme Director will also ask Prof. P. Chan to add sustainability to the Fuel Design course.

Responsibility for following up: Programme Director
Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #5: UNENE should negotiate with COG to explore ways to facilitate access to the wealth of operational safety knowledge at COG without jeopardizing proprietary information.
Response: UNENE agrees and has made an initial request to COG.

Responsibility for following up: Programme Director
Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #6: Promote further cooperation/integration between UNENE and UOIT.
Response: UNENE agrees and the diploma is designed to be a cooperative venture with UOIT and may serve as a model for further cooperation.

Responsibility for following up: Programme Director
Timeline: Update at 18 month report
Recommendation #6: Industry-oriented engineering projects could be initiated earlier in the program and linked to the courses. The topic along with the academic and industry advisors would then be identified sooner, and students could begin working on the project at an earlier stage.
Response: UNENE responded by stating that they did not favour a more open-ended project as they felt students would be even more discouraged by the length than they are now. The program proposed that the Engineering Project could be designed to be more appealing to students and so the program will explore some other ideas.
Responsibility for following up: UNENE
Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #7: Offer the UNENE courses as a vehicle for professional development for employees in the nuclear industry in Canada
Response: UNENE has outlined that they are already doing some professional development. The diploma will further such opportunities. The program has just finished a professional development module on Project Management with a UNENE utility.
Responsibility for following up: UNENE
Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #8: The Review Team endorses the concept of the Diploma.
Response: UNENE is drafting the application this coming academic term.
Responsibility for following up: UNENE
Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #9: The UNENE Master's of Nuclear Engineering is almost ideally suited to help meet international needs.
Response: The program stated that neither COG nor UNENE has this as their mandate. UNENE does not have the resources to offer courses at its own expense. However, UNENE will continue to pursue international opportunities on a case-by-case basis consistent with the overall CANDU strategy.
Responsibility for following up: N/A
Timeline: Update at 18 month report

Recommendation #10: The distance delivery technology would benefit from improvement.
Response: The program agrees so the next step will be to set up a system similar to what is used at COG.
Responsibility for following up: Programme Director
Timeline: Update at 18 month report
Senate Undergraduate Council met on 13 May 2014, 10 March 2015, and 14 April 2015, and on behalf of Senate approved minor changes to academic plans, changes to faculty regulations, new courses, course changes, course inactivations and course reactivations. Council agreed to forward the following items to Senate for information and approval. Council recommends that these items be included in the consent agenda.

Further details are available at: uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/committees-and-councils/senate-undergraduate-council

FOR APPROVAL

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

1. Motion: Council recommends approval of the undergraduate admission requirements for 2016 as detailed in Attachment #1.

CHANGES TO ACADEMIC PROGRAMS [effective 1 September 2016]

Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
Recreation and Leisure Studies

2. Motion: To approve amendments to the Honours Recreation and Leisure Studies plan as described. (Note: strikethrough = deleted text, bold = new text)

Recreation courses (minimum of 10.0 units):

Required Recreation courses (4.0 units): REC 100, REC 101, REC 107, REC 120, REC 201, REC 205, REC 220, REC 270, REC 356, REC 371, REC 373, REC 405, and REC 420, REC 471A/REC 471B or two 400 level REC courses.

Recreation elective courses (minimum of 6.0 units):

Each student must complete additional recreation electives to meet the required minimum of 10.0 recreation units.
- Note that MU353 (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar) "Inclusive Arts for Children" is accepted as a University of Waterloo recreation elective (1.0 unit).
- All cross-listed courses with REC are counted as recreation electives and are included in the major average.

Courses outside the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies (maximum of 10.0 units):

Required courses (1.0 unit):
- PSYCH 101
- SOC 101

Restricted elective courses (2.0 units):

Select one course from four of the following eight subject categories: You must complete a total of four courses from the following twelve subject categories. To fulfill this requirement, you may only choose one course per subject category.
- An English course
  - An English writing course (one of ENGL 109, ENGL 129R, or ENGL 140R, or any ENGL 210 course) is strongly recommended.
- A Fine or Performing Arts course
  - DRAMA, FINE, MUSIC
- A Humanities course
  - CLAS, EASIA, HIST, HUMSC, JS, MEDVL, NATST, PACS, PHIL, REES, RS, SPCOM, SPD, VCULT, WS
- A Social Science course other than Psychology or Sociology
  - ANTH, ECON, LS, PACS, PSCL, SDS, SMF, SOCWK, STV, WS
- A Language course from the Faculty of Arts (other than English or ESL–EMLS)
- A Psychology course (other than PSYCH 101/101R, 121R)
- A Sociology course (other than SOC 101/101R, 120R)
- A course from the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences (other than REC)
  - AHS, GERON, HLTH, KIN
- A course from the Faculty of Environment
  - ENBUS, ENVS, ERS, GEOG, INDEV, INTEG, PLAN
- A course offered by the School of Computer Science
- A course offered by the Faculty of Mathematics
  - ACTSC, AMATH, CO, COMM, MATBUS, MATH, MTHEL, PMATH, STAT
- A course offered by the Faculty of Science
  - BIOL, CHEM, EARTH, MNS, PHYS, SCI

Note: The course subjects listed may not be comprehensive. For a complete list, or approval of a specific course subject, please see the academic advisor or the department website.

Free elective courses: 7.0 units

Total number of units to complete degree is 20.0.

Note:
1. The elective courses are used to fill the recreation elective courses and free elective courses.

Rationale: As a result of the department’s recent augmented review and the recommendations made as part of the review, the department has undertaken an extensive curriculum review process. The core requirements for all degrees have been changed to facilitate engaging and high impact student learning experiences to inspire passion, action, and leadership. The revised curriculum focuses on cohort experiences for students beginning in first year through to graduation and incorporates increased opportunities for experiential learning, case-based learning, community engagement opportunities, and greater integration of classroom, research, and work/volunteer experiences.

3. Motion: To approve amendments to the Honours Recreation and Sport Business plan as described.
   (Note: strikeout = deleted text, bold = new text)

Recreation courses (minimum of 10.0 units):

Required Recreation courses (6.0–8.0 units): REC 100, REC 101, REC 107, REC 120, REC 201, REC 205, REC 213, REC 215, REC 220, REC 270, REC 313, REC 356, REC 371, REC 373, REC 405, REC 413, and REC 420. One 400 level REC course, two of REC 215, REC 314, REC 316 or REC 415, two of REC 200, REC 202, REC 203.
Recreation elective courses (minimum of 4.0 2.0 units):

Each student must complete additional recreation electives to meet the required minimum of 10.0 recreation units.

- Note that MU353 (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar) "Inclusive Arts for Children" is accepted as a University of Waterloo recreation elective (1.0 units).
- All cross-listed courses with REC are counted as recreation electives and are included in the major average.

Courses outside the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies (maximum of 10.0 units):

Required courses (3.5 4.5 units):
- PSYCH 101
- SOC 101
- AFM 123
- AFM 131 or BUS 111W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BET 100
- BUS 121W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 352W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar) or ECON 344
- BUS 288W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar) or PSYCH 338 or MSCI
- HRM 200

Restricted elective courses (2.0 units):
Select one course from four of the following eight subject categories:
- An English course
  - An English writing course (one of ENGL 109, ENGL 129R, ENGL 140R, or any ENGL 210 course) is strongly recommended.
- A Fine or Performing Arts course
  - DRAMA, FINE, MUSIC
- A Humanities course
  - CLAS, EASIA, HIST, HUMSC, JS, NATST, PACS, PHIL, REES, RS, SPCOM, SPD, WS
- A Social Science course other than Psychology or Sociology
  - ANTH, ECON, SDS, LS, PSCI, SMF, SOCWK, STV
- A Language course from the Faculty of Arts (other than English or ESL)
- A course from the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences (other than Recreation)
  - Geron, Hlth, Kin
- A course from the Faculty of Environment
  - Envs, Ers, Geog, Indev, Integ, Plan
- A course offered by the School of Computer Science

Note: The course subjects listed may not be comprehensive. For a complete list, or approval of a specific course subject, please see the academic advisor or the department website.

Recreation and Sport Business elective courses (2.0 2.5 units):
Recreation and Sport Business electives have been categorized into five the following focus areas. 
- Finance and Administration, Marketing, Human Resources, Management and Application, and Communications. Students may opt to choose electives courses from one focus area or any combination of courses listed any of the areas, or concentrate on one area. The focus area is does not appear designated on the your transcript or degree. It is only a guideline for selecting your Sport and Business Elective courses. Some courses may have prerequisite courses that the student will need to complete.

Select 2.0 2.5 units from the following lists:
Finance and Administration
- AFM 102
- AFM 231/MTHEL 100/BUS 231W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 311W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- ECON 101
- ECON 102
- ECON 254
- PHIL 215
- REC 316
- REC 416
- SOC 241, SOC 243
- WS 207

Marketing
- BUS 362W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 412W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 432W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 452W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 462W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 472W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 482W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- REC 215, REC 415

Leadership/Group Dynamics
- PACS 202
- SPCOM 227
- SPCOM 432

Human Resources
- BUS 398W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 468W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- BUS 474W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- HRM 200
- HRM 301*
- HRM 303*
- HRM 305*
- HRM 307*
*may require declaration of minor

Management and Application
- REC 311
- REC 312

Communications
- BUS 458W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- ENGL 210F
- ENGL 295
- REC 314
- SPCOM 100/BUS 208W (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
- SPCOM 101
- SPCOM 223
• SPCOM 225
• SPCOM 226
• SPCOM 228
• SPCOM 324

Government and Policy
• PSCI 100
• PSCI 231
• PSCI 252
• PSCI 260
• PSCI 283
• PSCI 331
• PSCI 334

Occupation/Culture
• PHIL 206
• PHIL 215
• SOC 241

Entrepreneurship
• BET 300
• ECON 220
• REC 218
• REC 311
• SPCOM 433
• WS 207

Practicum
• REC 312

Note: Students may only count REC courses listed here as business electives if they are taken over and above the required recreation business courses (see #1 above).

Free elective courses: 2-5 3.0 units

Total number of units to complete degree is 20.0.

Notes:
1. The elective courses are used to fill the recreation elective courses, non-department restricted elective courses, recreation and sport business elective courses, and free elective courses.
2. Students are permitted to pursue a double major in any of Honours Recreation and Sport Business, Honours Therapeutic Recreation, and Honours Tourism Development and Parks Management, by meeting the requirements of each plan.

Rationale: See rationale for item #2.

4. Motion: To approve amendments to the Honours Therapeutic Recreation plan as described. (Note: strikeout = deleted text, bold = new text)

Recreation courses (minimum of 10.0 units):
Required courses (7-5 10.5 units): REC 100, REC 101, REC 107, REC 120, REC 151, REC 201 REC 205, REC 220, REC 251, REC 252, REC 253, REC 270, REC 351, REC 356, REC 357, REC
371. REC 373, REC 405, REC 420, REC 450A or an approved work term (see academic advisors for more information), REC 450B, and REC 455.

Recreation elective courses: (minimum of 2.5 units):
Each student must complete additional recreation electives to meet the required minimum of 10.0 recreation units. Although students are not required to complete additional recreation electives, they may take additional recreation courses as part of the free electives category below.

- Note that MU353 (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar) "Inclusive Arts for Children” is accepted as a University of Waterloo recreation elective (1.0 units).
- All cross-listed courses with REC are counted as recreation electives and are included in the major average.

Courses outside the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies:
Required courses (2.0 units):
- AHS 150
- HLTH 245
- PSYCH 101
- SOC 101

Restricted elective courses (2.0 units):
Select one course from four of the following eight subject categories:
- An English course
  - An English writing course (one of ENGL 109, ENGL 129R, ENGL 140R, or any ENGL 210 course) is strongly recommended.
- A Fine or Performing Arts course
  - DRAMA, FINE, MUSIC
- A Humanities course
  - CLAS, EASIA, HIST, HUMSC, JS, NATST, PACS, PHIL, REES, RS, SPCOM, SPD, WS
- A Social Science course other than Psychology or Sociology
  - ANTH, ECON, LS, PSCI, SMF, SOCWK, STV
- A Language course from the Faculty of Arts (other than English or ESL)
- A course from the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences (other than Recreation)
  - GERON, HLTH, KIN
- A course from the Faculty of Environment
  - ENVS, ERS, GEOG, INDEV, INTEG, PLAN
- A course offered by the School of Computer Science

Note: The course subjects listed may not be comprehensive. For a complete list, or approval of a specific course subject, please see the academic advisor or the department website.

Therapeutic Recreation elective courses:
Select 3.0 units from:
- BIOL 273
- BIOL 304
- GERON-220/HLTH-220
- GERON-255
- HLTH-101
- HLTH-102
- KIN-100
- KIN-242
- MU353 (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar)
PHIL 226
PSYCH 211
PSYCH 213R
PSYCH 257/PSYCH 257R
PSYCH 317
PSYCH 334/PSYCH 334R
REC 356
REC 364
REC 362/GERON 352/HILTH 352/KIN 352/SOC 352
REC 405
SDS 150R
SOC 222
SOC 223/SOC 223R
SOC 248
SOC 249
SPCOM 225
SPCOM 324

Free elective courses: 3-7.5 units

Total number of units to complete degree is 20.0.

Notes:
1. The elective courses are used to fill the recreation elective courses, non-department restricted elective courses, therapeutic recreation elective courses, and free elective courses. Students will be advised to take a selection of elective courses within preferred areas of concentration to fulfill their elective course requirements.
2. Students are permitted to pursue a double major in any of Honours Recreation and Sport Business, Honours Therapeutic Recreation, and Honours Tourism Development and Parks Management, by meeting the requirements of each plan.
3. Students are required to complete REC 253 by the end of their third year.
4. Students who use an approved co-op work term in place of REC 450A to complete their required internship hours (see academic advisors for more details) must complete REC 450B during that work term. Students who use an approved work term approved in advance by Associate Chair, Undergraduate Studies in place of REC 450A should plan to complete an additional recreation elective worth 0.5 units so that they have the required 20.0 units to graduate.

Rationale: As a result of the department’s recent augmented review and the recommendations made as part of the review, the department has undertaken an extensive curriculum review process. The core requirements for all degrees have been changed to facilitate engaging and high impact student learning experiences to inspire passion, action, and leadership. The revised curriculum focuses on cohort experiences for students beginning in first year through to graduation and incorporates increased opportunities for experiential learning, case-based learning, community engagement opportunities, and greater integration of classroom, research, and work/volunteer experiences. The removal of the restricted and therapeutic electives categories increases the degree of flexibility for students to complete a joint degree, major, minor, or option in another area of concentration along with the Therapeutic Recreation degree requirements. The curriculum ensures that students can apply for professional eligibility with the National Council for Therapeutic Recreation Certification and/or apply for eligibility for Registration with Therapeutic Recreation Ontario.
5. **Motion:** To approve amendments to the Tourism Option plan as described.
   (Note: strikeout = deleted text, **bold** = new text)

**Parks Option and Tourism Option**

An option is a specified combination or grouping of courses which provides the student with an emphasis in a particular discipline. The **Tourism Option is available to all University of Waterloo undergraduate degree students.** The Option is designed for students specializing in tourism impacts, tourism planning, tourism marketing, heritage, and outdoor recreation.

The Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies has available the following options to students in honours or general plans:

1. **Parks Option** (see Motion 2.2.1, inactivating the Parks Option)
2. **Tourism Option**

The requirements for the Tourism Option are eight courses (four required and four elective) with a minimum cumulative overall average of all eight courses of 65%. **Environment students must have approval of the Office of the Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies, Faculty of Environment to use their thesis towards this option. Recreation and Leisure Studies students should seek advice from the Recreation and Leisure Studies academic advisor.**

Students interested in pursuing an option should speak with the academic advisor by the beginning of second year.

**Tourism Option**

- **Required courses (at least 2.0 units):**
  - GEOG 233
  - GEOG 423
  - REC 280
  - REC 383/GEOG 323
  - **One 400 level Tourism course from the following list:** GEOG 430C (1.5 units), REC 425/PLAN 414, REC 433/ENVS 433 (1.0 unit), REC 475 (005), REC 480, a tourism related thesis REC 471A/REC 471B or GEOG 490A/GEOG 490B (1.0 unit). Please see the appropriate academic advisor for thesis approval.

- **Elective courses:**
  (choose 4 courses from the following, with at least 2 of which must be above greater than the 200 level.)
  - ANTH 348
  - ECON 220
  - ENGL 208M
  - GEOG 202
  - GEOG 319/PLAN 320
  - GEOG 333/REC 333
  - GEOG 426
  - HRM 200
  - REC 215
  - REC 218
  - REC 230
  - REC 311
  - REC 312
  - REC 380
  - REC **422**
  - REC 425/PLAN 414
  - REC 433/ENVS 433
  - REC 480
Rationale: As a result of the department’s recent augmented review, and the recommendations made by the review committee, the department has undertaken an extensive curriculum review process. The option is offered jointly with Geography and Environmental Management. The requirement changes reflect changes in the curriculum from both departments while increasing flexibility for students and departments in course offerings.

Faculty of Environment

Parks Option

6. Motion: To approve amendments to the Parks Option plan as described.
(Note: strikeout = deleted text, bold = new text)

Parks Option

The Parks Option is available to all students in the Faculty of Environment. He Parks Option is open to University of Waterloo undergraduate students, with appropriate approval of their home Department.

The requirements for the Option are eight courses (four core and four elective) with a minimum overall cumulative average of 65%.

Required Courses

Four courses:
ENVS 200 or BIOL 150, ENVS 334/REC 334, ENVS 433/REC 433 or ENVS 444/REC 437, REC 230, ERS 346, ERS 454

Elective Courses

Four of the following courses: BIOL 350, BIOL 456, BIOL 457, BIOL 458, BIOL 489, ENVS 201, ENVS 334/REC 334, ENVS 433/REC 433 or ENVS 444/REC 437, REC 230, ERS 234, ERS 283, ERS 234, ERS 382, ERS 422, ERS 443, ERS 446, ERS 454, GEOG 102 or SCI 250, GEOG 323/REC 333, GEOG 333, GEOG 356, GEOG 368/PLAN 341, GEOG 405, PLAN 340, REC 230, REC 280, REC 316, REC 416, REC 425/PLAN 414

Rationale: The option is a series of courses that cross disciplines and focus on the ecological and policy issues related to parks and protected areas. The University and the Faculty of Environment have well-established and active relationships with a number of prominent provincial and federal agencies with emphasis on park management. These relationships present opportunities in both research and teaching that have promoted experiential learning and employment in the field of parks and protected areas management, ecology, and policy. Within the Faculty, the option is being led by the Department of Environment and Resource Studies with less support from other departments within and external to the Faculty. The proposed changes to the option result from both a consolidation of responsibility for the option, and from an updating of course content in other units.

Tourism Option

7. Motion: To approve amendments to the tourism option plan as described.
(Note: strikeout = deleted text, bold = new text)

...
*Recommended elective course: Students must have approval of the Office of the Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies, Faculty of Environment to use their thesis towards this option

Requirements:

The Tourism Option is available to any University of Waterloo undergraduate degree students who meet the required prerequisites of their Faculty. The Option is designed for students specializing in tourism impacts, tourism planning, tourism marketing, heritage, and outdoor recreation.

The requirements for the Option are eight courses (three four core and five four elective) with a minimum overall cumulative average of 65%.

Required Courses

**Three Four courses:**

GEOG 233, REC 280, REC 383/GEOG 323

One of: GEOG 430C (1.5 unit), REC 425/PLAN 414, REC 433/ENVS 433 (1.0 unit), REC 475 (Topic: Tourism/Commercial Recreation), REC 480, a tourism related thesis* REC 471A/REC 471B or GEOG 490A/GEOG 490B (1.0 unit)

Elective Courses

Five Four of (two of which must be at the 300 or 400 level): ANTH 348, ECON 220, ENGL 208M, ENVS 433/REC 433 (1.0), GEOG 202, GEOG 319/PLAN 320, GEOG 333/REC 333, GEOG 426, HRM 200, REC 215, REC 218, REC 230, REC 311, REC 312, REC 380, REC 422, REC 425/PLAN 414, REC 480

Rationale: As a result of the augmented review in recreation and leisure studies the department has undertaken an extensive visioning and curriculum review process. The option is offered jointly with Geography and Environmental Management and the requirement changes reflect changes in the curriculum from both departments while increasing flexibility for students and departments in course offerings.

**FOR INFORMATION**

**CURRICULAR MODIFICATIONS**

A course change was approved for the Faculty of Arts (accounting and financial management) effective 1 May 2015.

A course change was approved for the Faculty of Engineering (nanotechnology engineering) effective 1 September 2015.

New courses, course changes and course reactivations were approved for the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences (applied health sciences; gerontology; health studies; kinesiology; recreation and leisure studies), the Faculty of Arts (anthropology; East Asian studies; English; fine arts; history; Japanese; legal studies; political science; psychology; sociology), the Faculty of Engineering (civil and environmental engineering);
electrical & computer engineering; nanotechnology engineering; planning), the Faculty of Environment (civil and environmental engineering; environment & resource studies; planning) and the Faculty of Science (biology; chemistry; pharmacy; professional development for pharmacy students; science) effective 1 January 2016.

New courses, course changes, course inactivations, minor plan changes, and regulation changes were approved for the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences (courses at Wilfrid Laurier University; health studies; kinesiology; public health; recreation and leisure studies), the Faculty of Arts (dean’s honours list; management studies; petition procedures; social development studies; unit weights of courses), the Faculty of Engineering (examinations and promotions), and the Faculty of Environment (environmental studies; geography & environmental management; international development; petitions; recreation & leisure studies) effective 1 September 2016.

Course inactivations were approved for the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences (kinesiology) effective 1 September 2019.

NEW UNDERGRADUATE AWARDS

Attachment #2 to this report contains a listing of newly-approved entrance scholarships/awards/bursaries, upper-year scholarships/awards/bursaries, international experience awards and athletic awards.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORTS

Two Year Report – Religious Studies – Please see Attachment #3.

Two-Year Report – English – Please see Attachment #4.

Mario Coniglio
Associate Vice-President, Academic
Memo

To: Undergraduate Council (For approval)

From: André Jardin, Associate Registrar, Admissions

Date: March 18, 2015

Re: Undergraduate Admission Requirements for 2016

For your consideration and approval, the 2016 admission requirements:

1. Faculty of Mathematics – all programs
   • Require completed Admission Information Form (AIF) for admission consideration.

Rationale
Change recommended due to the high volume and quality of applicants to Faculty of Mathematics programs. The Admission Information Forms are read and scored. The score is added to the admission average and helps distinguish between students will similar grades. It is also a factor in scholarship consideration, and is sometimes used for special consideration.

2. Faculty of Engineering – all programs
   • Require completed Admission Information Form (AIF) for admission consideration.

Rationale
Change recommended due to the high volume and quality of applicants to Faculty of Engineering programs. The Admission Information Forms are read and scored. The score is added to the admission average and helps distinguish between students will similar grades. It is also a factor in scholarship consideration, and is sometimes used for special consideration.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at ext. 32265 or at acjardin@uwaterloo.ca.
ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS/AWARDS/BURSARIES:

**Cindy Colvin Women in Computer Science Entrance Scholarship**
A scholarship, valued up to $1,200, is provided annually to an outstanding full-time female undergraduate student entering Year One in the David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science in the Faculty of Mathematics. This fund is made possible by a donation from Cindy Colvin, BMath ‘83, (Computer Science).

*Method of Financing: endowment*

**Ross and Doris Dixon Mathematics Entrance Scholarship**
A scholarship valued at $2,000 is awarded annually to an outstanding full-time undergraduate student enrolled in Year One in the Faculty of Mathematics on the basis of academic achievement, performance on the Euclid Mathematics Contest, and extracurricular achievements as assessed through the Admission Information Form. These funds are made possible by a donation from The Ross and Doris Dixon Charitable Foundation in honour of its founders.

*Method of Financing: annual donation (on-going)*

**RBC Global Business and Digital Arts Entrance Scholarship**
One scholarship, valued at $2,500, is provided annually to a student entering Year One of the Bachelor of Global Business and Digital Arts program at Stratford Campus in the Faculty of Arts. Selection will be based on academic achievement, and significant demonstrated extracurricular involvement as assessed through the Admission Information Form. This fund is made possible by a donation from RBC Foundation.

*Method of Financing: annual donation (four-year pledge)*

UPPER-YEAR SCHOLARSHIPS/AWARDS/BURSARIES:

**Dr. Brian D. Bornhold Scholarship**
A scholarship, valued at $2,000, is awarded annually to a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in Year Two, Three or Four in Earth and Environmental Sciences in the Faculty of Science on the basis of academic achievement. This award is made possible by Dr. Brian D. Bornhold, PhD, P.Geo.(BC), who was the first graduate of Waterloo’s Earth Sciences program, receiving a BSc in 1967.

*Method of Financing: endowment*

**Brock Solutions Scholarship**
A scholarship, valued at $2,500, is provided annually to an outstanding full-time undergraduate student enrolled in Year Three or Four in one of the following programs: Computer, Electrical, Mechanical, Mechatronics, Software or Systems Design Engineering. Selection is based on a combination of strong academic achievement (minimum 80%) and demonstrated leadership as evidenced through involvement in extracurricular or volunteer activities either at the University or within the community. Interested students should submit an application by June 15. This fund is made possible by a donation from Brock Solutions to support Engineering students.

*Method of Financing: one-time donation to provide the scholarship for three years*
Anish Chopra Excellence in Finance Scholarship
One scholarship, valued at $2,500, will be presented annually to a full-time undergraduate student entering Year Four in any program in the School of Accounting and Finance. The successful candidate will have demonstrated academic excellence (cumulative average of 80% or greater) and show an interest in finance through work experience and/or related activities, such as finance competitions or the SAF Student-run Investment Fund. Interested students should submit an application by October 1. This fund is made possible by a donation from Anish Chopra, MAcc ’94.

Method of Financing: donation held by School to support scholarship for four years

Crosslink Technology Inc. Scholarship
Two scholarships, valued at $5,000 each, are awarded annually to full-time undergraduate students enrolled in Year Two, Three or Four: one to an Electrical Engineering student and one to a Chemical Engineering student. Selection will be based on academic excellence (minimum 80% cumulative average), extracurricular involvement/participation in volunteer activities and demonstrated leadership potential. Interested students should submit an application by July 1. This fund is made possible by a donation from John Ulcar and Karl Egenberger, owners of Crosslink Technology Inc., to support and recognize Waterloo Engineering students.

Method of Financing: annual donation (ongoing)

Forrec Architecture Award
An award, valued at $2,000, is provided annually to a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in Year Three or Four in the School of Architecture. Selection is made on the basis of academic achievement (minimum 80% cumulative average) and excellence in design of the final project in the Third/Fourth Year Design Studio acknowledging innovative conceptualization and graphic representation. In addition to their project, students must submit a digital 500-word document explaining why they feel their work is conceptual and innovative. An application is required by March 15. This fund is made possible by a donation from Forrec in support of the program and in recognition of the graduates of the program who have and continue to work at Forrec.

Method of Financing: annual donation (four-year pledge)

Frank Goodman Memorial Scholarship
One scholarship, valued at $1,000, will be provided annually to a student enrolled in Year Four in Mathematical Physics in the Department of Applied Mathematics based on academic excellence (minimum cumulative average of 80%). This fund has been created by family, friends, and faculty members of the Department of Applied Mathematics to honour the memory of Professor Frank Goodman.

Method of Financing: annual donations held by Department (assumed to be ongoing)

Jim Colvin Scholarship in Computing and Financial Management
A scholarship, valued at up to $1,200, will be awarded annually to a full-time undergraduate student enrolled in Year Three or Four of the Computing and Financial Management program. Selection is based on strong academic achievement (minimum overall average of 80%), and leadership abilities as demonstrated through involvement in extracurricular activities. Interested students must apply by February 1. This fund is made possible by a donation from Jim Colvin, BMath ’84 (Computer Science).

Method of Financing: endowment
**Métis Nation of Ontario Bursary**

Bursaries, valued at $1,000 or more, are awarded annually to full- or part-time undergraduate Métis students from Ontario enrolled in any program of any year at the University of Waterloo who are in good academic standing and who have demonstrated financial need. Interested students must complete the Full-time Bursary/Award Application or the Part-time Undergraduate Bursary Application by November 1. As well, candidates must self-identify as Metis by completing a declaration form. This fund is made possible by a donation from the Métis Nation of Ontario.

*Method of Financing: endowment*

**Ontario Pharmacists Association Outstanding Service Award**

An award valued at $2500, is provided annually to two full-time undergraduate students enrolled in Year Three in the School of Pharmacy on the basis of academic achievement (minimum 75%) and extracurricular involvement within the School of Pharmacy, professional associations, or community organizations. Interested students should submit an application by April 1. This fund is made possible by a donation from the Ontario Pharmacists Association.

*Method of Financing: annual donation (ongoing)*
Introduction

A review of the undergraduate program in Religious Studies was conducted in 2011. In April of 2012 the chair of the department responded to the fourteen recommendations of the review committee (see appendix A). Two recommendations were rejected (#3 and #13), two were considered to be beyond the control of the department (#1 and #5).

This report (2014) outlines the progress made to date in implementing the recommendations made in that review.

The department has taken the steps and initiatives below as part of a strategy to arrest the decline in majors through better communication and to better position the program within the Faculty of Arts.

Action taken since submission of the report (2012)

1. In January 2014 a department retreat was held at CIGI and facilitated by Veronica Brown and Kyle Schultz of the UW Centre for Teaching Excellence. There are 17 members of the department. Of those 17, 11 attended (65%). Those who did not attend: 2 on sabbatical (both of whom were either out of the country or KW); 1 out of town; one ill; 1 with a conflicting appointment (Chair of Sociology); one religious obligation. Given the difficulty of scheduling meetings, we were pleased with the attendance and the enthusiasm. The department discussed the outcomes they wished for students, examined the current areas of strength and weakness in the department curriculum, and administrative obstacles that make it difficult to achieve those objectives. Following the retreat the department, again with the assistance of CTE, held a ‘mapping’ session where several required and elective courses were tested to see if they met the pedagogical objectives established at the retreat.

2. As a preliminary step to the revision of the program, the department has de-activated a large number of courses (33) in order to make room for new courses that will better fit the pedagogical objectives of the department and the needs of the various constituencies that make up the department. There have been discussions with the department at large, and proposals by the curriculum committee dealing with all aspects of the program (course requirements, distribution of courses across our areas of expertise (Biblical, Jewish Studies, Asian religions, Christian tradition and theology, religion and society), course levels and progression through the major. The department met with the Arts Undergraduate Office March 16th to review our progress and receive any suggestions they felt might be helpful.
3. The Undergraduate Affairs Committee is currently putting together a curriculum that will better co-ordinate our offerings at all levels and provide a clear progression for students as they proceed through their degree. This RS Plan adjustment will be in line with the Faculty of Arts Plan Standardization initiative. Course syllabi will contain a statement of how the course learning outcomes relate to the RS program, and assignments will contain a statement explaining the role of the assignment in accomplishing the learning outcomes. This clear communication of requirements and progression will assist in attracting new majors. The Arts Undergraduate Office has scheduled two extra meetings of Undergraduate Affairs Group (May/June) to approve revised Plans. The Religious Studies Plan will be presented at one of those meetings (likely June).

4. The department, with the support of AFIW academic Deans, has agreed to share courses to a greater degree than has been the case previously. For example, RS100, formerly a St. Paul’s course, is currently being offered by Conrad Grebel online (W) and Renison (S) online as well as on campus by instructors from St. Paul’s (F), St. Jerome’s (W) and UW (S). This pattern will be also implemented with RS110. This decision will allow the various constituencies to meet their RS equity levels more consistently and provide variety for both faculty and students. Required and upper level courses that draw fewer students will also be rotated so that no one constituency will be adversely affected. As well as assist in a fair distribution of equity, this measure should assist the department in increasing its majors.

5. New minors with an applied focus are currently being considered. The Chair of RS and the Dean of Renison College would like to explore the possibility of a minor with both RS and SDS components. Since the report, Renison has a new Principal, Dean, and Chair of SDS. Thus, discussion of this possibility has temporarily been put on hold. We will continue to explore the possibility of developing applied minors with other departments.

6. The department engaged a consultant to advise on improvements that could be made to the department website. Changes have been made within the UW parameters on standardized websites. Some videos of faculty members have been added to the site and news of events is updated on a regular basis. In addition, another department member has committed to creating a department blog regarding faculty activities, publications, and other events in the department, including the activities of our undergraduate student society. The creation of this blog (at least once a term) will also serve as a vehicle for alumni outreach. The first installment of the blog is in the process of being formatted by the professor who created it (currently on sabbatical in Asia) and will be posted as soon as possible. The Student Society has created a Facebook page with a link to the department. The page has postings from both professors and students. Not only are student events listed but numerous articles pertaining to the study of religion and religion in the news. Our Administrative Assistant is creating an e-newsletter for distribution to alumni with undergraduate, graduate and alumni profiles, professor research and publications, and
news of current and coming events. The website improvements, blog, Facebook page and newsletter are important tools in communicating to others about the department in ways that have not been done before (professor videos, students talking about the program and their experience with it). These tools should generate more student activity, inquiries and hopefully, more majors.

7. The department engaged a graduate student (1/2 TA) to assist in rejuvenating the student society. While small, it is active and has offered a series of events throughout the last few years that drew in not only undergraduate students but also graduate students and professors. Since then, we have instituted a position of ‘faculty liaison’ to assist the students if necessary and keep the department apprised of student events.

8. The meeting room/lounge is used extensively. Graduate classes are held in the room, meetings are held there, as are student events and department events; moreover, it is used for studying by all students. Along with the two initiatives listed above, increased use of the room has helped in developing RS student cohesion. Pictures of room in use (classes, meetings, social) are posted to the website and will be updated on a regular basis.

9. Undergraduate students will be consulted regarding major structural changes. Consultation with students is an ongoing process. There has always been student consultation through the student society via e-mail and their meetings. The addition of a faculty liaison enhances this process. The fact that the students do not have direct representation at the department meeting level does not imply that they have no voice. Their voice, individually and collectively, has always been and always will be heard. Students frequently express the comfort they feel interacting with RS faculty and staff. There is also a good rapport between our graduate and undergraduate students.

10. Since the review there have been funding changes that address the recommendation that a sessional instructor be hired to cover a course release for the Associate Chair, Undergraduate. The undergraduate officer now receives a stipend ($3,000) and a course release that is constant rather than the formerly ad hoc basis.

11. The Associate Chair, Graduate now receives a stipend ($3,000) and a course relief thanks to the Dean of Arts.

**Recommendations not acted upon or pending**

1. The department is very interested in adding an experiential component to our Plans. There has been little progress in developing experiential opportunities beyond the Beyond Borders program and the India Study Term (2012). RS 100 has not yet been offered in a small seminar format with community visits however a smaller offering of
RS 100 using a blended-block pedagogical style has been initiated. Discussion on this issue will become more of a focus as we move through our curriculum adjustments.

2. The department is unable to address the gender imbalance and lack of diversity in the department as it only hires two of its faculty. It can only encourage the five agencies to consider this factor when making hires. Since the report, Conrad Grebel University College has hired a new female professor. This means that there are now 4 female faculty out of 15.

3. The first recommendation of the external review was a position in Islam. The department has repeatedly requested a position in Islam from both the Faculty of Arts and the other agencies of the department, including the idea of sharing an appointment with another department. This was not successful. What was accomplished was an appointment by the Faculty of Arts in Anthropology (Anthropology of Religion). The person hired will teach one course for the RS department on Islamic ritual in a global context. Further, since the submission of the 2 year report, St Jerome’s University will be offering the course for the department. They will be offering the course twice a year. Thus, we now have 2 offerings in Islam, one historical and doctrinal, one rooted in Islamic experience.

Conclusion
The Department of Religious Studies has made significant progress in implementing the recommendations of the external reviewers. In terms of curricular matters (Appendix A #5, #7, # 8), teaching and assessment, quality indicators and declining enrolments (shared by all departments in the Faculty of Arts), we are constructing a streamlined program that will better suit the needs of our students. We anticipate being able to bring this new program to the Undergraduate Affairs Group in Fall 2015. Students will be consulted on structural changes but they will not have a seat at the department (Appendix A # 11). Although the equity agreement between the AFIW and the University of Waterloo is something over which the department has no control (Appendix A #6), we have managed to achieve the objectives of the equity agreement without the necessity of revisiting it. While we are supportive of experiential learning, we have not yet had the opportunity to research possible positions from which our students might benefit. We expect that our revised website (Appendix A #4), department blog and alumni outreach plans may provide these opportunities. Issues regarding proper compensation for the associate chairs (Appendix A #14) have been settled. In terms of new initiatives, a faculty wide minor will be created. It is hoped that this will be ready to present to Undergraduate Affairs Group in Fall 2016 for implementation in 2017.
We have been unable to secure a faculty appointment in Islam and, given current budgetary restraints, it is unlikely that we will in the near future (Appendix A #1). We will however, be able to offer an additional course in modern Islam once a year. The addition of a new female hire has increased our gender diversity but further progress is unlikely due to fiscal restraint (Appendix A #9).

Prepared by: Mavis L. Fenn
Chair, Department of Religious Studies

Reviewed by: Douglas Peers
Dean, Faculty of Arts
APPENDIX A
Recommendations from the 2011 external review of Religious Studies

Objectives
1. That a position in Islamic studies be created in the Religious Studies Department;
2. That the Department explore the integration into the program of experiential learning and engagement with the wider community through co-op placements and/or internships;

Admissions
3. That the Department produce a handbook for undergraduate students;
4. That the Department give special attention to creating a more navigation friendly website;

Curriculum
5. That the Department continue to review and revise their course offerings as per the suggestions offered above;
6. That the university revisit the equity document in light of the uniqueness of the Religious Studies;

Teaching and Assessment
7. That each course syllabus articulates how the student outputs (e.g., assignments) are linked to the program outcomes;

Quality indicators
8. That the Department establish clear, focused program-specific learning outcomes linked to specific types of student engagements within the program.

Faculty
9. That the university, the Department, and the colleges that contribute classes to the program address the imbalance in diversity in the Department of Religious Studies;
Students

10. That the Department use half of a Teaching Assistantship to foster community among Religious Studies undergraduate students;

11. That the Department normally include student representation in structural discussions whenever possible;

Graduates

12. That the Department design and implement a periodic survey of its graduates;

Other issues

13. That (name removed) job grade be raised from its current level;
14. That the University of Waterloo through the Department of Religious Studies fund the cost of a sessional instructor to teach a course to cover the course release of the Undergraduate advisor.
Two Year Progress Report of the
Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts

(submitted March 2014; revised May 2015)

Introduction

English Language and Literature is the largest humanities department at the University of Waterloo and it offers robust and popular undergraduate and graduate programs. English currently has the third largest departmental undergraduate program in the Faculty of Arts (after Psychology and Economics), the second largest PhD program (after Psychology), and the largest research MA program. The Department is distinguished by its integration of the study of English literature, rhetoric, professional and technical writing, and digital media in a single disciplinary unit. Unlike other English departments in Canada, English at Waterloo combines elements of communication design, digital culture, and writing studies with literary studies. The creative focus in this English Department is different, too: we teach and research the making of technical writing, business communication, and digital media with literary and rhetorical sophistication. English at Waterloo is further distinguished by its humanistic approach to pragmatic issues of communication and interpretation. The Department is accordingly well connected with local enterprise through faculty and alumni contacts and through Co-op. The Department of English Language and Literature has offered regular Co-op since 1978, and it continues to be the only humanities department at Waterloo that does so. English offers Co-op through three Honours BA streams (Literature; Literature and Rhetoric; and Rhetoric and Professional Writing) and three MA streams (Literary Studies; Rhetoric and Communication Design; and Experimental Digital Media), and is investigating the possibility of adding to these a Co-op PhD option. We are determined to be Canada’s go-to department for the study of communication with literary finesse; for a pragmatic inflection on humanistic education; and for a historically-informed engagement with technical creation.

The most recent self-study of the Department of English Language and Literature was completed in June, 2010 by Associate Chair (Undergraduate) Kate Lawson. The Academic Program Review of English Undergraduate Programs, authored by external reviewers Heather Murray (University of Toronto) and Dale Sullivan (North Dakota State University), and by internal reviewer Steve Furino (Faculty of Mathematics), dated December 23, 2010, was received in January, 2011. A full response to the review, with a seven-year plan for English Language and Literature, was submitted on April 11th, 2011 by the Chair of English Language and Literature, Fraser Easton. Dr. Easton’s response and seven-year plan also addressed the recommendations made the previous year by the reviewers of the Department’s graduate programs, Jo-Ann Wallace (University of Alberta) and Richard Grusin (formerly of Wayne State University; now at the University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee), whose OCGS Consultants’ Report on the English Graduate Programs was submitted in May 2010. The present report outlines the progress that English Language and Literature has made since April 2011, with a focus on
undergraduate programs. In addition, the present report specifically addresses the recommendations of the Academic Program Review of English Undergraduate Programs.

Summary

The Academic Program Review of English Undergraduate Programs found English Language and Literature to be a “very well-managed and collegial unit with excellent esprit de corps among its full-time faculty members, its staff members, and even (this is more unusual) its sessional-stipendary instructors.” The review noted that English at Waterloo was distinctive in offering an undergraduate program that ambitiously and successfully aims 1. to provide a “unique suite of courses in rhetoric and professional writing [and] digital media,” 2. to offer a “full service” of English literary studies with robust historical coverage, and 3. “to have these [three] streams work synergistically together.” The review also suggested that “given its size and the demographics of its faculty, ELL [English Language and Literature] is already ‘punching above its weight.’”

Below are particular recommendations from the Academic Program Review, as well as areas of concern, and the actions taken by English Language and Literature in response to these suggestions and observations since April 2011. Also below is a list of new ideas and initiatives that were not included in previous reports or the Department’s seven-year plan.

1. Actions taken as proposed in the two-year plan

a) Curriculum

i) Recommendation: That the Department give stronger definition to its program streams, simplify the pathway strands, and re-envision the goals of the Literature stream in particular.

Response: During her preparation of the self-study for the Academic Program Review, the then Associate Chair (Undergraduate) Kate Lawson simultaneously embarked upon a full review of our undergraduate plan structures and curriculum. As a result of this review, and after wide consultation, Dr. Lawson proposed a new model for representing the program streams, the pathways through the curriculum, and the course offerings. This new curricular model met the stated goal, in Dr. Easton’s response to the external reviewers, to “smooth” curricular offerings in all English programs.

More particularly, Dr. Lawson’s curriculum map gave much stronger definition to the architecture of the Rhetoric and Professional Writing program and redefined the Literature program according to one index—temporal periods—rather than according to the mix of temporal and geographical (British versus North American) indices that the unreformed plan utilized. The new curriculum map was thoroughly reviewed by the Department and by the larger English Discipline Group and successfully approved during the tenure of the subsequent Associate Chair (Undergraduate) Heather Smyth in 2011-12. The new curriculum map passed the Faculty of Arts Undergraduate Affairs Group in
2013 and appeared in the 2014-15 Calendar. We plan to assess the success of the new map in the coming years through the monitoring of the popularity of English degree plans and through consultations with students.

This new, revised curriculum map satisfies several of the External Reviewers’ recommendations: 1. it offers greater clarity to students in identifying the pedagogical intent of their plan requirements and the pathways through the degrees; 2. it shifts some emphasis away from periods of British literature in the core curriculum for those students who choose to shape their programs differently (see below 1.a.iii); 3. it increases the number of open English electives; and 4. it gives a new capstone function to final-year Special Topics courses focused on particular areas of study (see below 1.a.ii).

The new curriculum map was developed further in early 2015 in concert with a Faculty of Arts “plan standardization” initiative. Jay Dolmage, the current Associate Chair (Undergraduate), used this initiative as an occasion to propose changes to the English plans that streamline progress in the Honours degrees and harmonize Honours plans with the four-year General degree plans. Dr. Dolmage also took this as an opportunity to clarify the Notes in the Calendar text of all of the Department’s plans (Notes list exceptions, recommendations, and other guidelines that do not appear in the text of the degree plan; they appear as footnotes below the degree plan text). Clarification of plan Notes will help reduce plan complexities and make the requirements and exceptions easier for students to understand. It is expected that these changes will appear in the 2016-17 Calendar; currently, they have been approved by Department of English and by the Faculty of Arts Undergraduate Affairs Group.

The Department has also made some plan-specific changes. In 2013 the Department reviewed and simplified the Rhetoric and Professional Writing plan by removing from this plan the requirements of a Computer Science course and two courses in a language other than English. The need for the Computer Science course had been superseded by developments in digital technologies. The language courses were no longer needed because the Rhetoric and Professional Writing plan is less focused on linguistics than it had once been. In addition, the Computer Science course requirement was removed from all English Co-op plans for the same reason it was removed from the Rhetoric and Professional Writing plan. The Undergraduate Committee is currently revising the digital communication and professional writing courses in the Rhetoric and Professional Writing curriculum to clarify and streamline further the degree pathways. The Department has already created a Technical Writing Minor and Specialization, as well as several new courses in the area of technical communication, that relate to Rhetoric and Professional Writing plan elements (see 3.a. below). The overall revision will remain mindful that digital communication and professional writing courses play a key role in several English plan cursus, including those of the Rhetoric and Professional Writing major (which, since professional writing digitized in the 1990s, must perforce have a strong digital rhetoric and media component), the Digital Media Studies Specialization, and the Technical Writing Minor and Specialization.
**ii) Recommendation:** That the Department consider offering fourth-year specialized and advanced topics courses in a smaller class or seminar setting.

**Response:** As part of the revision of its curriculum map, the Department replaced ENGL 301H: Honours Literary Studies, which was required in the Honours Literature and in the Honours Literature and Rhetoric plans, with one of a set of 400-level Special Topics courses, now required for students in all three Honours plans. We changed the pre-requisites on our existing Special Topics courses from 3A to 4A Honours English; modernized the titles of the existing courses; and created new Special Topics courses to reflect the new course groupings in our plans. The Department is committed to offering the Special Topics courses regularly to enable fulfillment of this new Honours plan requirement. Resources permitting, these Special Topics courses will be offered in a smaller seminar format, which will create more smaller class settings in English.

**iii) Recommendation** Literature students expressed a wish for more upper-year courses in the areas of global literatures, Canadian, contemporary, and genre studies, and a concern about having too many required courses in British literature. The Academic Program Review recommended that the Department adjust requisites so the ‘core’ curriculum is less focused on British literature.

**Response:** This recommendation was based partly on an error of understanding about the number of required British literature courses, as noted in the April 11, 2011 report by Dr. Easton, Chair of English. It also did not acknowledge the distinctive focus of English at Waterloo—compared to other smaller departments of English—on the historical study of literatures in English, which is why, under the new curriculum map, we require Honours Literature students to take four courses in areas of literature in English before 1800, two courses in areas of nineteenth-century literature in English, and two courses in areas of literature in English after 1900 (students may, of course, take additional elective courses in modern and contemporary literature in English).

Nevertheless, the new curriculum map is not unmindful of the spirit of the reviewers’ concerns, as expressed here, since the new map divides the literature courses solely by temporal period instead of by both temporal period (for British and Commonwealth literatures) and geography (British and Commonwealth; North American). While still anchored in historical approaches to literature, the new map gives students interested in North American or global literatures in English the option of fulfilling more of their required upper-level literature courses with courses from those areas. The curriculum change also creates an opening for future course creations in earlier periods of Canadian, American, and global English literatures.

New courses in global English literatures (ENGL 280: Literatures of Migration and ENGL 291: Global Literatures) have been created, and discussion of new courses in global English literatures at the 300- and 400-level are planned. ENGL 294: Game Studies and ENGL 295: Social Media have been created. New courses in writing and composition studies—particularly professional writing fields such as Grant Writing—have also been developed (ENGL 210G: Grant Writing, ENGL 210J: Technical Editing,
and ENGL 472: Research Methods in Technical Communication). Finally, both the Digital Media Studies specialization and the English Literature in a Global Context specialization (renamed Global Literatures) have been revised.

In order to continue to measure our program improvements against student expectations and preferences, the Undergraduate Committee in English is also developing an online exit survey to be offered to graduating students each year (likely using Survey Monkey) to find out what they liked and disliked about their programs and what changes they would like to see. We will also monitor the popularity of the English undergraduate degrees, both at Waterloo and at other universities, as another measure of the impact of our curriculum changes.

iv) Note: “Certain areas—most notably First Nations/Aboriginal Literatures—are unrepresented in the curriculum.”

Response: A new course, ENGL 211: First Nations, Metis and Inuit Literatures, has been created and will be offered for the first time in Fall 2015.

b) Faculty and Staff complement

i) Recommendation: The review team noted that the Department’s rhetoric and digital media program is “one of the leading programs of its kind in North America” and that “only a few English, communication, or rhetoric programs in North America offer [our] range of rhetorical studies.” They expressed a concern about the need for more faculty members with expertise to teach our rhetoric courses. “Attention to staffing issues—replacement in key areas, positions in new fields, sufficient staffing to deploy full-time faculty more fully at the 300- and 400-levels—would be, in our opinion, the sine qua non for further program growth and reputational enhancement.” More particularly, the report recommended the addition of faculty lines in the areas of the specializations (Digital Media, Global Literatures), as well as in Romanticism, to fill key program needs.

Response: English at Waterloo is unique for embedding the study of digital media and digital communication within the well-established field of multimodal rhetoric. Thanks to significant additional resources being provided to English Language and Literature since April 2011, the Department, with the support of the Dean of Arts, Douglas Peers, has been able to dedicate new, incremental tenure-stream positions to some areas of key program need, and to make very strong hires, beginning with Beth Coleman (Digital Media) in 2012 and Frances Condon (Writing Studies, Critical Race Studies) in 2013 on the Rhetoric and Professional Writing side. Also on the Rhetoric and Professional Writing side, we await the arrival of Ashley Kelly (Technical Communication), who will join us on 1 July 2015. In addition, two Definite Term Lecturers in Rhetoric and Professional Writing areas joined us in 2014: Bruce Dadey (Business Communication) and Stephanie White (Composition Studies). On the Literature side we hired Jennifer Harris in 2013 (Nineteenth-Century American Literature) and John Savarese in 2014 (British Romanticism). It should be noted that the External Reviewers identified British Romanticism as a key gap in our faculty expertise and program capacity and that
American Literature is among the most popular areas of specialization among our PhD students.

ii) **Recommendation:** “ELL [English Language and Literature] should contemplate ways to move more tenured and tenure-track faculty into its upper year courses.”

**Response:** As detailed above, with the support of the Dean of Arts, Douglas Peers, we have made several incremental new tenure-stream hires in Rhetoric and Professional Writing (Coleman, Condon, and Kelly) as well as in areas of literature in English (J. Harris and Savarese), permitting us to place tenure-track faculty increasingly in both the upper-year courses and in the important recruitment sphere of first-year classes, which aids us in attracting students to the English major. Another new tenure-track colleague in English, Vinh Nguyen (Diaspora Literatures), will arrive at Renison University College in July 2015; he will contribute to teaching in the area of global English literatures and global Englishes, supporting student interest in these areas and providing further expertise for the Global Literatures Specialization. Our new commitment (see section 3.b., “Mathematics English Language Proficiency Initiative,” below) to teach ENGL 109: Introduction to Academic Writing to Faculty of Mathematics students in a small-section on campus format that is largely faculty taught will place more tenure-stream faculty in the ENGL 109 classroom. This new model of ENGL 109 delivery will draw some faculty members in English away from upper-year teaching in the English plan courses; despite that, however, we are making overall progress on moving more tenure-stream faculty into upper-level courses, which the addition of one or two strategic tenure-stream positions in rhetoric and in language studies would advance significantly. Other commitments to be mindful of in terms of program impacts: the Department delivers two courses a year for the Masters of Public Service program, currently taught by Frankie Condon; we continue to grapple with a historical legacy of understaffing in the Rhetoric and Professional Writing areas; and the tenure-stream English faculty at St. Jerome’s and Renison specialize in literature fields. More tenure-stream faculty are needed for the delivery of core upper-level Rhetoric and Professional Writing courses.

iii) **Recommendation:** That English hire a Distance Education [now known as Extended Learning or EL] coordinator to ensure quality of distance education [EL or online] courses and provide support for sessional instructors.

**Response:** In 2011, Dorothy Hadfield was hired as a Definite Term Lecturer in English to teach and to serve as the Department’s Extended Learning Coordinator, a major role. Dr. Hadfield has been teaching and coordinating the large online [EL] courses such as ENGL 210F: Genres of Business Communication, has significantly redeveloped and refreshed this very popular and important course, and has engaged in the long-term revision and refreshing of the online offerings to support the online three-year General English degree and expand our online commitments.

iv) **Concern:** “Office/administrative staffing in ELL [English Language and Literature] appears inadequate for a unit with so many students, programs, and involvements, and where further growth (especially at the graduate level) is impending. Further, the current
allocation and scheduling of duties does not allow highly-competent staff members to use their time efficiently and effectively.” The Reviewers recommended hiring a clerical assistant for the Department. This would also allow the Undergraduate Coordinator to do more advising and free the Associate Chair (Undergraduate) for “more urgent tasks.”

**Response:** The new commitment with the Faculty of Mathematics to teach multiple small on-campus sections of ENGL 109 has brought with it a 0.5 staff position, but this does not address the recommendation of the reviewers or the escalating Departmental need for a full-time clerical assistant.

v) **Concern:** “‘Service’ and DE [EL/online] teaching rests largely on stipendiary-sessional instructors, with the rest devolving to graduate instructors... This has the benefit of releasing regular faculty for on-campus classes... However, the reliance of ELL [English Language and Literature] on stipendiary and graduate instructors is at an alarming level.”

**Response:** The Department’s new and in-coming, incremental tenure-stream and definite-term faculty appointments are intended to ease this pressure and the situation will be monitored by the Chair of English and the Dean of Arts.

c) **Procedures**

i) **Recommendation:** That the Department increase communication with undergraduate students through a bulletin board or listserv.

**Response:** The Department has developed a Facebook page and a Twitter feed and prompted all instructors to circulate information about them to their classes via syllabi. The Facebook representative posts material regularly, drawing from a weekly series of interviews with English alumni posted on our Department blog, from other posts of interest to our students, and from content developed for our YouTube site, including career videos and videos of visiting speakers. The Facebook site has over 400 regular recipients at present. The former Associate Chair (Undergraduate), Dr. Smyth, also consulted with Amanda Connolly, Program Coordinator at Stratford campus, on English’s social media strategy and has worked with the Faculty of Arts to implement some of Ms. Connolly’s recommendations regarding high school outreach and the use of social media tools such as Facebook.

ii) **Recommendation:** That the Department consider offering a more regular cycle of course counselling, perhaps through group sessions at the end of each semester.

**Response:** Currently the faculty member Associate Chair (Undergraduate) and staff member Undergraduate Coordinator dedicate significant energies and resources to the effective and timely counselling of students, and work in close coordination with the advising done by the Chair of English at St. Jerome’s. The Department’s website offers a great deal of information to students, and during the website migration exercise in 2013, English focused on clarifying degree expectations and general advising information. We
continue to develop a FAQ page for general advising matters. In 2012-13 we created a series of annual cohort lunch events focused on the advising and general support needs of students at each year level.

**iii) Recommendation:** More training, monitoring, and feedback on teaching performance for sessional and graduate instructors.

**Response:** The Chair monitors and works with sessionals as appropriate, but in general their overall performance in the classroom is excellent, as represented by scores on the Arts Course Questionnaires for their courses. A new faculty member service role of Graduate Independent Course Coordinator was created by the Chair in 2011 and has served to provide support, oversight, and feedback on graduate independent course instructors. The new Lecturer in Business Writing, Dr. Dadey, is pioneering a new role as the Department’s TA Coordinator; he has proposed, designed, and implemented a Teaching Portal on the Department website for TAs and Graduate Independent instructors, and he is providing robust training, monitoring, support, and feedback for the Department’s large numbers of graduate TAs (approximately 90 TAships a year, currently).

2. Recommendations not acted upon, but for which action is planned

**a) Curriculum**

i) **Recommendation:** That the Department develop a longer ‘window’ of course offerings, allowing students a greater opportunity to select courses of interest and plan for their degree requirements, e.g., a course rotation schedule made available to students.

**Response:** As projected in Dr. Easton’s response to the reviewers, since the Fall of 2011, English Language and Literature has been submitting accurate course projections for pre-enrollment planning (now “enrollment” with the new timetabling system). The Department has also begun looking into new ways to communicate course offerings to students two terms in advance. With turnover in the Undergraduate Coordinator staff position, however, our ability to act on this recommendation has been delayed. We have now resumed our plan to address it.

**b) Procedures**

i) **Recommendation:** That the Department investigate the feasibility of instituting an annual assessment of the program through reading student portfolios or evaluating student papers from across the curriculum.

**Response:** The Faculty of Arts Advising Group already works closely with the Undergraduate Chair in English to monitor student progress at the end of each semester. The current Associate Chair (Undergraduate), Dr. Dolmage, contacts all students who have had recent “academic progression” issues, and meets in person with most of them. That said, the present recommendation, as well as the recommendation above regarding a
more regular cycle of course counselling, would constitute a significant new way of tracking students’ performance as they move through their programs in English. Adoption of these recommendations would also impact English Discipline Group faculty in the federated university and affiliated colleges (St. Jerome’s and Renison). We are currently striking a task force, with representation from English Discipline Group members at St. Jerome’s and Renison, to address these proposals.

3. New ideas or initiatives not included in previous reports or the seven-year plan

a) Technical Writing Minor: As of Fall 2015, English will launch a new, career-oriented minor in Technical Writing, open to all Waterloo students. A cognate specialization in Technical Writing has been created for English majors. These programs are built on our current and incoming faculty expertise in professional communication and technical writing and our Department’s longstanding juxtaposition of the rhetorical study of genres with the study of writing practices and communication design. The Technical Writing specialization will benefit our own majors by clarifying and strengthening the technical and professional writing core of our Rhetoric and Professional Writing Honours degree curriculum; it will also help prepare our students more pragmatically for Co-op and for careers. The Minor will offer to students in other undergraduate majors in Arts, and at Waterloo more broadly, professional writing expertise to which they can bring their own subject specializations for career purposes. These developments also support the Faculty of Arts Strategic Plan.

b) Mathematics English Language Proficiency Initiative: Jointly with the Department of Drama and Speech Communication in the Faculty of Arts, the Department of English at St. Jerome’s, and the English Language Studies unit at Renison, English Language and Literature has agreed to deliver small-section, regular faculty-taught course offerings to students in the Faculty of Mathematics (main campus English currently offers ENGL 109 and, with St. Jerome’s, ENGL 119). Mathematics asked for this course provision, and the former Provost, Geoff McBoyle, resourced it, for several reasons. One reason was to respond to the conclusions of the report by the ad hoc committee headed by Gordon Stubley on English Language Competency at the University of Waterloo (the so-called Stubley report, submitted October 2012). Another reason was in light of the feedback that Mathematics has received from Co-op employers and others about the English language abilities of its students. Two of the five incremental tenure-track positions noted above come as a result of this initiative; but they may not add incremental new teaching to the undergraduate programs in English due to the expected teaching in Mathematics. It is anticipated that the four new Definite Term Lecturers attached to this initiative (two for main campus English, and two for St. Jerome’s English) will teach entirely in connection with it. This is a major improvement in the delivery of writing instruction to some students at Waterloo; it will pilot best practices for the delivery of ENGL 109 and ENGL 119 at the University; and it is an opportunity for English to bring its pedagogical expertise to bear on a key student need for students outside Arts. But it is not directly connected to the delivery of English’s own programs, or to those in Arts more generally.
c) **High School Outreach**: English has been working closely with the Arts Marketing and Recruitment team to support the scheduled recruitment events (Ontario Universities Fair, Fall Arts Showcase, March Break Open House), to coordinate outreach to students given offers of admission, and to offer content and stories as often as possible for Arts recruitment. The Associate Chair (Undergraduate) from main campus English has met with the St. Jerome’s Registrar to learn of their high school initiatives and main campus English works with St. Jerome’s to coordinate materials for recruitment events. St. Jerome’s and student volunteers also write personal letters to applicants to Waterloo and St. Jerome’s. We have been building relationships with teachers, guidance counsellors, and local school boards to develop on-campus enrichment visits and programs for high school English students and recruitment opportunities for our Department and Arts. English has worked with Renison University College to stage on-campus full-day workshops for the Waterloo District School Board creative writing awards and we are renewing our commitment to the High School Achievement test program. The current Associate Chair (Undergraduate), Dr. Dolmage, also coordinates campus visits with local high school enrichment students and travels to high schools locally and in the greater Toronto area to promote our programs.

d) **Peer Mentoring group**: At the initiative of an upper-year English major, Katie Jessup, the Department created a grassroots English Peer Mentoring group that pairs upper-year mentors with lower-year mentees and transfer students. The mentors are trained at the Student Success Office and also receive English-specific training. The group meets several times a term for social events, study sessions, and academic skills workshops and one-with-one mentoring happens throughout the term in person and through a Gmail account. The group helps to improve student experience and to build cohort relationships, offers students peer academic support, aids with recruitment into the major, and provides valuable skills and resume-building to our students. We coordinate our efforts and messaging in this area with Stephanie Bromley and the Arts Peer Mentoring initiative and with Laura Maple at the Student Success Office.

e) **Career Event**: In 2012, with the help of members of the English Advisory Council—led by noted broadcaster and Waterloo English alumnus Eric Friesen, and including such distinguished alumni and friends of English as George Elliott Clarke (Toronto Poet Laureate, Professor at the University of Toronto), Sandra Martin (Journalist with the Globe and Mail), Mandy Lam (marketing specialist at Open Text), and Scott Wahl (Vice-President of Software Services at BlackBerry)—we held a very successful and well-attended career panel with professionals from many fields who hold English degrees (BA, MA, PhD), most from Waterloo English. We videotaped the event and created two short videos and one long video that are posted on the English Department’s YouTube site for recruitment and career-counselling purposes. We will continue to involve our English Advisory Council in undergraduate career counselling and networking and will hold more events of this nature in future.

f) **Online Initiatives**: The EL Coordinator Dorothy Hadfield is overseeing the refreshing of our existing EL courses, and the creation of new ones, to enable more flexible completion of the on campus degrees as well as support for the fully online Three Year
General English degree. Future EL preparations are being targeted with the goals of 1. relieving some of the course bottlenecks in the plan requirements (for example, the core history of rhetoric courses ENGL 309A/B/C and the introductory linguistics course ENGL 306A) and 2. making it easier for students to take course requirements while on Co-op work terms or in a mix of online and on-campus academic terms. New online course creations may make an Honours English degree online possible. Course creation in new areas of digital media studies and rhetoric will maximize the resources of online delivery as a medium and will showcase the Department’s contribution to underserved fields of online offerings in North America.

Submitted by Fraser Easton
Chair of English Language and Literature
FOR INFORMATION

Recognition and Commendation
The American Cancer Society has given a researcher from the University of Waterloo the award considered the top in the world for tobacco control. Geoffrey Fong, a professor in the Department of Psychology and the School of Public Health and Health Systems at Waterloo, has received one of the American Cancer Society’s Luther R. Terry Awards for Outstanding Research Contribution. Fong founded the International Tobacco Control Policy Evaluation Project in 2002. It has been at the forefront of research that combats tobacco use, the number one cause of preventable death in the world. Tobacco use is projected to kill one billion people in the 21st century, with 80 per cent of the deaths occurring in low and middle-income countries. [Waterloo Stories, 19 March 2015]

Three sustainability leaders from the University of Waterloo have been named to the annual Corporate Knights Top 30 under 30 list. The list honours young entrepreneurs, activists, corporate professionals and students making social and environmental change worldwide. Dominique Souris, an Environment and Resource Studies student; Jillian Rodak, a graduate student in the School of Environment Enterprise and Development and Sean Campbell a program coordinator at GreenHouse, an accelerator for social entrepreneurship at Waterloo’s St. Paul’s University College, were among the 30 young Canadians honoured. [Waterloo Stories 27 March 2015]

A Waterloo student who co-founded an oil and gas startup has won a national award for best co-op student of the year in Canada. He is among six students who received the University of Waterloo’s top award for co-op students in their Faculties. The Canadian Association for Co-operative Education selected Andrew Andrade from Waterloo’s Faculty of Engineering for its Co-op Student of the Year Award. Another Waterloo student, Skye Wattie, honoured as the top student in the Faculty of Arts, won a provincial award: the Education at Work Ontario Award for co-op student of the year. These two students, along with one student from every other Faculty won Waterloo’s top prize for co-op students of the year. It is recognition of their exemplary performance during a work term in 2014, along with other factors including community involvement, contribution to co-op and academic achievement. [Waterloo Stories, 18 March 2015]

Two researchers from the University of Waterloo recently received funding for Canadian Queen Elizabeth II Diamond Jubilee Scholarships. The scholarship funding, awarded by Rideau Hall Foundation, Community Foundations of Canada and Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, allows Canadian students at the undergraduate and graduate levels to participate in internships or academic study for periods of three months to one year in another Commonwealth country. Susan Elliott, a professor in the Faculty of Environment’s department of Geography and Environmental Management is receiving $449,800. Elliott hopes to bring at least four fully funded graduate students to the University of Waterloo to develop a global wellbeing index (nicknamed GLOWING) similar to the Canadian Index of Wellbeing – a project developed at Waterloo. Ashwin Nayak, a professor in the Department of Combinatorics and Optimization and Quantum Information Graduate Program Director at the Institute for Quantum Computing (IQC) will receive $260,000. The funding will be used to financially assist 24 Canadian undergraduate and graduate students from IQC to visit the National University of Singapore's Centre for Quantum Technologies. [Daily Bulletin, 1 April 2015]
FOR INFORMATION

A. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS

**Definite term Reappointment – full time**

AZAGBA, Sunday, Research Assistant Professor, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences, (Propel Centre for Population Health Impact), Applied Health Sciences, October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2018. BA, Economics, Ambrose Alli University, Nigeria, 2000, MA, Economics with Distinction, University of Lagos, Nigeria, 2002, MA, Finance with Distinction, University of Skovde, Sweden, 2005, PhD, Economics, Concordia University, Montreal, Ontario, 2012.

**Postdoctoral Fellows appointed as part time lecturer and research**

MALACHOWSKI, Cindy, School of Public Health and Health Systems, May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2017.

For approval by the Board of Governors

B. SABBATICAL LEAVES

LAING, Andrew, Assistant Professor, Department of Kinesiology, January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2016, one year at 85%.

James W.E. Rush
Dean, Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
FOR INFORMATION

A. APPOINTMENTS

Adjunct Appointments – Instruction

BARICHELLO, Steve, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

CRAVEN, Caitlin, Lecturer, Department of Political Science, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

LEUNG, May, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

MILLOY, John, Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Master of Public Service, May 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

RAJSIC, Predrag, Lecturer, Department of Economics, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

TIMBERG, Robert, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

WITTEVEEN, Roger, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

Adjunct Reappointments – Instruction

AFROS, Elena, Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

BALABAN, Steven, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

BASHIR, Mohsin, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

BIRKE, Lisa, Lecturer, Department of Fine Arts, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

CUMMINGS, Ruth, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

DE ROOIJ-MOHLE, Margreet, Lecturer, Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

DIGNAN, Paul, Lecturer, Department of Fine Arts, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

DUCHARME, Robert, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

FATIMA, Nafeez, Lecturer, Department of Economics, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

HE, Zhen, Lecturer, Department of Economics, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

HOLUKOFF, Kurt, Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

HUNTER, Natalie, Lecturer, Department of Fine Arts, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

IV, Kieng, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.
KROEKER, Ronald, Lecturer, Department of Classical Studies, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

KUMASE, Wokia-azi, Lecturer, Department of Economics, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

LAIKEN, Stan, Professor, (Professor Emeritus), School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

LIAQAT, Zara, Lecturer, Department of Economics, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

LIN, David, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

MACKINNON, Ernie, Associate Professor, (Associate Professor Emeritus), Department of Psychology, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

MANNING, Thomas, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

MEINYKEVYCH, Viktoriya, Lecturer, Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

NABERT-CHUBB, Rebecca, Lecturer, Department of Political Science, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

PECKHAM, William, Lecturer, Department of Psychology, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

RAY, Nicholas, Lecturer, Department of Philosophy, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

REICHERT, Tetyana, Lecturer, Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

ROCKER, Maike, Lecturer, Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies, May 1, 2015 to July 31, 2015.

ROGOZYNSKI, Daniel, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

SHAKESPEARE, Robert, Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

STETTNER, Shannon, Lecturer, Women’s Studies, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

WENSLEY, Karen, Lecturer, School of Accounting and Finance, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

Graduate Students Appointed as Part-Time Lecturers

ARThUR, Kasandra, Department of English Language and Literature, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

EDWARDS, Lucie, Department of Political Science, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

JORDAN, William, Department of Philosophy, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

MACDONALD, Ian, Department of Philosophy, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

DIXON, Mike, Acting Chair, Department of Psychology, July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.
FENN, Mavis, Acting Associate Chair Graduate Studies, Department of Religious Studies, January 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

HELMES-HAYES, Rick, Acting Chair, Department of Sociology & Legal Studies, July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016.

O’CONNOR, Dan, Chair, Department of Sociology & Legal Studies, July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2020.

Reappointment
MACLEOD, Colin, Chair, Department of Psychology, July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018.

C. SABBATICAL LEAVES
Approved by the Board of Governors:
BESNER, Derek, Professor, Department of Psychology, July 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, 85% salary.

BOIDO, Mario, Associate Professor, Department of Spanish and Latin American Studies, July 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, 85% salary.

CHAUSSÉ, Pierre, Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, July 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

COUTU, Joan, Associate Professor, Department of Fine Arts, July 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, 85% salary.

DOUGLAS, Heather, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 85% salary.

GALLUPE, Owen, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Legal Studies, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

LAM, Jean-Paul, Associate Professor, Department of Economics, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

HIRSCHKOP, Ken, Associate Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 85% salary.

INSLEY, Margaret, Associate Professor, Department of Economics, July 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015, at 85% salary.

LOWRY, Chris, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

MACFARLANE, Emmett, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

MCAULEY, Tara, Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

MILLIGAN, Ian, Assistant Professor, Department of History, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.
MOMANI, Bessma, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, September 1, 2015 – February 29, 2016, 85% salary.

O’CONNOR, Daniel, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Legal Studies, July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016, 91.3% salary.

PARÉ, François, Professor, Department of French Studies, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

PARK, Robert, Professor, Department of Anthropology, July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016 at 100% salary.

VETZAL, Kenneth, Associate Professor, School of Accounting and Finance, July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016, 85% salary.

VIDEKANIC, Bojana, Assistant Professor, Department of Fine Arts, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

D. ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVES
Approved by the Board of Governors:
COUTU, Joan, Associate Professor, Department of Fine Arts, January 1, 2016 – April 30, 2016, 100% salary.

MCWEBB, Christine, Associate Professor, Department of French Studies, September 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, 100% salary.

[Signature]
Douglas M. Peers
Dean, Faculty of Arts
UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
REPORT OF THE DEAN OF ENGINEERING TO SENATE
May 19, 2015

For information:

A. APPOINTMENTS

New Definite Term Appointment – full-time

AL-HAMMOUD, Rania, Lecturer, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering,
June 1, 2015 – May 31, 2018. PhD University of Waterloo 2013; MA.Sc University of Waterloo 2006; BE American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon 1998. Dr. Rania Al-Hammoud will join the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering as the Graduate Attributes Lecturer. In this position she will have a partial teaching load, and provide long-term support for the outcome-based accreditation process and the new Ideas Clinic. After she completed her PhD at the University of Waterloo she joined the Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Minnesota Duluth, Duluth, MN, USA. We welcome her back to Waterloo where her interest in engineering education will be a great asset to the department.

WRIGHT, Derek, Lecturer, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, April 15, 2015 – April 14, 2018. PhD University of Toronto 2009; MA.Sc University of Waterloo 2004; BA.Sc University of Waterloo 2003. Dr. Derek Wright is appointed as a lecturer in the ECE department. Dr. Wright received his Ph.D. from the University of Toronto in 2009, from the Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Institute of Biomaterials and Biomedical Engineering. His research and teaching interests lie in the broad area of Electrical & Computer Engineering with particular emphasis on bio-medical applications.

Visiting Appointments

APARECDA DE OLIVEIRA, Cibele, Scholar, Department of Chemical Engineering,
May 1, 2015 - May 31, 2016.


FANG, Yong, Professor, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering,

FENG, Yu, Scholar, Department of Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering, May 1, 2015 – December 31, 2016.

GANGADHARAN, Swathi, Scholar, Department of Chemical Engineering, January 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.


LIANGXUE, Cai, Researcher, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering,

MEHRATA, Mina, Scholar, Department of Chemical Engineering, March 2, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

MUDASSIR, Aiza, Scholar, Department of Chemical Engineering, February 26, 2015 – August 18, 2015.

MI, Changhuan, Associate Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering, June 15, 2015 – June 14, 2016.

PEIK, Soren Frank, Professor, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, March 7, 2015 – August 14, 2015.

RAHMAN, Arifah, Scholar, Department of Chemical Engineering, March 16, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

SI, Yujun, Scholar, Department of Chemical Engineering, September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016.


Visiting Reappointments

ZANDIEH, Alireza, Researcher, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, April 1, 2015 – March 31, 2016.

Special Appointments – Undergraduate Instruction
ALUC, Gunes, Lecturer, Department of Management Sciences, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

GRIFFITHS-FULTON, Karl, Lecturer, Department of Systems Design Engineering, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

MEUNIER, Sarah, Lecturer, Department of Chemical Engineering, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

MORENO, Carlos, Lecturer, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

Adjunct Appointments – Graduate Supervision and Research
LIN, Xiaodong, Assistant Professor, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, April 1, 2015 – March 31, 2018.

Adjunct Appointments – Graduate Supervision
ROE, Peter, Professor, Department of Systems Design Engineering, March 1, 2015 – February 28, 2018.

Adjunct Reappointments – Research
LAWSON, Scott, Associate Professor, Department of Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering, May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2018.
MORALEJO, Carol, Assistant Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering, May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2017.

**Adjunct Reappointments – Graduate Supervision and Research**
LENARD, John, Professor, Department of Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering, May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2018.

**Cross Appointments**
CHEN, Zhongwei, John, Associate Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering to Department of Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering, March 1, 2015 – February 28, 2018.
GRINDROD, Kelly, Assistant Professor, School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Science to Department of Systems Design Engineering, March 1, 2015 – February 28, 2018.

**Cross Reappointments**
AL-MAYAH, Adil, Assistant Professor, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering to Department of Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering, June 1, 2015 – May 31, 2018.

**B. ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS**
IOANNIDIS, Marios, Associate Chair, Undergraduate Studies, Department of Chemical Engineering, May 1, 2015 – April 30, 2017.

**C. SABBATICAL LEAVES**
*For Approval by the Board of Governors*
HEGAZI, Tarek, Professor, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, March 1, 2016 – August 31, 2016, six months at 100% salary.
HEUNIS, Andrew, Professor, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016, twelve months at 85% salary.
MANTIN, Binyamin, Associate Professor, Department of Management Sciences, September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016, twelve months at 92.6% salary.
PARKER, Wayne, Professor, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016, twelve months at 100% salary.
PETErssoN, sean, D, Professor, Department of Mechanical & Mechatronics Engineering, January 1, 2016 – June 30, 2016, six months at 100% salary.

Pearl Sullivan
Dean, Faculty of Engineering
FOR INFORMATION

A. APPOINTMENTS

Probationary Term Appointment

COLLINS, Andrea, Assistant Professor, Department of Environment and Resource Studies, July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2018; PhD, Queen’s University, 2014; MA, University of Waterloo, 2008; BA, University of Waterloo, 2006. Currently, a SSHRC-funded postdoctoral researcher at the Institute of Political Economy (Carleton), Dr. Collins has a strong publication record and an evident passion for teaching and research. Her work focuses on the global governance of land and gender dynamics around land governance in a global context and will provide a valuable contribution to the Environmental Governance and Policy profile in the Faculty of Environment.

Adjunct Appointments

Graduate Supervision

SINCLAIR, John, Professor, Department of Environment and Resource Studies, March 1, 2015 to April 30, 2018.

YERUBANDI, Ram, Research Scientist, Department of Geography and Environmental Management, April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2018.

ZHUANG, Cecilia, Assistant Professor, School of Planning, January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015.

Special Appointments

Instruction

JOAKIM, Erin, Lecturer, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

JOAKIM, Erin, Lecturer, Faculty of Environment, September 1, 2015 to April 30, 2016.

PHAN, Thang Chau, Lecturer, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

STEWART, Douglas, Lecturer, Department of Environment and Resource Studies, September 1, 2015 to December 31, 2015.

Cross Appointments

FRAYNE, Bruce, Associate Professor, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development to the Department of Environment and Resource Studies, May 1, 2015 to April 30, 2018.

WEBER, Olaf, Associate Professor, School of Environment, Enterprise and Development to the Department of Environment and Resource Studies, March 1, 2015 to December 31, 2018.

Graduate Students Appointed as Part-Time Lecturers

CRAY, Heather, Faculty of Environment, May 1 2015 to August 31, 2015.

DOU, Yue, Department of Geography and Environmental Management, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.
McTAVISH, Michael, Faculty of Environment, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

SILVER, Amber, Department of Geography and Environmental Management, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENT
SINGH, Simron, Teaching Fellow, Faculty of Environment, August 1, 2015 to June 30, 2018.

Jean Andrey
Interim Dean
FOR INFORMATION

A. APPOINTMENTS (for approval by the Board of Governors)

Provisional-Term Appointments
LIU, Jun (BS, 2002, Shanghai Jiao-Tong University; MS, 2005, Peking University; PhD, 2010, University of Waterloo), Assistant Professor, Dept. of Applied Mathematics, September 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018. Dr. Liu is currently a Lecturer at the University of Sheffield, UK. Dr. Liu's area of research is the theory and applications of nonlinear, hybrid and networked control systems. Dr. Liu has made significant contributions to the stability theory of hybrid dynamical systems. Recent work is in the area of correct-by-construction control design. Dr. Liu will strengthen the Control Theory group in the department.

Continuing Appointments
SKRZYDLO, Diane (BMath, 2006; MMath, 2007, both from the University of Waterloo), Lecturer, Dept. of Statistics and Actuarial Science, January 1, 2016. Ms. Skrzydlo will teach six courses per year and participate in department activities as required.

Definite Term - Appointments
AHMED, Reaz, Research Assistant Professor, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, April 1, 2015 – March 31, 2016.


Definite Term - Reappointments
ROH, Patrick, Lecturer, Dept. of Combinatorics and Optimization, May 1, 2016 – April 30, 2017.

SAFAYENI, Suzanne, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016.

Visiting Appointments
LAHLOU, Laaziz (Universite de Paris), Scholar, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – September 30, 2015.

XU, Wei, Associate Professor, Dept. of Combinatorics and Optimization, July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016.

Adjunct Appointments

Research
COLLINS, Benoit (Kyoto University), Professor, Dept. of Pure Mathematics, July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018.

Adjunct Reappointments

Instructor
AL-MASRI, Eyhab, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

BARSALOU, Edward, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

CHOW, Amenda, Lecturer, Dept. of Applied Mathematics, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

DICKEY, Leroy, Lecturer, Dept. of Pure Mathematics, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

DUR-E_AHMAD, Muhammed, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

HARJI, Ashif, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

HOLTBY, Dan, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

LANCTOT, Kevin, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

ROBERTS, Collin, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

SAKHNINI, Victoria, Lecturer, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.


Research
OLIVEIRA, Toacy (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro), Associate Professor, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, March 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018.

Graduate Students appointed as Part-time Lecturers
BEVOCICH, Cecylia, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

DERKA, Martin, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

Graduate Students reappointed as Part-time Lecturers
AVERY, Jeff, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

BRIGHT, Curtis, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, May 1, 2015 – August 31, 2015.

Postdoctoral Fellows appointed as Part-time Lecturers
CARRELL, Sean, Dept. of Combinatorics and Optimization, June 1, 2015 – May 31, 2016.
B. ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

ADMINISTRATIVE REAPPOINTMENTS


STRUTHERS, Cynthia, Faculty Teaching Fellow, Office of the Dean, July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016.

C. RETIREMENT
ZORZITTO, Frank, Professor, Dept. of Pure Mathematics, effective August 31, 2015.

D. SABBATICALS (for approval by the Board of Governors)
KÖNEMANN, Jochen, Professor, Dept. of Combinatorics and Optimization, September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016, with 98.9% salary.

LI, Yuying, Professor, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016, with 100% salary.

LUBLIW, Anna, Professor, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016, with 85% salary.

SANITA, Laura, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Combinatorics and Optimization, July 1, 2015 – December 31, 2015, with 100% salary. This is a special early sabbatical.

SHALLIT, Jeffrey, Professor, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, September 1, 2015 – August 31, 2016, with 85% salary.

WEDDELL, Grant, Professor, David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, September 1, 2015 – February 29, 2016, with 85% salary.

Ian P. Goulden
Dean
A. **APPOINTMENTS**

**Definite Term Reappointment – Full-Time**

DURR, Hans, Research Assistant Professor, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2018.

**Visiting Reappointment**

LEGGETT, Anthony J., Professor, Department of Physics and Astronomy and Institute for Quantum Computing, June 16, 2015 to August 15, 2015.

**Adjunct Appointments**

**Graduate Supervision**

HIGGINS, Scott N., Professor, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2018.

**Graduate Supervision and Research**

COOK, Rachel, Assistant Professor, Department of Biology, April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2018.

**Adjunct Reappointments**

**Graduate Supervision**

JEEN, Sung-Wook, Assistant Professor, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017.

QUINTON, William L., Professor, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, March 1, 2015 to February 28, 2018.

SCHNETTER, Erik, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics and Astronomy, April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2020.

**Graduate Supervision and Research**

BURGESS, Cliff, Professor, Department of Physics and Astronomy, February 1, 2015 to January 31, 2020.

DUMBROFF, Erwin B., (Distinguished Professor Emeritus), Professor, Department of Biology, May 1, 2015 to April 30, 2018.

MOFFAT, John W., Professor, Department of Physics and Astronomy, June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2020.
Graduate Instruction/Graduate Supervision/Research

HARDY, Lucien, Associate Professor, Department of Physics and Astronomy, May 1, 2015 to April 30, 2020.

Cross Appointments

COURTENAY, Simon C., Professor, Department of Environment and Resource Studies, cross appointed to Department of Biology, April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2018.

Change in Appointment

CHRISTIAN, Lisa, Associate Clinical Professor, School of Optometry and Vision Science, first probationary appointment extended one year in accordance with Policy 76 due to maternity leave. Original appointment dates were January 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016; new end date is now June 30, 2017.

Special Appointment

Staff Appointed as Faculty

MARRONE, Laura, Sessional Lecturer, Department of Chemistry, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

Postdoctoral Fellow Appointed as Lecturer

EAGLING, Jane, Sessional Lecturer, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, January 1, 2015 to April 30, 2015.

VEERAMANI, Harish, Sessional Lecturer, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, January 1, 2015 to April 30, 2015.

Special Reappointment

Undergraduate Instruction

SIAN, Preet, Sessional Lecturer, School of Pharmacy, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

Postdoctoral Fellows Reappointed as Lecturer

DELANEY, Keith, Sessional Lecturer, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

HEINIG, Nina, Sessional Lecturer, Department of Physics and Astronomy, May 1, 2015 to August 31, 2015.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENT

FRAPE, Shaun, Associate Chair and Undergraduate Officer, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, May 1, 2015 to April 30, 2017.
ADMINISTRATIVE REAPPOINTMENTS

CHARLES, Trevor, Associate Chair, Graduate Studies, Department of Biology, May 1, 2015 to June 30, 2015.

CHRISTIAN, Lisa, Associate Director, Clinics, School of Optometry and Vision Science, February 2, 2015 to August 31, 2017.

JONES, Deborah, Associate Director, Academics, School of Optometry and Vision Science, July 1, 2015 to August 31, 2017.

FOR APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

C. SABBATICAL

CHUONG, Simon, Associate Professor, Department of Biology, September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016, 100% salary arrangements.

JENNEWEIN, Thomas, Associate Professor, Department of Physics and Astronomy, September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016, 85% salary arrangements.

T.B. McMahon
Dean

TBM:lw
The Senate Executive Committee met on 2 March 2015 and 4 May 2015 and agreed to forward the following item to Senate for first reading (23 March) and second reading (19 May).

FOR SECOND READING

Senate Bylaw 4: A bylaw relating to the naming of additional \textit{ex officio} members of Senate
The amended Senate Bylaw 4 [see attachment 1] is forwarded to Senate for second reading. The recommended changes include the addition of the associate vice-president, academic as an \textit{ex officio} member of Senate and the deletion of the vice-president, administration & finance as membership for this position is provided in \textit{The University of Waterloo Act}, s.18.a.3.

Feridun Hamdullahpur
President
Senate Executive Committee
Report to Senate – 19 May 2015

Senate Bylaw 4

A bylaw relating to the naming of additional *ex officio* members of Senate of the University of Waterloo.

BE IT ENACTED as a bylaw of Senate of the University of Waterloo, as follows:

1. *Ex officio members*

WHEREAS *The University of Waterloo Act, 1972* provides in section 18.a.9 that Senate of the university may add to its membership such other *ex officio* members as Senate by bylaw may, from time to time, designate; and

WHEREAS *The University of Waterloo Act, 1972* provides in section 18.b.2 that elected members of the faculty shall equal in number one more than the total number of all other members of Senate; and

WHEREAS *The University of Waterloo Act, 1972* provides in Section 18.c. that upon the designation of and addition, from time to time, by Senate of any additional *ex officio* members, the number of elected members from the Board of Governors, the undergraduate students, the graduate students and the alumni shall be increased by whatever numbers are necessary to retain the ratios, in each case, of the number of such elected persons to the number of elected faculty.

BE IT THEREFORE enacted as a bylaw of Senate of the University of Waterloo as follows:

That the following be named as *ex officio* members of Senate:

a. The vice-president, administration & finance.
b. The vice-president, advancement.
c. The vice-president, university relations.
d. The vice-president, university research.
e. **The associate vice-president, academic.**
f. The associate provost, resources.
g. The president of the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo.
h. The president of the Federation of Students, University of Waterloo.
i. The president of the Graduate Student Association - University of Waterloo.

That the chief returning officer be empowered upon passage of this bylaw to take whatever steps are necessary to carry out such elections or by-elections as may be necessary to comply with the provisions of *The University of Waterloo Act, 1972*, cited above and arising from the designation of *ex officio* members of Senate by the passage or amendment of this bylaw.

Approved by Senate May 20, 1975.
Amended by Senate at two readings, December 1980 and January 1981.
Amended by Senate at two readings, December 1983 and January 1984.
Amended by Senate at two readings, May 1987 and June 1987.
Amended by Senate at two readings, May 1990 and June 1990.
Amended by Senate at two readings, October 2012 and November 2012.
Amended by Senate in two readings, November 2013 and January 2014.
Amended from bylaw 11 by Senate in two readings, September and October 2014.
Senate Finance Committee met on 18 March 2015, and agreed to forward the following item to Senate for information.

Further details are available at: https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat-general-counsel/committees-and-councils/senate-finance-committee

FOR INFORMATION

At the meeting of Senate on 20 October 2014, Senate passed a motion directing each of its committees and councils to review term limits for membership and the composition of those committees and councils.

Senate Finance Committee Membership

SFC is established pursuant to Senate Bylaw 2, section 2. The *ex officio* membership of SLRP is provided in section 2.02(a) as follows:

a. *Ex Officio*
   i. The president of the university, who shall chair this committee.
   ii. The vice-president, academic & provost.
   iii. The vice-president, administration & finance.
   iv. The vice-president, university research.
   v. The associate provost, graduate studies.
   vi. The associate provost, resources.
   vii. The dean of each faculty.

The elected membership of SUC is provided in section 3.02 (b) as follows:

b. Elected
   i. One member from the community-at-large members of the Board of Governors.
   ii. One elected faculty member of Senate from each faculty and one faculty member of Senate from the affiliated and federated institutions of Waterloo.
   iii. Three members from the elected student members of Senate, at least one of whom shall be an undergraduate student and at least one of whom shall be a graduate student.
   iv. One member from among the alumni members of Senate.

Observations of SFC

SFC considered its composition, term limits and general activity. Following this consideration, SFC provided no prospective amendments to its composition, term limited or any other aspect of its section of Senate Bylaw 2.

Feridun Hamdullahpur
President and Vice-Chancellor
Senate Graduate & Research Council met on 9 March 2015, and agreed to forward the following item to Senate for information.

Further details are available at: https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/committees-and-councils/senate-graduate-research-council

FOR INFORMATION

At the meeting of Senate on 20 October 2014, Senate passed a motion directing each of its committees and councils to review term limits for membership and the composition of those committees and councils.

Senate Graduate & Research Council Membership

SGRC is established pursuant to Senate Bylaw 2, section 4. The \textit{ex officio} membership of SGRC is provided in section 4.02(a) as follows:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ex Officio}
  \begin{enumerate}
  \item The president of the university.
  \item The vice-president, academic & provost.
  \item The vice-president, university research, who shall co-chair this council.
  \item The associate provost, graduate studies, who shall co-chair this committee.
  \item The associate dean of graduate studies in the graduate studies office.
  \item The associate vice-president, university research.
  \item The associate vice-president, external research.
  \item The chief ethics officer.
  \item The director, research partnerships.
  \item The director, graduate academic services.
  \item The university librarian, or designate.
  \item The president of the Graduate Student Association.
  \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

The elected/appointed membership of SGRC is provided in section 4.02 (b) as follows:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Elected / Appointed
  \begin{enumerate}
  \item Two faculty members with Approved Doctoral Dissertation Supervisor status from each faculty, one of whom must be an associate dean with a research and/or graduate studies portfolio. Associate deans serve without term limits; others serve for a two-year term.
  \item One faculty member from the affiliated and federated institutions of Waterloo, who shall serve for a term of two years.
  \item One graduate student from each faculty, each of whom shall serve for a term of two years.
  \end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}
Observations of SGRC

SGRC considered its composition, term limits and general activity and made the following observations which are forwarded for the information and consideration of Senate:

1. Consideration for amendment of graduate student appointments to a one year renewable term from a two year term
   - SGRC noted the inherent difficulty in recruiting graduate students to serve
   - In practice these two year terms are usually filled by doctoral students, who are in general more certain about their long time horizon at the university
   - A shorter one year commitment may better facilitate access to service on the committee from master’s students, who may otherwise anticipate being on campus for a short time that would not allow for a full two year term.
   - This proposal would also maintain flexibility for students to serve for longer periods

2. In practice the two faculty members identified in section 4.02(b) are the associate deans for research and for graduate studies. SGRC speculated that a third faculty member serving a two-year term may provide an important resource when the associate dean(s) may not be available

3. Potential to separate the powers and duties so as to delineate between graduate and research functions
   - The current structure of SGRC is the result of a merger of the formerly separated graduate studies and research councils in 2003. Each area has seen significant growth since that time, which may provide a rationale for separation on the grounds of practicality and the significant volume of business proceeding through SGRC
   - However, members also noted the close relationship between graduate studies and research with respect to the intercalation of activities and funding, which suggests that there are important synergies to be retained in maintaining the merged functions

4. SGRC may investigate the establishment of a subcommittee to handle otherwise routine matters, such as minor curricular submissions

Aside from the summary provided in this report, SGRC made no observations as to the desirability of removing or adding any *ex officio* positions.

SGRC would like to obtain the views and opinions of Senate regarding these observations before embarking on further activity toward a potential amendment to its bylaw.

/sg
George Dixon Jim Frank
Vice-President, University Research Associate Provost, Graduate Studies
Senate Long Range Planning Committee met on 13 March 2015, and agreed to forward the following item to Senate for information.

Further details are available at: https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/committees-and-councils/long-range-planning-committee

FOR INFORMATION

At the meeting of Senate on 20 October 2014, Senate passed a motion directing each of its committees and councils to review term limits for membership and the composition of those committees and councils.

Senate Long Range Planning Committee Membership

SLRP is established pursuant to Senate Bylaw 2, section 3. The *ex officio* membership of SFC is provided in section 3.02(a) as follows:

a. *Ex Officio*
   i. The president of the university.
   ii. The vice-president, academic & provost, who shall chair this committee.
   iii. The vice-president, administration & finance.
   iv. The vice-president, university research.
   v. The associate provost, graduate studies.
   vi. The associate provost, resources.
   vii. The dean of each faculty.

The elected membership of SLRP is provided in section 3.02 (b) as follows:

b. Elected
   i. One elected faculty member of Senate from each faculty and one faculty member of Senate from the affiliated and federated institutions of Waterloo.
   ii. One member from the Board of Directors of the Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo.
   iii. Three members of Senate from the elected student members, at least one of whom shall be an undergraduate student and at least one of whom shall be a graduate student.
   iv. One member of Senate from the community-at-large members of the Board of Governors.
   v. One member from among the alumni members of Senate.

Observations of SLRP

SLRP considered its composition, term limits and general activity and made the following observations which are forwarded for the information and consideration of Senate:

1. Consideration for longer terms for members appointed to a one year term, and potential to enshrine the ability to reappoint members with one year terms.
   - With relatively few meetings per year, the one year appointment term can be constraining and hinders the accumulation of corporate memory for those members serving one year terms

SLRP would like to obtain the views and opinions of Senate regarding these observations before embarking on further activity toward a potential amendment to its bylaw.

Ian Orchard
Vice-President, Academic & Provost
Senate Undergraduate Council met on 10 March 2015, and agreed to forward the following item to Senate for information.

Further details are available at: uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/committees-and-councils/senate-undergraduate-council

FOR INFORMATION

At the meeting of Senate on 20 October 2014, Senate passed a motion directing each of its committees and councils to review term limits for membership and the composition of those committees and councils.

Senate Undergraduate Council Membership

SUC is established pursuant to Senate Bylaw 2, section 5. The *ex officio* membership of SUC is provided in section 5.02(a) as follows:

a. *Ex Officio*
   i. The president of the university.
   ii. The vice-president, academic & provost.
   iii. The associate vice-president, academic, who shall co-chair this council.
   iv. The dean of the federated university.
   v. The associate dean for undergraduate studies for each faculty.
   vi. The registrar of the university.
   vii. The university librarian, or delegate.
   viii. The vice-president (education) or equivalent from the Undergraduate Student Association of each faculty of the university.

The elected/appointed membership of SUC is provided in section 5.02 (b) as follows:

b. Elected / Appointed
   i. One member of the faculty from each faculty of the university which offers undergraduate programs, each of whom shall serve for a term of two years.
   ii. One member of faculty from the federated university, who shall serve for a term of two years.
   iii. One member of faculty from the affiliated university colleges, who shall serve for a term of two years.
   iv. A director appointed from Co-operative Education & Career Action.
   v. An executive member appointed from the Federation of Students.

Observations of SUC

SUC considered its composition, term limits and general activity and made the following observations which are forwarded for the information and consideration of Senate:

1. It would be desirable to allow a delegate to attend in place of the vice-president (education) or equivalent from the Undergraduate Student Association of each faculty of the university
- This would facilitate greater student involvement and participation. Many students are often not on campus due to co-op terms, or may otherwise discover conflicts with their academic programming after their appointment has been made.

2. Section 5.02(a)(v) may be amended from “The associate dean for undergraduate studies for each faculty” to “An associate dean from each faculty with an undergraduate studies portfolio”
   - Some faculties have restructured or are restructuring the portfolios of associate deans whereby more than one person may have responsibility for undergraduate studies, and this amendment would reflect this evolution.

3. Section 5.02(b)(iv) may be amended from “A director appointed from Co-operative Education & Career Action” to “The executive director, Co-operative Education & Career Action or delegate”, and movement of the position from the Elected/Appointed Category into the Ex Officio category
   - This proposal would more accurately reflect the role played by this member on the committee.

4. Members expressed general agreement with the two year terms for members with those terms, and to not imposing any limit the number of allowed terms for those members.

SUC would like to obtain the views and opinions of Senate regarding these observations before embarking on further activity toward a potential amendment to its bylaw.

Mario Coniglio  
Associate Vice-President, Academic

/mg
Senate Graduate & Research Council met on 13 April 2015, and agreed to forward the following items to Senate for approval. These items are recommended for inclusion in the regular agenda.

Further details are available at: https://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/committees-and-councils/senate-graduate-research-council

FOR APPROVAL

CHANGES TO ACADEMIC PLANS

Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
School of Public Health and Health Systems

1. Motion: To approve a change to the name and acronym of the PhD and MSc degrees in the School of Public Health and Health Systems from “Health Studies and Gerontology” (HSG) to “Public Health and Health Systems” (PHHS).

Rationale: With the previous transformation of the Department of Health Studies and Gerontology to the School of Public Health and Health Systems, along with rapid expansion and increasing diversity of courses and interests of students, the nomenclature for the PhD and MSc degrees no longer is appropriate. In an academic program review of the school’s undergraduate and graduate programs, the external reviewers recommended changing the names of the MSc and PhD degrees to better reflect the nature of the programs. The school is in the process of reviewing and revising the PhD and MSc programs and the change in the degree name is a first step in the process.

Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
School of Social Work

2. Motion: To amend the Master of Social Work plan to add the milestone “Master’s Seminar Presentation” and to amend the text of the degree requirements in the graduate calendar as presented.

(note: strikeout = deleted text)

Degree Requirements

One Year (Full-Time) and Two Year (Part-Time) MSW degree requirements:

The Master of Social Work (MSW) program has a course-based curriculum, which includes a degree requirement of 6 required courses (4 online courses and 2 week-long, on-campus summer block courses, one in August at the beginning of the program and one in July or August (TBD) at the end of the program), two online elective courses, plus one practicum (462 hours of supervised practice including the Capstone Experience), and one integration seminar. The Practicum, Integration Seminar and Seminar Presentation Capstone are all graded credit/non-credit.

Rationale: In the original plan proposal, the capstone presentation was included in a practicum course which was changed to a milestone degree requirement in 2012. Now that the first cohort has completed the program (including the milestone which includes the capstone presentation), it has become clear that the capstone presentation needs to be a separate milestone degree requirement due to the intensity and time commitment of this academic expectation.

George Dixon   Jim Frank
Vice-President, University Research   Associate Provost, Graduate Studies
Senate Undergraduate Council met on 14 April 2015 and Senate Graduate & Research Council met on 13 April 2015 and both councils agreed to forward item #1 for Senate approval.

Senate Undergraduate Council met on 14 April 2015, and on behalf of Senate approved minor changes to academic plans, changes to faculty regulations, new courses and course changes. Council agreed to forward the following items (excepting item #1) to Senate for approval.

Further details are available at: uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/committees-and-councils/senate-undergraduate-council

FOR APPROVAL

INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS

1. Motion: To approve amendments to the university’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) as described in Attachment 1.

Rationale: The attached document tracks draft changes to the IQAP which aim to improve the clarity and flow of the document and integrates lessons learned by many of the main actors involved in the IQAP. Following approval of the revised IQAP by Senate, the IQAP must be ratified by the Ontario Quality Council.

NEW ACADEMIC PLANS [effective 1 January 2016]

- Faculty of Engineering
  Mechanical Engineering

2. Motion: To approve the new Welding and Joining Specialization as presented.

   Elective Courses - Complementary and Technical

   …

   o Courses required for the Welding and Joining Specialization
     ME 435 Industrial Metallurgy
     ME 436 Welding and Joining Processes
     ME 526 Fatigue and Fracture Analysis
     ME 535 Welding Metallurgy
     ME 538 Welding Design, Fabrication and Quality Control
     ME 547 Robot Manipulators: Kinematics, Dynamics, Control (optional)

   …

The Mechanical Engineering Welding and Joining Specialization

Only Mechanical Engineering students may take the Welding and Joining Specialization. Details of this specialization are to earn the Welding and Joining Specialization designation, students must take five (5) specific technical electives in their 4A and 4B terms; ME 435, ME 436, ME 526, ME 535, ME 538, as shown below in Table B:

Table B – The Mechanical Engineering Welding and Joining Specialization

Key for next table:
* Recommended Only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4A (F,S)</td>
<td>ME 400A  ME 481  ME 435  ME 436  TE  1 CSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B (W)</td>
<td>ME 400B  ME 482  ME 526  ME 535  ME 538  TE/ME 547*  1 CSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An average of at least 60% in the five specialization courses and a grade of at least 50% in each of the five courses is required. For students that take and meet the specialization requirements, the credential is recognized on both the diploma and the transcript.

**Rationale:** This specialization has existed within the department for several years and this motion will move the specialization to one that is university-sponsored and which will appear on transcripts and diplomas. The amendments indicated in the submission serve to show changes that will also be made to the calendar text in migrating the specialization out of the department.

**CHANGES TO ACADEMIC PLANS [effective 1 September 2016]**

**Faculty of Applied Health Sciences**

**Recreation and Leisure Studies**

3. **Motion:** To change the plan name from Honours Tourism and Parks Management to Honours Tourism Development, and to approve amendments plan as described.

(Note: **strikeout** = deleted text, **bold** = new text)

Honours Tourism **Development** and Parks Management

Recreation courses (minimum of 10.0 units):

- Required Recreation courses (6.5 8.5 units): REC 100, REC 101, **REC 107, REC 120, REC 201, REC 205, REC 220, REC 230, REC 270, REC 280**, REC 311, REC 334/ENVS 334, **REC 356, REC 371, REC 373, REC 380, REC 405, REC 420, REC 480**, and three of REC 383/GEOG 323, REC 416, REC 425/PLAN 414, REC 433/ENVS 433, REC 437/ENVS 444, REC 480 with a minimum of two of these (1.0 unit) at the 400 level.

Recreation elective courses (minimum of 3.5 1.5 units):

Each student must complete additional recreation electives to meet the required minimum of 10.0 recreation units.

- Note that MU353 (see Wilfrid Laurier University calendar) "Inclusive Arts for Children" is accepted as a University of Waterloo recreation elective (1.0 unit).
- All cross-listed courses with REC are counted as recreation electives and are included in the major average.

Courses outside the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies (maximum of 10.0 units):

- Required courses (2.0 1.0 units):
  - ECON 101
  - ENVS 200 (Parks) or ECON 220 (Tourism)
  - PSYCH 101
  - SOC 101

- Restricted elective courses (2.0 units):
  - Select one course from four of the following eight subject categories:
    - An English course
      - An English writing course (one of ENGL 109, ENGL 129R, ENGL 140R, or any ENGL 210 course) is strongly recommended.
- A Fine or Performing Arts course
  - DRAMA, FINE, MUSIC
- A Humanities course
  - CLAS, EASIA, HIST, HUMSC, JS, NATST, PACS, PHIL, REES, RS, SPCOM, SPD, WS
- A Social Science course other than Psychology or Sociology
  - ANTH, ECON, SDS, LS, PSCI, SMF, SOCWK, STV
- A Language course from the Faculty of Arts (other than English or ESL)
- A course from the Faculty of Applied Health Sciences (other than Recreation)
  - GERON, HLTH, KIN
- A course from the Faculty of Environment
  - ENVS, ERS, GEOG, INDEV, INTEG, PLAN
- A course offered by the School of Computer Science

Note: The course subjects listed may not be comprehensive. For a complete list, or approval of a specific course subject, please see the academic advisor or the department website.

Tourism and Parks Management elective courses (3.5-5.0 units):
Tourism and Parks Management electives have been categorized into two focus areas—Tourism Management and Park Management. Students may choose electives from one focus area or any combination of courses listed. The focus area is not designated on the degree.

Select 3.5-5.0 units from the following list:

Tourism Management
- ANTH 348
- NATST 272
- ECON 220
- ENGL 108D
- ENGL 208M
- ENGL 295
- ENVS 200, 195
- ERS 253
- ERS 371
- ERS 372
- ERS 404/PSCI 432
- GEOG 202
- GEOG 233
- GEOG 319/PLAN 320
- GEOG 323/REC 383
- GEOG 333/REC 333
- GEOG 423
- GEOG 426
- GEOG 432/HLTH 420/PLAN 432
- HRM 200
- INDEV 100
- INTST 100
- PLAN 100
- PSCI 252
- PSCI 350
- PSCI 389
- PSCI 404
- REC 215
- REC 218
- REC 311
- REC 312
- REC 422
- REC 425/PLAN 414
- REC 433/ENVS 433
- REC 480

Park Management
- ECON 220
- ENVS 201
- ERS 215
- ERS 383/BIOL 383
- GEOG 102 or SCI 250
- GEOG 356
- GEOG 368/PLAN 341
- GEOG 405
- PLAN 340
- REC 316
- REC 416
- REC 425/PLAN 414
- REC 433/ENVS 433
- REC 437/ENVS 444

Note: Students may only count courses listed here as Tourism and Park Management electives if they are taken over and above the required recreation courses (see #1 above).

Free elective courses: ≥ 4.0 units

Total number of units to complete degree is 20.0.

Notes:
1. The elective courses are used to fill the recreation elective courses and free elective courses.
2. Students are permitted to pursue a double major in any of Honours Recreation and Sport Business, Honours Therapeutic Recreation, and Honours Tourism Development and Parks Management, by meeting the requirements of each plan.

Rationale: As a result of the department’s recent augmented review and the recommendations made as part of the review, the department has undertaken an extensive curriculum review process. The core requirements for all degrees have been changed to facilitate engaging and high impact student learning experiences to inspire passion, action, and leadership. The revised curriculum focuses on cohort experiences for students beginning in first year through to graduation and incorporates increased opportunities for experiential learning, case-based learning, community engagement opportunities, and greater integration of classroom, research, and work/volunteer experiences. The Parks Management curriculum components have been removed from the degree due to decreasing enrolment in this area. Students interested in studying park management can continue to do so through the parks option in the Faculty of Environment.

Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
School of Public Health and Health Systems

4. Motion: To rename the Bachelor of Health Promotion program and degree nomenclature to Bachelor of Public Health.
Rationale: Both a Bachelor of Health Promotion and Bachelor of Public Health were proposed within months of each other. External reviewers expressed concern at the appropriateness of the degree nomenclature and felt that the entry-level Bachelor of Health Promotion (BHP) might better have been entitled a Bachelor of Public Health. The external reviewers added that with the addition of concentrations or distinctive tracks, the first of which could be health promotion, this would offer the same advantages as the BHP nomenclature with greater clarity to potential employers. Reviewers suggested consolidating the proposed new degrees (e.g., BPH) and adding streams or specializations within our existing degrees to most effectively use the faculty expertise extant within the school. Therefore, the school proposes the renaming of the program and degree as Bachelor of Public Health.

Faculty of Arts  
Plan Standardization

5. **Motion:** To approve the plan standardization templates as presented in Attachment 2.

   **Rationale:** The Faculty of Arts has undertaken its plan standardization initiative with the aim of retaining more students within declared disciplinary majors and with honours standing, while also improving clarity and ease of access for students who wish to switch or combine their major plans. The template attached will facilitate a standard approach and common look and feel to arts plans toward these goals.

Faculty of Arts  
Anthropology

6. **Motion:** To amend all anthropology plans as presented in Attachment 3.

   **Rationale:** The Faculty of Arts has undertaken standardizing plan requirements for all BA academic plans within departments, as well as plan requirements between departments. For the Honours major, the collapsed text aims to simplify the navigation within the UG Calendar and to remove redundant text.

Faculty of Arts  
Sociology

7. **Motion:** To amend all sociology plans as presented in Attachment 4.

   **Rationale:** See rationale for motion #6.

CHANGES TO REGULATIONS

Office of the Registrar  
Amendments to Regulations

8. **Motion:** To approve amendments to the exam regulations and related matters of the calendar to add the prohibition of food at exams as presented and effective 20 May 2015.

   Students are prohibited from bringing food in to final examinations. Water is allowed as long as it is in a clear bottle without labels. Students can make arrangements for short nutrition breaks with the Instructor/Proctor. Students must register for special accommodations with AccessAbility Services and submit appropriate documentation from a recognized professional at least two weeks prior to the start of the final examination period.

   **Rationale:** This new regulation will mitigate issues of distraction during exams, including for such distractions as noise and smell, while also helping to counter risks to academic integrity by removing potential unauthorized aids. This regulation was brought to the Undergraduate Student Relations
Committee and the Graduate Student Relations Committee and did not encounter major objections at those bodies.

9. **Motion:** To approve amendments to regulations on changes to a student record or transcript post degree conferment to disallow any change to a student’s record once the degree has been conferred, as presented and effective 1 September 2016.

(note: **underline** = new text)

...  

**Convocation/Application for Degree**
The University of Waterloo confers degrees and/or diplomas at two convocations per year, Spring (June) and Fall (October). All undergraduate students who expect to receive their degree or diploma at the next convocation ceremony must complete an Intention to Graduate form by the appropriate deadlines:

- Students completing degree requirements in the Fall term: December 1 (Spring Convocation)
- Students completing degree requirements in the Winter term: March 1 (Spring convocation)
- Students completing degree requirements in the Spring term: August 1 (Fall convocation)

Students should note that **adherence to these deadlines is critical** to allow the time required for processing and an in-depth review of their academic record.

Students who have applied to graduate but do not yet qualify for their degree must submit another Intention to Graduate form after completing the necessary degree requirements. Their academic records will then be reviewed for the next convocation ceremony.

**Once the degree, diploma or certificate has been conferred, a student is ratifying the undergraduate academic record upon which it was based. Therefore, student initiated changes to that record will not be made.**

The name printed on the diploma must be the student's legal name as recorded on his/her academic record. Any change to this name must be supported by official documentation and submitted to the Registrar's Office by the above deadlines.

Graduands who are unable to attend convocation will have their diplomas mailed to their permanent home address by the Registrar's Office.

**Rationale:** The Undergraduate Operations Committee has requested that a clearer message be placed in the calendar stating that once a degree has been given to the student, the student record cannot be changed, unless an administrative error was made. All faculties have agreed to adopt this general principle and Senate Undergraduate Council is in support of this principle as well.

Mario Coniglio  
Associate Vice-President, Academic
Proposal to update University of Waterloo’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)

**Motion:** To amend the University of Waterloo’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)

**Rationale:** Senate approval is required to implement needed updates to our existing IQAP. From the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (http://oucqa.ca/framework/1-3-quality-assurance-framework/)

“Over a period of two years, during which there was extensive consultation, OCAV developed this <Quality Assurance> Framework for quality assurance of all graduate and undergraduate programs offered by Ontario’s publicly assisted universities. Under this Framework, these institutions have undertaken to design and implement their own Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) that is consistent not just with their own mission statements and their university Degree Level Expectations, but also with the protocols of this Framework. The IQAPs are at the core of the quality assurance process. Furthermore, the universities have vested in the Quality Council the authority to make the final decision on whether, following the Council-mandated appraisal of any proposed new undergraduate or graduate program, such programs may commence.”

The current IQAP document is accessible at the following link: https://uwaterloo.ca/academic-reviews/sites/ca.academic-reviews/files/uploads/files/Institutional%20Quality%20Assurance%20Framework_0.pdf

The revised document is the first update since UW’s IQAP was first approved in 2011. The revised document has been improved substantially through numerous minor edits (shown in red text) to improve readability and reduce repetition. Text has also been rewritten or reorganized to improve clarity and flow. More substantive editorial changes are identified by the mark-up text on the right hand margin of the document. The document has also been modified to describe more accurately the processes followed and informed by experience garnered in the offices of the Associate Vice-President, Academic and Associate Provost, Graduate Studies and Institutional Analysis and Planning in preparing proposals for new programs and executing the regular cyclical reviews of existing programs.

The only substantial change to process (“Guidelines for Site Visits”, p. 9) relates to the review of interdisciplinary options and minors that are not attached to degree programs. In the previous IQAP three internal arms-length reviewers were required from outside the Faculty in which the program resided. The proposed revision reduces the number of internal reviewers to two, one of whom could be from the same Faculty, but demonstrably at arm’s length. This change has two benefits – there is less demand from UW faculty to participate in these reviews, and importantly, it should now be possible to include a reviewer with some related disciplinary expertise germane to the program under review. In the past, reviews of non-degree related
minors and options were less likely to have been critically examined by a reviewer having a closely-related disciplinary expertise.

The only substantial changes to content ("After the Site Visit", p. 13-15) are more clearly articulated requirements for program responses and two-year progress reports as they relate to the cyclical review of existing programs.

Following approval of the revised IQAP, the IQAP must be ratified by the Ontario Quality Council.
Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP)

Office of the Associate Vice-President, Academic Programs
and Office of the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1

Approved March 8, 2011
Revised March 2015
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A. Purpose and Scope of Reviews

Consistent with good educational practice, the University of Waterloo regularly reviews its academic programs. The schedule for undergraduate and graduate program reviews is based on a seven year cycle.

This Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP) document is consistent with recommendations of the Ontario Universities Council on Quality Assurance (the Quality Council), and is effective July 1 2011. Waterloo’s IQAP document replaces the previous guidelines for undergraduate programs (originally approved by Senate in February 1997), and previous guidelines for graduate programs (Ontario Council for Graduate Studies guidelines originally implemented in 1982). The current version of Waterloo’s IQAP was reviewed and updated in March 2015.

Any changes to the IQAP are subject to approval by Waterloo’s Senate and by the Quality Council. The review processes described herein are subject to regular audit by the Quality Council, on a schedule determined by the Quality Council. The threshold framework for degree expectations are Waterloo’s guidelines for Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (adopted by Senate in 2008), and Waterloo’s guidelines for Graduate Degree Level Expectations (adopted by Senate in 2010). These in turn conform to the Guidelines for Degree Level Expectations adopted by the Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) 2005.

In addition to the Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations, Waterloo intends its graduating students at the Bachelor’s level to be able to articulate their learning from experiential or applied opportunities, and to demonstrate an understanding of the intellectual, social, cultural, and political diversity of the world in which we live.

The OCAV framework for degree expectations, together with Waterloo’s enhancements, will support departments and academic units in planning or revising curricula and in communicating program goals and outcomes to students and other stakeholders. As of July 2011, departments and faculties engaged in program review shall use these guidelines as base expectations while retaining the flexibility to add objectives unique to their specialties.

The Quality Assurance Framework of the Quality Council is the foundational document for Waterloo’s IQAP. This framework defines a degree program as the “complete set and sequence of courses, combinations of courses and/or other units of study, research and practice prescribed by an institution for the fulfillment of the requirements of a particular degree”. Programs\(^1\) are not necessarily congruent with academic organizational units, and provision should be made to include joint programs and multi- or inter-disciplinary programs in a way

\(^1\)Note that while Waterloo’s student information system often uses the term “plan” to refer to a program, the term “program” will be used throughout this document to avoid confusion.
appropriate for the institution. At Waterloo, many students complete their degrees in a faculty rather than in a department or school. Faculty-based programs are treated similarly to their counterparts in departments or schools.

Following the Quality Assurance Framework, the scope of academic reviews at Waterloo covers “new and continuing undergraduate and graduate degree/diploma programs whether offered in full, in part, or conjointly by any institutions federated and affiliated with the university.” This also extends “to programs offered in partnership, collaboration or other such arrangement with other postsecondary institutions including colleges, universities, or institutes, including Institutes of Technology and Advanced Learning...”

At Waterloo, the fundamental purposes of the review process are to:

1. Help each program to achieve and maintain the highest possible standards of academic excellence, through systematically reflecting on its strengths and weaknesses, and looking forward to determine what actions would further enhance quality in the program;

2. Assess the quality of the program relative to counterpart programs in Ontario, Canada and internationally;

3. Meet public accountability expectations through a credible, transparent, and action-oriented review process; and

4. Create an institutional culture which understands and values the benefits of program reviews, while recognizing the significant workload implications of preparing a self-study, hosting a site visit, and providing a two-year progress report.

The design of the Program Review process is intended to be as streamlined as possible, while ensuring its accessibility and transparency to the Waterloo community. At Waterloo, the responsibility for undergraduate academic reviews rests with the position of Associate Vice-President Academic Programs. The responsibility for graduate academic reviews rests with the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies. Responsibility for combined (or augmented) reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs is allocated to one of these two individuals. These are the sole institutional contacts with the Quality Council.

Waterloo encourages combined augmented reviews where feasible. Not only can they be more efficient, they also have academic merit as there are frequently interactions between the undergraduate and graduate programs. Academic units proposing an augmented review should indicate their intention to the Associate Vice-President, Academic (AVPA) or Associate Provost, Graduate Studies (APGS) as soon as possible prior to the academic year in which the self-study actually takes place.

Academic programs are normally reviewed every seven years. To achieve alignment between the timing of reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs, dates can be adjusted, subject to the interval between reviews of individual programs not exceeding eight years. The
accreditation schedule for professional programs can be adjusted to allow the program review to occur simultaneously with the professional accreditation review.

Policy since 1998 has been that:

1. reviews would be treated as “whole of program reviews” in the belief that undergraduate and graduate programs should be considered together;
2. interdisciplinary options and minors are reviewed under the same arrangement as for single-discipline reviews except for the composition of the review committee; and
3. review processes for professional accreditation would be examined to determine if they meet the Waterloo and the Quality Council requirements for a program review.

The design of the Program Review process is intended to be as streamlined as possible, while ensuring its accessibility and transparency to the UW community.

At the University of Waterloo, many students complete their degrees in rather than in a or . Faculty-based programs are treated similarly to schedule for based on a seven year cycle and has been organized to place undergraduate program reviews in the same year as, or one year before or after, the scheduled Graduate Program Reviews, in order to allow information from one review to be used in the other review. Units are also encouraged where desired and appropriate to undertake combined undergraduate and graduate reviews (i.e. augmented reviews). However, it also is recognized that accreditation for professional programs occurs on a five year cycle the UW schedule of reviews to occur simultaneously with the professional accreditation review.

The self-study process is started during the preceding academic year with a joint presentation in September organized by the AVPA (undergraduate reviews) and the APGS (graduate reviews). In cases where the academic unit chooses to submit an augmented review, either the AVPA or APGS assumes primary responsibility for overseeing that particular review. Augmented reviews are shared in order to balance workloads. At the presentation, the nature of the review process is discussed, and opportunity is provided for questions. After the presentation, departments can contact either the AVPA or APGS office for further clarification on matters pertaining to their program. The self-study is submitted the following June, so that the site visit could be scheduled for either the following fall or winter term. Data for the self-study is provided primarily by Institutional Analysis and Planning (IAP) to ensure that it reflects centrally compiled institutional data, ensuring consistency in definitions, sources and dates, which is responsible for the integrity of the data. This data is not publicly available.

The following sections outline the expectations and processes associated with program reviews at the University of Waterloo. Throughout the UW guidelines, summaries/explanations/suggestions are written in italics.
B. Cyclical Reviews of Existing Academic Programs

1. Academic Programs

The Quality Assurance Framework specifies the key elements for the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). Waterloo’s approach to fulfilling each of the criteria is described in the sections “Guidelines for Self-Studies” and “Guidelines for Site Visits” below. These are identified below, followed by the UW approach to each. After discussing the basic process, information is provided regarding the processes for the Self-Study and Site Visits.

According to the Quality Assurance Framework, the institutional review practice should:

1. include a self-appraisal by professors, faculty, staff and students participating in the program (see section below “Guidelines for Self-Studies”).

(UW: A Self-Study for an undergraduate program will be reviewed and approved by the Associate Vice-President Academic Programs. A Self-Study for a graduate program will be reviewed and approved by the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies. A Self-Study for an augmented program will be reviewed and approved by both the Associate Vice-President Academic Programs or the Associate Provost, Graduate Studies. The guidelines for those reports are provided in the Manual). See Cyclical review template.

2. (2) have an evaluation, including a site visit by at least two external reviewers including one from a university outside Ontario. One internal reviewer is also mandated, from outside the discipline under review (see section below “Guidelines for Site Visits”).

(UW: each Site Visit involves two external reviewers, at arm’s length [not collaborators from the past seven years, supervisors or supervisees, relatives, etc.] from the program under review, normally with one from a university in Ontario and one from a university from outside Ontario. Reviewers should be Associate or Full Professors or equivalent, preferably with some experience of program management). Each Site Visit Team also involves one internal UW reviewer, chosen by the AVPA/APGS from a different Faculty than the one in which the program under review is located). See criteria for choosing Arm’s length reviewers. Guidelines for Site Visits are provided below.

3. (3) describe the process of assessment of the self-study and review within the university, describe how a final assessment report will be drafted, including an implementation plan for recommendations (see sections below “Quality Council Evaluation Criteria”, “Guidelines for the Report from the Review Team”, “4. After the Site Visit”).

4. describe reporting requirements (see section below “4. After the Site Visit”).

(UW: the Program Chair/Director, in collaboration with the Faculty Dean, submits a
Chair/Director’s Report to the AVPA/APGS, indicating actions to be taken as a result of what has been learned from the Self Study and the Site Visit. The AVPA/APGS writes a Final Assessment Report, summarizing information from the Self Study, the Review Team Report, and the response from the Program and the Dean as well as the implementation plan. Two years after the entire review process is complete, a Two-year Progress Report is submitted to either the AVPA/APGS in which progress is documented regarding actions taken by the Program, the Faculty and the University. Both the Final Assessment Report and the Two-year Progress Report are commented on and evaluated by Senate Undergraduate Council (undergraduate reviews) or Senate Graduate and Research Council (graduate reviews) or both for augmented. Any comments and/or concerns raised by Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council, together with the program’s response, will be incorporated into the Final Assessment Report or the Two-year Progress Report prior to it being presented to Senate. The AVPA/APGS subsequently reports to Senate, and provides a one-page summary for all programs which the Provost uses for reporting to the Board. At the time of the next Program Review, the Program is accountable for commitments made in response to the previous Program Review.

The Two-year Progress Report is presented to Senate and hence available publicly in the Senate Minutes; links to these documents are also available from

5. (a) provide an institutional manual that supports the institutional quality assurance process. Note that the approach at Waterloo here has been to develop an informative web site as well as a comprehensive template for the self-study document (volume I – Self-Study), as well as templates for the required supporting documentation (volume II – Faculty CVs, volume III – Proposed Reviewers)

How Waterloo’s IQAP meets criteria 1 through 4 is described below.

manual website (UW: Manual for Academic Reviews. Maintained by AVPA/APGS: individual items are updated regularly and sent to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for information; available online at http://grad.uwaterloo.ca/faculty/review.html)

The Quality Council Evaluation Criteria
The curricular content, admission requirements, mode of delivery, basis of evaluation of student performance, commitment of resources and overall quality of any program and its courses are all necessarily related to their goals, learning objectives and learning outcomes. Goals provide an overview for students, instructors and program/course evaluators of what the program or course aims to accomplish. Learning objectives are an expression of what the instructor intends that students should have learned or achieved by the end of the program or course. Learning
outcomes are what the students have actually learned or achieved in the program or course.

The Quality Assurance Framework specifies that the review of existing programs should use the following criteria (excerpted from Quality Assurance Framework):

1. Objectives
   a) Program is consistent with the institution’s mission and academic plans.
   b) Program requirements and learning outcomes are clear, appropriate and align with the institution’s statement of the undergraduate and/or graduate Degree Level Expectations.

2. Admission requirements
   Admission requirements are appropriately aligned with the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.

3. Curriculum
   a) The curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study.
   b) Evidence of any significant innovation or creativity in the content and/or delivery of the program relative to other such programs.
   c) Mode(s) of delivery to meet the program’s identified learning outcomes are appropriate and effective.

4. Teaching and assessment
   a) Methods for assessing student achievement of the defined learning outcomes and degree learning expectations are appropriate and effective.
   b) 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 objectives and the institution’s statement of Degree Level Expectations.

5. Resources
   Appropriateness and effectiveness of the academic unit’s use of existing human, physical and financial resources in delivering its program(s). In making this assessment, reviewers must recognize the institution’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation.

6. Quality indicators
   a) Faculty: qualifications, research and scholarly record; class sizes; percentage of classes taught by permanent or non-permanent (contractual) faculty; numbers, assignments and qualifications of part-time or temporary faculty;
   b) Students: applications and registrations; attrition rates; time-to-completion; final-year academic achievement; graduation rates; academic awards; student in-course reports on teaching; and
c) Graduates: rates of graduation, employment six months and two years after graduation, post-graduate study, "skills match" and alumni reports on program quality when available and when permitted by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA). Auditors will be instructed that these items may not be available and applicable to all programs.

7. Quality enhancement
Initiatives taken to enhance the quality of the program and the associated learning and teaching environment.

8. 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) Definition and application of indicators that provide evidence of faculty, student and program quality, for example:
  - Faculty: funding, honours and awards, and commitment to student mentoring;
  - Students: grade-level for admission, scholarly output, success rates in provincial and national scholarships, competitions, awards and commitment to professional and transferable skills;
  - Program: evidence of a program structure and faculty research that will ensure the intellectual quality of the student experience;
  - Sufficient graduate level courses that students will be able to meet the requirement that two-thirds of their course requirements be met through courses at this level.

Guidelines for Self-Studies
The chair/director of the program under review arranges for completion of a self-study with input from the dean, faculty members, staff, students and alumni. The template provided for the self-study reflects closely the guidelines articulated by the Quality Assurance Framework. The template includes the major headings relevant to self-assessment of the past, present and future, the organization and the people involved, research, service, teaching (with special attention to co-operative education and online learning), the students and the support available (human, physical and financial).

The Waterloo guidelines are broad in scope, so that each program being reviewed can emphasize those aspects that are most relevant. The review covers the last seven fiscal years (spring/fall/winter), with emphasis on the last several years. IAP provides most of the historical data for each program and ensures its integrity review.

Under each heading in the Waterloo guidelines are suggested areas that could be discussed and critically examined. In some cases, a topic may fit just as well under another heading. It is not necessary to repeat information in several sections, and generally it will be up to the program to
decide where information should be included in the self-study. The self-study should be broad-based, reflective, forward-looking and include critical analysis.

The self-study should address and document the:

- **consistency** of the program’s learning outcomes with the institution’s mission and **Degree Level Expectations**, and how its graduates achieve those outcomes;
- **program**-related data and measures of performance, including applicable provincial, national and professional standards (where available);
- **integrity** of the data;
- **review** criteria and quality indicators identified above;
- **concerns** and recommendations raised in previous reviews;
- **areas** identified through the conduct of the self-study as requiring improvement;
- **areas** that hold promise for enhancement;
- **academic** services that directly contribute to the academic quality of each program under review;
- **participation** of program faculty, staff, students and **alumni** in the self-study

**Faculty, staff and students associated with a program** should be provided the opportunity to participate in the self-appraisal process and to comment on the **self-study**. Faculty from the **Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo** and part-time faculty who regularly teach in the program are also to be given this opportunity. If there are differing views among the faculty these should be noted. Also all faculty members should have the opportunity to participate in the program’s response to the **review** team report. Again the response should note differing views if there is no consensus among faculty. It is also **good practice, once the program review has been completed, to include staff and student participation in the self-appraisal process, and to inform faculty, staff and students (e.g., at a **town hall** meeting) of the review team’s findings and plans for program improvement.**

### Guidelines for Site Visits

The following guidelines **will** assist **departments/schools** in making arrangements for the **site visit** related to their **program** reviews. The **program** under review **takes** the lead role in making arrangements for scheduling the **site visit**. However, arrangements should be prepared in consultation with the **office** of the AVPA or the **APGS**, as appropriate. For augmented reviews (reviews combining both undergraduate and graduate offices), one **office** will be assigned primary responsibility, and consultation with the other will occur as needed. Contact the relevant **administrative assistant**.

The schedule for the **site visit** should be prepared at least one month in advance of the visit, so that the **review** team can see the schedule, and have an opportunity to suggest changes.

**1. Prior to the Site Visit**
1.1 The chair/director of the program under review, in consultation with the dean of the faculty, develops a proposed list of reviewers (including full contact information and a brief biography) which is submitted to the AVPA/APGS (Volume III – Proposed Reviewers). For most program reviews, two external reviewers and one internal reviewer are required. Five names should be proposed, and ranked in order of preference, for each of (1) an external reviewer who will normally come from a university in Ontario; (2) an external reviewer who will normally come from a university outside Ontario, but at the undergraduate level usually within Canada. One external reviewer may be a non-university appointee (e.g., someone from government or the private sector), provided that she/he has appropriate qualifications to fulfill the reviewer role. An internal reviewer, who will come from Waterloo but normally from outside the home faculty, will be selected by the AVPA/APGS.

For interdisciplinary options and minors not attached to degree programs, these programs are reviewed by two arm’s length reviewers (see 1.2 below), at least one of whom should have some relevant disciplinary experience. In this situation, one or both reviewers may be from the faculty in which the program resides.

1.2 All proposed reviewers should be at arm’s length from the program, meaning not collaborators, supervisors/supervisees, relatives, etc. The AVPA/APGS will make the final choice of members for the review team.

1.3 The chair/director identifies several two-day blocks suitable to the program under review for the site visit, and provides those to the AVPA/APGS.

1.4 The office of the AVPA/ APGS contacts the proposed external and internal reviewers, to invite them to serve as the external reviewers for the program review process.

1.5 The office of the AVPA/APGS confirms the time and arrangements for the site visit with the reviewers, and obtains the Social Insurance Numbers from the external reviewers.

1.6 The office of the AVPA/APGS co-ordinates some travel arrangements and the hotel accommodations for the external reviewers.

1.7 The office of the AVPA/APGS sends a copy of the self-study to the external reviewers at least one month prior to the visit.

2. The Site Visit

2.1 The external reviewers normally arrive no later than the evening before the site visit activities are to begin.

2.2 An initial meeting with the AVPA/APGS is usually held at the start of the visit, typically
conducted as a breakfast meeting that also includes the faculty dean (or equivalent if the program is based in one of the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo) and the chair/director of the program.

The AVPA typically hosts a meeting on the evening before the Site Visit activities begin, for the two External Reviewers and the Internal Reviewer, as well as the Undergraduate Chair/Director of the Program under review and the Dean of the Faculty (or his or her delegate) in which the Program is based. The APGS similarly has an initial meeting with Reviewers at the beginning of the site visit. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that the reviewers:

- understand their role and obligations;
- identify and commend the program’s notably strong and creative attributes;
- describe the program’s respective strengths, areas for improvement, and opportunities for enhancement;
- recommend specific steps to be taken to improve the program, distinguishing between those the program can itself take and those that require external action;
- recognize the institution’s autonomy to determine priorities for funding, space, and faculty allocation;
- respect the confidentiality required for all aspects of the review process.

2.3 The review team usually has two days to meet with key stakeholders in the program under review. For reviews of interdisciplinary options and minors not attached to degree programs, the site visit should take place over a single day.

The chair/director should make arrangements for the review team to meet at a minimum with the:

- dean and associate dean(s) (subject to availability) relevant to the program under review.
- chair/director and associate chairs
- faculty (including adjunct faculty and those in the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo where applicable) in groups, or, if feasible, individuals when requested
- staff
- the relevant Librarian
- Co-operative Education and Career Action (if there is a co-op stream)
- undergraduate students (more than one time slot should be identified for undergraduates to ensure that adequate opportunity is provided to meet with...

\[\text{from the Quality Assurance Framework}\]
the Review Team). These meetings should be arranged without faculty present, to facilitate frank and open discussion. It is good practice to ask the departmental/school undergraduate student association (where one exists) to invite students to participate in this meeting.

- graduate students, with particular attention to ensuring teaching assistants are well represented. As with the undergraduates, these meetings should be arranged without faculty present, and it is good practice to ask the departmental/school graduate student association (where one exists) to invite students to participate in this meeting.

- Vice-President Academic and Provost (subject to his/her availability)

Graduate reviews will conclude with a second wrap-up meeting with the APGS; undergraduate reviews will conclude with a second/wrap-up meeting with the AVPA; and augmented reviews will typically conclude with a meeting that includes both the APGS and AVPA.

2.4 If possible, the review team should be provided by the program under review with an office in which the reviewers can leave their belongings, and have discussions among themselves.

2.5 The host program should discuss with the review team if, over lunch periods, the review team would like to be by itself, in order to discuss what has been learned, or whether it would appreciate the opportunity to meet with other people.

2.6 The program should allocate time in the evening after the first day of the site visit, and in the latter part of the second day, for the review team members to discuss among themselves what they have been learning, how they will structure their report, and how they will divide the tasks for writing the report. The internal member of the review team typically does not participate directly in the writing of the report. As the review team’s report is expected within two weeks of the site visit, they must be given sufficient time to make arrangements for the preparation of the report before completing the site visit.


3.1 The review team will prepare a report which should be submitted to the AVPA or APGS with separate sections for each program (undergraduate and graduate) evaluated, which should be submitted to the AVPA/APGS within two weeks of the completion of the site visit. For augmented reviews, sections pertaining to the undergraduate and graduate programs should be clearly differentiated. There is no fixed format for the report, provided that it The report should cover the evaluation criteria identified in the Quality Assurance Framework. Reviewers may find the external reviewers’ report template to be useful. The report should include relevant details on the following:
Part 1: The Review Process
- time of visit.
- documents reviewed.
- individuals and groups met.
- adequacy of site visit arrangements.

Part 2: Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

3.2 In preparing its report, the review team should be aware that the Quality Assurance Framework specifies that a review of programs should address the review criteria 1 through 8 in the previous section “Quality Council Evaluation Criteria”. The review team is welcome to add other topics as long as attention is given to the points highlighted above.

3.3 The most useful report for Waterloo is one which is “constructively critical”, identifying strengths which should be protected and enhanced, weaknesses or challenges that deserve attention, and new opportunities. When weaknesses or challenges are identified, the report will be more helpful if suggestions are presented regarding how they could be addressed.

3.4 The review team report will lose credibility within Waterloo if it is perceived primarily to be a “booster report” for a discipline or profession, and only recommends providing more funding to the program. A more helpful report will consider what could be done by the program, by itself or in collaboration with its faculty and the University, in using limited resources more efficiently and effectively, along with considering where new resources would represent a strategic investment to allow a program to increase quality.

3.5 The review team report, if necessary, may include a confidential letter of transmittal to cover personnel issues. This letter would only be available to the Dean, AVPA/APGS, and the Vice-President Academic and Provost.
4. After the Site Visit

4.1 The review team report is submitted to the AVPA/APGS, and copies are then distributed to the Vice-President Academic and Provost, the dean of the faculty, and the chair/director of the program.

4.2 The external review team members submit their travel and accommodation expense claims to the office of the AVPA/APGS. Honoraria for the external reviewers are paid after receipt of their final report.

4.3 The program under review is invited to provide comments to the AVPA/APGS, verbally or in writing, regarding the experience with the site visit, and especially to identify aspects of the site visit that could be improved. It is important that students also have an opportunity to provide comments related to the site visit.

4.4 The chair/director and the faculty members of the department/school have an opportunity to provide comments on factual errors in the review team report. Comments should be sent to the AVPA/APGS within four weeks of receiving a copy of the report. If no comments are received within that time period, unless other arrangements have been made, it will be concluded that the program has no initial comments to make about the report.

4.5 The chair/director will submit a report ("program response") endorsed by the faculty dean (or equivalent in the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo) to the AVPA/APGS addressing each of the following:
   - plans and recommendations proposed in the self-study report
   - recommendations advanced by the review team in its report

The program response should include a credible implementation plan that not only addresses the substantive issues identified from the program review process but also identifies clearly:
   - what actions will follow from specific recommendations
   - any changes in organization, policy or governance that would be necessary to follow the recommendations
   - resources, financial or otherwise, required to support the implementation of selected recommendations
   - who will be responsible for providing resources
   - a proposed timeline and responsibility for oversight for implementation of any of those recommendations.
   - priorities for implementation and realistic timelines for initiating and monitoring actions

The program response should be submitted within 10 weeks of the program receiving
its copy of the review team report.

4.6 The AVPA/APGS provides a final assessment report (“FAR”) to the Vice-President Academic and Provost, outlining the nature of the review process, the main findings, conclusions and recommendations from the review team report, and the main conclusions and proposed actions proposed and prioritized by the program response, including the implementation plan. These actions will include any changes in organization, policy or governance that are necessary, the resources (financial or otherwise) that would be needed, and a proposed timeline. The FAR is submitted within four weeks of receiving the chair’s/director’s report described in 4.5 above. The FAR is presented for approval to Senate Undergraduate Council (for undergraduate program reviews) or Senate Graduate and Research Council (for graduate program reviews), or both (for augmented reviews). The program chair/director may be invited to these meetings to respond to questions.

4.7 The AVPA/APGS submits the FAR to Senate for information, that the has been completed, and highlight main findings and conclusions. The AVPA/APGS will to the Quality Council, The Vice-President and Provost reports to the Board of Governors once a year on which programs were reviewed the previous academic year. The FAR is available publicly in the Senate agenda; however, other documents associated with the program review (self-study, review team report, program response) are not publicly available.

4.8 The Vice-President Academic and Provost, or designate, will have responsibility for ensuring that all recommendations and issues arising from the reviews are dealt with in a manner that brings closure to the process, including provision of necessary resources.

It is good practice for the /to arrange a town hall meeting with staff and students to provide feedback on the review findings.

4.9 The chair/director is responsible for a two-year progress report on steps taken since the program review was completed. This report is presented to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for approval and then Senate for information. The two-year report is available publicly in the Senate agenda.

The two-year progress report must outline what progress has been achieved to date with regards to the implementing plan from the last program review. The report does not need to be long, but should accomplish the following:

- clearly describe progress achieved on the various action items in the original implementation plan, and discernible impacts, if any
- propose an amended implementation schedule for items that are behind schedule. There should be a clear indication of when specific actions will occur, who will be responsible for oversight or implementation, and, if there are resource implications, where those resources will come from
- explain any circumstances that have altered the original implementation plan
- if certain recommendations or planned actions are no longer considered
appropriate, indicate why

- address any significant developments or initiatives that have arisen since the program review process, or that were not contemplated during the program review process
- report on anything else the program considers to be appropriate to bring to Senate concerning this program

The FAR as well as the two-year progress report are available to the Ontario Quality Council through Waterloo’s annual reporting.

Table 1. Summary of timelines for reviews of existing programs

| Fall (September), previous academic year | Meeting of those responsible in department/school, with AVPA/APGS and resource persons; final decision as to whether review will be augmented or only undergraduate/only graduate |
| June 1 | Complete draft of self-study submitted to AVPA/APGS |
| July 1 | Final copies of v.I (self-study), v. II (faculty CVs) and v. III (proposed reviewers) submitted to AVPA/APGS |
| Fall/Winter | Site visit occurs |
| 2 weeks after site visit | External reviewers submit report to AVPA/APGS |
| 4 weeks after external reviewers’ report received | Chair/director submits comments on factual errors/issues in report to AVPA/APGS or both for augmented reviews |
| 10 weeks after external reviewers’ report received | Program response submitted on what was learned from self-study and external reviewers’ report, and plans for future |
| 4 weeks after program response received | AVPA/APGS submits final assessment report (FAR) to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for approval, and then to Senate for information. FAR is made available to the Quality Council in July |
| February of subsequent academic year | Provost reports to Board of Governors all programs reviewed in previous academic year cycle |
| 2 years after site visit | Two-year progress report submitted by department/school to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for approval, and Senate for information |
2. Academic Programs Related to Professional Accreditation

The Quality Assurance Framework (section 4.2.7) states that “The IQAP may allow for and specify the substitution or addition of documents or processes associated with the accreditation of a program, for components of the institutional program review process, when it is fully consistent with the requirements established in this framework... A record of substitution or addition, and the grounds on which it was made, will be eligible for audit by the Quality Council.”

The AVPA/APGS as relevant reviews the guidelines for the accreditation process, meets with the person(s) at Waterloo responsible for the professional accreditation together with the director of the program, to review the guidelines for the accreditation and Waterloo reviews, and to determine what additional information, if any, is required for the Waterloo review. Such discussions occur at the time when work begins by a program to prepare for the accreditation process, and a memo is filed documenting the decision taken. If necessary, the program under review will be asked to provide supplemental information to meet the needs of the Waterloo review process.

When the review team is appointed by an accreditation organization, Waterloo will seek to have one of its faculty members included as a member of the review team. If this is not possible, then Waterloo may arrange to have a faculty member conduct interviews and examine documents related to the program review process to provide his or her perspective, and prepare a written report to supplement the accreditation report from the review team.

For master’s programs which are subject to accreditation reviews, it is usually necessary to review the research components of the program. These aspects can be reviewed in conjunction with a review of the PhD program (if one exists) or research master’s in the same unit (if one exists). If the only graduate program in the unit is a professional master’s subject to accreditation, then a separate review of the research components is required.

3. Combined Reviews of Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

UW encourages combined reviews (augmented reviews). Augmented reviews can be more efficient and also have academic merit, there are frequently interactions between the undergraduate and graduate programs. Academic units proposing an augmented review should indicate their intention to the AVPA/APGS in good time (prior to the end of the previous calendar year). The AVPA/APGS will then allocate one of their two as having primary responsibility for the logistics of the review. The review will then follow the normal process appropriate to that augmented reviews will be presented both at Senate Undergraduate and Senate Graduate and Research Council. The AVPA will be invited to both meetings to respond to questions, the AVPA will be invited to Senate Graduate and Research Council, and the APGS to Senate Undergraduate Council, to ensure coherence in the response to the reviews of the undergraduate and graduate components.
3. **Multi- or Interdisciplinary Programs**

Reviews of interdisciplinary programs which lead to a degree should follow the same procedures as those for single discipline programs, as described above. The review of an interdisciplinary program (including collaborative graduate programs) can be, where appropriate, combined with the review of a larger program. One of the considerations in such combined reviews is whether a review team can be assembled which has expertise in the various disciplinary areas. Separate report sections must also be written for each program.

Where an interdisciplinary undergraduate program does not lead to a separate degree (for example, an undergraduate option), the composition of the review team will follow the same process as for minors not attached to degree programs. The program is reviewed by two arm’s length reviewers, at least one of whom should have some relevant disciplinary experience. In this situation, one or both reviewers may be from the faculty in which the program resides. The Committee is composed of two University of Waterloo faculty members and one external reviewer. The director of the interdisciplinary program and the Dean (or equivalent in the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo) who provide oversight of the program will be invited to suggest individuals to serve on the review committee. The composition of the review committee will be determined by the AVPA/APGS. The review process follows the same arrangement as for single-discipline reviews.

4. **Programs Joint with other Universities**

For programs offered jointly with another/other Ontario universities, the procedure is that one individual (normally the director or equivalent of the joint program) will prepare a self-study following the template of his/her university, in consultation with faculty, staff and students at the other institution(s). The review team will be chosen in consultation with both/all partners, and the “internal” reviewer can come from each partner, or be chosen to represent all partners. The review visit will include both/all campuses. The response to the review can be written by the director of the joint program in consultation with the appropriate chairs and deans at both/all participating institutions, and then sent through the regular process at both/all universities. If deemed more appropriate, separate responses could be prepared, one for each participating institution, to follow the normal process at each university.

For programs joint with other universities outside Ontario, Waterloo will follow the review process for Ontario universities. This would not necessarily require a site visit to the other university, provided that the Quality Council has determined that the partner university is also subject to an appropriate quality review process in its own jurisdiction. However, Waterloo would obtain information about the components of the program completed outside Ontario as appropriate, and include this in the review within Ontario.

If, in future, Waterloo develops partnerships to offer degree or diploma programs with other
institutions such as colleges or institutes, the present document will be modified to include such programs.

5. Programs at the Federated or Affiliated Institutions

The University of Waterloo has one federated university (St. Jerome’s University) and three affiliated university colleges (Conrad Grebel, Renison, St. Paul’s). Waterloo has made arrangements with the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo to ensure that program reviews are completed in a coordinated manner. Two major considerations are being addressed. First, when a program is primarily based within one of the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo, the lead role for the program review is taken by the relevant institution, with the self-study submitted to the AVPA or APGS at Waterloo. During their program reviews, academic departments at Waterloo are directed to identify when there are complementary disciplinary or program activities at one or more of the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo, to ensure that such activities are considered in their self-study.

The Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo may opt to have their program reviews considered at their own council, in parallel to consideration at Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council.

6. Credit-Bearing Diploma and Certificate Programs

Diplomas and certificates, where offered for credit, are reviewed on the same cycle as other programs. Where possible, they should be reviewed in conjunction with a related degree program. Only graduate diplomas (certificates) are reported to the Quality Council.

C. Reviews of New Programs

At Waterloo, academic reviews of new programs follow a similar procedure to reviews of existing programs, with appropriate modifications to the program proposal documentation and the external review (for example, there are no current students to interview or for whom to provide statistics). See Manual for a comprehensive template is provided for the proposal document (volume I – Proposed Brief), as well as templates for the required supporting documentation (volume II – Faculty CVs, volume III – Proposed Reviewers).

For new undergraduate programs, the AVPA has responsibility for the review, whereas for new graduate programs it is the APGS.

The steps for approval for new programs are similar to those for review of current programs.
1. An initial proposal document is developed, addressing the topics outlined in the Quality Council criteria. This proposal goes to the appropriate department/school committee and faculty council and Institutional Analysis & Planning (IAP) for discussion and approval. If the program includes co-op experience, a report from Co-operative Education and Career Action is required. The proposal specifies the tuition rate the program intends to adopt as well as the expected provincial funding weight (BIU weight), if the program is full cost-recovery or not. The proposal should also include a report from the Library to confirm that existing resources are in place to support the program, and what, if any, additional library resources may need to be acquired.

2. For many programs, in addition to the academic review, the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) must also review the program to ensure that enrolments in the new program are eligible to generate provincial grant funding, and to allow students to be eligible for the Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP). MTCU also needs to approve the proposed tuition rate. IAP manages this process. Departments should consult with IAP early in the planning stage to discuss the MTCU approval process.

3. For all programs, in addition to the academic review and the MTCU review, the program must also be reviewed by IAP and the Provost from a financial perspective. IAP assists departments in completing a Financial Viability Analysis, which must be approved by the Provost before the program proceeds to Faculty approval or Quality Council.

4. If an external review with a site visit is required, this occurs following faculty council approval, and the unit concerned has the opportunity to respond to the review comments.

5. The proposal (modified if appropriate following the external review) then goes to either Senate Undergraduate Council, or Senate Graduate and Research Council, and then Senate, for approval.

6. At this point the proposal is sent to the Quality Council for approval, if approval is required, or for information (new undergraduate minors and options do not require notification to the Quality Council).

7. The Board of Governors receives information once a year about programs approved to commence in the previous year (along with information on completed reviews of existing programs).

8. If MTCU approval of funding is required, a submission is made to MTCU.
6.8. As is the case for reviews of existing programs, a two-year progress report is required for new programs. The purpose of the two-year progress report is to provide initial data on student progress and implementation of the program, and to respond to any issues raised by the external review. Copies of the two-year progress report are made available to the Quality Council for information (or, if required, for decision).

7.9. hereafter the program enters into the regular review cycle.

**Definition of a New Program**

The Quality Assurance Framework defines a new [degree] program as “Any degree, degree program, or program of specialization, currently approved by Senate or equivalent governing body, which has not been previously approved for that institution by the Quality Council, its predecessors, or any intra-institutional approval processes that previously applied. A change of name, only, does not constitute a new program; nor does the inclusion of a new program of specialization where another with the same designation already exists (e.g., a new honours program where a major with the same designation already exists).” The Quality Assurance Framework further clarifies that “a ‘new program’ is brand-new: that is to say, the program has substantially different program requirements and substantially different learning outcomes from those of any existing approved programs offered by the institution”.

Depending on the type of program, the levels at which approvals are required differ, as shown in Table 2 below. All new programs require internal approval (up to the Senate level), and depending on whether Quality Council and/or MTCU approval is also required, additional approval steps are needed.
Table 2. Level of approval required for new programs and major modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>External reviewers</th>
<th>Quality Council</th>
<th>MTCU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad minor, option, certificate or diploma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad major or specialization</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes if “brand-new”</td>
<td>Yes if “brand-new”</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, in non-core areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate diploma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate field</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate collab. program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New graduate degree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Diploma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, if stand-alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major change to existing program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (but notification required)</td>
<td>No, but change needs to be reported to MTCU in the Annual Program Development Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor change to existing program</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, but change needs to be reported to MTCU in the Annual Program Development Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Major modifications are defined in section D below
2. See definition of new program above table; notification is required if the change is a major modification but not “brand-new”
3. Consult IAP to determine if a program is core or non-core.
4. If graduate programs wish to advertise that a field has been approved by the Quality Council, it must be submitted for Expedited Approval.
5. Follows Expedited Approval process defined by the Quality Assurance Framework.

Aims

The procedures for assessing proposals for new programs should ensure:
- the program achieves Waterloo’s academic excellence goals
- the program name is appropriate to the content and recognizable to employers
- the program reflects Waterloo’s distinctiveness, is technologically current, is creative and
innovative in its curriculum content and delivery, and entrepreneurial and appropriately inter-disciplinary in perspective

- the program has the potential to be one of the best in Canada and at least among the top quarter of similar programs in North America
- the program has the potential to attract excellent students
- the program has sufficient resources committed to it

**Planning**

The origins of the idea of a new program, the detailed planning process for new programs takes place in the academic unit that will host it. This planning is done in consultation with various groups, some of which are: the Registrar’s Office; Institutional Analysis and Planning (IAP); other relevant academic departments in the University; Co-operative Education and Career Services (CECA) (if a co-op plan is being proposed); the offices of the dean and associate dean (undergraduate/graduate as appropriate) of the faculty. In addition it is the unit’s responsibility to meet the Degree Level Expectations approved by the University (see Manual) and by MTCU, for non-core undergraduate programs undergraduate and all graduate programs which are requesting approval for specific funding for BIU entitlement (see Manual).

**Program Proposal**

A program proposal document is required, following the provided template (volume I – Proposed Brief). A template for new graduate programs is provided in the Manual, and a similar template for new undergraduate programs will shortly be available also in the Manual.

Any proposed new program will be reviewed using the Quality Assurance Framework criteria for new programs, reproduced verbatim below, quoted directly from p8-11, as follows:

**1. Objectives**

a) Consistency of the program with the institution’s mission and academic plans.

b) Clarity and appropriateness of the program’s requirements and associated learning outcomes in addressing the institution’s own undergraduate or graduate Degree Level Expectations.

c) Appropriateness of degree nomenclature.

**2. Admission requirements**

a) Appropriateness of the program’s admission requirements for the learning outcomes established for completion of the program.

b) Sufficient explanation of alternative requirements, if any, for admission into a graduate, second-entry or undergraduate program, such as minimum grade point average, additional languages or portfolios, along with how the program recognizes prior work or learning
experience.

3. Structure
a) Appropriateness of the program’s structure and regulations to meet specified program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
b) For graduate programs, a clear rationale for program length that ensures that the program requirements can be reasonably completed within the proposed time period.

4. Program content
a) Ways in which the curriculum reflects the current state of the discipline or area of study.
b) Identification of any unique curriculum or program innovations or creative components.
c) For research-focused graduate programs, clear indication of the nature and suitability of the major research requirements for degree completion.
d) 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.

5. Mode of delivery.
   Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.

6. Assessment of teaching and learning
a) Appropriateness of the proposed methods for the assessment of student achievement of the intended program learning outcomes and Degree Level Expectations.
b) Completeness of plans for documenting and demonstrating the level of performance of students, consistent with the institution’s statement of its Degree Level Expectations.

7. Resources for all programs
a) Adequacy of the administrative unit’s planned utilization of existing human, physical and financial resources, and any institutional commitment to supplement those resources, to support the program.
b) Participation of a sufficient number and quality of faculty who are competent to teach and/or supervise in the program.
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.

8. Resources for graduate programs only
a) Evidence that faculty have the recent research or professional/clinical expertise needed to sustain the program, promote innovation and foster an appropriate intellectual climate.
b) Where appropriate to the program, evidence that financial assistance for students will be sufficient to ensure adequate quality and numbers of students.
c) Evidence of how supervisory loads will be distributed, and the qualifications and appointment status of faculty who will provide instruction and supervision.
9. Resources for undergraduate programs only
Evidence of and planning for adequate numbers and quality of: (a) faculty and staff to
achieve the goals of the program; or (b) of plans and the commitment to provide the
necessary resources in step with the implementation of the program; (c) planned/anticipated
class sizes; (d) provision of supervision of experiential learning opportunities (if required);
and (e) the role of adjunct and part-time faculty.

10. Quality and other indicators
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.

Approval Process
The normal approval process is as follows (with some variations according to the organization of
the academic unit, and whether one or more academic units are involved):

- approval by departmental/school curriculum committee(s)
- approval by department/school as a whole at a department/school meeting
- review by IAP and CECA
- approval of the financial plan by IAP and the Provost
- approval by the appropriate faculty(ies) undergraduate/graduate council(s)
- approval by the appropriate faculty council(s)
- site visit by external reviewers (if required)
- departments/school response to external reviewers and modifications of proposal (if
  required)
- approval by Senate Undergraduate Council or Senate Graduate and Research Council
- approval by Senate; programs may be advertized once Senate approval has been
  granted and the proposal has been sent to the Quality Council, but should clearly
  state “subject to approval by the Quality Council”
- approval by the Quality Council for approval or information, whichever is appropriate
- approval for funding by MTCU, if required
- after a new program is approved to commence by the Quality Council, the program
  needs to begin within 36 months of the date of approval, otherwise the approval will
  lapse
- report to Board of Governors on new degrees, programs, certificates, diplomas, and
  minors approved in previous year
- two-year progress report to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and
  Research Council and then Senate, for new degrees, programs, certificates, diplomas
and minors. This report should include responses to any questions posed by the external reviewers and provide preliminary information on student numbers and progress

- two-year progress report to the Quality Council, if requested

**Site Visit (if required)**

Guidelines for the site visit for existing programs should be used. The main difference is that there are no existing students who can be interviewed. However, it may be appropriate for some new programs to invite current students who are interested in the new program, to meet with the reviewers. This can include students who are interested in transferring into the new program (at the undergraduate level) or applying to the new graduate program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Timelines for approval of new programs$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month$^5$ 5-6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month$^5$ 6-7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month$^5$ 7-8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Months 8-9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month 10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month$^5$ 13-24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two years after site visit</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$Note: not all new programs require external reviews (for example, graduate collaborative programs, graduate diplomas); if so, the timeline will be shorter. Otherwise these represent the minimum time required.

$^2$MTCU has four approval cycles per year with submission deadlines in July, November, January and April. Minimum approval time is 4 months, but approval can take as much as 12 months.

---
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or longer if MTCU has concerns with the program or the tuition proposed.
D. Major Modifications of Existing Programs

Definition of a Major Modification
The Quality Assurance Framework defines a major modification to a program as one or more of the following changes:

1. requirements for the program that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review
2. significant changes to the learning outcomes
3. significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential physical resources as may occur, for example, where there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery

The following examples of major modifications are provided in the Quality Council’s Quality Assurance Guide:

1. Examples of requirements that differ significantly from those existing at the time of the previous cyclical program review
   • merger of two or more programs
   • new bridging options for college diploma graduates
   • significant change in the laboratory time of an undergraduate program
   • introduction or deletion of an undergraduate thesis or capstone project
   • introduction or deletion of a work experience, co-op option, internship or practicum, or portfolio
   • at the master’s level, the introduction or deletion of a research project, research essay or thesis, course-only, co-op, internship or practicum option
   • creation, deletion or re-naming of a field in a graduate program
   • any change to the requirements for graduate program candidacy examinations, field studies or residence requirements
   • major changes to courses comprising a significant proportion of the program, where significant is defined as more than one-third of the courses

2. Examples of significant changes to the learning outcomes
   Changes to program content, other than those listed in “a” above, that affect the learning outcomes, but do not meet the threshold for a “new program”

3. Examples of significant changes to the faculty engaged in delivering the program and/or to the essential resources, for example, when there have been changes to the existing mode(s) of delivery (such as different campus, online delivery and inter-institutional
collaboration)

• changes to the faculty delivering the program; for example, a large proportion of the faculty retires; new hires alter the areas of research and teaching interests
• change in the language of program delivery
• establishment of an existing degree program at another institution or location
• offering of an existing program substantially online where it had previously been offered in face-to-face mode, or vice versa
• change to full- or part-time program options, or vice versa
• changes to the essential resources, where these changes impair the delivery of the approved program

If there is uncertainty as to whether a particular change is major or minor, the AVPA or APGS will be the arbiter for undergraduate and graduate programs, respectively. The Vice-President and Provost has the final say in this decision. The Vice-President and Provost has the right to choose to send a particular major modification to the Quality Council for an expedited review, as per section 3.3 of the Quality Assurance Framework, and if so would follow procedures similar to those for a new graduate field.

Procedure

Major modifications to existing programs require normal internal approval (approval at department/school, faculty, Senate Undergraduate Council or Senate Graduate and Research Council, and Senate). Depending on the nature of the changes, Co-operative Education and Career Services and the Library should be consulted to confirm any impact of the proposed changes. Minor modifications follow the same process, with the exception that Senate Undergraduate Council and Senate Graduate and Research Council are empowered to approve these changes on behalf of Senate, as per Senate Bylaw 2. If an existing program is offered in a new location, this requires notification at the department, faculty and Senate Undergraduate/Senate Graduate and Research Council levels.

Major modifications require reporting to the Quality Council on an annual basis.

E. Audit Process

The Quality Council will audit each institution once every eight years. The objective of the audit is to determine whether or not the University, since the last review, has acted in compliance with the provisions of its IQAP for cyclical program reviews as ratified by the Quality Council. The Quality Council’s Quality Assurance Framework indicates the means of selection of the auditors, together with the steps in the audit process.
F. References


1. **PLAN STANDARDIZATION** [for approval]

## A. PLAN STANDARDIZATION TEMPLATES

### Background and rationale for “Plan Standardization” items 1 and 2:

The standardizing of Bachelor of Arts academic plans in Arts has three main drivers:

- The wish to retain more students in honours standing during the course of their undergraduate careers, based on a reasonable expectation of success at graduation (In Arts at Waterloo, honours students accrue 1.5 BIUs, and general students 1.0. It has been calculated that in Arts, general students are costing the faculty approximately 4 million dollars per year in foregone revenue, based on this model);
- The wish to have more students in declared disciplinary majors, and fewer in Liberal Studies (Arts’ non-major General academic plan for students unable to continue in their chosen major);
- The wish to increase clarity and ease of access for students in Arts wishing to switch or combine majors.

The plan standardization initiative proposes to achieve these goals by:

- Lowering the major average for Honours plans;
- Standardizing the number of courses in all Arts major plans;
- Adding intensive specialization subplans for those majors as required, and standardizing topic specializations within majors;
- Eliminating where possible redundant or moribund plans.

### Lowering the major average for Honours plans:

The major average for all standardized Honours plans in Arts is being lowered from 75% to 70%. Under current and future budgetary and resource models, this lower average will allow the Faculty to retain more undergraduate students in Honours plans, and will directly and positively impact resourcing for the Faculty as a whole, as well as for individual units. Retaining more students in honours standing will also positively impact students’ (and their parents’) perception of their own success and achievement.

Consider the following example (Fall 2014):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Total UG Students</th>
<th>Total UG General Students</th>
<th>% in General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4,626</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>10.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (BA)</td>
<td>6,050</td>
<td>2,784</td>
<td>46.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Faculty of Science has 90% of their students in Honours plans and the Faculty of Arts has 55% of our students in Honours plans.

When undergraduate students apply to graduate programs, those schools do not look at the minimum requirements to obtain the undergraduate degree; instead, they assess each potential candidate on her/his own merit: the student’s earned grades in required courses, the student’s achieved averages, and the student’s overall undergraduate career. It is the student’s responsibility to ensure they have met the requirements set out by the school to which they are applying; it is not the undergraduate degree school’s responsibility to ensure Honours students are acceptable by all graduate programs upon completion of the minimum requirements of their undergraduate degree – indeed, no graduate school accepts students...
achieving the minimum requirements as they stand currently. As such, the lowering of the Honours average should not hinder a student’s potential to be accepted into a graduate program.

The majority of Honours plans currently offered by the other five faculties have lower major averages (MAV) than Arts’ current practice (MAV = 75%). Those that do have similar 75% MAV are by and large due to Arts’ involvement in the plan. Such plans include Mathematical Economics (ECON courses only – ARTS and MATH), Computing and Financial Management (MATH); Honours Psychology (same plan as Arts’ – SCI). Where feasible and appropriate, it is hoped that these plans will consider reducing their requirements accordingly.

There exist across the university a handful of Honours plans with a 70% MAV, including Bachelor of Accounting and Financial Management (ARTS); Recreation and Leisure Studies (AHS); all Bachelor of Environmental Studies Honours plans (ENV); Mathematical Finance (MATH); Biotechnology/Chartered Accountancy (SCI). The remaining Honours plans offered by the other faculties at Waterloo – that is, the majority of the university’s Honours plans – require a MAV of 60%, including Engineering. Despite the lower MAV, those plans do not appear to be viewed as being less prestigious or rigorous, either within or outside the university.

Co-op Education and Career Action has been consulted about the possible impact of lowering the average on co-op placements/job availability, and a feasibility brief for Senate Undergraduate Council will be undertaken. It is acknowledged that the change will bring about some net gain in numbers of students seeking co-op jobs; however, that increase is presumed to be manageable within a broader review and contextualization of the aims and operations of co-op within Arts. It is further recognized that any concerted effort to decrease attrition from co-op in Arts and Business (currently approximately 35%) would have a similar result.

**Standardizing the number of courses in all major plans:**
The Faculty of Arts currently has many versions of Honours plans: regular Honours, separate requirements for Joint Honours or departmental co-op, and a separate version for students combining their requirements with Arts and Business. Having one iteration of Honours requirements that can be followed by a student who is completing the academic plan solo, or in combination with either another Honours plan (within or external to Arts), or with Arts and Business will simplify many processes. For example, it will reduce the confusion for students switching majors, and for those wishing to combine majors. It will also simplify, for advisors and staff alike, the process of advising students, especially for degree audits. In addition, it will make plan administration cleaner, quicker, and more efficient, with fewer calendar pages to maintain and update, fewer degree checklists offered by each major, fewer academic advisement templates, etc.

A standardized Honours major template will also provide clear guidelines for new academic plans when they come forward for approval, and will provide greater consistency in structure and academic expectations of students across the faculty.

It will strengthen Arts’ well-established recruitment stance about academic flexibility for students in Arts – for example, by making it easier to combine two majors within one’s undergraduate career, or easier to combine a minor with their major.

A considerable majority of our students complete an undergraduate degree as a strategy for entering the work force, where more and more employers are requiring an undergraduate degree for entry-level positions. For that purpose, employers do not investigate the requirements of the degree, but simply verify that it has in fact been conferred. Reducing the number of required courses to 16 will not have an impact on students’ employment prospects after graduation. As already stated, for students pursuing graduate school a demonstration of much higher academic achievement and commitment is necessary, whatever the honours plan’s minimum standards.
Conferring a BA as a Joint Honours (e.g., in major X and major Y) means that the student has completed the requirements for Honours plan X and Honours plan Y. Having standardized honours plans that may be combined will increase the depth/breadth in our Joint Honours plans, and will more accurately reflect the student’s achievement in combining their studies.

Discussions at the Arts Undergraduate Affairs Group (UGAG) made clear that there were too many perceived impediments to eliminating all disciplinary General plans entirely – concerns about shrinking numbers in disciplinary majors, even more migration to Liberal Studies, no “fall back” plan that still acknowledges a student’s achievement within the major, etc.

Adding intensive specialization subplans for some majors:
An Honours Intensive Specialization subplan is being created to allow disciplines to stream eligible students towards graduate programs, to meet other requirements determined by external organizations, or to simply augment the level of preparation in their students.

It protects those disciplines whose current structure precludes a plan with a reduced number of courses and/or major average being sufficient for their students’ needs. It also provides greater depth within the discipline while still allowing some flexibility in course offerings beyond the base honours template. The higher average requirement will also assist departments in planning their upper-year offerings, typically with smaller enrolment and greater intensity of student experience.

Standardizing topic specializations within majors:
The University of Waterloo (UOPs) defines a specialization as “a specified selection of courses that provides a primary emphasis in an academic plan. The specialization is meant to provide additional depth/focus into some aspect of the primary discipline.”

On the books for 2015-2016, Arts currently has 26 specializations:
- 15 of those are open to Honours or Four-Year General students
- 2 are open to all students in the major, including Three-Year General students
- 9 are open only to Honours students.

The number of required courses currently ranges from 3 to 9. Course double-counting rules do not apply. 16 of these specializations have been created effective September 2011 or later. As the topic specializations are being standardized, redundant or under-subscribed ones will be eliminated.

1. ACADEMIC PLAN CHANGES [for approval]
1.1. Dean of Arts
   Effective September 1, 2016

1.1.1. Plan Standardization (Bachelor of Arts)
   Motion: UGAG approves in principle the standardization of academic plans offered as a Bachelor of Arts (BA) as it relates to plan requirements, specifically number of courses and average requirements. This principle will be achieved by adopting an agreed-upon plan template applicable to all honours plans owned by the Faculty of Arts.

Motion passed at the October 2, 2014 UGAG meeting.
1.1.2. **Honours BA Template**
- All Honours plans within a particular major to be identical (i.e., requirements for Honours major = Joint Honours major = departmental co-op major = Arts and Business Co-op major = Arts and Business Regular major):
  - Honours major average (MAV) ≥ 70%;
  - CUM average ≥ 60%;
  - Number of required courses in the major = 16;
  - Number of total BA courses = 40.

Motion passed at the November 6, 2014 UGAG meeting.

1.1.3. **Four-Year General Template**
- All existing Four-Year General plans (with the exception of Liberal Studies):
  - General major average (MAV) ≥ 65%;
  - CUM average ≥ 60%;
  - Number of required courses in the major = 16;
  - Number of total BA courses = 40;
  - Major course requirements must be identical to the Honours major requirements.

Motion passed at the January 15, 2015 UGAG meeting.

1.1.4. **Three-Year General Template**
- All existing Three-Year General plans (with the exception of Liberal Studies):
  - General major average (MAV) ≥ 65%;
  - CUM average ≥ 60%;
  - Number of required courses in the major = 12;
  - Number of total BA courses = 30.

Motion passed at the December 4, 2014 UGAG meeting.

1.1.5. **Template for Specializations within majors ("topic" specializations)**
- All existing specializations:
  - Number of required courses = 4-6;
  - Will become available to all students within the major (i.e., General and Honours);
  - No special average to be calculated;
  - “Specialization” as a title shall not be used to describe a major plan.

Motion passed at the December 4, 2014 UGAG meeting.
2. **NEW ACADEMIC PLANS** [for approval]

2.1. **Dean of Arts**

Effective September 1, 2016

2.1.1. **Honours Intensive Specialization (subplan)**

- The Intensive Specialization provides increased depth and rigor across the whole major plan for students, through a higher average requirement and courses particular to students following the plan.
- An Intensive Specialization is achieved when a student completes an additional 4-6 specified courses (beyond the Honours major plan).
  - Courses may be reserved for students who have declared the subplan and/or have the required average.
- The Intensive Specialization is awarded when a student achieves a 75% average in all of their major courses (not just the additional 4-6 courses). This will be tracked by a Special Major Average (SMAV).

Motion passed at the November 6, 2014 UGAG meeting.
B. Department: Anthropology

1. Academic Plan Changes [for approval]
   Effective date: September 01, 2016

1.1 Three-Year General Anthropology
   Continuation in this academic plan requires a cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Anthropology major average of 65%.

   Eligibility for graduation in the Three-Year General Anthropology academic plan includes successful fulfillment of the following requirements:
   1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.
   2. Anthropology Plan-level requirements:
      o a minimum Anthropology major average of 65%
      o at least six academic course units (12 courses) in Anthropology with a minimum cumulative average of 65%, including:
        ▪ ANTH 201/CLAS 221, ANTH 202, ANTH 204
        ▪ six ANTH courses at the 300-level or above, one of which must be at the 400-level

1.2 Four-Year General Anthropology
   Continuation in this academic plan requires a cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Anthropology major average of 70% 65%.

   Eligibility for graduation in the Four-Year General Anthropology academic plan includes successful fulfillment of the following requirements:
   1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.
   2. Anthropology Plan-level requirements:
      o a minimum Anthropology major average of 65%
      o at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Anthropology with a minimum cumulative average of 70%, including:
        ▪ ANTH 201/CLAS 221, ANTH 202, ANTH 204
        ▪ ten ANTH courses at the 300-level or above, two of which must be at the 400-level

1.3 Honours Anthropology

   Honours Anthropology (Arts and Business Co-op and Regular)
   Joint Honours Anthropology

Motion: To amend the academic plan requirements for the Honours Anthropology, the Honours Anthropology (Arts and Business Co-op and Regular), and the Joint Honours Anthropology plans, and to collapse the calendar text for each plan as described.

   Honours Anthropology
   Continuation in this academic plan requires a cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Anthropology average of 75%.

   Eligibility for graduation in the Honours Anthropology academic plan includes successful fulfillment of the following requirements:
1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.

2. Anthropology Plan-level requirements:
   - at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Anthropology with a minimum cumulative average of 75%, including:
     - ANTH 201/CLAS 221, ANTH 202, ANTH 204
     - ten ANTH courses at the 300-level or above
     - two ANTH courses at the 400-level

Honours Anthropology (Arts and Business Co-op and Regular)
Students may combine the Honours Anthropology academic plan with Arts and Business.

Continuation in this academic plan requires a cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Anthropology average of 75%.

Eligibility for graduation in the Honours Anthropology (Arts and Business Co-op and Regular) academic plan includes successful fulfillment of the following requirements:

1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.
2. Anthropology Plan-level requirements:
   - at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Anthropology with a minimum cumulative average of 75%, including:
     - ANTH 201/CLAS 221, ANTH 202, ANTH 204
     - ten ANTH courses at the 300-level or above
     - two ANTH courses at the 400-level
3. Arts and Business requirements.

Joint Honours Anthropology
A Joint Honours academic plan with Anthropology may be taken in combination with most Arts disciplines in which an Honours academic plan is offered or with many Honours majors in other faculties.

Continuation in this academic plan requires a cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Anthropology average of 75%.

Eligibility for graduation in the Joint Honours Anthropology academic plan includes successful fulfillment of the following requirements:

1. Appropriate Program-level requirements for the Home Faculty, including at least 20 academic course units (40 courses). If the Home Faculty is Arts, see Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.
2. Anthropology Plan-level requirements:
   - at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Anthropology with a minimum cumulative average of 75%, including:
     - ANTH 201/CLAS 221, ANTH 202, ANTH 204
     - ten ANTH courses at the 300-level or above
     - two ANTH courses at the 400-level
3. Plan-level requirements for the second major.
**Honours Anthropology**
Continuation in this academic plan requires a cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Anthropology major average of 70%.

Eligibility for graduation in the Honours Anthropology academic plan includes successful completion of the following requirements:

1. **Appropriate Program-level requirements.** See [Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements](#).
2. **Anthropology Plan-level requirements:**
   - A minimum Anthropology major average of 70%
   - At least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Anthropology, including:
     - ANTH 201/CLAS 221, ANTH 202, ANTH 204
     - Ten ANTH courses at the 300-level or above, two of which must be at the 400-level

**Arts and Business (Co-op and Regular)**
Students may combine the Honours Anthropology academic plan with Arts and Business. In addition to the Honours Anthropology requirements, students must also complete the [Arts and Business requirements](#).

**Joint Honours**
Honours Anthropology may be taken in combination with most Arts disciplines in which an Honours academic plan is offered or with many Honours majors in other faculties. For further information, see the Joint Honours section of [Available Arts Academic Plans](#).

**Rationale:** The Faculty of Arts has undertaken standardizing plan requirements for all BA academic plans within departments, as well as plan requirements between departments. For the Honours major, the collapsed text aims to simplify the navigation within the UG Calendar and to remove redundant text.

The changes demonstrated in motions 1.1 to 1.3 are a result of applying the previously approved BA templates to the Anthropology major plans. Changes of particular note:
- Four-Year General: Reduction of the major average from 70% to 65%
- Honours: Reduction of the major average from 75% to 70%.
C. Department: Sociology and Legal Studies (Sociology)

1. Academic Plan Changes [for approval]

Effective date: September 01, 2016

1.1 Three-Year General Sociology

Continuation in this academic plan requires an overall cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Sociology major average of 65%.

Eligibility for graduation in the Three-Year General Sociology academic plan includes successful fulfillment completion of the following requirements:

1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.

2. Sociology Plan-level requirements:
   o a minimum Sociology major average of 65%
   o at least six academic course units (12 courses) in Sociology with a minimum cumulative average of 65%, including:
     ▪ SOC 101/SOC 101R, SOC 202, SOC 221
     ▪ SOC 280 or SOC 322
     ▪ four additional SOC courses at the 200-level
     ▪ four additional SOC courses at the 300-level

1.2 Four-Year General Sociology

Continuation in this academic plan requires an overall cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Sociology major average of 70% 65%.

Eligibility for graduation in the Four-Year General Sociology academic plan includes successful fulfillment completion of the following requirements:

1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.

2. Sociology Plan-level requirements:
   o a minimum Sociology major average of 65%
   o at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Sociology with a minimum cumulative average of 70%, including:
     ▪ SOC 101/SOC 101R, SOC 202, SOC 221, SOC 302, SOC 322
     ▪ SOC 280 or SOC 322
     ▪ one of SOC 401, SOC 404, SOC 405, SOC 406, SOC 407, SOC 408, SOC 418
     ▪ four three additional SOC courses at the 200-level
     ▪ five three additional SOC courses at the 300-level
     ▪ three additional SOC courses at the 400-level; or SOC 499A, SOC 499B, and one additional SOC course at the 400-level

1.3 Honours Sociology

Honours Sociology Co-op
Honours Sociology (Arts and Business Co-op and Regular)
Joint Honours Sociology

Motion: To amend the academic plan requirements for the Honours Sociology, the Honours Sociology Co-op, the Honours Sociology (Arts and Business Co-op and Regular), and the Joint Honours Sociology plans, and to collapse the calendar text for each plan as described.
Honours Sociology

Continuation in this academic plan requires an overall cumulative average of 60% and a cumulative Sociology average of 75%.

Eligibility for graduation in the Honours Sociology academic plan includes successful fulfillment of the following requirements:

1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.
2. Sociology Plan-level requirements:
   - at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Sociology with a minimum cumulative average of 75%, including:
     - SOC 101/SOC 101R, SOC 202, SOC 221, SOC 280, SOC 302, SOC 322
     - one of SOC 401, SOC 404, SOC 405, SOC 406, SOC 407, SOC 408, SOC 418
     - three additional SOC courses at the 200-level
     - three additional SOC courses at the 300-level
     - three additional SOC courses at the 400-level; or SOC 499A, SOC 499B, and one additional SOC course at the 400-level

Honours Sociology Co-op

Students in Honours Sociology academic plans may be admitted into Sociology Co-op at the start of the winter term of their second year. Students who are interested in applying for admission to co-op should consult with the Department's co-op advisor sometime in their first year so that they may select their courses accordingly.

Honours Sociology (Arts and Business Co-op and Regular)

Students may combine the Honours Sociology academic plan with Arts and Business.

Continuation in this academic plan requires an overall cumulative average of 60% and a cumulative Sociology average of 75%.

Eligibility for graduation in the Honours Sociology (Arts and Business Co-op and Regular) academic plan includes successful fulfillment of the following requirements:

1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.
2. Sociology Plan-level requirements:
   - at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Sociology with a minimum cumulative average of 75%, including:
     - SOC 101/SOC 101R, SOC 202, SOC 221, SOC 280, SOC 302, SOC 322
     - one of SOC 401, SOC 404, SOC 405, SOC 406, SOC 407, SOC 408, SOC 418
     - three additional SOC courses at the 200-level
     - three additional SOC courses at the 300-level
     - three additional SOC courses at the 400-level; or SOC 499A, SOC 499B, and one additional SOC course at the 400-level
3. Arts and Business requirements.

Joint Honours Sociology

A Joint Honours academic plan with Sociology may be taken in combination with most Arts disciplines in which an Honours academic plan is offered or with many Honours majors in other faculties.

Continuation in this academic plan requires an overall cumulative average of 60% and a cumulative Sociology average of 75%.

Eligibility for graduation in the Joint Honours Sociology academic plan includes successful fulfillment of the following requirements:
1. Appropriate Program-level requirements for the Home Faculty, including at least 20 academic course units (40 courses). If the Home Faculty is Arts, see Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.

2. Sociology Plan-level requirements:
   - at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Sociology with a minimum cumulative average of 75%, including:
     - SOC 101/SOC 101R, SOC 202, SOC 221, SOC 280, SOC 302, SOC 322
     - one of SOC 401, SOC 404, SOC 405, SOC 406, SOC 407, SOC 408, or SOC 418
     - three additional SOC courses at the 200-level
     - three additional SOC courses at the 300-level
     - three additional SOC courses at the 400-level; or SOC 499A, SOC 499B, and one additional SOC course at the 400-level

3. Plan-level requirements for the second major.

Honours Sociology
Continuation in this academic plan requires a cumulative overall average of 60% and a cumulative Sociology major average of 70%. Both regular and co-operative versions of this plan are available.

Eligibility for graduation in the Honours Sociology academic plan includes successful completion of the following requirements:

1. Appropriate Program-level requirements. See Bachelor of Arts Degree Requirements.
2. Sociology Plan-level requirements:
   - a minimum Sociology major average of 70%
   - at least eight academic course units (16 courses) in Sociology, including:
     - SOC 101, SOC 202, SOC 221, SOC 280, SOC 302, SOC 322
     - one of SOC 401, SOC 404, SOC 405, SOC 406, SOC 407, SOC 408, SOC 418
     - three additional SOC courses at the 200-level
     - three additional SOC courses at the 300-level
     - three additional SOC courses at the 400-level; or SOC 499A, SOC 499B, and one additional SOC course at the 400-level

Co-op
Students may be admitted into Honours Sociology Co-op at the start of the winter term of their second year. Students who are interested in applying for admission to co-op should consult with the Department’s co-op advisor some time in their first year so that they may select their courses accordingly.

Arts and Business (Co-op and Regular)
Students may combine the Honours Sociology academic plan with Arts and Business. In addition to the Honours Sociology requirements, students must also complete the Arts and Business requirements.

Joint Honours
Honours Sociology may be taken in combination with most Arts disciplines in which an Honours academic plan is offered or with many Honours majors in other faculties. For further information, see the Joint Honours section of Available Arts Academic Plans.

1.4 Sociology Minor
Students enrolled in any degree program may pursue a minor designation in Sociology.

The Sociology Minor requires successful completion of a minimum of four academic course units (eight courses) in Sociology, with a minimum cumulative average of 65%, including:

- SOC 101/SOC 101R
- three SOC courses at the 200-level
- four SOC courses at the 300-level or higher
**Rationale:** The Faculty of Arts has undertaken standardizing plan requirements for all BA academic plans within departments, as well as plan requirements between departments. For the Honours major, the collapsed text aims to simplify the navigation within the UG Calendar and to remove redundant text.

The changes demonstrated in motions 1.1 to 1.3 are a result of applying the previously approved BA templates to the Sociology major plans. Changes of particular note:

- Four-Year General: Reduction of the major average from 70% to 65%
- Honours: Reduction of the major average from 75% to 70%.

For motions 1.1 to 1.4: SOC 101R is being removed from the Sociology academic plans. Its removal is consistent with the Department of Sociology and Legal Studies’ goal of providing clarity to our students regarding which course they should be taking. Although SOC 101 and 101R are still cross-listed, cross-listings of courses will not be listed in the sociology plans.
FOR APPROVAL

Roster of Graduands
Since the roster of graduands will not be available until after the regular meeting of Senate in May and approval is required before the June meeting, the following motion is proposed:

Motion:
That Senate delegate such approval to its Executive Committee for its 1 June 2015 meeting.