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<thead>
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<th>Item</th>
<th>Action</th>
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| 1. Declarations of Conflict of Interest  
   a. Excerpt from Bylaw 1, section 8* | Information |
| 2. Renewal of Senate-approved Centres & institutes: Waterloo Institute For Hellenistic Studies* (Riemer Faber) | Decision (SGRC) |
| 3. Final Assessment Report – Masters of Nuclear Engineering* | Decision (SGRC) |
| 4. Co-chairs’ Remarks |  |
| 5. Minutes of 9 March 2015* and Business Arising | Decision (SGRC) |
| 6. Curricular Submissions  
   a. Applied Health Sciences*………………………………………………………… | 1 Decision (SGRC)  
   2,3 SEN-regular |
| b. Arts*………………………………………………………………………………… | A-E Decision (SGRC) |
| c. Environment*………………………………………………………………………… | 1 SEN-regular |
| 7. Graduate Awards* (Hildebrandt)  
   a. Gage-Babcock Graduate Fire Safety Award – trust | Decision (SGRC) |
| 8. Graduate Regulations*  
   a. Amendment to Graduate Admissions Requirements | Decision (SGRC) |
| 9. Proposal to Update University of Waterloo’s Institutional Quality Assurance Process* (Frank) | SEN-regular |
| 10. Fall Break Proposal* (Frank) | SEN-regular |
| 11. Other Business |  |
| 12. Next Meeting: Monday 11 May 2015, 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon in NH 3001 |  |

* material attached  
** to be distributed separately  
“SGRC” to be approved on behalf of Senate  
“SEN” to be recommended to Senate for approval

---

8 April 2015  
Mike Grivicic  
Assistant University Secretary
8. Declarations of conflict of interest

8.01 At the beginning of each meeting of Senate or any of Senate’s committees or councils, the chair will call for members to declare any conflicts of interest with regard to any agenda item. For agenda items to be discussed in closed session, the chair will call for declarations of conflict of interest at the beginning of the closed portion of the meeting. Members may nonetheless declare conflicts at any time during a meeting.

8.02 A member shall be considered to have an actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest, when the opportunity exists for the member to use confidential information gained as a member of Senate, or any of Senate’s committees or councils, for the personal profit or advantage of any person, or use the authority, knowledge or influence of the Senate, or a committee or council thereof, to further her/his personal, familial or corporate interests or the interests of an employee of the university with whom the member has a marital, familial or sexual relationship.

8.03 Members who declare conflicts of interest shall not enter into debate nor vote upon the specified item upon which they have declared a conflict of interest. The chair will determine whether it is appropriate for said member to remove themselves from the meeting for the duration of debate on the specified item(s).

8.04 Where Senate or a committee or council of Senate is of the opinion that a conflict of interest exists that has not been declared, the body may declare by a resolution carried by two-thirds of its members present at the meeting that a conflict of interest exists and a member thus found to be in conflict shall not enter into debate on the specified item upon which they have declared a conflict of interest. The chair will determine whether it is appropriate for said member to remove themselves from the meeting for the duration of debate on the specified item(s).
Review of the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies (WIHS)


Founding and Mission of the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies

This is the first five-year assessment of the Institute since it was founded in 2010. In that year it was proposed to establish the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies in order “to create an international node of scholarship in the field of Hellenistic studies, and to develop UW into an international leader in this area.” The Institute would draw upon existing strengths in UW’s Department of Classical Studies, other units within UW, and especially other Hellenistic scholars – regionally, nationally, and internationally – in order to “transform the local energies into a solid foundation for the Institute’s appeal.” Thus the goal of the Institute is to establish a clear international research profile that will facilitate the international involvement which Waterloo faculty are engaged in building. The Institute pursues enhanced opportunities for the kind of interdisciplinary and collaborative research which is envisioned as core to its mandate. Collaboration with two similar international research institutes was proposed to further enhance the Institute’s ability to develop a network of scholars studying the Hellenistic period from the perspective of various subdisciplines of material culture, religious studies, history, literature, etc. Moreover, by means of its global profile WIHS aims to acquire financial support for its research activities by applying for external funds, via SSHRC and international funding agencies, and via donations from individual patrons.

At the time of its founding WIHS undertook to concentrate on the period of ancient globalization represented by the Hellenistic Age (323 – 30 BCE). The multicultural exchanges that characterize the Hellenistic era lie at the heart of the Institute’s research program. In this way the Institute provides a historical and theoretical foundation for a thorough understanding of the history of East-West relations, for the interactions of different cultures, and for shifting social, political and economic forces. The main focus of the Institute’s activity is on collaborative and interdisciplinary research. Interdisciplinarity (both within and beyond the field of Classical Studies) is regarded as a key feature of the Institute’s research outcomes, and forms a mark of distinction for its knowledge mobilization. Moreover, as also expressed
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by the University’s strategic plan, community engagement is considered an important part of the Institute’s mission. The main focus of the Institute is to promote the acceleration of a global presence for Waterloo through enhanced international collaborative research in Hellenistic scholarship.

The Institute was founded by six members in the Department of Classical Studies at the University of Waterloo, with the support of six international collaborators who are leaders in the field. The Institute occupies a somewhat unique position within the Waterloo context in two respects:

- WIHS was established as a long-term research centre rather than a definite-term project marked by a single focus.
- WIHS seeks to create a national and especially international network of experts in addition to participating faculty members from within the University of Waterloo.

When it was founded in 2010, the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies determined the following metrics of success:

- Growth in membership
- Participation in seminars, conferences, etc.
- Peer-reviewed publication and reviews of such publication
- Receipt of first-rate manuscripts for publication
- International recognition of the Institute’s initiatives and contributions
- Attraction of funding
- Presence of visiting scholars, post-doctoral fellows, etc.
- Use of WIHS’s digital resources

Participating Research Associates, Faculty and Graduate Students

The Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies currently numbers 106 Research Associates and 12 Graduate (PhD) Student Members. Several University of Waterloo graduate (MA) students, though not officially members of WIHS, are involved actively as Research Assistants, and as participants in the projects of the Institute. The following MA students have contributed to the research, teaching and outreach activities of the Institute between 2010 and 2015: A. Barrales-Hall, B. Bartlett, V. Broadbent, D.J. Houle, K. Lawaska, L. Lemke, S. Reda, J. Rickert, L. Roncone, J. Salmon, M. Tatu, V. Vlasic, and R. Walsh.

The Research Associates are, for the most part, senior scholars holding tenured positions at academic institutions in Europe, North America, and Australia. They represent the following disciplines: Anthropology, Religious Studies, Philosophy, Archaeology, History, Literature, Egyptology, Numismatics, History of Art, and Biblical Studies. As they contribute directly to the research and teaching programs of the Institute, the Research Associates provide the following benefits to the Institute:
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- Interdisciplinary perspectives of avant-garde researchers
- Direct access to differing European and North American theories and methodologies
- Exposure to Doctoral and Post-Doctoral researchers in the field
- Connections to local resources such as libraries, museums, archaeological sites
- Information regarding upcoming conferences, research projects, and publications
- Links to international funding organisations

Research Associates at the University of Waterloo include the following faculty members: S. Ager (Classics), A. Coşkun (Classics), R. Faber (Classics), A. Faulkner (Classics), M. Liston (Anthropology), C. Hardiman (Classics), J. Novak (Philosophy), and C. Vester (Classics). Two colleagues from neighbouring Wilfrid Laurier University are also Research Associates: J. Fletcher (History) and G. Schaus (Archaeology). Other members of the network from Southern Ontario include colleagues from the Universities of Guelph, McMaster, Toronto, and York.

The twelve Graduate Student Members are junior scholars completing doctoral dissertations in the field of Hellenistic studies at universities in Canada, U.S., UK, France and Germany. For information about the Research Associates and their academic positions, and Graduate Student Members, please see the lists “Research Associate Members” and “Graduate Student Members” towards the end of this Report.

Governance of the Institute is provided by a Steering Committee (six Waterloo faculty from two departments) which meets approximately six times per year. Officers include Director, Treasurer, and Publication and Program Advisors. The Director answers to the Dean of Arts or a designate of the Dean. An informal advisory council consisting of proven donors and friends of WIHS serves in a consultative capacity to the Steering Committee and the Arts Development Office by networking among interest groups, providing overall strategic direction, accessing support, and promoting fundraising activities.

Reflection of the Opinions of the Institute’s Members

For a reflection of opinions of the Institute’s members concerning its operation, WIHS invited input from former (Post-)doctoral fellows; junior and senior scholars at universities in Ontario and other Canadian provinces; and international colleagues from the United States and Europe, including those with whom WIHS enjoys institutional partnerships. The following points summarize the feedback (complete evaluations are available on request):
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- The Institute’s global reach: 106 associate scholars well distributed across North America, Europe, Australasia and, to a lesser extent, Africa. WIHS has a marked and genuine international scope.
- The very real, meaningful engagement by Research Associates with the Institute. WIHS has succeeded in creating, quite uniquely, a permanent focus for the bulk of the Hellenistic scholars around the world. Associates have benefited from contacts made through the network.
- The success of the research workshops and Study Days, such as the repeated ‘Seleucid Study Day’. Publication and planned publication of the workshops attests to their value.
- The Institute’s remarkable fundraising ability. The sums that the Institute has been able to attract from external, philanthropic sources are impressive. The evidence for obtaining research funding in the midst of difficult economic circumstances in the Humanities research sector attests to the Institute’s reputation.
- The success in bringing together specialists of multiple disciplines (literature, history, archaeology, reception studies) who rarely have the opportunity to meet and share their expertise on different aspect of the Hellenistic world.
- The attention given by the Institute to young scholars and senior students specializing in the study of the Hellenistic world which is important to keep the future of our disciplines alive.
- The community outreach programs whereby the value of studying the Hellenistic period is exposed to members of the general public. Lectures at the Royal Ontario Museum, Third Age Learning, and interest-groups like the Pan-Macedonian Association.
- Project participants engage in sustained ways with each other’s ideas, thus effecting nuanced arguments and creativity in the resulting publications

Institutional Partnerships and Collaborative Projects

Together with three other international research programs, WIHS sponsors and maintains an online, peer-reviewed journal. Entitled *Aitia. Regards sur la culture hellénistique au XXIe siècle*, this e-journal serves as a “conduit of advanced research in the area of Hellenistic culture and ... [as] a bridge between Europan and American scholars.” The participating institutions are École normale supérieure de Lyon (France), where the journal is housed, Roma III University (Italy) and Ohio University (USA). Waterloo faculty serve on both the Editorial and Advisory Boards, and WIHS has taken responsibility for producing Volume V (2015). In the coming 5-year period WIHS will measure the impact of this publication by keeping close watch on the number and calibre of submissions, and by tracking references to Aitia’s articles in other (print) journals.
The University Seminars Program of the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation (USA) sponsors eminent scholars from the USA and abroad to offer lectures, seminars and courses at university campuses in North and South America. The Program promotes the interaction and exchange of scholarly views between the visiting scholar, the students, and the hosting faculty. The hosting institutions organize the visiting scholar's itinerary by planning lectures, seminars, and other academic activities that enhance the success of the visit. Offering financial support for both short- and long-term (3 months) stays by eminent scholars, the Onassis Foundation promotes research and teaching in all areas of Greek culture. All costs pertaining to the travel, accommodation, and per diem expenses of visiting scholars are generously provided by the Onassis Foundation.

The Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies has partnered with this philanthropic organization via its University Seminars Program since 2011. In that year Professor E. Carney (Clemson), as Visiting Lecturer, gave a presentation to the University community, met with graduate students to discuss their research projects, and conducted a senior seminar. In 2012 Professor Barbara Borg, chair of Classics at Exeter University, spent 3 months in Waterloo as Visiting Onassis Fellow. Dr. Borg contributed lectures to one graduate and three undergraduate courses, participated in a Study Day (“The Ancient [and modern] Relationship between Art and Text”), and met with local and regional Research Associates to discuss research strategies for the Institute.

In March 2014, respected international art-historian Professor Olga Palagia (University of Athens) visited Waterloo as the Onassis Visiting Lecturer. She also presented a public lecture in the Signy and Cléophée Eaton Theatre of the Royal Ontario Museum on “The Impact of Alexander the Great on the arts of Greece”. In Waterloo she lectured to university community, met with graduate students and faculty, and conducted a research seminar.

Starting September 2015, thanks to another Visiting Professorship fully sponsored by the Onassis Foundation, WIHS will play host for three months to eminent Hellenistic historian, Professor Waldemar Heckel (University of Calgary). Professor Heckel will contribute a module of lectures to a course offered in the Department of Classical Studies, conduct a research seminar, participate in a workshop (entitled “Celebrity, Fame and Infamy in the Hellenistic World”) and give a lecture at the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto.

The Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies enjoys a close working relationship with the Centre for the Study of the Hellenistic World at Edinburgh University. The Centre - of which three faculty members are Research Associates of WIHS - is noted for its strength in Hellenistic scholarship, and attracts the involvement of researchers and graduate students (also from Waterloo). In 2010 Waterloo’s Prof. C. Hardiman spent a half-year sabbatical at the Centre, conducting collaborative research in the aesthetics of Hellenistic art. In February, 2011 the Centre hosted a conference entitled “The Hellenistic Court” (2011), which demonstrated the centrality of palace institutions in the political milieu of the disparate
societies, and re-established the importance of recognising the royal court as a major component in the culture of the Greek-speaking world in the period c 323-31 BCE. The proceedings of the conference are forthcoming, including contributions by Prof. S. Ager (“Symbol and Ceremony: Royal Weddings in the Hellenistic Age”) and Prof. C. Hardiman’s (“Court-ing the Public: The Attalid Court and Domestic Display”).

WIHS also enjoys a close working relationship with the Centre for Hellenistic and Romano-Greek Culture and Society in Exeter. Four regular faculty in Exeter are Research Associates of WIHS. Waterloo’s Department of Classical Studies has mounted a full, reciprocal exchange program with the department of Classical Studies at Exeter. The first, jointly organized Study Day on the Seleucid kingdoms was hosted by Exeter and co-sponsored by WIHS in August 2011. Over the years three senior faculty members at Exeter have collaborated closely with Waterloo faculty: Profs. B. Borg, S. Mitchell, and D. Ogden. As was noted above, the chair of Classical Studies at Exeter, Prof. Barbara Borg, spent three months at UW in 2012 as Onassis Visiting Fellow, and at that time gave public lecture to the University community, contributed to senior undergraduate and graduate courses, mentored graduate students, and conducted research in the WIHS library.

Special and Regular Programming (Research, Teaching, Knowledge Mobilization)

WIHS has achieved its objectives for research, teaching, and knowledge mobilization by means of both Special and Regular programming. The former include Workshops, Study Days, Conference panels, and the development of an electronic database. The latter include regular lectures, seminars, and presentations to ‘town and gown’. These activities contribute to the preparation of research by Waterloo faculty that results in dissemination of Hellenistic scholarship via conferences and publications.

Special Research Programs

In December 2010 WIHS hosted an exploratory research workshop entitled, ‘Opportunities for Interdisciplinarity in Hellenistic Scholarship’. Funded by an SSHRC International Opportunities Fund Development Grant, this workshop allowed four local Research Associates to team up with a senior international scholar and promising graduate student to explore how WIHS can advance research and pedagogy in various subdisciplines (literature, art, history, etc.). The following areas of Hellenistic scholarship were explored:

- “Popular Performance and Recherché Reading in Hellenistic Literature” (A. Faulkner and P. Bing, Emory University)
- “Hellenistic Aesthetics in Practice” (C. Hardiman and S. Winder, Edinburgh)
Attended also by several junior researchers R. J. Greene (University of Washington), M. Constantinou and P. Saoulidou (Edinburgh), and M. White (Toronto), the Workshop served to identify opportunities for further research; various publications and joint research projects resulted from this workshop.

Since 2010 WIHS has mounted several Study Days, intense one-day research workshops in which Research Associates, Graduate Student Members, junior scholars and Waterloo graduate and undergraduates participate. They focus on historical, literary, artistic, and social-historical aspects of the Hellenistic era.

**Seleucid Study Days:**

“Seleucid Study Day I”, co-sponsored by WIHS, was held at the Centre for Hellenistic and Romano-Greek Culture and Society, University of Exeter in March 2010. Papers included topics such as dynastic issues of the Seleucids, the origin of their dynastic ties, the repudiation of Laodice III, the construction of Seleucid Royalty in the politics and propaganda of Antiochus I, Babylonian religion and Seleucid propaganda, and the Seleucids’ Iranian heritage.

“Seleucid Study Day II” was hosted by WIHS at University of Waterloo in November 2011. Research seminars focused on the rulers Seleucus II (Callinicus) and Antiochus Hierax, the role of numismatic evidence for the legend of Antiochus Soter, inter-dynastic marriages in the Hellenistic kingdoms, and marriage policies and roles of queens in mid-third century BCE kingdoms.

“Seleucid Study Day III” was held at Institut Ausonius, Université de Bordeaux, France, in September 2012. As session-panel of the VIIth Celtic Conference of Classics, this day’s meeting advanced the collaborative, interdisciplinary research agenda on the Seleucid Kingdoms, and included papers that demonstrated the importance of genealogical and prosopographical studies for our understanding of the empire.

“Seleucid Study Day IV” was co-sponsored by WIHS and McGill University in February 2013, and involved the following Waterloo faculty and students: S. Ager, B. Bartlett, A. Coşkun, C. Hardiman, and R. Walsh. Thanks to a SSHRC grant and support from Waterloo and McGill Universities, the fourth meeting of the Seleucid Study Group was dedicated solely to the topic of Seleucid Royal Women.

**The Ancient (and modern) Relationship between Art and Text:**
In March 2012 WIHS hosted the Study Day, “The Ancient (and modern) Relationship between Art and Text”. The workshop sought to make constructive use of two traditionally distinct sources of evidence for classical antiquity in order to promote a better understanding of the intellectual and artistic spheres of ancient society. Waterloo’s C. Hardiman introduced the challenge of the topic under the heading, “Art and Text: Uneasy Bedfellows”. Prof. B. Borg from the University of Exeter and Visiting Onassis Senior Fellow gave a paper entitled, “A Cup of Stories: Art and text on the ‘Homeric Bowls’”, in which she explored the inter-relations between the two media in certain unique vases. Prof. J. Burgess, University of Toronto, spoke about the transmission of literary and artistic themes in art and text, in a paper entitled, “Dolphins and Fishing in Early Greek Epic and Theocritus Idyll 1”. The final paper of the workshop was presented by R. Faber (Waterloo), on a cultural-poetic reading of epic descriptions that reveal the influence of real, ornamental weapons. His paper was called, “Gazing at the Shield: Imago Cipeata and the Evolution of Epic Shield-Descriptions”. Several research associates, graduate and undergraduate students and local faculty participated in this workshop.

“Interstate Study Day”:

In January 2013 WIHS hosted the “Interstate Study Day”. Several members of the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies contributed to the lively and controversial debate about the Greek and Roman foreign policy and diplomacy. The topics of exploration included the following: the tension between formal treaties and political interests; the role of amicitia in Roman diplomacy; relationships between federated states and their federation; and the procedures of conflict resolution in the Hellenistic world. The following presentations were held:

- Prof. H. Beck (McGill): “Of Pigs and Dolphins: Intercommunal Relations in a Hellenistic Federal State”
- Prof. S. Ager (Waterloo): “Middle Powers and Mediation”
- Dr G. Ramsey (Toronto): “The Seleucids and their Roman Friends”
- Prof. A. Eckstein (University of Maryland): “The Treaty of the Ebro”
- Prof. P. Burton (Australian National University, Canberra): “Friendship and Empire: The Establishment of Rome’s Amicitia with Heraclea Pontica (190 BC)”

The next Waterloo Study Day is planned for Winter 2016, when the focus will be on “Hellenistic Queens”.

“Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods”:

This large, multi-sponsored conference, held in July 2013 at National Museum for History and Archaeology, Constanța (Romania), was supported also by WIHS. It treated aspects of political, social, cultural, and economic exchange in the north-eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea (Pontus) region,
from classical antiquity into the Roman period. Waterloo’s Prof. A. Coşkun was among the approximately fifty presenters at this conference, of which the proceedings will be published in 2015.

“Kreuzung der Stimmen: Multiple Voices in Hellenistic and Roman Narratives”:

At the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada in Québec City, 2010, WIHS organized a panel-session called “Kreuzung der Stimmen: Multiple Voices in Hellenistic and Roman Narratives”. While scholarly effort has profitably been given to an examination of how Hellenistic and Roman poetry recalls and reconstitutes earlier models, and to the phenomenon of the mixing of genres (Kreuzung der Gattungen), sufficient attention has not, however, been given to the complex interplay of voices in Hellenistic and Roman poetry. This panel sought to address that gap with papers by Prof. J. Clauss (Washington), who examined how the voice of Apollonius’ Medea interacts with the earlier voices of Phaedra, Helen, and Penelope in Euripidean tragedy to show how a type of ‘ventriloquism’ appears in the voicing of his characters. Prof. R. Faber (Waterloo) addressed the question of voice in Hellenistic pattern-poems (with particular attention given to Simias’ Axe, Wings, and Egg) to demonstrate how the identity of the persona loquens in Hellenistic pattern-poems provides interpretative keys to the literary strategies. Prof. A. Faulkner (Waterloo) explored how voice functions in the Parthenos-Dike episode in Aratus’ Phainomena (96-132): the female voice of Dike admonishing humans in verses 123-6 constitutes the only example of direct speech in Aratus’ poem, and Dr. Faulkner showed how Dike’s speech, in part modeled upon the masculine utterance of Zeus Hesiod Works and Days 54-8, is consciously realigned.

Amici Populi Romani: a prosopographical database comprising data on the thousands of individuals in the Hellenistic world and the Roman Empire who were granted the status of Roman friendship. Such a database will provide unprecedented access to material of vital importance to those working on, for example, ancient concepts of multiculturalism and globalization. This online database was housed at WIHS from 2010-2014.

Regular Research Program: Lectures, Visiting (Post-)doctoral Fellows; Library Resources

An important element in WIHS’ research program are the regular visits to Waterloo by experts in diverse subdisciplines of Hellenistic studies. The following events, lectures, and presentations – many by Research Associates of the Institute - reflect the activities of the Institute between 2010 and 2015. The presence of these scholars, and the presentations of their expertise, have greatly benefited the research of Waterloo’s faculty and students. With the growing reputation of WIHS as a centre for research, a number of doctoral (and post-doctoral) researchers have visited Waterloo. The acquisition of a modest but growing and current collection of books in the field of Hellenistic studies provides the necessary resources for the research.
The following lectures and presentations were held at the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies between 2010 and 2015:

**Alexander and Achilles** - February 11, 2010. In this lecture Prof. Waldemar Heckel of the University of Calgary explored the accounts of Alexander’s fascination with and imitation of the homeric hero, Achilles, thus testing the historicity of several traditional accounts of the career of Alexander the Great.

**Establishing Roman Rule in Egypt** - March 23, 2010. Dr Martina Minas-Nerpel of Swansea University presented a lecture about the establishment of Roman rule in Egypt following 30 BCE. The lecture investigated the major processes of transformation that took place in the multi-ethnical populations of indigenous Egyptians, but also among the Greek elite.

**Virtual Greece: Hellenistic Literature in the East and West** - September 24, 2010. The lecture given by Dr James Clauss of University of Washington provided a wide ranging critical examination of Hellenistic literature, explored how the indigenous literature of Hellenized lands influenced Greek literature, and how Greek literature in return influenced Jewish, Near Eastern, Egyptian, and Roman literary works.

**The Attitude of the Successors towards the Indigenous Population of the East** - March 7, 2011. Dr Christian Mileta of Germany’s MLU Halle-Wittenberg gave a lecture considering the relationships and attitudes of the Hellenistic successor of Alexander the Great towards the indigenous populations of the East.

**Never Marry a Man Called Thunderbolt!** - October 14, 2011. Prof Elizabeth Carney, a visiting scholar sponsored by the Onassis Foundation, gave a presentation with the intriguing title “Never Marry a Man Named Thunderbolt” in which she considered the marriage of Arsinoe II, daughter of Ptolemy I and Berenice I, to Ptolemy Ceraunus.

**Polybius, the 'Treaty of Philinus', and the History of Roman Accusations against Carthage** - November 10, 2011. Prof. Arthur Eckstein of the University of Maryland explored the historiographical evidence for the so-called treaty of Philinus, as well as the political and military motivations for Rome’s charges of Carthaginian maneuvering.

**Exploring the Underground of Rome: The Roman Catacombs Reconsidered** - February 15, 2012. In this fascinating presentation on the Roman catacombs, Prof. Barbara Borg of Exeter University considered the various interpretations of the archaeological evidence for the multifaceted uses of the catacombs, and examined also the nature of the surviving iconography, suggesting a wider function of the catacombs than had been considered previously.

**Traces in Stone: Refugees in the Epigraphic Record** - March 14, 2012 Dr. Meagan Ayer of Dickinson College spoke about epigraphic evidence for the resettlement of refugee populations on the periphery of city-states, a phenomenon affected by domestic and military considerations.
Studying the borders of Attica. The Landscape of Athens' borderland in the Hellenistic Period - March 29, 2012. Dr Sylvian Fachard, Assistant Director of the Swiss School of Archaeology in Greece, spoke about the regional, cultural and economic history of the borderland of Attica during the Hellenistic era.

Style, Continuity, and the Hellenistic Baroque – March 17, 2013. Prof. Peter Schultz of Concordia College argued that the familiar characterizations of the Hellenistic baroque as innovative or revolutionary have obscured the fact that several aspects of the Hellenistic baroque are firmly rooted in a stylistic tradition dating to fifth-century BCE sculpture.

The Legend of Seleucus - October 18, 2013. As part of the celebratory book launch of Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World, Prof. Daniel Ogden, Professor of Ancient History of Exeter tested various legends and semi-historical accounts pertaining to the life and career of Seleucus.

Anacreon: The Destiny of an Ancient Rock-Star in the 5th Century B.C. - January 24, 2014. Professor Peter Bing of Emory University surveyed the reputation of the poet Anacreon, and the representation of him in later literature and art.

Anacreon: Narrative Strategies and Hesiodic Reception in Callimachus’ Bath of Pallas - March 21, 2014. Dr Athanassios Vergados of the University of Heidelberg demonstrated how the Hellenistic poet Callimachus employed various narrative techniques in the archaic poetry of Hesiod for the structure and themes of the literary hymn.

Ritual Dances in Greek Sculpture - March 26, 2014. The Department of Classical Studies of University of Waterloo presented a lecture by Dr. Olga Palagia from the University of Athens. The lecture, open to the public, was titled “Ritual Dances in Greek Sculpture”.

Affective Leadership: Political Judgment and the Emotions in Classical Athens - October 10, 2014. As part of the annual lecture series offered by the Classical Association of Canada and co-hosted by Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier University, Prof. Victoria Wohl of the University of Toronto spoke about the use of the emotions in socio-political contexts.

As part of the regular research endeavours of the Institute, WIHS invites doctoral candidates (ABD’s) and post-doctoral researchers in the field to spend a definite term in Waterloo. They are mentored by local and visiting faculty, make use of the library, electronic, and material resources of the Institute, and participate in its regular activities. These visiting junior scholars are invited to present a paper summarizing the findings of their research, share experiences with Waterloo’s MA students, and network with the other Research Associates of WIHS. Visiting fellows in the Department of Classical Studies between 2010 and 2015: M. d’Agostini (Milan, 2011), C. O’Hogan (Toronto, 2012), R. Franchi (2013), and D. Boero (UCLA, 2014). The visiting Doctoral Fellow in Fall 2015 will be J. Clement (Montpellier III).
Publications in the form of monographs, editions and commentaries, collections of essays, and articles in peer-reviewed journals represent in print the results of the individual and collaborative research conducted at and via the Institute. A representative publication of the research results produced by UW faculty is *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World* (University of Toronto Press, 2013), co-edited by two of UW’s founding faculty of WIHS. In addition to chapters by 4 UW faculty there are 14 contribution written by Research Associates that reflect the scope and range of the activities that the Institute promotes: archaeology, social history, language and literature. While an interdisciplinary approach may be applied successfully to the study of any epoch or geographical area, this approach is particularly well-suited for the Hellenistic period due to the increased social mobility and change at the time and the inter-national nature of the then ‘known world’. For a complete list of the monographs, editions, commentaries and peer-reviewed articles published by UW members of the Institute, please see “Appendix A: Selected Relevant Publications and Other Research Activities by Waterloo Members of WIHS (2010-2015)”.

**Library facilities:** Thanks to a donation of specialist books from Hellenistic literary scholar and historian, Prof. Victor Matthews (Guelph) the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies was able to mount a modest but growing collection of editions, monographs, and collected papers in the field of Hellenistic Studies. This collection, augmented by the library of the Department of Classical Studies, and supported by the annual WIHS budget, offers a small but specialized collection of current publications for research purposes. The Institute also maintains electronic and traditional subscriptions to important series in the field (e.g., *Studi Ellenistici*). Housed in dedicated space in the Department of Classical Studies, this library serves as an important resource for visiting Research Associates and Graduate Student members.

**Teaching**

Education in Hellenistic cultures, societies and languages constitutes and important part of WIHS’ mission to cultivate the next generation of scholars in the field of Hellenistic studies. Whereas Waterloo does not offer a PhD in Classical Studies, the recently formed MA program in Classical Studies has attracted students to Waterloo for the activities, publications, and research projects of participating local faculty. Thanks to the concentration of Hellenistic experts at Waterloo, Classical Studies offers a unique opportunity for students to specialize in this historical period by means of particular courses. Thus graduate (MA) teaching and supervision of students whose research focus is the Hellenistic period forms an important contribution by WIHS faculty to the cultivation of the next generation of scholars working in this field. More importantly, the reputation of WIHS promotes Waterloo’s MA graduates to pursue PhD studies at world-class universities and with leading experts, many of whom are Research Associates of the Institute. Since 2010 the following students enrolled in Waterloo’s MA program in Classical Studies have chosen Hellenistic and related topics for their theses or major research papers:
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- V. Broadbent: Augustus, Egypt, and Propaganda (2012)
- S. Reda: *Interregnum*: Queen Regency in the Seleucid Empire (2014)
- M. Sturym: Property Law in Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri: Safeguarding Women’s Economic Interests (2015)

The following Graduate and Undergraduate courses taught in the department of Classical Studies contain significant amounts of material dedicated to the Hellenistic period:

- Colossos: Figures of Antiquity, Alexander and Cleopatra (CLAS 103) 2013
- The Hellenistic Kingdoms (CLAS 351) 2013
- Greek and Latin Hymnography (GRK 691) 2012
- Intermediate Greek (New Testament) (GRK 201) 2011
- Ancient Novel: Daphnis and Chloe (GRK 391) 2011
- Identity and Oratory in Late Fourth Century Athens (GRK 331/600) 2013
- Art and Text: Problems and Issues (CLAS 691) 2012
- Artistic and Cultural Commonalities in the Hellenistic Mediterranean (CLAS 643) 2011
- Latin Poetry and the Hellenistic East (LAT 691) 2010
- Special Topics: Cleopatras (CLAS 691 / 486) 2010
- Women in Greek Literature (CLAS 486) 2014
- Advanced Topics: Art and Text: Problems and Issues (CLAS 486) 2012
- Greek Historiography (GRK 341) 2012
- Advanced Studies in Greek Art and Architecture: Hellenistic (CLAS 341) 2012
- Advanced Topics: Hellenistic Portraiture (CLAS 486) 2011
- Ancient Greek and Roman Epic (CLAS 331) 2011
- Study Abroad Course: Turkey (CLAS 390) 2010

To further enhance the educational experience of both graduate and undergraduate students, WIHS and the Department of Classical Studies offer the following opportunities to its students:

- Graduate Research Assistantships
- Undergraduate Research Internships
- Exchange program with institutional partner (Exeter)
- Travel Bursaries for trips to Greece and Courses Abroad
- Administrative experience in assisting in Study Days, etc.
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- Production of WIHS materials (Newsletters, Updates, Webpages)
- Bibliographic and Cataloguing skills in WIHS library
- Introductions to potential supervisors and experts in their field

The next Course Abroad will take place in Spring 2015. The Department of Classics (including 3 Research Associates) will lead a class of students and teachers on a travel-course through Greece. On-site lectures, tours by leading experts, and access to the materials and museums are the highlights. Graduate as well as undergraduate students benefit from direct access to the old-world sites and artefacts.

Student International Experience is an important aspect of WIHS’ teaching program. In partnership since 2008 with the Canadian Institute in Greece (Athens), Waterloo regularly sends graduate and undergraduate students for three-month internships during the academic year. In 2014 T. Rudnick benefited from an NA Engineering Travel Scholarship to serve as Intern at the Canadian Institute in Greece in Athens. The Travel Scholarship also permits students to participate directly in archaeological digs in the ancient world: in 2012 J. Shen partook in the Summer Session program at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, working alongside world-class experts in analyzing epigraphical records, etc. In Spring 2015 C. Davidson (MA student) and E. Knegt (BA student) will travel to Greece to participate in a Course Abroad (CLAS 390) offered by the Department of Classical Studies. Three local faculty members collaborate in teaching this course.

NA Engineering of Stratford Ontario donated $25,000 to the Institute (matched by the Ontario Trust for Student Support) established a travel award for graduate students in the Department of Classical Studies. Eligible students whose research focuses on Greece and falls within the scope of the Institute’s mission. The purpose of the award is to make it possible for needy students to travel to Greece in order to visit archaeological sites and museums, to work with a professor in Greece, or to make use of facilities or courses offered there. In this way WIHS advances the University’s strategy in providing international experience for Waterloo students.

Knowledge Mobilization

Knowledge mobilization, community outreach, and popular lectures serve an important purpose in the dissemination of research among the broader populace. As part of its commitment to increase popular appreciation for the importance of the Hellenistic era, and also to underscore the value of knowing the past for the circumstances of contemporary developments locally and globally, the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies promotes the sharing of Hellenistic scholarship with an audience wider than that of academia. The Institute, motivated by the conviction that a historical and theoretical basis would make for a more nuanced understanding of current East-West relations, of interactions between widely different cultures, and of shifting social, political and economic forces around the globe, seeks to engage members of the general public in its appreciation of diverse civilizations and cultures of the
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Mediterranean basin in the Hellenistic era. To that end WIHS has promoted a wider mobilization of knowledge in various ways.

“Third Age Learning Kitchener-Waterloo” (TAL), a non-profit organization of professional retirees, that offers eclectic, continuing-education challenges through in-depth lecture series. In Winter term 2012, WIHS presented eight lectures to approximately 300 members of TAL with the theme, “The Hellenistic Age: Tumult and Change”. It focused on the shifts in outlook of Mediterranean and Near Eastern peoples who were engaged in the dynamics of globalization not unlike those today. The following speakers and topics were included in the program:

1. S. Ager, The Birth of the Hellenistic World
2. R. Faber, Multiculturalism in the Hellenistic Era
3. A. Coşkun, Power Games in the Hellenistic World: the Seleucid Empire
4. C. Vester, Commoners on Stage: Menander, New Comedy, and the Changed Politics of Greek Theatre
5. R. Porter, Rome and the Hellenistic States: the Case of Rhodes
6. S. Ager, Sovereign Women: the Hellenistic Queens
7. C. Hardiman, Hellenistic Art: A Game Changer
8. S. Ager, The Twilight of the Hellenistic World

Looking ahead to its next research project, namely the SSHRC-funded workshop “Celebrity, Fame and Infamy in the Hellenistic World” (beginning September 2015), WIHS has arranged another series of lectures for Third Age Learning with the theme of heroes, villains and scapegoats throughout the ages.

Special-interest groups, educational associations, and museums have also collaborated with WIHS in the past five years to make the Hellenistic period more accessible to the general population. Waterloo members of the Institute have given lectures dealing with various Hellenistic topics to the following associations, or presented information about the activities of the Institute:

- Pan-Macedonian Association (Toronto)
- The Canadian Institute for Mediterranean Studies (Toronto)
- The Greek Cypriot Community of Kitchener-Waterloo
- The Hellenic Heritage Foundation (Toronto)
- The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA)
- The Greek Students Association (University of Toronto)

Finances and Fundraising

The Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies was started in 2010 with the generous financial support of the University of Waterloo and the office of the Dean of Arts. Prior to its founding, WIHS had received
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funding of $8,000 towards hosting the conference *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World*. This event, which brought leading scholars in various Hellenistic subdisciplines to Waterloo, produced, among other results, the opportunity to establish the first (and only) research centre dedicated to the Hellenistic period in North America. In 2010 the startup budget of $8,800 permitted the Institute to mount a presence on the World Wide Web through its WIHS webpages (now more fully developed), to advertise the Institute to colleagues and students around the world by means of Newsletters, brochures, ‘brag sheets’ and other means of announcement. It also provided a basis for the grant applications and other sources of external funding.

Much of the Institute’s operations between 2010 and 2015 has been supported by external funding agencies such as the Canada Research Council; the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences Aid to Scholarly Publications Program; and individual faculty research grants. These have been augmented by generous support from the Faculty of Arts and the Office of the Vice-President (Research).

The Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies has dedicated considerable energies and time, with the unstinting support of the Arts Development Office, to the pursuit of financial donations from national and international philanthropic institutions, individual benefactors, educational programs, and special-interest groups. These include (but are not limited to): the Embassy of Greece (Ottawa), the Consulate-General of Greece (Toronto), the Onassis Foundation, the Pan-Macedonian Association, NA Engineering of Stratford, and many Waterloo alumni, faculty and friends. Donations from these sources have been placed in the Endowment Fund and the Director’s Fund of WIHS. As was noted above, in 2011 NA Engineering of Stratford donated $25,000 towards the NA Engineering Travel Award (matched by the Ontario Trust for Student Support), an award that permits deserving students to pursue research in Greece.

In 2013 WIHS received a challenge grant of $100,000 from NA Engineering. Initial instalments of this grant have been placed in a Director’s Fund. In 2014 the Pan-Macedonian Association of Ontario undertook to contribute $10,000 per year for three years; placed in the Director’s Endowment Fund, the moneys are helping the Institute to reach its goal of matching the recently obtained challenge gift of $100,000 from NA Engineering (Stratford Ontario). With the support of the Arts Development Office, WIHS is currently seeking to match or surpass the challenge grant, so that a considerable sum of principal funds may be established to ensure the long-term viability of the Institute’s operations. Together with the Arts Development Office, WIHS has formulated well-defined, achievable fundraising goals for 2015-17.

The purpose of the Endowment revenues and Director’s fund is to support WIHS research, programming, and infrastructure. In an era of prerequisite matching funds for humanities research, WIHS considers the creation of a solid financial basis as critical to its ongoing and future success. The
following charts provide an overview of Annual Revenues since the fiscal year 2008-09, as well as Expenditures by Activities for the same period.

**Annual Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start Up</td>
<td>$8800.00</td>
<td>$8000.00</td>
<td>$8000.00</td>
<td>$1500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations – Trust Fund</td>
<td>$83.33</td>
<td>$1749.96</td>
<td>$3299.96</td>
<td>$999.96</td>
<td>$6049.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations - Endowment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Workshop funding</td>
<td>$8000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Expenditures by Activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistants</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$909.52</td>
<td>$916.78</td>
<td>$1288.56</td>
<td>$393.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>$108.00</td>
<td>$309.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$291.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td>$786.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5633.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/Workshops</td>
<td>$4522.54</td>
<td>$2585.92</td>
<td>$839.86</td>
<td>$2210.36</td>
<td>$2421.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$1972.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>$111.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>$158.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative costs</td>
<td>$2861.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$284.49</td>
<td>$111.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$715.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Research and Publication Awards and Grants**

In addition to individual research awards from within the University of Waterloo such as SSHRC 4A, Harding Endowment Grant, UW SSHRC Seed Money Grant, and the UW Travel Grant, the following external Awards and Grants have been obtained by WIHS and its local faculty:

- SSHRC International Opportunities Fund grant ($24,985) for “Opportunities for Interdisciplinarity in Hellenistic Studies Workshop” (S. Ager, A. Coşkun, R. Faber, A. Faulkner, C. Hardiman, C. Vester), 2010
- Humboldt Fellowship ($60,000) (A. Faulkner), 2010
- Ontario Early Researcher Award ($190,000) (A. Faulkner), 2010
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- Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences Aid to Scholarly Publications Program subvention ($8,000) for the publication of *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World*. University of Toronto Press (S. Ager, R. Faber), 2013
- SSHRC Connection Grant ($28,817) for “Celebrity, Fame and Infamy in the Hellenistic World” (R. Faber), 2015

Benefits of WIHS to UW Faculty

Since 2010 Waterloo faculty associated with the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies have derived the following benefits and distinctions:

- Contracts with reputable publishing houses for monographs and volumes of essays
- Appointment as senior editor responsible for the Hellenistic era in the *Encyclopedia of Ancient History* (Wiley-Blackwell)
- Successful applications to SSHRC and other major funding agencies for research in Hellenistic studies
- Raised national and international profile for the Department of Classical Studies through the Institute’s association with colleagues world-wide
- Service on editorial boards that guide the direction of the discipline
- Access to international (esp. Greek) agencies that support collaboration among researchers
- Financial support from special-interest groups in Southern Ontario
- Added value to the teaching of formal courses by means of visiting lecturers, specialists and graduate students
- Enriched academic experience through presence of visiting (Post-)doctoral fellows


WIHS intends to pursue the following general and specific opportunities in research activity, teaching and outreach, and fundraising:

- Maintain and enhance collaborative research and publication projects within the network of Research Associates by means of Study Days, workshops, conference panel sessions, etc.
- Leverage current donations and pledges ($200,000) to effect a significant Director’s Endowment Fund via philanthropic organizations and granting agencies.
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- Continue community outreach projects such as presentations to K-W Third Age Learning, the Pan-Macedonian Association, and the Royal Ontario Museum.
- Develop Graduate Student Travel Fellowships and maintain Internships for students at the Canadian Institute in Greece (Athens).
- Explore possible collaborations with the School of Architecture and the University’s International Experience program, with a special focus on the research and teaching facilities at Rome.
- Employ the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Mid-West and South (April 2017 in Waterloo) to disseminate Hellenistic scholarship and build networks with colleague-members of the CAMWS.
- Improve organizational structure by implementing the recently approved *Template for the Organization and Management of UW Research Centres and Institutes*.
- Augment the specialized WIHS library holdings (books and e-data) with a view to attracting visiting researchers.
- Expand the network of research collaborators within the University of Waterloo to maximize on local, interdisciplinary expertise and for added value of WIHS locally.
- Develop sessional Lectureships to recruit accomplished researchers and teachers for courses for the Classical Studies program.
- Maintain and augment opportunities for student international experience.

**Names of Experts who could Provide External Assessments**

The Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies recommends that the University consider the following experts who could provide external assessments. While they have some familiarity with WIHS, they are not currently Research Associates; their experience within the discipline of Classical Studies, their position in relevant professional associations, and their status in their respective subdisciplines makes these senior scholars suitable reviewers of the Institute and its programs:

- Prof. Ben Acosta-Hughes (Ohio University)
- Prof. Patrick Baker, Past-President of the Classical Association of Canada (Université Laval)
- Prof. Elizabeth Carney (Clemson University)
- Prof. Margriet Haagsma (University of Alberta)
- Prof. Olga Palagia (University of Athens, Greece)

This report was prepared by Riemer Faber, Director of Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies, and approved by the WIHS Steering Committee, February 16, 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Ager, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laury-Nuria André, PhD</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral Fellow of Classics</td>
<td>École Normale Supérieure Lyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borja Antela-Bernárdez, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Ancient History</td>
<td>Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costas Athanasopoulos, PhD</td>
<td>Director of Distance Learning</td>
<td>Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies, Cambridge, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Ballesteros Pastor, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Ancient History</td>
<td>Universidad de Sevilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Barbantani, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Classical Philology</td>
<td>Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Beck, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Ancient History and Classics</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Blouin, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor in Greek and Roman History</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Borg, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Classical Archaeology</td>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konstantin Boshnakov, PhD</td>
<td>Instructor of Greek History</td>
<td>George Brown College, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Brumbaugh, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Bugh, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Ancient History</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Burton, PhD</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer in Classical Studies</td>
<td>The Australian National University, Canberra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Campbell, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Classics</td>
<td>Miami University of Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefano Caneva, PhD</td>
<td>Research Fellow in the Department of Ancient History</td>
<td>University of Liege, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paola Ceccarelli, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Greek Cultural History</td>
<td>Newman College, Cambridge, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris Chrubasik, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Classics</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Clauss, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Classics</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Séverine Clément-Tarantino, PhD</td>
<td>Lecturer in Latin Language and Literature</td>
<td>Université de Lille 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Cojocaru, PhD</td>
<td>Researcher in Classics</td>
<td>Romanian Academy of Iasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altay Coşkun, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christophe Cusset, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>Université de Lyon, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica D’Agostini, PhD</td>
<td>Research Fellow in Classics</td>
<td>Università Cattolica del Sacro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anca-Cristina Dan, PhD</td>
<td>Faculty Member and Researcher</td>
<td>University of Reims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François de Callataï, PhD</td>
<td>Professor, Royal Library of Belgium</td>
<td>Université libre de Bruxelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Depew, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classics</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massimiliano Di Fazio, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Archaeology</td>
<td>Università di Pavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margherita Maria Di Nino</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Classics</td>
<td>Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Dodd, PhD</td>
<td>Independent Scholar of Classics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yannick Durbec, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Researcher of Philology</td>
<td>l'Université de Provence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Eckstein, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Hellenistic History</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Engels, PhD</td>
<td>Professor-Chair of Roman History Department</td>
<td>Université Libre de Bruxelles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Engels, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Classics</td>
<td>Universität zu Köln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Erickson, PhD</td>
<td>Lecturer in Classics</td>
<td>University of Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Erskine, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Ancient History</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riemer Faber, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Faulkner, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christelle Fischer-Bovet, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Classics</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Fletcher, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of History</td>
<td>Wilfrid Laurier University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia Floridi, PhD</td>
<td>Research Fellow in Classics</td>
<td>Università degli Studi di Milano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Fountoulakis, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor in Greek Literature</td>
<td>University of Crete, Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Franchi, PhD</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral Research Fellow</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Gibbs, PhD</td>
<td>Instructor of Classics</td>
<td>University of Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Graninger, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of History</td>
<td>University of California, Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin J. Greene, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Classics</td>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Gutzwiller, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Classics</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Hardiman, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Harland, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor in History and Religious Studies</td>
<td>York University, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldemar Heckel, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of History</td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Höschele, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classics</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noreen Humble, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Greek and Roman Studies</td>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hutter, MA</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina Ierodiakonou, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Ancient Philosophy</td>
<td>University of Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christoph Jedan, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor in Ethics and Religious Studies</td>
<td>University of Groningen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Kanellou, PhD</td>
<td>Researcher and Faculty Member of the Classics Department</td>
<td>University College London, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Keaveney, PhD</td>
<td>Reader Emeritus of Ancient History</td>
<td>Kent University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Klooster, PhD</td>
<td>Marie Curie-Pegasus Fellow</td>
<td>Ghent University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Klein, PhD</td>
<td>Head of Humanities and Information Sciences</td>
<td>Université de Lille 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kloppenburg, PhD</td>
<td>Professor in Study of Religion</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Kroeker, PhD</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy LaBuff, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of History</td>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franca Landucci, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of History, Archaeology and History of Art</td>
<td>Catholic University of Milan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Llewelly-Jones, PhD</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer in Ancient History</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Luke, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Classics</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Lykke, PhD</td>
<td>Researcher and Faculty Member of the Department of Numismatics</td>
<td>University of Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim Lytle, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classics</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Mairs, PhD</td>
<td>Lecturer in Classics</td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora Manakidou, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Ancient Greek Philology</td>
<td>Democritus University of Thrace, Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Mason, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Classics and Religious Studies</td>
<td>York University, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martina Minas-Nerpel, PhD</td>
<td>Reader in Egyptology</td>
<td>Swansea University, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Mitchell, PhD</td>
<td>Emeritus Professor of Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Ogden, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragab Salama Omran, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of History</td>
<td>Hail University, Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giorgos Papantoniou, PhD</td>
<td>Irish Research Council/Marie Curie Postdoctoral Fellow</td>
<td>Trinity College, Dublin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joanna Papayiannis, PhD  
Lecturer in Classics and Material Culture  
University of Toronto

Anna Passoni Dell’Acqua, PhD  
Assistant Professor of Biblical Philology  
Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milan

Marco Perale, PhD  
Post-doctoral Associate in Papyrology  
University of Minnesota

Ivana Petrovic, PhD,  
Senior Lecturer of Greek Literature  
University of Durham

Mirjam Plantinga, PhD  
Dean of Faculty of Humanities and Performance  
University of Wales, Trinity Saint David

Frances Pownall, PhD  
Professor of History and Classics  
University of Alberta

Évelyne Prioux, PhD  
Director of Research, CNRS  
Université Paris Ouest-Nanterre

Maria Protopapas-Marneli, PhD  
Director of Research in the Centre for Greek Philosophy  
Academy of Athens, Greece

Gillian Ramsey, PhD  
Assistant Professor of Classics  
University of Toronto

Gary Reger, PhD  
Professor of History  
Trinity College, USA

Jacek Rzepka, PhD  
Assistant Professor of Ancient History  
Warsaw University Krakowskie Przedmieście

Eduardo Sánchez-Moreno, PhD  
Associate Professor of Ancient History  
Universidad Autonoma de Madrid

Constantine Sandis, PhD  
Professor of Philosophy  
Oxford Brookes University, UK

Gerald Schaus, PhD  
Professor of Archaeology and Classical Studies  
Wilfrid Laurier University

Joseph Scholten, PhD  
Associate Director of the office of International Affairs  
University of Maryland

Peter Schultz, PhD  
Chair of Department of Classical Studies  
Concordia College, USA

Daniel L. Selden, PhD  
Professor in the Department of Literature  
University of California Santa Cruz

Alexander Sens, PhD  
Professor of Classics  
Georgetown University

Graham Shipley, PhD  
Professor of Ancient History  
University of Leicester, UK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selina Stewart, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of History and Classics</td>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolf Strootman, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of History</td>
<td>University of Utrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Tordoff, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classics</td>
<td>York University, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Trentin, PhD</td>
<td>Lecturer in Classics</td>
<td>University of Toronto Mississauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Vester, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Classical Studies</td>
<td>University of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walsh, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of History</td>
<td>Carleton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Westgate, PhD</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer in Ancient History and Archaeology</td>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Wheatley, PhD</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer in Classics</td>
<td>University of Otago, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josef Wiesehofer, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Ancient History</td>
<td>Universität Kiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilkins, PhD</td>
<td>Professor of Classics and Ancient History</td>
<td>University of Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jürgen Zeidler, PhD</td>
<td>Lecturer in Egyptology and Classics</td>
<td>Universität Trier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meagan Ayer</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>University of Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François Chevrollier</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>University of Paris-Sorbonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jérémy Clement</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>Univeristé Montpellier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Djurslev</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>Exeter University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Higgins</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Russell Holton</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>University of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Lester-Pearson</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>University of St. Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander James McCauley</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Nuss</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>Universität Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Powers</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>University College, Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniele Sberna</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>University of Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Vadan</td>
<td>PhD Candidate</td>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Selected Relevant Publications and Other Research Activities by Waterloo Members of WIHS (2010-2015)

1. Edited Volumes (Edited Books)


2. Book Chapters


---. “‘He shall give him the daughter of women’: Ptolemaic Queens in the Seleukid House”. *Festschrift for Getzel Cohen*. Eds. R. Oentjen and F. Ryan (Forthcoming).


---. “Staging the Oikos: Character and Belonging in Menander’s *Samia*”. *Belong and Isolation in the Hellenistic World*. Eds. S. Ager and R. Faber. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013. 225-244.

3. Articles in Refereed Journals and Proceedings


Faber, Riemer. “The Hellenistic Origins of Memory as Trope for Literary Allusion in Latin Poetry”. *Philologus* (Forthcoming)


4. Encyclopedia Articles


5. Conference Papers and Presentations

Ager, Sheila, Hardiman, Craig. “Seleukid Female Portraits: Where are They?”. *Seleukid Study Day IV Conference*. McGill University, Canada, 2013.


---. “Wege und Formen spätantiker Dichtung: die biblishe Paraphrase des Apollinaris von Laodikeia”. *Heidelberg Graduate Student Colloquium on Late Antiquity and Byzantium*. Germany, 2012.


---. “Callimachus’ Hymns”. *The Ohio State University Graduate Seminar*. The Ohio State University, US, 2011.


---. “Menander’s Dyskolos and the Common Man as Protagonist”. Dyskolos Launch: Keynote speaker. Trent University, Canada. 2011.

6. Organized Conferences and Sessions


---. Seleucid Study Day II. Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies, Canada, 2011.


February 27, 2015

RE: Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies, Review

I am writing to communicate my support of the renewal of the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies. With its commitment to an international research profile as well as collaboration with other institutes and scholars working in Hellenistic Studies, the institute has demonstrated its ability to sustain both research networks and implement knowledge mobilization. Since its inception in 2010, the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies has trained numerous graduate students (MA and PhD); engages 106 associate scholars from North America, Europe, and Australasia; and continues to organize highly research workshops and community outreach programs. The institute's work clearly contributes to research efforts broadly at the University of Waterloo, and substantively enriches scholarly work in the Faculty of Arts.

I am pleased, on behalf of the Faculty of Arts, to recommend renewal of this important research institute.

Sincerely,

Doug Peets
Dean, Faculty of Arts
Re: WIHS Review

I am writing to indicate the continued support of the Department of Classical Studies for the Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies (WIHS). The Institute has over the past five years contributed significantly to the research activity of the Department, with which it has worked synergistically, and has provided many valuable opportunities for both faculty and students. At the same time, it has supported and furthered the teaching and outreach activities of the Department through the endeavours of the core faculty of the Institute at Waterloo, the impact of the wider members of the Institute, and the visiting lecturers and events it has brought to Waterloo. The activities of WIHS have also had a meaningful impact on faculty success in external research grants and in attracting donors to support the study of antiquity at Waterloo.

I look forward to continued collaboration between the Department of Classical Studies and WIHS. Please let me know should you have any further questions.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Faulkner
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
Present: Katherine Acheson, Bernard Duncker, George Dixon, Coleen Even, Jim Frank, Anwar Hasan, Bruce Hellinga, Sarah Hildebrandt, Robert Hill, Yuying Li, Daniel McRoberts, Bruce Muirhead, Maureen Nummelin, Boyd Panton, Paul Parker, Maryam Shahtaheri, Mike Szarka, Lana Vanderlee

Secretariat: Mike Grivicic

Resources: Pascal Calarco, Jennifer Kieffer, Kerry Tolson

Guests: Jeannette Nugent (2)


*regrets

Organization of Meeting: George Dixon, co-chair of the council, took the chair, and Mike Grivicic, acted as secretary. The secretary advised that due notice of the meeting had been given, a quorum was present, and the meeting was properly constituted.

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST
None declared.

a. Excerpt from Bylaw 1, section 8. This item was received for information.

2. GRADUATE ADMISSIONS UPDATE
Jeannette Nugent provided a handout and elaborated on the strategic priorities, goals and objectives. Members clarified: Waterloo welcomes female students from Saudi Arabia; increase in applications and acceptances is related to the current job market and also to new initiatives of the university; utilization of software to detect plagiarism in applications; tracking of student outcomes occurs after they arrive; significant competition for domestic students, with Waterloo seeing increases in that space and projection of flat demographics into the foreseeable future; some programs would benefit from the transition year used to acclimatize international students.

3. CO-CHAIRS’ REMARKS
Dixon welcomed Szarka as a new member to council. He noted the submission for Canada First Research Excellence Fund went out the previous week and provided some detail on the submission. He provided funding-related news to members on NSERC Discovery Frontier LOI’s, prospective research funding implications from the forthcoming federal and provincial budgets, and forthcoming funding announcements.

Frank noted the significant and high-quality response to the NSERC Canada Graduate Scholarships-Master’s awards. He indicated that Lynn Judge will be brought in to review the criteria of the university’s internal scholarship programs with the aim to simplify offerings and to utilize excess funds for which deployment is hindered by existing constraints.

4. MINUTES OF 9 FEBRUARY 2015 AND BUSINESS ARISING
A motion was heard to approve the minutes as distributed. Parker and Vanderlee. Carried.

5. CURRICULAR SUBMISSIONS
a. Engineering. Council heard a motion to approve changes to degree requirements in chemical engineering and the collaborative nanotechnology program as presented. Hellinga and Hasan. Carried. Council heard a motion to approve the addition of program requirements in the collaborative water program as presented. Hellinga and Hasan. Carried. Members discussed the prospective change to the comprehensive examinations in item 2(a) of the submission: intention to have two separate milestones; manner of appropriately determining
background for exams; mechanics of re-examination; delays beyond the sixth term are handled on a case-by-case basis; other departments in the faculty are interested in seeing the outcome of this retooling. Council heard a motion to recommend that Senate approve the format change to the comprehensive exams in electrical and computer engineering as presented. Hellinga and Hasan. Carried. Council took items 2(b)-(e) together and heard a motion to approve the items as presented. Hellinga and Hill. Carried.

6. NEW AND CONTINUING MEMBERSHIPS – CLINICAL RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE
Nummelin provided an overview of the submission, noting that normally there is a two-term limit but that this may be superseded if council determines it is appropriate to do so. Council heard a motion to approve the membership renewal for a third term as presented. Nummelin and Acheson. Carried, with Nummelin abstaining.

7. PROPOSAL TO UPDATE UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO’S INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESS
This item was deferred to the next meeting.

8. MEMO: REVIEW OF EX-OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP AND APPOINTMENT TERMS
Grivicic provided a short overview, and members observed: prospect to separate graduate studies and research functions, which was the case in the early 2000’s; all faculties send their associate deans, and adding a third member from each faculty may be prudent; graduate students might do well to have their term changed to one-year renewable to make service more obviously amenable to master’s students will relatively short time horizons on campus; consideration of how graduate students are selected and challenges in recruitment to serve on council or other similar bodies; potential to establish a subcommittee of council to handle routine matters; prospect to change meeting length to two hours.

9. CALL FOR NOMINATIONS – HONORARY DEGREES AND CONVOCATION SPEAKERS
This item was received for information.

10. OTHER BUSINESS
Hasan inquired as to the open access policy from the Tri-Agencies and Dixon observed that the proposal is still some distance from approval and will be discussed at an upcoming meeting of associate deans, research. Calarco noted that disciplinary and/or institutional repositories may be utilized, and that UWSpace is being updated which is also an option.

11. NEXT MEETING
The next meeting will be on Monday 13 April 2015, 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon in Needles Hall, Room 3001.

8 April 2015

Mike Grivicic
Assistant University Secretary
TO: Mike Grivicic, Secretariat
FROM: Tracy Taves, Faculty Graduate Coordinator
DATE: March 5, 2015
SUBJECT: Graduate Studies Report

The following items were approved by the Applied Health Sciences Faculty Council on January 30 (new courses and milestone motions) and February 27, 2015 (academic program change) are being forwarded to Senate Graduate & Research Council. Would you please place them on the agenda for the next Senate Graduate & Research Council meeting?

Thank you!
GRADUATE STUDIES

FACULTY OF APPLIED HEALTH SCIENCES

REPORT TO SENATE GRADUATE & RESEARCH COUNCIL

1. NEW COURSES (for approval)
   1.1 School of Social Work .................................................................3

2. NEW MILESTONE (for approval)
   2.1 School of Social Work .................................................................3

3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM CHANGES (for approval)
   3.1 School of Public Health and Health Systems ..............................3
Graduate calendar changes for Applied Health Sciences

1. NEW COURSES

1.1 School of Social Work

1.1.1 To approve the new elective course SWK 653R “Palliative Care” to the MSW program.

*Rationale:* There are currently no social work courses in palliative care in the country. With the aging population, there is a growing need for greater palliative care resources. This course will help position social workers to work in palliative care and become leaders in the field.

1.1.2 To approve the new elective course SWK 690R “Special Topics: Substance Abuse & Chemical Dependency” to the MSW program.

*Rationale:* This course reflects the growing need among learners in health care professions such as Social Work and Pharmacy for pedagogy that is interdisciplinary in nature. The MSW program offered at Renison University College is the only online program that prepares students to engage in the delivery of healthcare at the micro, mezzo and macro level. A deeper understanding of the etiology and best practices of addictions and mental health is necessary to support this goal.

2. NEW MILESTONE

2.1 School of Social Work

2.1.1 To add the milestone “Master’s Seminar Presentation” to the MSW program.

*Rationale:* In the original MSW proposal, the capstone presentation was included in the practicum course SWK 607R. SWK 607R was changed to a milestone degree requirement in 2012. Now that the first MSW cohort has completed the program (including 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.

3. ACADEMIC PROGRAM CHANGES

3.1 School of Public Health and Health Systems

3.1.1 To change 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 transformation from 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, in their March 13, 2014 report, 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. The School voted in favour of the name change at a faculty retreat on January 9, 2015.
Faculty: Applied Health Science  
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015  

Course ☒ New ☒ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐  
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐  

New milestone title: Choose an item.  

For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: (e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)  

Course Subject code: SWK  Course number: 653R  
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Palliative Care  
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Palliative Care  
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL  
Course Credit Weight: 0.50  
Course Consent Required: ☐ Department  

Course Description:  
Palliative care is a model of health care that cares for people with terminal illnesses, along with their families, in order to relieve suffering and improve quality of life. Care is provided from early diagnosis through to bereavement care of the family. Palliative care is delivered by an interprofessional team which is most often comprised of medicine, nursing, social work and chaplaincy; other professions are often involved such as pharmacy, occupational therapy and others. (Note: This is an online course).  

Reserve: SWK Masters Students Only  
Only offered Online  

New course description (for revision only):  

Meet Type(s): Lecture Seminar Seminar Tutorial  
Primary Meet Type: Lecture  
Requisites: None  

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒  
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒  
Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status: Sections combined/heldwith:
Rationale for request:

There are currently no social work courses in palliative care in the country. With the aging population, there is a growing need for greater palliative care resources. This course will help position social workers to work in palliative care and become leaders in the field.

This is an elective course.

Prepared by: Marion Reid

Date: 5-Nov-14
Faculty: Applied Health Science
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course ☒ New ☒ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title: Choose an item.
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: N/A (e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: SWK Course number: 690R
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Special Topics: Substance Abuse & Chemical Dependency
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department

Course Description:
This course serves as an overview of addiction, chemical abuse and chemical dependency and how social workers and pharmacists can independently or as a member of an interprofessional health team impact those affected. Topics include prevention, identification, treatment options, clinical aspects of treatment, and an understanding of support systems available for those in recovery. (Note: This is an online course).

Reserve: SWK Masters Students Only
Only offered Online

New course description (for revision only): N/A

Meet Type(s): Lecture Seminar Seminar Tutorial
Primary Meet Type: Lecture
Requisites: None

Special topics course: Yes ☒ No ☐
Cross-listed: Yes ☒ No ☐

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with: Pharmacy 375 Course ID: 014163
**Rationale for request:**

This course reflects the growing need among learners in health care professions such as Social Work and Pharmacy for pedagogy that is interdisciplinary in nature. The MSW program offered at Renison University College is the only online program that prepares students to engage in the delivery of healthcare at the micro, mezzo and macro level. A deeper understanding of the etiology and best practices of addictions and mental health is necessary to support this goal.

This is an elective course.

Prepared by: Alice Schmidt Hanbidge PhD  
Date: 29-Oct-14

Colleen McMillan PhD
Faculty:    Applied Health Science
Effective term:    Term/Year Spring 2015

Course ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☒ New ☒ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title:  Master’s Seminar Presentation

For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code:  Choose an item.  Course number:
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces):
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):
Grading Basis: Credit/no credit
Course Credit Weight:  Choose an item.
Course Consent Required:  ☐ Choose an item.
Course Description:
New course description (for revision only):

Meet Type(s):  Choose an item.  Choose an item.  Choose an item.  Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type:  Choose an item.
Requisites:
Special topics course:  Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed:  Yes ☐ No ☒
Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/heldwith:

Rationale for request:  In the original MSW proposal, the capstone presentation was included in the practicum course SWK 607R.  SWK 607R was changed to a milestone degree requirement in 2012.  Now that the first MSW cohort has completed the program (including 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. The new milestone degree requirement will read:

Milestone Seminar Presentation

The capstone experience is intended to be both a synthesizing experience and a culminating
experience; the focus is on the development of the “professional self”. The capstone experience is a student-directed demonstration of beginning master’s level practitioner competence developed over the student’s career, a chronicle of career development and reflection and a glimpse into the student’s professional future learning through a plan for continued growth. It is a scholarly and creative collection of artifacts accumulated through course work, field practicum and daily experiences that demonstrate the students’ abilities to articulate a model of practice and sense of the integration of the domains of professional social work. The capstone experience culminates in designated days of student sharing and demonstration to a panel of social work professionals about their learning as MSW students. Like the practicum, it will be graded as credit/non-credit.

Therefore, the following would change in the GSO calendar.

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.
TO: Members, Senate Graduate and Research Council
FROM: Marina Ivanova, Administrative Coordinator, Arts Graduate Studies & Research
RE: Graduate Affairs Group Reports dated December 18th, 2014 and January 22nd, 2015

The attached Arts Graduate Affairs Group reports were approved by the Arts Faculty Council meetings on January 13, 2015 and February 10th, 2015 and are now being submitted for approval by the Senate Graduate and Research Council on April 13th 2015.

Marina Ivanova

Attach.
ARTS FACULTY COUNCIL
REPORT TO SENATE GRAD AND RESEARCH COUNCIL
March 2015

CURRICULAR ITEMS for approval [bottom centre pagination]

A) Sociology
   Course Inactivation: SOC 766 Participatory Action Research [pg.1]
   Course Inactivation: SOC 768 Community Engagement & Social Development [pg.2]

B) School of Accounting & Finance
   Memorandum [pg.3]
   Course Activation: TAX 614 An Introduction to Accounting for Income Tax [pg.4]
   Course Inactivation: TAX 615 Taxation and Finance [pg.5]
   Course Inactivation: TAX 617 Integration of Tax/Audit/Accounting [pg.6]
   Course Revision: TAX 636 Estate and Retirement Planning [pg.7]

C) Anthropology
   Memorandum [pg.8]
   Course Revision: ANTH 600 Public Issues Anthropology [pg.9]
   Course Revision: ANTH 604 Human Development in a Cross-Cultural Perspective [pg.10]
   Course Revision: ANTH 608 Anthropological Theory [pg.11]
   Course Revision: ANTH 614 Research Methods [pg.12]
   Course Revision: ANTH 659 Conservation, Communities and Globalization [pg.13]
   Course Revision: ANTH 661 Research Seminar in Public Issues Anthropology [pg.14]

D) Sociology
   Course Revision: SOC 716 Qualitative Methods [pg.15]

E) Psychology
   Course Revision: PSYCH 677A Fundamentals of Behavioural Neuroscience [pg.16-17]

FYI:
ADDS nominations:
Jennifer Mensch, Philosophy
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Winter 2015
Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☒
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title:
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)
Course Subject code: SOC Course number: 766
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Participatory Action Research
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Participatory Action Research
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: N/A ☐

Course Description: This course is designed to introduce students to the history, theoretical background and application of Participatory Action Research represents an alternative and collaborative approach to the design implementation and outcomes of a community-based research project whereby democratic processes of social and organizational change are a priority. A PAR approach is both a method for conducting research and a framework for the ongoing negotiation of building meaningful collaborations with community participants for the purpose of encouraging and/or facilitating social change and social action. The use of various methodologies including peer researchers, mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative), knowledge translation, mobilization strategies for the purpose of needs assessment, program evaluation and policy research, will be explored. Examples of PAR in Canada will be examined as well as examples from international practice. Both the benefits and challenges of a PAR approach will be discussed throughout the course.

New course description (for revision only):
Meet Type(s): Seminar
Primary Meet Type: Seminar
Requisites: no
Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed: Yes ☒ No ☐

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request: Soc 766, Participatory Action Research, was a course option made available when the Community Research Methodology sub-specialization was implemented, approved in January 2009 as per SGRC minutes. As the Community Research Methodology Sub-Specialization was inactivated in June 2014, this course no longer serves a purpose. SDS 450 is currently cross listed with Soc 766. With the deactivation of Soc 766 it will indicate SDS 450 as a standalone.

Prepared by: Ilona Kosa Date: 24-Nov-14
Faculty: Arts

Effective term: Term/Year Winter 2015
Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☒
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title:
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)
Course Subject code: SOC Course number: 768
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Community Engagement & Social Development
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Community Engagement
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: N/A ☐

Course Description: This course highlights the importance of participation by community members in matters related to their well-being and with methods to encourage their involvement. Community based research (CBR) as a method to engage communities towards social development will be explored. Processes of community entry and community engagement, particularly with disenfranchised and/or marginalized communities, will be examined, whereby methods for enhancing community capacity, inclusion, and empowerment will be given special attention. The role of effective leadership toward creating and sustaining social innovation will be discussed and examples of innovative social development practices in Canada will be assessed as well as examples from international practice. The theoretical and historical background of social development will be covered, including social capital theory, and political economy perspectives of urban sustainability.

New course description (for revision only):
Meet Type(s): Seminar
Primary Meet Type: Seminar
Requisites: no
Special topics course: ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐
Cross-listed: ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status: Sections combined/held with:
Rationale for request: Soc 768, Community Engagement & Social Development, was a course option made available when the Community Research Methodology sub-specialization was implemented, approved in January 2009 as per SGRC minutes. As the Community Research Methodology Sub-Specialization was inactivated in June 2014, this course no longer serves a purpose. SDS 450 is currently cross listed with Soc 768. With the deactivation of Soc 768 it will indicate SDS 450 as a standalone.
Prepared by: Ilona Kosa Date: 24-Nov-14
MEMORANDUM

To: Graduate Affairs Group
From: Deb Kraft
   Director, Master of Taxation Program
   School of Accounting & Finance
Date: December 1, 2014
Re: Master of Taxation Program Changes

a. Introduction of a New Course

   Background:
   A new course, Tax 614 (Accounting for Income Taxes), is being introduced to expand and
   enhance the student’s knowledge in the area of accounting for income taxes. It will be a 12-
   week, required course. Tax 614 will replace two 6-week courses (Tax 615 and Tax 617).

   This change has been approved by the faculty in the School of Accounting and Finance at their
   November 28, 2014 meeting.

   Tax 614 (Accounting for Income Taxes) Course Description:
   The goal of financial accounting is to reflect the economic activities of the firm in its financial
   statements. Students are introduced to accounting for income taxes with a particular focus on
   analyzing differences between accounting and tax treatments, computing tax provisions, and
   disclosing tax information in corporate financial statements. They will build a solid grounding in
   the preparation of accounting information related to taxation. Through exposure to both
   internal and external uses of tax accounting disclosures, students also gain an appreciation for
   the role of financial accounting in tax planning and compliance decisions.

   Motions:
   1. Motion: To add Tax 614, Accounting for Income Taxes, as a new required course
      beginning in the Fall 2015
   2. Motion: To remove Tax 617, Integration of Tax/Audit/Accounting, as a required course
      effective in the Fall 2015 (last course taught in Fall 2014)
   3. Motion: To remove Tax 615, Taxation and Finance, as a required course effective in the
      Fall 2015 (last course taught in Fall 2014)

b. Change to Enrolment Coding

   Background:
   Courses in the Master of Taxation program require the department’s consent to register. This
   was the original intent and is how all of the courses are coded, except Tax 636 (Estate &
   Retirement Planning). There appears to be an error in the calendar where Tax 636 does not have
   this restriction. We are requesting this change to reflect the intended coding.

   Motion: To amend the course description of TAX 636 to include “Department Consent
   Required”.
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Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015
Course ☒ New ☒ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
New milestone title:
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: TAX Course number: 614
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): An Introduction to Accounting for Income Taxes
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Tax Accounting
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department

Course Description:
The goal of financial accounting is to reflect the economic activities of the firm in its financial statements. This course introduces students to the accounting for income taxes with a particular focus on analyzing differences between accounting and tax treatments, computing tax provisions, and disclosing tax information in corporate financial statements. The course also provides exposure to the both internal and external uses of tax accounting disclosures. In doing so, the course builds a solid grounding in the preparation of accounting information, but also helps students gain an appreciation for the role of financial accounting in tax planning and compliance decisions.

New course description (for revision only):
Meet Type(s): Lecture
Primary Meet Type: Lecture
Requisites:
Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request:
This new course expands and enhances a current 6-week course (Tax 617) and makes it a full 12 week course. Tax 617 will be eliminated.

Prepared by: Deb Kraft, MTax Program Director Date: 28-Nov-14
Faculty:  Arts  
Effective term:  Term/Year  Fall  2015  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>☒</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Inactivation</th>
<th>☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Inactivation</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New milestone title: | Choose an item.  
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:  
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites) |
| Course Subject code:  TAX | Course number: 615  
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Taxation and Finance  
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): |
| Grading Basis: | Choose an item.  
Course Credit Weight: | 0.25  
Course Consent Required: | ☐ | Choose an item.  
Course Description:  
New course description (for revision only): |
| Meet Type(s): | Choose an item.  
Primary Meet Type: | Choose an item.  
Requisites: |
| Special topics course: | Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |
| Cross-listed: | Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |
| Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status: |
| Sections combined/held with: |
| Rationale for request: |
| This course is being replaced with new Tax 614. |

Prepared by:  Deb Kraft, MTax Program Director  
Date:  28-Nov-14
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☒
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title: Choose an item.
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: TAX Course number: 617
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Integration of Tax/Audit/Accounting
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):
Grading Basis: Choose an item.
Course Credit Weight: 0.25
Course Consent Required: ☐ Choose an item.
Course Description:
New course description (for revision only):

Meet Type(s): Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Choose an item.
Requisites:

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☐
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☐
Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request:
This 6-week course is being replaced with new Tax 614 (12-week).

Prepared by: Deborah Kraft, Director, Master of Taxation Date: 28-Nov-14
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Winter 2016

Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☒ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title: Choose an item.

For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: (e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)
Please change enrolment code to “Department Consent Required”

Course Subject code: TAX Course number: 636
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Estate and Retirement Planning
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):
Grading Basis: Choose an item.
Course Credit Weight: Choose an item.
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department
Course Description:
New course description (for revision only):

Meet Type(s): Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Choose an item.
Requisites:
Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☐
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☐
Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request:

Courses in the Master of Taxation program require the department’s consent to register. This was the original intent and is how all of the courses are coded, except Tax 636 (Estate & Retirement Planning). There appears to be an error in the calendar where Tax 636 does not have this restriction. We are requesting this change to reflect the intended coding.

Prepared by: Deborah Kraft, Director, Master of Taxation Date: 1-Dec-14
MEMORANDUM

TO: Graduate Affairs Group
FROM: Robert Park, Associate Chair Graduate Studies. Department of Anthropology
DATE: December 12, 2014
RE: Anthropology Course Revisions—adding Department Consent

Description of Proposed Change:
The Department of Anthropology would like to add the note, ‘Departmental Consent Required’ to all its Graduate courses that do not currently require permission for enrollment. These courses are ANTH 600, ANTH 604, ANTH 608, ANTH 614, ANTH 659, and ANTH 661.

Rationale:
This change will ensure that Graduate students from other departments and faculties cannot enroll themselves in these courses in Quest without permission from the department. This measure is to ensure that all students enrolled in these courses will have the necessary background in order to be successful.
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015
Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☒ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
New milestone title: Choose an item.
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: Consent (e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: ANTH  Course number: 600
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Public Issues Anthropology
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Public Issues Anthropology
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department
Course Description:
An examination of the application of anthropological knowledge to public issues. The issues studied will vary from year to year; they may include such topics as race and ethnicity, citizenship and the state, marriage and sexuality, conservation and the environment, and the ownership, interpretation and display of artifacts and human remains. Students will present their research in forms appropriate to both academic and general audiences.

New course description (for revision only): Add: [Note: Department Consent Required]

Meet Type(s): Seminar  Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Seminar
Requisites:
Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒
Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request:
This change will ensure that students from other departments and faculties cannot enroll themselves in these courses in Quest without permission from the department. This measure is to ensure that all students enrolled in these courses will have the necessary background in order to be successful.

Prepared by: Stacy Reda  Date: 11-Dec-14
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☒ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
New milestone title: Choose an item.
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: Consent (e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: ANTH Course number: 604
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Human Development in a Cross-Cultural Perspective
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department

Course Description: Seminar in current issues in the anthropology of the life cycle. This course will deal with child rearing, young adulthood, aging and the female and male life cycles, among other topics, from the perspective of various cultures.

New course description (for revision only): Add: [Note: Department Consent Required]
Meet Type(s): Seminar Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Seminar
Requisites:

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒
Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/heldwith:

Rationale for request:
This change will ensure that students from other departments and faculties cannot enroll themselves in these courses in Quest without permission from the department. This measure is to ensure that all students enrolled in these courses will have the necessary background in order to be successful.

Prepared by: Stacy Reda Date: 11-Dec-14
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☒ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title: Choose an item.

For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: ANTH Course number: 608
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Anthropological Theory
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Anthropological Theory
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department

Course Description: An examination of classical and contemporary anthropological theory, including an emphasis on the most recent directions in the discipline.

New course description (for revision only): Add: [Note: Department Consent Required]

Meet Type(s): Lecture Seminar Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Lecture
Requisites:

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request:
This change will ensure that students from other departments and faculties cannot enroll themselves in these courses in Quest without permission from the department. This measure is to ensure that all students enrolled in these courses will have the necessary background in order to be successful.

Prepared by: Stacy Reda  Date: 11-Dec-14
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☒ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐
New milestone title: Choose an item.
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: Consent
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: ANTH Course number: 614
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Research Methods
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Research Methods
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department
Course Description: An examination of the methods of qualitative research, including participant observation and unstructured interviews, as well as the ethical considerations of fieldwork. Other topics, such as comparative and historical methods, may be included.

New course description (for revision only): Add: [Note: Department Consent Required]

Meet Type(s): Lecture Seminar Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Lecture
Requisites:

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒
Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/heldwith:

Rationale for request:
This change will ensure that students from other departments and faculties cannot enroll themselves in these courses in Quest without permission from the department. This measure is to ensure that all students enrolled in these courses will have the necessary background in order to be successful.

Prepared by: Stacy Reda Date: 11-Dec-14
Faculty: Arts  
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015  
Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☒ Inactivation ☐  
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐  
New milestone title: Choose an item.  
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: Consent (e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)  
Course Subject code: ANTH  
Course number: 659  
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Conservation, Communities and Globalization  
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):  
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL  
Course Credit Weight: 0.50  
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department  
Course Description: Biological anthropology has a long history of examining our closest living relatives, the nonhuman primates. Increasingly, these species are threatened by extinction, which brings to light larger questions regarding our place in the natural world. Anthropology is uniquely positioned to examine the interaction between efforts to conserve biodiversity and natural resources, community rights, and globalization. This course will focus on attempts to balance the preservation of nature within the health and socioeconomic well-being of neighbouring communities, and how these relationships are affected by processes of globalization. Other topics such as the effects of climate change, heritage management, and indigenous rights may be addressed.  
New course description (for revision only): Add: [Note: Department Consent Required]  
Meet Type(s): Seminar  
Primary Meet Type: Seminar  
Requisites:  
Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒  
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒  
Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:  
Sections combined/heldwith:  
Rationale for request:  
This change will ensure that students from other departments and faculties cannot enroll themselves in these courses in Quest without permission from the department. This measure is to ensure that all students enrolled in these courses will have the necessary background in order to be successful.  
Prepared by: Stacy Reda  
Date: 11-Dec-14
Faculty: Arts
Effective term: Term/Year Fall 2015

Course ☒ New ☐ Revision ☒ Inactivation ☐
Milestone ☐ New ☐ Revision ☐ Inactivation ☐

New milestone title: Choose an item.
For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: Consent
(e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: ANTH
Course number: 661
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Research Seminar in Public Issues Anthropology
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):
Grading Basis: NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight: 0.50
Course Consent Required: ☒ Department

Course Description: The objective is to write a research paper in Public Issues Anthropology. In this course, you will learn how to craft a research statement, construct a theoretical model, and interpret, analyse and communicate your results.

New course description (for revision only): Add: [Note: Department Consent Required]

Meet Type(s): Seminar Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item.
Primary Meet Type: Seminar
Requisites:

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☒
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request: This change will ensure that students from other departments and faculties cannot enroll themselves in these courses in Quest without permission from the department. This measure is to ensure that all students enrolled in these courses will have the necessary background in order to be successful.

Prepared by: Stacy Reda
Date: 11-Dec-14
Faculty:  Arts

Effective term:  Spring 2015 Term/Year  Spring 2015
Course ☒ New  ☐ Revision  ☒ Inactivation  ☐
Milestone  ☐ New  ☐ Revision  ☐ Inactivation  ☐

New milestone title:  Choose an item.

For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes:  deletion of prerequisite Soc 712
e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code:  SOC  Course number:  716
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces):  Qualitative Methods
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces):  Qualitative Methods
Grading Basis:  NUMERICAL
Course Credit Weight:  0.50
Course Consent Required:  ☐ Choose an item.

Course Description:  This course covers the basic techniques for collecting, interpreting, and
analyzing qualitative data. The course will operate on two interrelated dimensions, one focused on
understanding the relationship between theory, methods and data, the other focused on practical
techniques such as identifying informants, and coding and analyzing data.

New course description (for revision only):

Meet Type(s):  Seminar  Seminar  Seminar  Seminar
Primary Meet Type:  Seminar
Requisites:

Special topics course:  Yes  ☐  No  ☒
Cross-listed:  Yes  ☐  No  ☒

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:
Sections combined/held with:

Rationale for request:  When Soc 716 was originally conceived, Soc 712 was a prerequisite.
The prerequisite should be removed. The course does not require it.

Prepared by:  Ilona Kosa  Date:  5-Jan-15
Faculty: Arts  
Effective term: Term/Year Spring 2015  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>☒</th>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>Inactivation</th>
<th>☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Inactivation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New milestone title: Choose an item.

For course revisions, indicate the type(s) of changes: Title, description, cross-listing (e.g. consent, description, title, requisites)

Course Subject code: PSYCH  
Course number: 677A  
Course Title (max. 100 characters incl. spaces): Fundamentals of Cognitive Neuroscience  
Course Short Title (max. 30 characters incl. spaces): Fundamentals of CN  
Grading Basis: Choose an item.

Course Credit Weight: Choose an item.

Course Consent Required: ☐ Choose an item.

**Course Description:** This survey course will be team-taught by members of the collaborative program, and will serve to introduce students to major subareas of ongoing behavioural neuroscience research at Waterloo. Topics will include cognitive psychopathology, apraxia, topics in visual neuroscience, early experience and brain development, cognitive electrophysiology, human locomotion, neuropathology of schizophrenia, object recognition, hemispheric specialization, motor control and psychoneuroimmunology.

**New course description (for revision only):** This survey course will be team-taught by members of the Cognitive Neuroscience Area, and will serve to introduce students to ongoing cognitive neuroscience research at Waterloo. Topics will include research using imaging methods of Cognitive Neurosciences (fMRI, ERP), as well as the application of cognitive tasks to better understand the relations between brain and behavior in healthy and atypical populations.

Meet Type(s): Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item. Choose an item.  
Primary Meet Type: Choose an item.

Requisites:

Special topics course: Yes ☐ No ☐
Cross-listed: Yes ☐ No ☒

Course Subject(s) to be cross-listed with and approval status:

Sections combined/held with:

**Rationale for request:** Changes are being made since the collaborative program no longer exists and to reflect the updated course material. Approval to remove the cross-listing with HSG 677 and KIN 687 is forthcoming; the departments will approve the change at faculty level shortly.

Prepared by: Rita A. Cherkewski  Date: 12-Jan-15
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1. Brief Description and Rationale

The Graduate Diploma in Planning will be a for-credit graduate program offered to domestic and international students to advance their professional knowledge and skills in the various aspects of planning. It will be an on-line, course-based, professional program primarily for practicing planners and related professions/fields interested in expanding and updating their knowledge, and enhancing their employment flexibility and opportunity for advancement.

The proposed new graduate program is a Type 3 Graduate Diploma developed by the School of Planning based on the existing Master of Planning and conceived to meet the needs of practicing planners. The proposed Type 3 stand-alone Diploma will be open to domestic and international students. Due to the growing complexity of planning and the distance of many communities from centres with universities, the demand for a focused program with remote participation capabilities is increasing. The on-line offering of the proposed program allows practitioners with busy schedules to participate and to count their course work as part of their continuing professional education requirements. The program will normally be offered only for part-time study.

In addition to a BES (Bachelor of Environmental Studies) the School of Planning currently offers research masters programs leading to MA (Master of Arts) and MES (Master of Environmental Studies) degrees. All three are accredited by the Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP). The School of Planning offers a PhD but CIP does not accredit PhD programs. The School recently revised its non-accredited professional MAES (Master of Applied Environmental Studies), which is now offered part-time, on-line. The revision included a change of degree designation to MPlan (Master of Planning). The MPlan is the “parent” program for the Graduate Diploma.

The previous MAES professional program was offered on campus with a focus on full-time enrolment. However it has not attracted many students since the target audience is practicing planners who are generally working full time. Moving to an entirely on-line format will open the MPlan (the renamed MAES) and the proposed Graduate Diploma in Planning (GDipPlan) to potential students in any location. The availability of on-line courses through the diploma program will provide educational flexibility for those not ready for the longer-term commitment of a full degree program.

2. Objectives of the Program

According to the University of Waterloo Strategic Research Plan, “The University of Waterloo’s mission is to advance learning and knowledge through teaching, research and scholarship in an environment of free inquiry and expression. The University fulfills this mission by: offering undergraduate and graduate students the best possible educational experience in selected regular, co-operative and professional programs; engaging in basic and applied research and scholarly activity that is recognized nationally and internationally; and providing service to society through the transfer of knowledge and cultural enrichment.”

The Faculty of Environment Strategic Plan states in part the desire to, "Enhance the vibrancy of our intellectual community by providing more opportunities for mentorship and peer-to-peer learning relationships.”

The proposed Graduate Diploma in Planning aligns with the mission of the university and the Faculty Strategic Plan by offering the best possible experience for professionals who wish to upgrade their education and connect with our intellectual community. The program will engage practitioners on a wide range of topics from theoretical reflection to specific skills development and will help them stay abreast of new research and thinking within the discipline. The extension of the offering to international students
will lead to the recognition of the University of Waterloo as a centre of excellence for expertise in planning and will play a part in the professional qualification of planners wishing to immigrate. In summary the program objectives are:

- To offer graduate-level, course-work based, professional education for practicing planners
- To provide newly graduated planners an opportunity to pursue graduate education
- To provide new immigrants and foreign-trained planners a program of study that facilitates entry to the Canadian workforce
- To provide learning opportunities for those seeking to remain up-to-date on advancements in planning and planning research

The proposed program may be taken by full-time candidates who could qualify in one or two terms and those who wish to study on a part-time basis while remaining in full-time employment. Candidates in this program are expected to be financially self-supporting.

3. Program Learning Outcomes

Graduates will:

- Develop more breadth and depth of knowledge about planning in Canada
- Be up-to-date on advancements in planning and planning research
- Have a strong understanding of the role planning plays in a modern democracy
- Be able to effectively select, design, and implement plans for community improvement
- Have enhanced ability to effectively communicate with professionals and citizens
- Have conducted critical analysis of issues and new applications related to planning; and
- Have conducted critical analysis of novel issues or new applications related to planning

The outcomes of the program are listed in Table 1. These outcomes have been mapped against Graduate Degree-Level Expectations (GDLE) as shown in the table.

Table 1: Graduate Diploma in Planning Learning Outcomes Mapped to the GDLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To develop more breadth and depth of knowledge about planning in Canada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be up-to-date on advancements in planning and planning research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have a strong understanding of the role that planning plays in a modern democracy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To be able to effectively select, design, and implement suitable strategies for community improvement

To develop the ability to effectively communicate with individuals working on the design and/or implementation of solutions to planning issues

To have conducted critical analysis of novel issues or new applications related to planning issues

To have conducted critical analysis of novel issues or new applications related to planning

4. Admission Requirements

The admission requirements are the same as for admission to the MPlan program in the Faculty of Environment, [https://uwaterloo.ca/planning/future-graduate/programs](https://uwaterloo.ca/planning/future-graduate/programs). These are summarized as follows:

- An honours Bachelor’s degree (or equivalent) in an acceptable discipline, from a university of recognized standing, with at least a B+ (78%) standing or equivalent for international applicants
- Three letters of reference, (at least one must be from an academic)
- Proof of competency in English (if applicable)
  - TOEFL: minimum score of 100, with minimum skill scores of 26 in each of speaking and writing
  - Paper-based TOEFL - minimum of 600 overall is required and 4.0 on the TWE and 50 in the TSE
- Two years of work experience in Planning or a related field
- NOTE – if the Faculty and/or the University changes the language requirement this section would be adjusted accordingly
- The fee structure will be the same as for the MPlan

5. Diploma Requirements

The proposed graduate diploma requirements are as follows:

- Four, one-term (0.5 unit) graduate level courses (or courses acceptable for graduate credit)
  - The mandatory (on-line) course, Plan 700: Theory and Practice of Planning,
  - Three courses from the on-line offerings listed in section 7 or other courses offered by the School
- The candidate must obtain a passing grade in all courses with a minimum overall average of no less than 70% (Faculty requirement for graduate-level coursework)
6. Program Structure

The normal graduation requirements for this program include accumulating a total of four courses. The program entails one mandatory core course and three elective courses. The candidates who are registered in the proposed program are normally expected to complete the minimum number of courses in two to four academic terms. The expected start date of the Diploma is Fall 2015.
7. Graduate Diploma in Planning Courses

The School of Planning offered four graduate on-line courses in 2014-15 with current work on additional courses underway. The following five on-line graduate courses are part of the proposed diploma program, offered and ready for Fall 2015. This list will expand in the years ahead as more on-line electives are added within the Planning program and through agreements with relevant on-line programs at the University of Waterloo.

- PLAN 700 Planning Paradigms and Theory
  Historical background and development of planning including cultural, philosophical and disciplinary roots; planning theory and its applications in urban, regional, service and environmental areas.

- PLAN 705 Design in Planning
  The foundation of this course is the intersection of the strong relation between urban design as the shaping of urban space and urban planning as the strategic and regulatory mediation of urban change. Establishing the basis of this relationship, the course critically explores contemporary issues in urban design and their implications for urban futures, planning, the environment, and the public realm. Case studies drawn from around the globe are featured.

- PLAN 706 Contemporary Issues in Planning
  The major issues facing cities today are central to Planning research and practice realms which include, housing, economic development, quality of life, design, transportation and sustainability. This course provides a framework for issue exploration which connects research, public discourse, media, and planning practice.

- PLAN 625 Methods of Social Investigation for Planners
  Selected research approaches and methods used in planning research and practice including, for example, survey research, field research, participatory research; methods using existing data; needs assessment research. The purposes of social inquiry, the development of theories, the use of research in policy-making, and the ethical issues associated with social research provide the context for discussing the details of research methods. A course for those with some research skills and wishing to pursue planning-related methods.

- PLAN 704 Methods of Planning Analysis
  This course is a graduate level introduction into the analytical methods employed in planning research and practice. The broad spectrum of tools, approaches and techniques drawn from quantitative and qualitative traditions will be reviewed. Commonly employed examples will form the basis for developing applied problem solving skills. Operational considerations, critical assessment, and analytical communication provide the important review context. The following is a tentative list of the next courses that the School of Planning is targeting for development for on-line delivery.

- PLAN 619 Regional Planning Economic and Investment Analysis
- PLAN 615 Community Economic Development
- PLAN 622 Contemporary Urban Planning and Governance
- PLAN 639 Health, Environment and Planning
- PLAN 641 Heritage Planning Workshop
- PLAN 657 GIS and Spatial Decision Support for Planning and Resource Management

8. Mode of Delivery
These on-line courses are generally part of the MPlan degree but will be available to students wishing either to complete the Graduate Diploma in Planning or to enroll as non-degree students to take an individual course. This provides the maximum flexibility for prospective students.

9. Assessment of Teaching and Learning

Teaching Assessment

High standards of teaching excellence and quality learning experience are the key to the University of Waterloo education and reputation. Teaching evaluation and student feedback will be collected to evaluate the quality of each course and the program as a whole. Like other courses, the CEL questionnaire for on-line course evaluation will be employed to assess the teaching quality. In addition to the quality indicators therein, the students will be given an opportunity to evaluate the on-line education experiences with an open-ended question. Surveys will be generated and analyzed at the departmental level to ensure each student’s anonymity and encourage honest feedback. Results will not be released until final marks have been reported to the Office of the Registrar. Data will be used by Course developers and instructors to improve course content and presentation.

Learning Assessment

All the policies applied to the in-class on-campus graduate students will apply to the remote students. Each individual instructor will be given the power to evaluate the students based on his/her best judgment of the students’ performances. Depending on the individual instructor the evaluation methods may use more on-line tools. Students will be evaluated by completing: on-line quizzes, virtual tutorial activities where applicable, on-line group discussions, on-line assignments and projects, and final exams. Students are encouraged to share their technical experience while being given opportunities to exchange information amongst class-mates. These on-line class activities are considered to be effective tools for the assessment of students’ learning.

The University of Waterloo’s Center for Extended Learning will coordinate the proctoring of final exams for remote students in their exam centers nationally and internationally.

10. Resources

Human Resources

Three experienced tenured faculty members will teach in the program from its launch. The faculty member who will be the core instructor in the proposed program is Pierre Filion. Professors Laura Johnson and John Lewis are the other current instructors offering on-line courses. Two more on-line courses are in preparation and will be taught by Professors Mark Seasons and Luna Khirfan. Over the next four years eight other regular planning faculty members will join the on-line team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name &amp; Rank</th>
<th>Gender (M/F)</th>
<th>Home Unit</th>
<th>Supervisory Privileges</th>
<th>Human/Built Environment</th>
<th>Physical/Natural Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Filion, Professor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lewis, Associate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Parker, Associate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td>Advisor Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu Qian, Assistant</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Seasons, Professor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Casello, Associate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Dean Assistant</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Drescher, Assistant</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Feick Associate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Johnson Professor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luna Khirfan Associate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Law, Associate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Lewis, Associate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Mitchell, Assistant</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus Moos, Assistant</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Woudsma, Associate</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>Masters/PhD</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category 1 are those whose advising is entirely within Planning while Category 3 are those who also advise in other departments.

As documented in their CVs, the faculty members have a proven record of accomplishments, in both teaching and research. They have been actively involved in curriculum developments through novel pedagogies while being committed to utilize active learning methods in their lectures. Their commitment to teaching has resulted in enviable evaluations in their courses.

**Teaching Resources**
The School of Planning is currently undergoing its regular cyclical review and up-to-date information on library and other resources is available.

**Financial Resources**
Existing human and financial resources are in place to support the MPlan degree. No extra resources will be required to launch the new graduate diploma program. The School of Planning has access to extensive support for on-line learning provided by the Centre for Extended Learning.

**Teaching Assistants**
The School will provide the instructors with adequate teaching assistance to conduct on-line delivery of the courses based on the number of students enrolled and types of assessment.

**Compensation to instructors**
All courses planned will be within the regular teaching assignments of the core faculty so there will be no requirement for additional compensation.

**Funding for program promotion**
The School of Planning will provide funding for local and global advertisement in selected international conferences, domestic and international newspapers, and in special circumstances travel to international institutes, for recruitment purposes.
11. Quality and Other Indicators

The proposed program is structured to ensure each student acquires theoretical, practical and professional skills commensurate with a graduate diploma program, as indicated in learning outcomes and its mapping to the course structure (see Table 1). The School of Planning has a unique team of faculty with expertise in areas of professional planning. The expertise covers a wide range of topics and technologies.

12. Projected Enrollment

This proposed Diploma and our MPlan degree will be unique in Canada and welcomed by those seeking to pursue graduate level education related to cities, communities and planning. We expect 10 to 25 students in the first years with the potential for those numbers to grow in the future following the implementation of marketing and promotion around our flexible offerings. (MPlan, Diploma, or Individual Courses).

13. Promotion Plan

Upon approval of this proposal, the program will be advertised in the publications of domestic and international professional societies and newspapers. The material will also be delivered to our own graduates as some of them may want to continue their part time education. Faculty members are encouraged to travel to international conferences and other countries to promote the program. In particular, we will attend both the meetings of the provincial and the national planning institutes.

14. Financial Plan

There is no financial plan for this proposed diploma because the resources already exist to support its delivery through the MPlan and current departmental (School of Planning and broader institution) resources available.
Items for Information

a) Gage-Babcock Graduate Fire Safety Award – trust

Previously approved at SG&RC in June 2010 as follows:

An award valued at $3,000 will be awarded annually to a graduate student enrolled in the MEng, MASc or PhD programs in Mechanical Engineering (Fire Safety) in the Faculty of Engineering. Selection will be based on academic achievement (minimum cumulative average of 80%) and a proven interest and involvement in fire safety research. Interested students must apply for the award and submit it to the Fire Safety Program Coordinator each Fall.

The award is made possible by an annual donation over five years from Gage-Babcock Associates Limited.

It is the intention of the donor to continue the award for the next five years, until 2019. There is no revision in the eligibility or selection criteria, however the value of the award is being increased from $3,000 to $4,000 annually.
TO: Mike Grivcic, Assistant University Secretary, Senate Graduate and Research Council

FROM: Jeanette Nugent, Associate Director, Graduate Admissions

RE: Agenda item for Senate Graduate & Research Council – April 2015

Rationale:
The regulations on Graduate Admissions were written prior to the implementation of professional graduate programs at the University of Waterloo. Subsequently a number of programs were approved by Senate and Quality Council with requirements that differ from the minimum stated in the graduate calendar regarding the requirement of academic references. Since professional reference letters are now accepted for certain graduate programs, it is necessary to update the wording in the Graduate Academic Calendar to reflect this. [http://gradcalendar.uwaterloo.ca/page/GSO-General-Admission](http://gradcalendar.uwaterloo.ca/page/GSO-General-Admission)

Proposed Change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Calendar Copy:</th>
<th>Proposed Revised Calendar Copy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's Admission</strong></td>
<td><strong>A 75% overall standing in the last two years, or equivalent, in a four-year Honours Bachelor's degree or equivalent is the minimum requirement for admission to a Master's program. Departments and Faculties may set higher admission requirements.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of two letters of reference from academic referees are required for admission to a Master's program. Departments or Faculties may set higher requirements.</td>
<td>A minimum of two letters of reference are required for admission to a Master's program. <strong>Academic references are required unless a professional reference is specified (see program admission requirements).</strong> Departments or Faculties may set higher requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Admission</strong></td>
<td><strong>A 75% overall standing, or equivalent, in the previous degree is the minimum requirement for admission to a PhD program. In addition, candidates must demonstrate other superior qualifications, such as advanced research ability. It should be noted that many departments have</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 75% overall standing, or equivalent, in the previous degree is the minimum requirement for admission to a PhD program. In addition, candidates must demonstrate other superior qualifications, such as advanced research ability. It should be noted that many departments have</td>
<td><strong>A 75% overall standing, or equivalent, in the previous degree is the minimum requirement for admission to a PhD program. In addition, candidates must demonstrate other superior qualifications, such as advanced research ability. It should be noted that many departments have</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments have standards higher than the minimum. Some departments admit exceptional applicants directly into the PhD from an Honours undergraduate program; most admit from the Master's into the PhD; and in certain instances a candidate who has successfully completed one PhD may be admitted into a second PhD in a complementary area. A minimum of three letters of reference from academic referees are required for admission to a PhD program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards higher than the minimum. Some departments admit exceptional applicants directly into the PhD from an Honours undergraduate program; most admit from the Master's into the PhD; and in certain instances a candidate who has successfully completed one PhD may be admitted into a second PhD in a complementary area. A minimum of three letters of reference are required for admission to a PhD program. Academic references are required unless a professional reference is specified (see program admission requirements).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

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 (UW) 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. The UW 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 the UW IQAP was reviewed and updated in March 2015.

Any changes to the IQAP are subject to approval by UW’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 the UW guidelines for Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (adopted by Senate in 2008), and the UW 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, UW 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 the UW 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 UW’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 appropriate for the

^1Note that while University of Waterloo 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.
institution. At the University of 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 University of 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 UW, 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 UW community. At the University of 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.

UW 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 for professional programs commonly occurs on a five year cycle and the UW schedule of reviews 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 UW and the Quality Council requirements for a program 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. This data is not publicly available.

The following sections outline the expectations and processes associated with program reviews at the University of Waterloo.

B. Cyclical Reviews of Existing Academic Programs

1. Academic Programs not related to Professional Accreditation

The Quality Assurance Framework specifies the key elements for the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). The University of Waterloo’s approach to fulfilling each of the criteria is described in the sections “Guidelines for Self-Studies” and “Guidelines for Site Visits” below.

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

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

5. provide an institutional manual that supports the institutional quality assurance process. Note that the approach at UW 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 the UW IQAP meets criteria 1 through 4 is described below.

**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 UW 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 review.

Under each heading in the UW 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
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 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 UW 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.

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.

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
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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 Services (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 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 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. 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 UW 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 UW 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 UW, 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
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 program response, including the implementation plan. 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. 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 publically 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.

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

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

Table 1. Summary of timelines for reviews of existing programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall (September), previous academic year</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Complete draft of self-study submitted to AVPA/APGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Final copies of v.I (self-study), v. II (faculty CVs) and v. III (proposed reviewers) submitted to AVPA/APGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Winter</td>
<td>Site visit occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 weeks after site visit</td>
<td>External reviewers submit report to AVPA/APGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks after external reviewers’ report received</td>
<td>Chair/director submits comments on factual errors/issues in report to AVPA/APGS or both for augmented reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 weeks after external reviewers’ report received</td>
<td>Program response submitted on what was learned from self-study and external reviewers’ report, and plans for future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks after program response received</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February of subsequent academic year</td>
<td>Provost reports to Board of Governors all programs reviewed in previous academic year cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years after site visit</td>
<td>Two-year progress report submitted by department/school to Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council for approval, and Senate for information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 UW responsible for the professional accreditation together with the director of the program, to review the guidelines for the accreditation and UW reviews, and to determine what additional information, if any, is required for the UW 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 UW review process.

When the review team is appointed by an accreditation organization, UW will seek to have a UW faculty member included as a member of the review team. If this is not possible, then UW may arrange to have a UW faculty member conduct interviews and examine documents related to the UW 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. 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 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, UW 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 UW 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, UW 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). UW has made arrangements with the Affiliated and Federated Institutions of Waterloo to ensure that program reviews are completed in a coordinated manner. 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 UW. During their program reviews, academic departments at UW 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 councils, 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.

C. Reviews of New Programs

At University of 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). 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 Services is required. The proposal specifies the tuition rate the program intends to adopt as well as the expected provincial funding weight (BIU weight).

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. 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).

9. Thereafter 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</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, in non-core areas</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>Yes, in non-core areas</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 UW’s academic excellence goals
- the program name is appropriate to the content and recognizable to employers
- the program reflects UW 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 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; 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 and by MTCU, for non-core undergraduate programs and all graduate programs which are requesting approval for specific funding for BIU entitlement.

Program Proposal
A program proposal document is required, following the provided template (volume I – Proposed Brief).

Any proposed new program will be reviewed using the Quality Assurance Framework criteria for new programs, reproduced verbatim below:

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 advertised 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
- 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 3: Timelines for approval of new programs
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------
| **Month 1**      | Approval by department                         |
| **Month 2**      | Approval by faculty                            |
|                  | • co-op report commissioned                    |
|                  | • library report commissioned                  |
|                  | • list of possible external reviewers sent to office of AVPA/APGS |
|                  | • proposal brief prepared (allow 1 month for external reviewers to read document) |
| **Months: 5-6**  | External reviewer site visit; review report received within 2 weeks Chair/director ensures consultation and implementation of any changes recommended by reviewers; submits revised brief |
| **Months: 6-7**  | Approval by Senate Undergraduate Council/Senate Graduate and Research Council |
| **Months: 7-8**  | Approval by Senate; advertising permitted with qualification “subject to approval by the Quality Council” |
| **Months 8-9**   | Submission to Quality Council and MTCU (if required) |
| **Month 10**     | Approval by the Quality Council                 |
| **Months: 13-24**| Approval by MTCU                                |
| **Two years after site visit** | Two-year progress report submitted, as for existing programs |

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 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). 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


Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

Motivation

• Most Ontario universities have a Fall Break varying from 2-5 days in length

• WLU initiated a 3 year pilot in Fall 2014

• There was an impending undergraduate student referendum on desirability of a Fall Break at uWaterloo
Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

Working group established in Spring 2014 to:

• Outline all scheduling options and note pros and cons of each
• Recommend an option should one become clearly optimal

Group was asked not take a position on whether or not uWaterloo should adopt a Fall Break.
Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

Complicating factors

- 60 teaching days/term
- Fall classes started Monday following Labour Day, regardless of its timing
- Pre-final exam study days (minimum 2)
- Tight exam schedule (12 days in past, 14 days for last few years)
- No Sunday exams
- Exams must end on Dec. 22
- uWaterloo teaches 3 terms/year (co-op)
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Report to Vice-President and Provost: (Sept. 2014)

“Consideration of a Fall Break at the University of Waterloo”

Conclusions

• Recommended a 2-day Fall Break ➔ start classes 2 days early (Thursday of Orientation Week)
• Consider a trial pilot for 3 years
• Develop strategies to maximize student benefit from a Fall Break
• Develop terms of reference for a mid-term break
• Consult widely with all stakeholder groups to understand potential obstacles/complications to implementing a Fall Break
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Undergraduate Student Referendum: (Nov. 2014)

- Over 6000 students responded to the question:
  "Should classes start on the first Thursday after Labour Day to allow two additional days off in the Fall Term?"
- 4600 students (~74%) voted in favour of the proposed break

Working group was asked to explore more fully implementation of a Fall Break with uWaterloo community
Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

**Stakeholders consulted** (Nov. 2014 – Jan. 2015)

- Faculty Association, Staff Association
- Federation of Students, Undergraduate Students Relations Committee
- Graduate Students Association, Graduate Students Relations Committee
- Leadership Forum
- CUPE Local 793, Custodial and Ground Services, Food Services

**Report to Vice-President and Provost:** (Feb. 2015)

“Proposed Fall Break – Stakeholder Consultation”
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Issues raised

• Faculty, staff and co-op students who work or study during the spring term saw the break before the Fall term as important for holidays, and for international students, family visits. An early start effectively reduces this time interval by 4 days.

• Views were mixed as to impact of shortening Orientation Week

• Concern was expressed that scheduling issues would arise (e.g., tutorials, Science labs)

• Senior students would be tempted to miss classes Thursday and Friday after Labour Day
## Spring to Fall transitions – impact on possible holiday time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class end</th>
<th>Exams end</th>
<th>Grades are due</th>
<th>Co-op ends</th>
<th>Labour Day</th>
<th>Classes start</th>
<th>Classes start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before the start of classes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 – Earliest Labour Day</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 days</td>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>Sept. 1</td>
<td>Sept. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 days</td>
<td>18 days</td>
<td>11 days</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 – Latest Labour Day</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 days</td>
<td>29 days</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>Sept. 7</td>
<td>Sept. 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 days</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 – Earliest roll-out</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 days</td>
<td>29 days</td>
<td>22 days</td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>Sept. 5</td>
<td>Sept. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 days</td>
<td>25 days</td>
<td>18 days</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Options for timing of a Fall Break
(in order of preference)

1. Extension of Thanksgiving weekend
   (~1 month after classes start)
2. Last Thursday and Friday in October
   (~1.5 months after classes start)
3. Attached to Remembrance Day holiday
   (~3 weeks before end of classes)
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Thanksgiving weekend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially coincides with break at WLU</td>
<td>May occur too early in term to be strategically beneficial to students (~1 month after classes start)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows a 5-day break (capitalizes on Thanksgiving Monday)</td>
<td>May interfere with early term momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes disruption to Science labs scheduled on all 5 days of the week or that run bi-weekly</td>
<td>Sub-optimal timing for fall co-op process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs before most mid-term tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Last Thursday/Friday in October

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimal timing for co-op process</td>
<td>Effectively a 4-day break (rather than 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurs around time of most mid-term tests – optimal for student success?</td>
<td>Not synchronized with WLU fall break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disruption to Science labs scheduled on all 5 days of the week or that run bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attached to Remembrance Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimal timing for co-op process</td>
<td>Effectively a 4-day break (rather than 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not synchronized with WLU fall break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disruption to Science labs scheduled on all 5 days of the week or that run bi-weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-optimal benefit to students (after mid-terms, after drop date for courses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>2016</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Labour Day</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>8 Classes start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario 1
No Remembrance Day holiday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13 Break</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20 Break</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27 Alt break</td>
<td>28 Alt break</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scheduling of Saturday class TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Classes end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Exams start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 exam days
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>2016</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Labour Day</td>
<td>6 Orientation</td>
<td>7 Orientation</td>
<td>8 Classes start</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Thanksgiving</td>
<td>11 Break</td>
<td>12 Break</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alt break 9</td>
<td>Alt break 10</td>
<td>11 Rem. Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19 Make up day</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 Classes end</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Study</td>
<td>6 Study</td>
<td>7 Exams start</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22 Exams end</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scenario 2**
Includes Remembrance Day holiday

Scheduling of Saturday classes TBD

14 exam days
Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

Need to commit to examine ways to maximize time gap between Spring and Fall terms

1. Schedule exams early for instructors teaching in Spring and Fall terms?
2. Schedule start of Spring exams earlier?
Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

Motion 1:

Modify calendar guidelines for 3 years to include a two-day fall break following Thanksgiving by allowing classes to start earlier by two days (Thursday of Orientation Week). Evaluate initiative to extend pilot to permanent guideline if deemed successful after 3 years.
Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

Motion 2 (if Motion 1 does not pass):

Modify calendar guidelines for 3 years to include a two-day fall **break being the last Thursday and Friday in October** by allowing classes to start earlier by two days (Thursday of Orientation Week). Evaluate initiative to extend pilot to permanent guideline if deemed successful after 3 years.
Proposal for the Adoption of a Fall Break

**Motion 3 (if Motion 2 does not pass):**

If Remembrance Day is designated as a statutory holiday, modify calendar guidelines for 3 years to include a two-day fall break attached to Remembrance Day holiday by allowing classes to start earlier by two days (Thursday of Orientation Week). Evaluate initiative to extend pilot to permanent guideline if deemed successful after 3 years.